

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 14 April, 1980

Time: 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham(Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions. . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of Peter J. Reimer and Others, Praying for the passing of an Act to Incorporate the Bethesda Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Eighth Annual Report of the Manitoba Police Commission for the year 1979.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance indicate whether or not the introduction of the provincial budget will be delayed pending the introduction of the federal budget in order to better ascertain the steps that the federal government have in mind pertaining to assistance to homeowners, business, and farmers, in light of today's Throne Speech announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, inasmuch as there was no indication in the Throne Speech this morning as to an early date for the federal budget, it seems most likely that we're now looking at some time later on in the second half of 1980 for a federal budget; that being the case, then the answer to the question would be no. I would think that if a federal budget were coming in any time in the next few weeks, that very likely we would have heard about it this morning.

MR. PAWLEY: A further question to the House Leader or the Attorney-General. In view of the announcement from Ottawa that freedom of information legislation will be introduced, can the Minister advise whether or not the impact of the resolution that was passed in this House last year re the establishment of freedom of information vehicle, will indeed be established during this session?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not fully aware of the announcements that were apparently in the Throne Speech this morning. I am not certain if the new government intends to introduce the legislation that was brought forward by the previous government. Perhaps I could take the question as notice and refer back to the resolution that was apparently passed in order that I might have a chance to look at that.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed I'd like to ask the indulgence of the House to welcome 22 students of Grade V and VI standing from Montrose Elementary School under the direction of Mrs. Laura Hanna, this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights. On behalf of all the Honourable Members we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Attorney-General, whether or not the federal government proceed with freedom of information legislation, does the Attorney-General intend to introduce legislation along the measures as outlined in the resolution which was passed in this Chamber some two years ago, pertaining to freedom of information legislation?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and examine the resolution that was apparently passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports. Can the Minister advise me whether there are negotiations under way of which he is aware and whether there are any developments with respect to the proposed exchange of surplus hydro power as between Manitoba and states in the United States, I believe Nebraska is included, whereby Manitoba would sell power in the wintertime and receive surplus power in exchange in the summertime.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, those negotiations are currently proceeding.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the negotiations are taking place, is the Manitoba Hydro Board free to deal with a letter which they received from the opposite party in these negotiations and which they have apparently - or I'm asking whether they have been apparently told that they cannot, of their own consideration, respond to the letter.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Hydro Board will ultimately, if there is a Letter of Intent, letter entered into with Nebraska, it will be that agency, namely the Hydro Board that will enter into it, but inasmuch as that Letter of Intent would lead to an agreement which would have to be ratified by the Legislative Counsel, by the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to that extent there has been very close co-ordination, co-operation between the Hydro utility and the government with regard to the Letter of Intent, and from that point of view it has been a joint committee that has been working from the Manitoba point of view on it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister confirm or deny that it is a fact that he has taken charge of these negotiations, that he has prevented the Hydro Board from dealing with the letter which has been sent by the other utility and that, contrary to the recommendations of Mr. Justice Tritschler, there has been no directive in writing stipulating the government's limitations to Hydro with respect to these particular negotiations.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the case is the opposite to what the member is suggesting. The utility in the United States has already cleared all the ingredients of its position with the State Government of Nebraska. At this point in time the conditions of the Letter of Intent are a subject of discussion and negotiation between the government of Manitoba, the Hydro Board personnel and the utility in Nebraska. That is the current state of affairs.

When the conditions that can be entered into for the export sale are satisfactory to both the utility and to the government of Manitoba, we'll be in a position to proceed, and that's where we are now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Then will the Minister not confirm that he has taken charge of these negotiations; that the government of Manitoba has stipulated that the Manitoba Hydro Board cannot conclude them without the consent of the government of Manitoba; and furthermore, that the government's directives have not been put forward, in writing, as recommended by Mr. Justice Tritschler?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the member, I think, is on the wrong track. The Tritschler Report recommended, as one of its principle recommendations, that the government be more responsible and directly involved in extra-provincial negotiations and, in fact, arm itself with sufficient knowledge and manpower to be able to judge these more adequately before they came to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for a decision; and that is exactly what we're doing.

Now, on a second part, as to whether or not the utility has been given written instructions in this regard. In that regard the committee that is working on these was a committee that was set up some time back, almost a year ago, Mr. Speaker, a negotiating committee that was made up of a number of utility people, of government people and an outside committee chaired by a legal counsel there had been a legal counsel for the utility for some time and to that extent the whole host of external negotiations were looked at. Those included, to a lesser degree than some others, the so-called ManDan agreement, but from that negotiating committee has emerged the present one that is currently carrying on the work.

And, Mr. Speaker, from that point of view I can indicate to you that the matters have moved along quite well. But the key to it is, Mr. Speaker, that at this point in time the Nebraska utility had approval of the terms and conditions upon which it was entering into negotiation and that point is still a point of discussion with regard to Manitoba, but emerging principally because the Letters of Intent leading to an agreement would leave very little flexibility for the government to deal with if it came to Order-in Council stage for the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that we thank him for his explanation. That was a rather lengthy explanation.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, members opposite have asked whether or not an enquiry would be held with respect to the death of a patient at the Brandon Mental Health Centre. Mr. Speaker, I would advise members opposite that an inquest will be held into that matter but a date has not yet been set.

On another matter, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood asked me what specific dates had been set for the re-opening of the Ackland inquest. Mr. Speaker, those dates are April 24th and 25th.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether he can look into a situation where a patient from the Health Sciences Centre is apparently recommended for treatment in the United States, and wherein it is apparently the belief of the patient and his family that they have to assume the added costs. I am wondering whether the Minister would find out report to the House, whether or not the Health Services Commission will honour costs incurred outside of Manitoba for medical treatment, wherein the medical people in Manitoba are recommending the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to give me the details of that case I will look into that case

specifically, but in general terms, yes, where a Manitoba resident is referred by a specialist or a practitioner here for medical treatment in the United States, the costs of that are borne by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, to help the Minister, I would indicate to him that the patient's name is one, Mr. Long, from Lockport. It involves a situation of bone marrow transplant, as I understand it, and the community around Lockport and Selkirk is currently involved in a fund raising campaign in an effort to raise some \$30,000 to finance the difference. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba collectively would prefer to finance that cost rather than a few people in the given area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister in charge of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House as to his knowledge regarding the move of the entire Public Welfare Department to 705 Broadway in the Wolseley residential community. I wonder if he could tell us if there was any consultation with the community, any environmental impact study planned or any type of relief in sight for the impact of this very large facility in our community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there as been no consultation with me. I would suggest that the member consult a city councillor.

MR. WILSON: Since this large percentage of welfare recipients initially become wards of the province and since the Minister is in charge of Urban Affairs, could he consider discussing this at the next joint meeting as to the possible extra police protection to avoid the additional panhandling and drunken disturbances and extra social problems occur when a large department of this nature is dropped into a community, and could he also consider the reassessment of property values in the area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Development.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could consider that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Tourism Minister. Would the Honourable Minister please deny that he has today selected a unique personage - I am using what are alleged to be his words - to represent the province in the tourism season and that this is a 21-year old woman, to be known as "The Golden Girl"?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.
The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, Mr. Speaker, I won't deny it. I can't see anything wrong with having an ambassador for the province of Manitoba known as "The Golden Girl". We are very proud of all our girls and women in the province of Manitoba. And I would also say, Mr. Speaker, I don't know her age.

MRS WESTBURY: I was reading from the Minister's own handout. I'm surprised he hadn't read it himself.

Mr. Speaker, is it true that in the Minister's statement he stated that, "This woman is a personage reflecting imagery distinct to Manitoba, qualities such as a vibrancy of youth, golden opportunities, the abundance of sunshine, the economic well-being and the golden harvest," - presumably the golden harvest is a symbol of fertility - "are all embodied in the "Golden Girl" concept, and the most obvious

connection is the Golden Girl's counterpart role to Manitoba's most enduring symbol, the Golden Boy." Can we then, Mr. Speaker, can we take this statement as a confirmation that the rumour abroad in Winnipeg that the Golden Boy is to be replaced by a Sterling Lyon, is not true? --(Interjection)--

MR. JOHNSTON: I thank the honourable member for the ad. I appreciate the advertising. We are very pleased with our choice of ambassador, that will be crossing the provinces with the ambassadors from the other provinces. The last part of her question is not worth answering.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, was this position bulletined and what were the qualities that were being looked for in the appointment of this position?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, her qualities are such that she's a graduate of Red River College, in communications; she's worked with the Tourism Department; she's worked as a tourist guide at this building; she has been very experienced and knowledgeable about the province of Manitoba. Her qualifications are excellent for the job. There was a very large number of suggestions made, and I think that having a very smart looking young girl that is looking at Manitoba for the future, instead of having a Trapper John or the Sailor from Nova Scotia, I think our representative will be one that we'll all be very proud of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education. Could the Minister advise as to the current status of the proposed new regional high school at Ile des Chênes, Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): The matter is still under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the Minister of Education. Could he inform the House as to whether he has met with the group which is asking for that high school, as he has apparently met with the group which is opposing it?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not met with the group that the Member for Rossmere refers to nor have I met with any other group other than the school board. Another group did meet with my executive assistant, however, and left a petition that was forwarded to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise as to whether it is his intention to have either himself or his executive assistant meet with the group which is asking for this new regional high school?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to that group signifying that that type of communication or that type of meeting would be quite feasible in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Labour, in view of Judge Baryluk's criticism on the Provincial Labour Department elevator inspection procedure, can the Minister indicate whether the backlog of inspections has been caught up with and whether there's an improvement and whether the Minister has sufficient inspectors on staff now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I would think, Mr. Speaker, it's an interpretation of the word 'sufficient'; we believe that we have sufficient people on staff.

MR. FOX: Would the Honourable Minister indicate whether he has caught up on the backlog of inspections that were supposed to be done annually?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Act specifies annually, it specifies when deemed and when required, and I think that we are doing a sufficient job in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a final supplementary.

MR. FOX: In view of the Minister's also public statement that he is not going to create any legislation in respect to aprons on elevators, which has been in place for 14 years in Ontario, can he indicate what other safety measures he is taking in respect to elevator safety?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I notice the members opposite are making reference to ladders and ropes, our emphasis is that people do not try to get out of the elevator via any means except the doorways when it comes to a particular floor. That has created some tragedies in the history of not only Manitoba but in the country. To that extent, the members opposite are aware that the posted signs, hopefully in all elevators in the Province of Manitoba, advising people that there was in fact no fear of them if in fact they stayed within the elevator, the problem is created when people try to get out of the elevators. We have set up a log system, Mr. Speaker, and we think that it is being done as reasonable as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow that up and ask the Minister whether it is not in fact true that he is ignoring the recommendations of the inquest, namely that it is because of the lack of inspectors and because of the lack of inspections that this death occurred; is it not true that he is in fact rejecting that recommendation by the judge?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't really want to get into a debate about the incident of the particular fatality but I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact an elevator was inspected at 2:00 o'clock and somebody tried to get out of that elevator at 2:05 and was caught between doors, it wouldn't have mattered whether you did the inspection at 2:00 o'clock or 1:30.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that the Minister is in fact rejecting the recommendations of the inquiry. I ask him whether it is not true that that elevator was in fact known to be malfunctioning for many months, if not for a period of over a year. It is because of the fact that there wasn't a regular inspection that that death occurred. I ask the Minister whether he can comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I think some of what the Member for Elmwood has said came out in the inquiry, but I suggest to the member again, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't particularly matter exactly the time that you inspect an elevator if people insist on trying to get out. That was part of the recommendations also and we are living up to that, to endeavour to educate people that they should not try to get out of the elevators.

Further to the question from the Member for Kildonan, we haven't totally dismissed the apron idea. I know the paper says it sounds pretty heavy; in fact, it insinuates that we have dismissed it, but our information is that when the aprons

under the elevators are in place, it has created some problems with people attempting to maintain the elevators.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am rather taken aback at the answers of the Minister and I ask him again whether he doesn't feel that by having a larger inspection force looking at the hundreds or thousands of elevators in the province, that he might not first of all ensure their proper functioning and, secondly, eliminate the possibility of similar disasters occurring? The Minister simply argues that if he inspects an elevator today it might malfunction tomorrow? Is he suggesting that inspections are totally useless in regard to elevator safety?

MR. MacMASTER: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. I am just saying that regardless of the number of inspections the emphasis has to be on educating people to stay within the elevator and not try to get out of it, or other incidents in history dictate that people have tried to open the doors to get into the elevator when in fact the elevator wasn't even there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, in view of the experience in Ontario for 14 years with a tremendously much greater volume of elevators than in Manitoba, would not the Minister concur that it was a hasty decision, or a hasty statement, that they were going to reject aprons in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that whether a Minister concurs or agrees or disagrees is basically not a question seeking information. Would the member care to rephrase his question?

MR. FOX: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister comment in respect to the Ontario legislation? Would he not believe that the Ontario government would have changed their legislation if it had not been effective for 14 years?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there have been several governments in power during that last 14 years that might have reviewed that particular situation, Mr. Speaker. We are the first ones, and I am the first Minister to have a look at that option. If the Member for Kildonan had been listening, I think that my answer to the last question was that the article in the paper that he is reading from says that we have totally rejected it and I told him that that was a pretty harsh hard line, that we haven't totally rejected it, that we are reviewing that because it has now been brought to our attention that there is a possibility of danger to the maintenance people who try to get in under the elevators to maintain them.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister reporting for Hydro: I would like to ask him if he could clarify his statement of last week where he said that the previous government had signed a 20-year Hydro agreement for a diversity exchange to the U.S. at a price of 6 mils when the cost of production was 30 mils.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the member can refer to the 1976 National Energy Board hearings. It is all contained therein.

MR. WALDING: I would like to ask the Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, whether, if that was a diversity exchange, whether the province of Manitoba, or Manitoba Hydro, would purchase power at the same price at which it sold it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Hydro.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, under that agreement, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a final supplementary.

MR. WALDING: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Minister now prepared to give an undertaking to the people of this province that in the event that the province enters into an agreement to sell firm power to Alberta, that it will not sell that power below the full costs of the production and transmission?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that question has been dealt with at an earlier question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Approximately two weeks ago, I asked the Minister to report on a possible asbestos contamination problem at the Leaf Rapids town centre. I also requested information in this regard by letter dated October 23, 1979. As it has been six months since the initial request, my question to the Minister is can he now inform the House as to the current status of that investigation of this potential, or possible asbestos contamination problem at the Leaf Rapids town centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Correspondence, Mr. Speaker, has taken place between ourselves and the people in Leaf Rapids and in addition to what the Member for Churchill had requested and the letter requested, we have asked for additional samples from other portions of the complex.

MR. COWAN: I would hope that the Minister would be prepared to table a copy of that correspondence, or a carbon copy to myself, in that regard.

My question is to the Minister of Public Works: Can the Minister indicate if any systematic inventory of government buildings has been undertaken to determine if asbestos contamination exists in any of those buildings and that employees and the public may unknowingly be exposed to asbestos contamination?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Government Services)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: A final supplementary to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps he wishes to undertake it as it asks for detailed information. Can the Minister indicate how many asbestos cases were brought before the Worker's Compensation Board during the previous year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll attempt to get that particular information for the member. I should tell him, as I'm sure he is aware, that in making your presentations on situations that deal with people in an alleged set of circumstances you are attempting to establish that if in fact it was asbestos related. I'm sure that's what he wants to know and I'll attempt to get him the numbers that made allegations, with or without support, to the Workmen's Compensation Board, that were claiming sickness or illness as it felt it related to asbestos.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. During the estimates debate on his department, I raised a question on elevator inspection, namely in the apartment block on Henderson Highway, Parkside Plaza. I'm not quite sure of the number; it's either 1662 or 1632, where there are no certificates of inspection in that building, on the three elevators operating in that building. I was in that building again this morning, Mr. Speaker, and there still are no inspection certificates. Has the Minister inspected that building, or has his inspectors inspected that building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned because I was assured that that particular area had been inspected, that a licence had been issued and that the licence was in fact on the premises and that someone had removed it from the elevator. I was particularly assured that within hours that licence would be replaced and that the holder for it was still in place. I can only assure the member that I relate to him what I knew to be the facts as I was told at that time and that, quite obviously, it has either been removed again or someone hasn't been telling me the whole story.

MR. JENKINS: That you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for that information and I hope that he'll look into it. Another question for the Minister is this: Has the Minister received a copy of the inquiry that was held in Ontario with regard to aluminum wiring and its hazards? If such a copy is available, would he make it available to the Members of the Opposition as well?

Mr. MacMASTER: I don't recall reading the particular copy. I know that there are some available and I'll make one available to the member. I do know that in Manitoba we have had absolutely no fires as they relate to aluminum wiring. I remember an article some place in the past that I read and I had that checked out by my department. We have not had any problems in the province of Manitoba as it relates to aluminum wiring but I will still attempt to get that copy and get it to the member.

Further, I knew that there was more to the Leaf Rapids town centre asbestos situation; I had forgotten part of it. The first series of tests, to the Member for Churchill, established that in fact there was no asbestos within the material that was sent to our office. That was the first set. Because of the members being inquisitive and mentioning other parts I think just in conversation during my estimates I've asked the department to ask for other samples. But the first sets, as it relates to the member's specific question, have been tested and there was no danger in those particular first samples.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment whether or not he is aware of the procedures employed to ensure public safety at the CIL dynamite storage plant at East Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Responsible for the Environment.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to take that question as notice.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would also take under advisement the suggestion, as least it has been suggested to me, that there is no round-the-clock supervision of the site and therefore there is obviously a question of children getting into the site and always a question of explosive devices being set on fire, or whatever. I think it's reasonable to expect that such a facility should have round-the-clock supervision, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I shall have that question looked into.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was going to pose a question to the Minister of the Environment but I've decided to be merciful in view of his problem with his voice.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to again ask the question to the Minister of Finance to whom Hydro reports. Can the Minister tell the House whether the chairman of the committee that was negotiating on behalf of Hydro used to be a Mr. Ross Nugent, Q.C., and that the Minister of Finance himself has now taken over the position of chairman of that negotiating committee, on behalf of Manitoba Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there is a joint committee of Hydro and the government department on this matter but as far as being the chief negotiator, I can't assume that title. I had one meeting with the parties on one occasion, Mr. Speaker, but the general negotiation, the meetings being held on the specific items are being held between the utilities. I would indicate to the member and whoever might be interested that the government does intend, though, to play a very active role in working with Hydro on the aspects of the agreement from the Manitoba point of view. Those actually in negotiation with the utility from Nebraska involve people from Manitoba Hydro and not myself.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, giving due allowance to the Minister's modesty in not wishing to accept titles and accepting his confirmation that the government has involved itself and intends to involve itself very much in the negotiations, is the Minister prepared to clear up to the Manitoba public the position that the government is taking vis-a-vis these negotiations as distinct and that would be taken by the Hydro board if the government was not involved, thereby clearly delineating, Mr. Speaker, responsibility for decisions as was suggested by Mr. Justice Tritschler?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think I should take the opportunity to clarify that the intent of the government, and I think it's in agreement with the intent of the Tritschler report, is that on matters that involve social versus utility matters, that there should be a clear delineation, and I think we have done that in instances such as the demand billing charges on recreation facilities. The government has made a fairly clear stated policy to the utility that if there is an extra cost borne by freeing the recreation facilities from demand billing the government would carry the cost. We are trying to keep those kinds of lines of communication clear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I hope that the answers we're getting will not lead to debate during the Question Period.
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, just to finish, but in the questions at hand, those of extra provincial negotiations, the government has made it very clear that it intends to play an active role in those negotiations. And in fact we indicated in the Throne Speech the intention to bring in legislation with respect to an energy authority, Mr. Speaker, and that is the intent of that legislation. And at this point in time, to clarify it, we have indicated we have been negotiating with the Hydro people with regard to the contents of their of their letter of intent so it doesn't hit a roadblock when it gets to Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the outcome of these negotiations and the speed at which the interconnections or the exchange of power is effected can have dramatic effects on when or if work has to commence on Limestone, will the government accept responsibility for now telling Hydro, as it has done and making it clear to the public that Hydro is not permitted to enter into this beneficial arrangement because the government has prevented them from doing so?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think it's perhaps important to advise the member that the agreement in question that he is talking about is not one that advances the construction of Limestone. If anything, it moves it in the other direction. So there is no great haste, Mr. Speaker, to move the construction further back on Limestone. The efforts of the government have been in regard to the Canadian negotiations to move the construction forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. On March 24th, Page 1463 of Hansard, the Minister promised to investigate and report on professional standards of pharmacists. Can he indicate the status of that investigation and report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have in fact heard from the professional association itself on the subject and in addition to that we asked the Drug Standards and Therapeutics Committee, the statutorily empowered committee appointed by government in that field, to look at the survey and the methodology of that survey. The Manitoba Society of Professional Pharmacists has investigated themselves and have responded with a very lengthy report which I certainly cannot capsulize at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, although I would be prepared to tempt to capsulize it and bring that form of answer into the House within the next day or two. Other than that, I can deal with it during my estimates which I believe are due to be called fairly shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a final question.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for the information. I hope he would also be prepared to give us a copy of the report instead of having to take up the time of the House. Secondly, the Honourable Minister promised to file a report with the Committee on Children's Dental Program. What is the status of that report?

MR. SHERMAN: That is also coming, Mr. Speaker. That has been the subject of discussion with the Chairman of the Review Committee and also with the executive of the Manitoba Dental Association. Once again, it can be dealt with either way. As the honourable member knows, the schedule for estimates was restructured last week and since those items will be coming up in my estimates and I intend to deal with them at length therein. But I also will be tabling that report. It has been dealt with in discussion between my office and the Chairman of the Committee and I wanted to complete those discussions before tabling it and issuing a covering statement on it. That is in the process, Mr. Speaker, and should be available within the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, I am holding an Order for Return in my name pending receipt of Hansard.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Morris McGregor (Virden): Committee come to order. We are dealing with Resolution 71. 2.(a)(1)--pass.
The Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Before we pass this item, I don't recall the Minister giving us a breakdown on staff man years or anything, could the Minister give us a breakdown for this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is no difference on this item, 15 staff man years provided for in 1979-80 estimates, the same 15 being requested for this year. The increase of some \$4,000 is salary adjustments.

MR. JENKINS: There are no vacancies at the present time, they are all filled?

MR. ENNS: I am advised that there are some vacancies but there always are in the field services . . .

MR. JENKINS: The one I'm interested in in particular, in the executive administration, there are no vacancies at the present time, is that correct?

MR. ENNS: No.

MR. JENKINS: Okay, I am prepared to let that item go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. (a)(1)--pass.

MR. JENKINS: Could the Minister just give us a brief explanation why there is a reduction in Other Expenditures, are we using less paper and pencils and erasers this year or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I never really got to call and you are asking for 2.(a)(2) then?

MR. JENKINS: No 2.(a)(2) yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes 2.(a)(1)--pass; 2.(a)(2).

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the slight reduction here of some \$4,000 is a reduction in automobile expenses in travel that we expect will be slightly reduced by this amount.

MR. JENKINS: Could the Minister give us an explanation of why he anticipates less automobile travel this year as compared to last year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it would likely arise from the fact that the amount of moneys being asked for in 1980-81 proved sufficient for last year's operation and we are budgeting for the same this year.

MR. JENKINS: Well, maybe I am misunderstanding the Minister but I see last year we had \$42,800 and this year we are budgeting for a figure of \$38,800 which is a reduction of about some \$4,000. The Minister had said that they anticipated there would be less automobile travel and what I want to know is why will there not be as much automobile travel this year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I promised myself this morning when I woke up that I would not unnecessarily provoke any committee members. We are dealing with an item of \$4,000 from a budget of \$47 million which in my judgement shows - and it's something that I have attempted to impress on the staff of Government Services and which I am happy to say is being followed through by senior staff of Government Services - that we budget for those reasonable sums of money that we think is necessary to carry on an operation.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the exercise of government is not to hold onto some particular figure or to attempt to, in all instances, be able to match last year's expenditures. If there has been a minute saving - and we are talking about a very minute saving here involved and senior staff indicates that they can live with this figure - then I think that's merely a matter of good housekeeping practice. There are other little items that I could refer to. I'm not so sure whether they refer to this instance. The member will become aware as we proceed with the estimates, that we have substantially shifted to compact cars, for instance, which in itself has helped, despite increasing energy costs, to bring about some holding of the line or indeed a reduction in the costs of operating government vehicles by government. It may well be that the combination of that, plus a little harder look at the amount of travelling and the needs for travel, consolidation through the Deputy Minister's office, the Minister's office, as to the numbers of people attending conferences, etc., that's the only explanation that I can really make for this situation.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information, and I promised myself that I am not going to try and provoke the Minister unnecessarily, although I may provoke him later on. That's one of the hazards we go through in the estimates procedure. I'm not trying to be picayune. The Minister's explanation is one that sounds feasible and when we get to the item of Central Vehicle Branch, I read the Minister's statement that he made, and I'll be raising some questions there with him on that. As long as the Minister feels that there is sufficient money here, then that's fine, I'm prepared to let the item go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. 2.(a)(2)--pass. 2.(b)(1)--pass - the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I see there's an increase here of approximately \$59,000.00. Is there a larger staff this year? Have you taken on more staff in the maintenance? Or is it just the anticipated increases in salary that makes the difference in the change here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman. There has, in fact, been some reduction in the total staff of maintenance. The increase however accounts for, again, the distribution of the general salary increases and the increments in the staffing requirements of this department. There are some 467 staff man years provided for in this division. So the honourable member will appreciate that the increase noted there is attributable to salary increases.

MR. JENKINS: I realize that this may be a fluctuating figure but what was the rough figure last year and what is the Minister budgeting for this year?

MR. ENNS: Last year the figure was 499.

MR. JENKINS: 499, and this year, what's the Minister . . . ?

MR. ENNS: To 467.

MR. JENKINS: 467. Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)--pass; (b)(2)--pass - the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Could the Minister just give us a brief explanation of this expenditure and just what is involved in this expenditure? It's approximately \$7.5 million.

MR. ENNS: Other Expenditures?

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Other Expenditures.

MR. ENNS: We have a number of new facilities coming on stream in this year. I can list them for the honourable member. The environmental lab is not yet on stream but we have to budget for it in this year's estimates; the Provincial Courthouse at 373 Broadway; the Broadway Home for Girls; Bannock Point; five remote nursing stations; and Egg Lake Rehabilitation Camp. This totals up some \$346,000.00.

We then have also included in this item the grant to Churchill which has been increased by some 10 percent from the \$460,000 last year to \$505,000 this year. I should indicate that that's not necessarily the total operating costs of the Churchill complex, that is our portion that we are paying to the LGD. I have asked my staff the same question and asked for whether or not the LGD has some additional figures to add to that.

In addition this vote calls for a 20 percent increase, 20.5 percent to be accurate, for fuel increases. After all, adjustments have been made for Churchill and new buildings and we have also increased this adjustment by some 4 percent, or 3.9 percent to be accurate, for utilities. The Department of Government Services assumes, in many of these buildings, the entire costs for fuel, utilities and other miscellaneous expenses associated with the operation of these buildings.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information. The Other Expenditures dealing with these new buildings coming on stream: the environmental lab in the core area; the Courthouse here on Broadway; the Broadway Home for Girls; and the Bannock Point Nursing Station. Would this be for furnishings in the buildings? Is that what these Other Expenditures would cover, or is that covered under the Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets?

MR. ENNS: That would be covered under that appropriation. These costs are for those items mentioned, actually field costs, utility costs, and/or staffing costs. We have assigned four additional people in the 373. Within the judicial complex, for instance, there's an increase of four additional security people, as a result of the new facility coming onstream.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How about the Environmental Lab. Is there a security on there?

MR. ENNS: I believe we have now a caretaker, or a maintenance man on staff. If not on staff now, because it's under construction, but we've had to make provisions in this set of estimates, for one person. In addition to that we are providing for the salary arrangements for a building manager, essentially or basically assigned to the new Environmental Lab, but with the possibility that he will share some responsibilities at the new provincial garage. We have a chap supervising the provincial garage at this time because there are activities taking place in the garage and it's deemed necessary that we have some staff person at the garage to look after the concerns that we would have about the building.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that information. Now the Minister said that they're increasing the grant to the Churchill LGD for the maintenance of the Churchill Centre, I don't know whether I just misunderstood him, but he's waiting for some operating cost figures from the LGD itself. Would the Minister be anticipating that if the costs have risen considerably, that he would look favourably to maybe increasing that grant to assist the LGD?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can indicate the following information to the honourable members about the operating costs of the Churchill Complex, which

continue to be a major concern to the Department of Government Services, but not to speak of a major concern to the LGD of Churchill.

In 1979 the actual operating costs for the Centre were \$791.6 thousand; we are projecting the 1980 costs to be at \$941.7 thousand which, in effect, is very near to the million dollars that is sometimes referred to as the operating costs; of which last year, by comparisons, to answer the Member for Logan's questions, last year the provincial government provided a direct grant of \$461,000 as compared to this year's \$505,000 - I'm rounding off, there's decimal points of two or three - there are an additional \$271,000 worth of operations for which the LGD receives support revenue, that is, from agencies operating within the complex, provincial agencies operating in the complex - such as the hospital facility, the school facilities, and so forth, that's your Department of Education, Department of Health supports. Municipal Affairs supports the operations of the LGD's office, which is maintained in the complex, leaving a balance of some \$164,900 for the LGD or the tax ratepayers of the LGD of Churchill to pick up.

By way of comparison, the costs of the centre are some \$941,000, of which \$164,000 is borne by the local tax base.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information. Then I take it from his answer that there is no federal support for this centre whatsoever. Has the Minister and the government made representations, because I think we would not be in disagreement on this, in that Churchill being situated where it is and the fact that there is a lack of federal support for, not only the townsite but also for the port facility, has the Minister, or is he anticipating putting some pressure on the federal government for some aid in operating this facility? I think it is necessary that the people who are living at that latitude have a facility of this nature and I am just wondering if the Minister has given any thought in forthcoming federal-provincial conferences of making the pitch to Ottawa for some aid for this centre. I think the use is for the people there and, God knows, it is a God-forsaken place . . . Well, I mean, the climatic conditions there in the wintertime you can't have a centre such as we could have here in Winnipeg where we have a much more temperate climate and I'm sure the Minister will agree with me that sitting out on that Bay with those northeast and northwest winds sweeping down, you have to look at a facility much different than what we have here in southern Manitoba.

I think it's incumbent upon the federal government to make some contribution for the upkeep of this centre and I would hope that the Minister would seriously consider that, he and his government would seriously consider making representation to Ottawa for some support for this centre, in view of the fact that they have been, over the last period of years, withdrawing their support for this centre. I think if we want to make Churchill a viable port then we have to have federal support from Ottawa and we also have to have support services for the people that are there. I think, in that respect, the Minister and I are not in any disagreement.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can indicate to the Honourable Member for Logan that about a year and a half ago I made a point of visiting the then Minister of Public Works Canada, the Honourable Jud Buchanan, with a specific goal in mind to hopefully begin some serious negotiations for some help with respect to the operating costs. The original capital construction of the project was shared, I believe, on a 55/45 percentage arrangement with the senior government in Ottawa taking the larger share. We feel, for many of the reasons that the honourable member has just expressed, that there needs to be some indication of ongoing concern by the senior government to help us with the maintenance and the operation of that centre. We feel that particularly so because there seems to have been, in this instance, a number of instances where governments are working at cross purposes, particularly when some federal installations are being withdrawn, further reducing the tax base and the number of people left to make use of that facility.

I can only assure the honourable member that while the Honourable Jud Buchanan, I understand, is back on the government side of the House I don't think he is the Minister of Public Works anymore, but that I will be contacting the new Minister of Public Works Canada once again to seriously try to sort out a longer-term solution. It throws a very serious imbalance into the moneys available to the

Government Services Department to have to allocate moneys of this kind of this one particular project.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information and I wish him well with his new federal counterpart. I think, in view of the election results here in western Canada, that perhaps some pressure should be put on the federal Liberal Party, the federal Liberal government, that if they want to improve their image in Manitoba, and in western Canada, this is one place where they can start. I think that we are fortunate here in Manitoba that we have an ocean port facility . . . --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Highways says that we are the only wet province in the Prairies but I don't know how he means "wet." I certainly appreciate the fact that the Minister has a problem and I wish him well in his endeavours. My words, I don't know if they would carry very much weight with the present Liberal government in Ottawa, but if he wants any help, I am certainly willing to put my two cents' worth in to helping him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(2)--pass; 2(b)(3) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister how he can justify a cut, a reduction in what I call preventive maintenance, which they call preventative maintenance, from \$279,000 to \$219,000.00. There is a cut there of \$60,000 and I guess about, what, 25 percent reduction. Then in the broad picture, in the whole maintenance area, you have an increase of only some 3 percent. This is what really concerns me, that this administration has been, first of all, doing very little in the way of capital construction and when it comes to maintenance, which is not a very glamorous area, they are squeezing it dry. I regard this as a matter of being penny wise and pound foolish. They are going to eliminate programs whereby, I think, money can be saved. Anybody who drives a car or owns a home, I think, knows that if you don't properly maintain something, especially when it has to do with any sort of machinery or even just paint and general upkeep, that you are going to pay possibly a lot more than you would have if you had done so on a regular basis.

I have to say to the Minister that this has to be an area that he has either underestimated or he has been pushed around in Cabinet. There is great temptation by other Ministers, or by the First Minister, to say, well you know, maintenance, we'll just cut money out of that; we can do without it.

I think that his reduction here in this particular section is really short-sighted and what's going to happen is in the long run that price is going to be paid. It reminds me of an editorial in one of the local papers in the last day or two which talked about the government's property tax credit. They said before you start dancing in the streets, you better keep your eye out for the potholes and so I'm saying that government is putting potholes and then at some point is going to have to fill them up. So I ask the Minister how he can justify this and what he has eliminated. I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, what has been cut out of that item and how the Minister can justify a \$60,000 reduction when he should be standing here defending a \$60,000 increase, which would have been probably money invested.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable former Minister of Public Works that this Minister of Public Works probably gets a similar number of phone calls from foisty First Ministers complaining about front doors not operating, particularly in cold weather and/or any other general circumstances, particularly around this building, that Ministers or the First Ministers are prone to complain about to Government Services. The member raises a point that we are concerned about. I've expressed the same concern to senior staff that maintenance not be allowed to suffer, particularly in the public buildings that we operate.

I should indicate to the honourable member, I believe or at least I'm informed by staff, that there's been a shift of some \$300,000 worth of estimates or of maintenance work, that some of which was normally in this appropriation is being included in our Construction/Acquisition program. In other words, that there are a number of smaller items being characterized either way as maintenance or renovation, if you like, and it's a judgement decision as to whether it's included in the Construction/Acquisition or in the Maintenance Budget that you have before

us here. There is some \$300,000 additional what could be termed as maintenance work in the Construction/Acquisition program.

A further feature that makes this reduction possible, we believe, is a greater recovery or a greater involvement of some of the line departments in providing some of the funds for the kind of maintenance or renovation work within their departments. We're satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that while we will want to monitor this area carefully, that the general maintenance level of public buildings will be maintained and cared for with this set of estimates before you.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just say in this particular area that the government is being consistent. In terms of capital they are, first of all, not undertaking much in the way of new developments or new construction and, secondly, in the maintenance department they're simply making an overall increase of 3 percent. Given that there's an inflation rate of probably 10 percent or more, the net effect is a reduction and that sooner or later we'll have to pay the price for putting off necessary maintenance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder in this connection with preventative maintenance whether the Minister can inform us whether the equipment in respect to the solar experiment is still on the building; whether it's being maintained or not and, further to that, whether there were any results of the research prepared and what is the status of those reports.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the equipment on top of the this building here, of a solar experimental nature, is essentially kept in a state of readiness for any future work that the new Department of Energy and Mines may well undertake. Discussions have been under way for some time now for that department to assume its appropriate role, I believe, in research and in perhaps developing further programs for that plant and equipment that we have stationed on top of this building.

The honourable member will recall that the initial purpose for the experimentation work up there was to gather data; data that was germane to the province of Manitoba in terms of what kind of energy was available under our conditions with that kind of equipment. That data was collected for a period of some two years. The simple recollecting that same data over a prolonged period of time was not serving any further useful purpose. There was no practical application of the experiment, other than the heating of some water, that was envisaged at that time. We expect, however, that the new Department of Energy and Mines will take and, in fact, is taking a look at the plant that is upstairs and will be devising some new research programs or some practical applications of that in the very near future.

MR. FOX: Has any of that data been collated and are there any results, or has it just been left in abeyance after the project was abandoned?

MR. ENNS: Well, the data has been made available to, particularly, interested groups, the Solar Society of Manitoba. The department has two years ago, I believe, issued a rather lengthy report on the experimentation. Current plans are, by the Department of Energy, to see whether or not we can't introduce some supplementary heating of water for this building as a practical application of the units on top of the building and have it serve that function from hereon in. But I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, that the responsibility for further work having to do with the solar equipment now rests with the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy and Mines.

MR. FOX: I just have one other question. I'm not sure whether it will come under preventive maintenance, but it is in the report in respect to the quarterly construction projection reporting system. Are those available and could we have copies of them? Are they going out quarterly?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan for that question. It enables me to indicate to members of the Committee that resulting from meetings with various interested groups, principally the construction industry spokesmen, some of the professional associations such as architects and consulting engineers as well as organized labour, again particularly in the construction industry, who have agreed that such a quarterly listing of projects, not simply the ones that are under way or the ones that have been approved of, in all it's final stages, but the ones that are being contemplated by government and it's agencies would be helpful in enabling the construction industry, organized labour and other associations associated with the construction industry, give them a better opportunity to plan their work schedules and their manpower schedules as these reports are available. My understanding from my Deputy Minister is that the first issuance of this report is imminent within the next week or 10 days, or the commitment was made that it would be available before the end of April.

I must indicate to the honourable members that this has some rather far-reaching ramifications in that buildings haven't yet received, for instance, approval in departmental estimates. Indeed as the honourable members are well aware, none of the projected construction schedule that is contemplated by the Department of Government Services or indeed any other department of government, can in fact proceed until final legislative authority is granted with the passage of the estimates; and therefore, you will note on that report, and this will be a public document and members of the opposition will receive it, and I will undertake to see that they get it, there is the line not unsimilar to the line that is used by the Department of Highways when they, in order to flatten out their tendering process in advance of estimate approval, have by long-standing practice been able to tender out upwards to 20 percent of the highways construction work in advance of legislative approval of the necessary funds. It has been accepted by the industry, in this case by the road builders that these tenders are tendered out subject to approval by the legislature of necessary funds. It is a technicality that has to be of some concern to us because a change of government, for instance, and a change of direction could make some of these projected construction efforts not take place.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister indicate the mailing list that this will go out to, and further let me ask him, does this indicate that his government has now changed it's direction and is not going to rely solely upon private enterprise to buoy the economy but is going to inject public enterprise as well into making the Manitoba economy get better?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, one of the prime reasons for introducing this report is to indicate that outside of the Hydro activity the amount of construction activity undertaken by the public and it's agencies has differed slightly in the last two years as compared to the last four or five years of the New Democratic Party administration. That is a point which has always been regrettably overlooked, that this report will contain last year for instance it was in the range of between \$400 million to \$500 million worth of construction activity that was undertaken by the public, and to that extent the member for Kildonan is quite right, this government has never abandoned the public involvement in terms of playing it's role in the economic stimulation in the affairs of this province. What has happened, of course, and the missing link to the economic generator in this province in terms of the construction industry is the very substantial amount of Hydro dollars being spent on the Nelson. But the accumulation or the putting together of the total number of dollars to be spent by the Public School Finance Board, by MTS, by Hydro despite the obvious cutback in terms of its major operation of the Nelson, by all other government departments, principally the Departments of Health in their personal care home construction, their hospital renovation and new construction; when you put these things together it will indicate . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. DOERN: I think we are getting a little off the topic here, namely, we are talking about maintenance and now the Minister is getting very very general

and I think I have to remind him that he's getting off the topic. If he want's to debate that I would be happy to do that but otherwise we're not going to in any way follow the estimates before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken. The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, I just have a comment to make Mr. Chairman, and if it is in order I would like to indicate that the Minister now indicates he's trying to out-socialize the socialists by having a projection in respect to construction, not necessarily construction, but projected projection of construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm just not sure where I should ask this question, so I'm going to ask the question through you to the Minister and perhaps he can give me an idea where to ask this question. It's dealing with entrance to this building off Memorial Boulevard. Who has the jurisdiction over the entrance into the buildings across Broadway, is it the . . . --(Interjection)-- .

MR. ENNS: I believe, Mr. Chairman, the next item - having just been admonished by you, Sir, I am going to be very careful . . .

MR. JENKINS: I don't want to get the Minister into hot water if I can help it I just wanted to ask him just where this item would be and if he says it's the next item I'll ask the question that I have.

MR. ENNS: The next item (c) which calls for improvements to buildings, grounds, alterations, furniture might be appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some remarks on solar energy - I was going to speak later but it's been debated under this section so I think I may as well speak at this point. My understanding is that the experiment on top of this building which was federal funded and provincially funded has been, in effect, out of action for the past one to two years. That, first of all, is something that I heard a few months ago and I was quite surprised about and it's been confirmed by the Minister today that, in spite of a fairly extensive expenditure and a great deal of effort into that particular program, it's been, in effect, closed. Now I recall a great deal of talk in the Throne Speech about energy development and alternate forms of energy. I'm not certain whether my colleague across the table from River Heights spoke about the solar energy experiment but he certainly, I think, talked about energy and he talked about solar energy - I believe I'm correct in saying that - I made a note at the time that he did so that the solar energy experiment was moribund. So here we have a government that's talking in generalities in a Throne Speech about doing something about energy, which is the hottest topic in Canada today, and then when we come to the practical application we see that they aren't doing anything and that their actions and their words are wide apart and separate. So I say to the Minister here is a project that took a great deal of time to develop. I recall that these things just can't be on track in 24 hours. You can give a green light once you have the money and all the approvals, but it still takes a great deal of time. I recall delays of equipment coming by boat, I think, from Rotterdam, other solar panels being flown in and others being developed in the States, others being Canadian-made, and so on.

I think, if my memory serves me correctly, that the experiment was opened in 1977; it could have been 1976 but I assume that it was about three years ago that there was a formal opening of that particular experiment. Then it runs, with some snags, not surprisingly, and some problems, for awhile and now, under the new administration, it is padlocked. I say, given that that hardware is there, given that there are people who have worked on that project, both within the Department of Public Works, at the University of Manitoba, and that if there was just one person who worked fulltime on some grant basis on that project, I think that we should not just let that thing slide. There is a great deal of work to be done.

Manitoba, when that experiment was opened, was a leader in solar energy in North America, and certainly a leader in Canada. There were only a small number of solar energy experiments that were going on in the country. There were some houses and so on, but when you came to a comparable experiment, we were at the top of the list. We experimented with a number of panels; there wasn't just one kind. We deliberately three or four or five or six different types. I just think that it is regrettable that the department has led that thing slide so that it is now declared inactive.

I would encourage the Minister to revive the experiment. He doesn't now have to go and spend a hundred or a couple of hundred thousand dollars to get that experiment going. I think he can make modifications to it, but I suspect that experiment, with some modifications, could be continued over a number of years and that valuable energy could be acquired.

Another point that comes to mind: We tried at one point to develop in this building, and I think it was never really completed, a room in which people could be taken. Maybe the Minister could explain what is being done in that regard. Down in the basement, there is a room, the idea was that there could be tours of the building and that, particularly school students and citizens, could be taken there and given an educational crash course in solar energy. I don't think that was ever completed, because of a shortage of funds. The solar experiment was located in this building, as opposed to the university, because of the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of tourists who come here annually. If my memory serves me correctly, something like a quarter of a million tourists go through this building every year. So, I simply say, the reason was to acquaint the public representatives at the provincial level with solar energy, to acquaint the tourists, the citizens and the school children with this.

Instead of continuing the experiment, instead of improving upon the experiment, the Minister simply says, "The experiment is over." I urge him to revive it, because otherwise he and his government are contradicting the position that they have outlined in the Throne Speech of this session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the matter that the Member for Elmwood has brought up, indeed the Energy Department had some involvement with that experiment and, as I understand it, there were many problems with it. It was an inappropriate design. Some of the piping has deteriorated and cannot be used. Some of the parts weren't compatible in the whole system and as in many experiments, something was learned and that is that the experiment didn't succeed in the application which was intended.

Although it is not in use, it is not in use because it is being evaluated as to what can be done to modify it, as the member has indicated, and what parts of it may be reused. As I understand, there are possibilities for it to make use of as many of the elements of the project as possible and to be redesigned and used for water heating within the building. That, at the moment, is under review by the Energy Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: This is an entirely different subject, Mr. Chairman, but if the Minister wants to reply to this specifically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(3) is what we are on.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think any further response is necessary. I thank the Honourable Member for River Heights for that additional information. The Department of Energy, as I indicated earlier, is going to be providing, directly responding to the question the Member for Elmwood talks about, a display area, or a display room. That is a central part of the new department's thrust, to provide not just a display area for solar, but of biomass energy, traditional uses of energy, at which it is hoped . . . An active program is being developed to involve the public, school children, etc., in a far more expanded way than would ever be possible, at the top of this building or in some room ferreted away in the basement of this building.

Mr. Chairman, let not the Honourable Member for Elmwood leave the impression that there was some great ongoing development of solar energy taking place on this roof. I am not suggesting there was anything wrong with what they did, but that's all it was, it was a setting up of a bank of collectors to collect certain data and it didn't do all that good of a job. The computer information, the equipment that they brought on stream never did work. The Member for River Heights has already indicated that we did learn some advance about the type of piping, the type of material that we could use.

But, you know, the truth of the matter is, I was Minister for three months when somebody suggested to me: You know, Enns, you've got a chap up there on the roof that's diligently working away and collecting data. I said: No, you've got to be kidding. When I asked the D.M. at the time to take me up and sure enough, I had a very nice, dedicated young fellow up there busily transcribing data. I asked him what did he do with the data and, well, he didn't particularly do anything with the data. It all added to a big compilation of data.

Far be it from me to stop that kind of a thriving thrust into the modern space and energy problems of this generation. I allowed him to proceed for another 12 months because we did want to get a whole winter's collection of data, a whole summer's collection of data, and we have all that data. There was no other goal set for that experimentation other than that. There was a PR goal set for it, of course, at the time of its setting up.

I just want to point out that there was not a prescribed definition or goal or aim for the project, other than the extraction of data about units of energy that was capable from certain types of collector panels. Having accomplished that it now moves to the next phase of applying some of the information that we have, and indeed applying some of the existing equipment that we have up there, to some practical application of energy savings within this building, such as the supplementary heat to water. But in essence, the members of the opposition will be pleased to know that the Department of Energy is in a downtown publicly accessible portion of Winnipeg, acquiring the space to, in a far more serious way than ever contemplated by the previous administration, to move fully with a high profile into the area of energy. I'm advised that space, by the way, will be available by July.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre has my eye next, unless he wants to forego back to the Member for Elmwood who was maybe going to touch on the same subject. I don't want to suggest but that's the way I see it.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us then that solar energy experimentation in Manitoba is over as far as he is concerned. They're closing this experiment off. He thinks it's very funny that there's somebody working on this and that they're accumulating data. Maybe he didn't know what the experiment was set up for; maybe he didn't know what the data was for; maybe he didn't know what the data was going to be analyzed for, but these programs were all worked out; they were approved by the federal government. There was a great deal of work done on this experiment by one, Bob Gemmel. I assume Mr. Gemmel must have developed some applications for this, in terms of the intent of the experiment, and so on. Is he telling me right now that although they're going to do a great deal on energy, all these new thrusts, that this is one of the areas that they are not, in fact, going to proceed with, there'll be no more solar energy development in this province by the Province?. Capital "P" in the second case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In response to that, the areas of the government's thrust into demonstration projects, research and development for alternate energy sources are going to come under the Department of Energy, not necessarily under the Department of Government Services.

With respect to the experiment on the Legislative Building it's, as the Minister indicated, intended to be turned into a long-term practical application in which the solar energy would be used to supplement water heating in the building.

The other areas that we are currently looking at and just awaiting the federal government's signing of the Federal-Provincial Energy Agreement, which will allow us to fund a number of alternate energy projects, many of which will be in the field of solar energy.

MR. DOERN: Well, then I understand that whereas the Minister doesn't know what's happening on the roof of this building, that I am now informed that the experiment will continue under another department. And I mention again that one of the reasons that our administration got into this experiment was that the federal government tried to encourage the provinces to do things. I assume that there is federal money available for certain projects of this type and I assume that the government has a responsibility to look at these and see, and pick and choose, as to what they want to do. So at least I'm pleased to learn that after a year or two of inactivity that there might be, rather than the project rusting away or being taken down at some point, that there is going to be some moneys expended and, I assume, some federal funds tapped as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: On this topic generally, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, perhaps the Minister could advise us, in this area of maintenance, of what the department's policy is, for example, with that old Dauphin jail. Perhaps I could preface my question briefly.

I believe the administrative decision was made in the mid-Fifties that The Pas Correctional Institution had to be replaced; I know that the former Conservative government and the New Democratic Party government for a number of years put band-aids on the old institution at The Pas; I know from current attention being paid perhaps the leaning of a ladder right-side-up or wrong-side-up isn't the answer to one of the problems that faces the Minister at Dauphin. But nevertheless, if the Minister has some suggestion as to what his intentions are, what the government's intentions are as far as the replacement of the institution at Dauphin, if he could advise us when the government plans to replace a facility like Dauphin; because the maintenance costs of buildings such as the jail at Dauphin really don't make economic sense in that we keep patching it up and it's just a patch-job, as it was at The Pas for years. It finally reaches a point where we have no other alternative but to replace them. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would advise the House as to what his intentions are, that we could get some concurrence by the Legislature that we would support bringing forward some of the construction programs which really haven't got that much political pizzazz.

I mentioned previously on this particular item it's difficult when a Minister is arguing with his colleagues to get roads for correctional institutions and some other public facilities. I know when we left the government that we had planned, not immediately but not in the too far distant future, to replace the Dauphin institution. So perhaps the Minister could advise us, in general terms without announcing an intended construction date, what their policy is as far as this kind of band-aid maintenance which really, in my view, is a waste of public funds.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would not mind at all responding to that question except that I'm always mindful of your gavel. We're now clearly in the area of Acquisition and Construction of New Facilities. I appreciate that it can be interwoven in maintenance costs but the kind of maintenance, or renovation costs that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is speaking about, is more appropriately dealt with in Acquisition/Construction of New or Existing Facilities.

The maintenance that we are talking about here is a maintenance that we all identify in terms of the care and wear and tear of the normal maintenance of government buildings. But I seek your advice, Mr. Chairman, as I always do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it could be covered in the next item correctly. It could also be covered here, I would guess. It's up to the committee and I'll call on the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: To that point, this is exactly why I raise it because when the policy decision is made we're going to replace that facility. Then the kind of maintenance that we're talking about right at the present time, well, we won't fix that, we'll let it go. So it is kind of unicorn country as far as where it could properly be discussed. But the kind of day-to-day maintenance which keeps a facility up-to-date usually slips and, as a result of it, it does shift it over to that New Construction. It really doesn't make any difference to me, Mr. Chairman, where we would discuss it. but I think it's important that we get some indication from the Minister, from the government just exactly how they're spending their money because, as I said earlier, it's pound foolish and penny-wise to continually spend token amounts in this kind of maintenance when they know full well that that darned thing should be replaced. And when I say the "darned thing", I'm specifically thinking of the Dauphin jail.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've said on a number of occasions that the Department of Government Services, as such, doesn't initiate new client demands for specific buildings. But let me hasten to assure honourable members that we do see it very much our responsibility to advise and recommend very strongly where we think renovation or maintenance costs are ill-advised or simply don't make the kind of economic sense where the application is to an old and deteriorating existing building. And the costs of renovations are such that the client department should well be advised to be looking at a new facility. That clearly is very much the Department of Government Services and I welcome support from all members of the House to assist the department in gaining that kind of support from government generally.

The specific area that the honourable member has raised, the facility at Dauphin, falls within that category. We have looked at that facility now for two construction years going. Some initial renovations were met with opposition from staff and local townspeople. Present plans for the renovations of that facility are of that magnitude, or of that order, where I have asked the Minister of Corrections to review the proposals for that facility because I think it just fits the kind of situation that the Member for Winnipeg Centre describes. The department is being asked to, in this case the Department of Corrections along with the Attorney-General's department because the facility is associated with the courthouse at Dauphin, there could be a rationale that will be pursued if the renovations could be looked upon as being helpful to the further use of that facility, perhaps not for its present use as a detention centre but as an addition to, or additional space available for expanded courtroom facilities, in which case this fire-grading work would have to be done in any event.

But the member raises a good point and I can assure the honourable member that it's just in the past little while that discussions have been entered into with the Department of Corrections as to their thinking and planning for that facility.

MR. BOYCE: Well perhaps, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I imagine some of the data is extant. But perhaps the Minister could undertake, on behalf of the House, to prepare a paper which would set forth the figures which would give us some basis on which to form a decision. If, for example, it costs \$3 million to \$5 million for a new institution, combined or separate institutions in Brandon, the capital costs and the amortization of that amount over the next 100 years, because that's what they plan these institutions for, as compared to an increasing maintenance cost. Because I think that in this kind of expenditure of public funds that we shouldn't just rely on the government to demonstrate this to the public that the tough decisions have to be made. The government made it a little bit more difficult for themselves in mixing current and capital because really this kind of expenditure has to be amortized over the life of the institution. It's very difficult for the government, I realize, to come out and add \$3 million to \$5 million on their current expenditure for a capital expenditure, which is going to be amortized over 100 years. But nevertheless, the cost of the capital has to be reflected in the figures which are taken into consideration.

I could sum up, Mr. Chairman, on this line of questioning in that I think it is important that the people of the province be given the information in a form that they can digest, that they can see the kind of increasing maintenance cost which

is associated with a public institution of the kind of correctional facilities, that they can see in their best long-term interests, it is better to reach a point and say, whoa, this thing has to come down and a new one has to be built.

Perhaps the Minister could have some of his staff address themselves to the problem in that manner, so that that information could be prepared for the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(3)--pass; 2.(c)(1) - the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The question I want to raise with the Minister is the entrance and egress from these grounds. I asked the Minister who was responsible for Memorial Boulevard, and I asked this question because I do see the Commissionaires that are duty in this building out there ticketing cars and what not. So I think we must have some jurisdiction over that portion of the road.

What I am primarily interested in is the problem that people have of crossing Broadway to enter these grounds or to leave these grounds. I think the Minister must have run into that sometimes as well when he has been leaving this building, especially during rush hour, of trying to get across Broadway with your automobile. I'll tell you what I did one day, I sent the passenger I had out to walk across the intersection and put his hand out. That was the only way I could get across the street.

I realize the traffic flow there is something that is in conjunction with the city. I raise this with the Minister, that I think it is of sufficient importance, that we have a lot of people trying to get into the grounds, into this building, and if they are coming here when the traffic flow is fairly heavy east and west on Broadway, trying to get into the grounds, or get out of the grounds onto Memorial Boulevard is a very difficult problem. I don't know if the Minister would be the one to take this up, or who, but I really think there should be a set of traffic lights there operating especially during the rush hour period, in the morning. It must be very difficult for people who are trying to get to work at this Legislature, who park on the grounds here. The same thing for people who are leaving here at 4:30, trying to cross that street.

I know when the House used to adjourn, usually on a Friday afternoon at 4:30, it was a devil of a job to get across that street with your automobile. I don't think that it would be that great a problem to set up. If people would obey The Highway Traffic Act and leave the . . .

MR. ENNS: You mean they don't?

MR. JENKINS: They don't even leave that portion open so that you can get across the street, because when the lights are red on Osborne Street, the traffic is not flowing anyway, the traffic builds up between Kennedy and Osborne Street and the thing is blocked solid; you can't get across there. Even if the lights weren't operating all day, if they were operating in the morning and the afternoon during the rush hours, I think it would be of facility to the employees of this building and to people trying to get in and out here to do business in this building.

I wish the Minister would take this under advisement and get in contact either with the City of Winnipeg, or maybe it's his own department that may be responsible. I don't know who is responsible for Memorial Boulevard. I do see the Commissionaires, who are on duty at this building, out there putting tickets on vehicles that are parked at the parking meters there. I don't know if they are city parking meters or if they are provincial parking meters. --(Interjection)-- The Minister indicates that they are his parking meters, and I hope he makes lots of money on them. --(Interjection)-- In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, it is something that I wish the Minister would look into. I meant to raise this with him before. I don't know if this is even the right item or whatnot to raise it, but I think that it is something that he should take under consideration. I would like to know if the Minister is seriously considering it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can, of course, suggest to him that the problem would be solved if city members would use Transit. Us rural fellows have no problem because we never leave this building until 8:30 or 9:00 and there is no traffic problem at that time of the hour.

More seriously, a large part of the problem, which has been a growing one, will be solved if we start solving some of our parking problems in this general area, if we reduce the on-site or on-building grounds parking that brings on a lot of . . . and in fact use more of the building site parking for the casual visitor to the building and/or those citizens who have business with the building. If we had a parking facility for the bulk of the public servants who are parking on the building site, and/or others, that would reduce the problem considerably.

The department is currently undertaking an extensive parking study. I might indicate that in the person of the Deputy Minister, who I have acquired from the City of Winnipeg, his fort , among other things, also lies in traffic engineering. He has a good background as a traffic engineer, and has taken this as a personal challenge to leave his mark on this general area during his tenureship as Deputy Minister of Government Services, to resolve it.

Seriously, the parking and all the associated problems of getting entrance, egress and exit of this site is, as the member describes, less than desirable. If we can shift a substantial number of cars that try to get on this building and off this building at more or less the same time every morning and every evening, that would certainly lessen the problem for the average citizen who has business and reason to call on us here at this building.

I can assure the honourable member that, particularly in view of the announced plans of the additional court facilities that are coming on stream here, we are very much aware that a "Russell Doern Memorial Parkade" or a "Harry Enns Parkade" will have to be considered in the very near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Minister for that information. In the meantime, until he gets those - I don't know whether it is going to be the "Doerns-Enns" or "Enns-Doern" parkade built, I don't expect the Deputy Minister to be out there as a traffic policeman . . .

MR. ENNS: We would use his name but it is too long.

MR. JENKINS: I would seriously suggest to the Minister that he suggest to the City of Winnipeg that they consider putting sort of a limited feature lighting system because those two pedestrian crosswalks there are not there for the purpose of stopping traffic, for automobile vehicles to go in and out of this building. I quite agree with the Minister that, sure, we should be using less automobiles, but nevertheless, there are people that have to do business on-site here and I think it has been suggested before that the Minister lift the grounds all up and put a nice parkade underneath. Maybe that's an idea, but that's something for the future. But something for the present time, I think we should be looking at some traffic lights or some way of stopping that traffic out there so people can get in and out of the grounds here.

That's a project for him and his Deputy Minister and, as I said before, I don't expect to see the Deputy Minister out there with a stop and go sign, because I don't think that's the answer. The Minister, I'm sure, is aware because I have been with him at times when we were both trying to get across that street and it has been a heck of a job. The fact that the Minister is aware of it, I leave the ball in his court now to do something about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I had a series of small questions here that I wanted to check with the Minister. On the south lawn, there was a very beautiful and elaborate design connected with the Osborne Street Bridge and someone designed a sidewalk which went along Assiniboine and then dips down towards the bridge as if it is going under the bridge and then there is a cutback up. The point I am making there is that people will take the shortest distance between two points and instead of following sort of a downward move in the sidewalk and then back up to the bridge, they tend to go straight. I would simply point out to the Minister that I think he should look into that and possibly arrange for a sidewalk to be built in that particular place. It might just be a hundred feet long and I just mention that in passing.

Only today I heard some complaints from some of the secretaries who work for our party about the elevators in this building, namely that they feel that there should be two elevators operating at all times and there apparently are times when there is only one. Some people - I'm not talking now about vigorous young people who can climb as many stairs as they want - but some people find it difficult to get up two or three flights by foot. I would again ask the Minister if he would look into that.

An area that I would like to make a suggestion to him on is the Riel Monument. Now, that monument was built by our administration almost 10 years ago and it seems to be a favorite site of pranksters, the latest being that somebody painted a pair of shorts on the founder of our province --(Interjection)-- A prude, perhaps. There also were other incidents. One of the most pathetic, I thought, was at one time there was this great startling development that was seized on by the local photographer. Somebody put a rubber tire on that statue. Now, if that's news, then I obviously don't know what news is, but it seems to me anybody could throw a rubber tire on any sculpture anywhere and to take a picture of that and put that in a daily newspaper seems to me to be scraping the bottom of the barrel.

MR. ENNS: That must have been a slow day at the Legislature.

MR. DOERN: It certainly was. I am simply saying that, given that there are endless incidents there and, I guess, smashed lights - there are lights, I think, on the interior of that monument - and so on, maybe the time has come to put some sort of a metal grillwork that would prevent people from entering that particular interior of the sculpture. There is a visual block there because of the design, and I guess part of the time, it is sort of a hangout and a place where people throw garbage and bottles and God knows what.

I simply ask the Minister whether he has had any recommendations about protecting that monument, first of all from pranks, and secondly from just general deterioration in terms of people throwing food and bottles and so on around there? I was just wondering if he is aware of that as a problem and if he has any solutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: The Member for Logan, Mr. Chairman, raised a question which prompts me to put on the record an incident which arose inter-sessionally where some people were asked to sign in when they came into the building. I just want to put on the record my appreciation for the prompt action of the Minister, because I know that he agrees with me that people who visit their MLAs shouldn't be required to sign in.

I also would like to put on the record my appreciation of the staff person who was involved because the individual handled an irate MLA, which is a very difficult task, with firmness and great tact. I was a little bit miffed at the Minister because he pulled the rug from under my feet in that I thought I had a perfect case to raise a point of privilege after his honour had vacated the Chair, but nevertheless, he stole my thunder and he acted promptly to rescind the directive which gave rise to the incident in the first place and I just want to put on the record my appreciation of his prompt action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister for some information in regard to art works. I assume this would fall under furnishings, etc? There was some attempt made a few years ago to encourage Manitoba artists and this was of course in two ways; one was to have 1 percent of the construction cost of a building allocated to artworks and these artworks were overwhelmingly purchased from Manitoba artists as opposed to Canadian or other. So I wonder if he can provide us with any figures over the last few years, compared to the last decade, on the amount of money that has been spent on the purchase of art and also the rental of art, most of which tended to come from the Winnipeg Art Gallery. I would ask him for that?

I would also ask him a couple of questions in regard to this particular room which was at one point, it was always I suppose for many years, used to contain, well in fact, I guess as long as I can remember, to house the portraits of Premiers, as opposed to the hallway which more recently was allocated to house the portraits of Speakers and I ask him a couple of questions here; one is that it's always struck me as peculiar that whereas the portrait of the last Premier hangs behind us, and on his right the Premier before him, that Premier Roblin for some reason hasn't been promoted to the other side of former Premier Schreyer and that has been true for at least the last year or more. I don't know if it is because of his left-leaning Red Tory tendencies or what, but I would like to know why that isn't properly arranged.

Secondly I would like to know when the Minister is going to approve a new portrait artist to paint the picture of the present Premier and Speaker and the former Speaker, my colleague from Kildonan, because although we had his portrait ready to be slated our government was defeated and I am concerned that if the Minister doesn't act soon his government will be defeated and then we will have to start all over again and arrange for his Leader and his Speaker to be painted out-of-office. Now the problem is this, a person is usually much happier and in a more smiling frame of mind and countenance when they are in office, they feel better. When you drag them back after their defeat they often don't look the same or don't feel the same about it.

So I just wondered if the Minister could inform us of what his plans are and if he has taken some steps or chosen an artist and then after that we can, of course, look at the artwork and decide whether we like it or not, as people have great fun in looking at paintings after they're done or sculptures or the design of buildings, and saying how they don't like it, how they don't agree with it, how they don't feel it's suitable. That's part of the fun of being in opposition is to be able to criticize the government for it's aesthetic judgement.

So I wonder if the Minister has any figures on art purchase and rentals? If not I would like to obtain them, shortly, and if he has any comments about his order to have the three gentlemen painted for posterity.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just let me reiterate the art-purchasing policy of this government has not changed since the time that the previous administration was in office. We still allocate 1 percent of construction costs of new buildings, or renovations to new buildings, substantial renovations like the close to \$1 million or \$900-some thousand for 373 Broadway . . .

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry, could I hear that again please.

MR. ENNS: One percent of Broadway costs which is between \$9,000 and \$10,000, will be allocated. The Art Committee which I believe is still much the same committee, at least headed by the same chairman at the University of Manitoba, is apprised of the requirements for that building; the formula for rural buildings is also the same at one half percent, half of 1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to provide the figures for the honourable member, I don't have them with me but possibly by evening or at latest tomorrow I will have some these figures. Understandably, the total amount unquestionably will be reduced in the sense that new buildings have not come onstream in this period of time, but the policy remains unchanged and I am sure the Art Committee is looking forward to participating with the furnishing of paintings for the new buildings that are now in the process of being readied and prepared.

With respect to the selection of an artist or artists for the paintings of former Speakers and Premiers, it is a concern, the honourable member has reminded me of that from time-to-time, as have individual members concerned. I agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood that time has a way of ticking away and that if possible, and certainly from a point of convenience, the matter of arranging sitting hours, etc., it is probably more convenient to have that done while the members are active and in the House. I have asked and received from Miss Irene Levinson her recommendations about a particular Toronto artist. I've also just recently asked that the committee I referred to a little while ago offer some further advice as to artist selection, but it would be my hope, and I have so indicated to the Premier and to the present Speaker and the former Speaker, that hopefully perhaps we can do something about it during this coming session.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, last night I watched a TV program on face-lifts and that's another reason I want to make sure that this is done so somebody doesn't feel that they have aged so much that they have to have a face-lift so they can be properly painted.

MR. ENNS: A sympathetic artist will usually do that for you.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, what is good? The good news is that the Minister says that the policy is unchanged - basically 1 percent for art - that's the good news. The bad news is there's been very little new construction and so I hope that if and when there's more construction that the Minister will fight for the maintenance of that policy. I am happy to hear that he's doing that in the new Broadway building because the market for artists in Manitoba has shrunk somewhat in the last few years and I would like to see them have an opportunity of selling some of their artwork to the Provincial Government.

I want to make one suggestion to him as well and that is that a few years ago, when the Royal Alec was torn down, there was a great emotional reaction, not only about the hotel but about the Challoner, Murals which were part of the history of this province and that building in particular, and some \$40,000 were spent. I remember the crisis - when I think of it I have to look at Keith Macmillan because this was one of his lightning night raids, sort of along CIA lines - where they were told to go in with a crew and they literally chipped these huge murals off the walls taking half an inch of plaster with them. I don't know how they did it. They were ordered by a very strong minister of the day, I can't remember his name, some ten years ago to get in there and get those murals out; and they did. Then there was a very long process of restoration and the murals were finally restored and they were exhibited a few times in Manitoba.

We once took them out to Brandon and so on but essentially they are rolled and stored somewhere in a Government Services warehouse. I want to say to the Minister something that I had in mind and maybe he can come up with a better idea; one of the thoughts that I had was when there was a new court building constructed or planned that one of the rooms, either in the entranceway or judges' quarters or courtroom, I don't know what; but given that a court building tends to be with higher ceilings, I don't know what this one will look like, I guess it won't look exactly like they used to in the old days, maybe it will have 9 foot ceilings or 8 foot ceilings but there must be some opportunity in that building for something with a larger scale and I think that the Minister of Government Services should think in terms of using the Challoner Murals, he's the custodian of those murals. It's really not as productive to have them stored and rolled and taken out once every few years, dusted off and shown to people. Ideally they should be placed in some building, preferably a public building where people can see them because they are not only interesting in terms of art, and they can be judged in various ways as to their artistic merit, but in terms of history they do show some early history and they are also part of the art history of this province. So I would ask the Minister to keep that in mind when he's making decisions and possibly inject that into the program for the new court building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, in view of the refurbishing and changing around of many of the area under government occupancy, can the Minister indicate what is being done in respect to some of this used furniture? I noted that there was quite a bit of it in storage in a number of places. Is there some of it being reclaimed? Is it being sold? What process is being utilized? Can the Minister give us some idea of the moneys involved in the restoration and the sale of the furniture and so on.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the department has a general policy, a formula by which it makes an assessment. If, in the opinion of our workshop, the costs of refurbishing or restoring furniture to a good standard is above 60 percent of the replacement cost then it is offered up for disposal as a Crown Asset; if it's below that then the restoration takes place. There's always every effort made to use the furniture that accumulates over a period of time, however, the honourable

member will also understand that particularly on the occasion when new buildings, new construction is entered into it, it's difficult in some instances then to furnish it with dated or outmoded types of furniture, even though to you and I that may not be the case.

In addition the department is responsive to a substantial number of appeals that we get from time-to-time of charitable groups or other organizations that from time-to-time ask for some particular piece of furnishing. If we are satisfied that it's that kind of an organization the department has the means and does provide from time-to-time furnishings to what we would call worthy agencies at no cost; and in addition, of course, the furnishings are from time to time, put up or offered for sale in the normal way that the department disposes of Crown assets.

MR. FOX: Is that by tender?

MR. ENNS: That is by tender, yes.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that ordinary individuals would have to buy job lots, they couldn't buy individual pieces?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that in most instances it's auctioned and the quantity, I'm sure, can be arranged at. I think if an individual citizen expressed a particular interest for a piece of furnishing that by so indicating it to the department the opportunity would be there to do so. For instance, I can indicate to you that in 1979-80 a total of \$320,000 worth of various government assets. This is far and above the furnishings, of course. It includes electric cars; it includes vehicles from the Central Vehicle Garage; it includes surplus construction material sheet piling; addition surplus material that the Department of Highways had, but also included is furniture. We have, for instance, itemized under furniture some \$7,300 worth of used furniture that was disposed of by auction in the year just passed.

MR. FOX: I'll get to a few more questions after 4:30. It's 4:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is 4:30, and I'm leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour. We will return at 8 o'clock.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 81 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources, Resolution No. 108, clause 9. Wildlife, (a) Administration, (1) Salaries--pass.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to review again for a few moments the Minister's view on the question of the treatment of polar bears in a recent experiment. Mr. Chairman, no sooner had we debated the issue in the Chamber when there was a statement that appeared in the paper on Saturday by the doctor from Norway who defended his experiment and seemed to think that everything was okay. What bothered me when we were talking about this on Friday was the fact that the Minister appears to take the position that he shows no possible uneasiness about approving the experiment and seems to suggest that he would do it again. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, my friend for Minnedosa obviously favours what went on and would, of course, support any continued experiments in that regard. But I say to the Minister that I believe that he made a mistake in the approval of that particular experiment and was extremely unwise in doing so. He seemed to show some sense of balance when he held the experiment, but he seems now to show no regret and to be quite set in the manner of possibly approving it again.

Mr. Chairman, what bothers me is that the Minister feels that as long as a number of scientific groups ask for an experiment, he feels that in itself is sufficient justification and that's where I beg to differ. He has a mandate from the people to protect wildlife, and I say to him that if a number of scientists

come up with an experiment that will damage wildlife or hurt wildlife or be unproductive in the sense that those experiments are unnecessary - and as some people have argued are inhumane - then I say that he has a right and the responsibility to say no. I don't care how many scientific organizations ask approval for an experiment he should not simply be obligated to approve anything that is asked, in the name of science, because I think some very sinister things have been done in the course of history, in the name of science. I think that certain things have taken place . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa on a point of order.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Yes, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is, I just wonder when we start to get into repetition and when we consider it useful information being sought from the Minister. We've been through the polar bear episode I think four or five times already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, I think that this was new information on the debate from last week and I was allowing it in hope that there would be some additional debate considering that there was some reporting in the newspapers on the weekend; I would not be about to rule the honourable member out of order at this point.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I said to the Minister and I say to him again, that the mere fact that a number of scientific organizations ask him to approve an experiment should not alone require him to approve that experiment. He has to weigh what is being asked and if they ask him whether they could set a germ or use some germ warfare on the animals of Manitoba, I wonder whether he would just automatically approve it. I assume what he would do is he would weigh what is being requested against the possible outcome and then make a decision. I say to him, on the other side of the coin, on the other side of the debate, is the fact that a number of prominent scientists, if he wants to debate scientists, have said that the experiments were unnecessary; and the most prominent of these is Dr. Clive Roots, who is the head of the Assiniboine Park Zoo, who surely in his field must be as imminent as anybody on the other side. So, if you just want to talk scientists, there are scientists on both sides of this issue and I think the Minister has to weigh that. I hope that my colleague for Churchill enters into the debate because he received a very interesting letter from a couple of men of science in regard to this issue and they were very upset at the response of the Manitoba Government.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I'm disappointed that the Minister feels that this experiment was okay, in spite of the fact that it was a dismal failure, in spite of the fact that the bears who were supposed to survive died, two out of three - one may or may not survive. He seems to feel that he did the right thing and he'd do it again. I find that surprising, first of all, because I didn't anticipate that response. I expected him to say that never again would he approve a similar experiment, but he didn't say that. I ask him, in particular, if he can tell us what benefit there was; what these men knew now; what practical advantage flowed from this experiment. What is the conclusion? Is the conclusion that whenever there's an oil spill there's going to be a score of workers go into the area, capture these animals and transport them from the northern regions? Is that what's going to happen? Because if that's what's going to happen, that could have been done without the experiment. I assume that the aim, in terms of the preservation of wildlife, would be to get the animals away from the oil spill, and I don't think we learned anything from this experiment in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say this, that these animals were sacrificed on the altar of science and I think that the Minister should not have revised his original concern. He apparently had a concern a year ago. He now shows that he has gone from a concern to no concern and I have to tell him that I'm disappointed in his present position. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to hearing what the Minister has to say. I cannot stay for all of it because I have to go to the Government

Services debate but my colleague for Rupertsland, I think, may also wish to comment on this particular item.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I just would like to put a few remarks on the record in response to the remarks from the Honourable Member for Elmwood. He says that I, as Minister, have shown no regret over this incident. Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my disagreement with that perception that the honourable member has. I have every regret that two of the bears died in the experiment, but all that I pointed out to the honourable member last week was that, given the set of circumstances, then the decision that I made I believe was a necessary decision. Now if he thinks that I should stand here using the 20-20 hindsight vision which he has just used; if he thinks that I should stand in my place and say that I was misled by scientists; they didn't need this information and that I didn't know what was going on upstairs, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to do that because I don't think that's a responsible thing to do. But given the 20-20 hindsight of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, obviously it was not a wise decision. It was not a wise decision from the point of view of the bears; it was not a wise decision from a political point of view. But without 20-20 hindsight I think that it was, in fact, a necessary decision. One other thing I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that the honourable member seems to pick and choose between the scientists and I don't think that's something that can be done. I think that an argument, a proposition, a theory has to be judged on its merits. One cannot simply decide to pick those scientists that happen to be in support of your position and reject those that are against it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I make just one observation there and that is my point. The Minister said that because a number of scientists - he used as evidence and read a list of letters and a list of organizations saying these people thought this was a good experiment - I simply wanted to point out there were people on the other side so it's a case of choosing, in a sense. If you're going to look at that as evidence and there are people on both sides, that's the problem of the politician. The politician has to decide the issue and if he's looking for backing he can go one way or another. And it reminds me of during the Second World War, Mr. Chairman, after the Second World War there was a great competition for German scientists in the world. There was a funny saying at the time, so many had gone to the Soviet Union, they were taken forcibly; so many had been attracted to the States; some had gone to Britain and one of the comments current at that time was as follows: that our German scientists are better than your German scientists. So I simply say to the Minister, he has to make the judgement on the basis of his best judgement and maybe he couldn't see some of the sides of the issue. Maybe it's true that hindsight is a wonderful thing, but given the benefit of hindsight I would think that he should - I don't like to say be man enough because I regard him as a man - but I would expect him to say that he in hindsight did make a mistake and that he would not ever again approve such a similar experiment. That is what I expect him to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. Before I acknowledge the next debater, might I just make the remark that we do have some problems with lead poisoning and I wouldn't want anything like that to happen in my committee. I would point out to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that when he stirs his coffee please don't use a pencil. I wouldn't want any dangerous things happening in this committee.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'll just be brief. I wanted to share with the Minister a letter that I had received the other day in regard to the polar bear controversy. It was directed to myself as environmental affairs critic, but I'm certain it was intended for the Minister as the Minister responsible for the issuing of the permit. I would only ask him if he's received a similar letter. Perhaps we can share experiences on this. The letter goes - and it's from two professors at the University of Massachusetts Medical School. It's dated March 29, 1980. "Dear Sir: I'm writing to protest a senseless and inhumane experiment which resulted in the death of two polar bears. The experiment was reported in the Worcester Telegram and Gazette on Thursday, March 27, 1980. A

third grade student could have told you what really would happen if you dunked a polar bear in oil. Your act should be on your conscience. I also hope they cost you your position. You do not belong in science, research or public service. An appropriate retaliation would be to dunk you in oil." I had received that letter and was quite put back by it. I'd ask the Minister if he's received a similar letter or letters to that effect from other areas?

MR. RANSOM: No. I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, which letter he's referring to so I can't really answer the question without knowing the signatures of the people involved.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like to, on a more serious vein, although that's not to take away from the seriousness of the situation with the experiments, but on a different vein - perhaps that would be the better way to phrase it - ask the Minister if this would be the appropriate area in which to discuss the Churchill wildlife area? Can the Minister - and the Minister is shaking his head in the affirmative - I'd ask him then if he could, at this point, perhaps bring us up-to-date on the status of that project, what is occurring and what he anticipates to occur in the near future.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member is probably aware that there is a Local Advisory Committee that was established in June of 1978, shortly after the Churchill Wildlife Management Area was designated. I believe it includes representatives of local trappers and outfitters, naturalists and the armed forces, and the purpose of the Advisory Committee is to enable the local residents there to have some kind of input into the management and development decisions that might be made with respect to this Wildlife Management Area. I believe that the committee has met on a number of occasions and have forwarded recommendations on management to the department.

I expect that there would be a draft plan discussed with the Advisory Committee probably late summer or into the fall of this year and until that draft plan is put forward and discussed, it's difficult to be very specific. But generally, I don't expect to see great changes in the way that things have been done there but it was felt necessary at the time that the management area was designated to have some means of controlling activities. We don't have another Act at the moment that would allow us to take a large area of Crown land and implement some of the restrictions that might be deemed necessary to implement. The Wildlife Management Area legislation was one that allows us to do the kinds of things that we think will be appropriate. So until that draft plan is discussed with the Local Advisory Committee, I really can't provide any specific information.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister if he can provide us with this information some time in the near future, if he doesn't have it before him today, and that is the members of that particular committee; who is currently responsible as Chairperson for that committee? I would also appreciate, if I could, have the terms of reference and correspondence between the Minister's department and that committee that would deal with those specific areas, such as the terms of reference for members, how the members are chosen, how long they sit on the committee. And would also appreciate from the Minister, if possible, a brief overview of what that committee has been doing, the number of meetings and what specific areas that they have been concerned with. If the Minister felt free to release the minutes of that committee - and I'm not certain how he would feel on that, but if he'd feel free to do that - that probably would provide myself, at least, with as comprehensive an overview as one could expect at this time.

In the meanwhile, I would ask the Minister who determines, at this point, how that land is used? In other words, if an individual wanted to start an operation that would take that individual into that area . . . This could be a fishing operation although that's unlikely given the circumstances of the area. It could be an operation for guiding which is probably most likely; that's what you would probably have is people wishing to guide. It could be for scientific research; they may wish to use that area for scientific research. There's a whole number of ways in which that area could be anticipated to be used and that individuals and

organizations both, would be making representations to the Minister, I would believe, for permits to use that area. I'd like to know what criteria is being used to determine if an individual will be empowered or allowed to use that specific area, or parts of that area, for operations that they may anticipate doing in the near future.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, it's fair to say that the way decisions have been made to this point has not been substantially altered because I don't think there have been substantial changes in the uses that are being made of that land. I think that the designation of it and the establishment of the Advisory Committee and the development of a plan are aimed more at providing that kind of basis to deal with future requests. Because up to this point it's probably fair to describe a lot of those types of decisions as being made rather on an ad hoc basis, and with the development of the plan then I would hope that our managers will have some kind of established guidelines within which they can make those decisions.

I can provide the honourable member with some background about the committee. There's a Mr. Chartier, who is the Chairman of the committee. I can get the membership and terms of reference and provide it fairly quickly.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will appreciate that information from the Minister and do look forward to receiving it so we can discuss it perhaps, if necessary, during the Minister's Salary.

I'd ask the Minister then, as it stands now, the situation is that a person who might wish to use a wild life area, who has not been using it in the past and therefore does not have either implied nor actual permission to use that land, were to come and make a request of the department to use that land, what procedures should that person follow; and in specific, what criteria will his department use in determining whether or not that person would be allowed to utilize parts of the wildlife area?

Now I realize that there is a draft plan being drawn up, and I know that that will take a certain amount of time, and I would wish to see that plan be as comprehensive and as well thought out as is possible. So I would not wish this sort of questioning to be interpreted as pressure on the Minister to hurry that draft plan, because I think that should follow its normal course, and I do believe that the more participation you can have in the development of those sort of plans, especially public participation, the better off you are. So I would hope that the committee, under the direction of the Minister, would be seeking public opinion, especially from long term residents, and that includes Indian and Metis residents as well as persons of non-native ancestry. So I would hope that would be an on-going process, but that's an aside.

The point that I would like to get to at the moment is, what criteria is being used to determine those decisions that have to be made presently before the draft plan will be put in place, or are all requests that are being forwarded to the Minister's department now for use of that land being told that they must wait until a draft plan - or actually in this instance it would not be a draft plan, but it would be a final plan - has been approved by the department.

MR. RANSOM: My understanding of the situation, Mr. Chairman, is that if there are some proposals that would seem to be consistent with uses that have been made of the area in the past, that those types of things are likely to be approved. If there are some proposals that are of what we might call major proportions, then I can see that there might be some necessity to delay those, pending the development of the plan and the guidelines. Those decisions have to be made to quite an extent on a judgemental basis, and people who have some proposals to make could make them to a number of different contacts, and they would end up in the right hands, eventually. They can contact the Director of Wildlife or they can send them through my office. Some of the licensing work is actually done through the Tourism Department but eventually, of course, if there is an application for a licence through Tourism, it eventually comes back to the agency that's managing the resources and the land to see whether it's appropriate.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I thank the Minister for that answer, and I do understand that it must, until there is some overview, some overall philosophy put into place or overall actual technical aspects of the plan put in place, that each decision must be an ad hoc decision and must be a decision that can be referred to as judgemental, as the Minister has indicated.

I would ask the Minister, then, if those decisions are being made by himself or if he is delegating those decision, and if he knows of the criteria that are being used to make those decisions? In other words, is it determined upon whether that person has historically occupied a part of that land and by historically I don't mean in the longer term, but I mean that individual has historically occupied a part of that land - or is it determined by the fact that individual may have an operation, although they have never occupied that part of the land, may have an operation that is in keeping with the philosophy, as it stands now which may undergo change, but the philosophy of the department and of the committee in regard to use of that land? I would ask the Minister if the committee that we have referred to earlier, the Local Advisory Committee, is brought into these determinations of whether or not a permit is issued at any point during the whole process of determining whether or not that permit will be issued?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. I think the committee is largely working on the development of the plan and the guidelines. It is hard to respond to that question. I think perhaps the member has a specific question and is framing it in the general and all I can say is that under these conditions, where the decisions are made on a judgemental basis and necessarily a subjective one, that it is difficult to say that a factor such as previous occupancy of the area would necessarily guarantee a right of use. It certainly should be one of the factors to be considered and I am sure that my staff would consider that.

To the best of my knowledge, I don't believe that any of the decisions have come to my office for a decision, or have been referred to me by any individuals who feel that they have not been justly dealt with by the department.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, the Minister is partially correct, I have a number of specific issues in which I have become involved and interested in determining some sort of policy so that I can answer enquiries that are given to me from time-to-time by members of the constituency, particularly members who live in the Churchill area who see that particular segment of their habitat being put aside and would like to know how they can gain access to it if they so desire. While it is not one specific individual that has approached me, it is a number of individuals and it would be hard to couch all their questions into one specific instance. That is why I am, of course, referring to this in the generalities.

The Minister indicated that the residency or the occupation of the land would be one of the factors that would be determined. I would ask the Minister, then if he knows of any other factors that might be used in such a determination as to whether or not a person would get a permit to use his particular piece of land?

MR. RANSOM; Not specifically, Mr. Chairman, but I would judge that one of the criteria would be that it would be relative to whether or not the proposed use is likely to be what we might call an irreversible use, that by permitting the use at this time that we would foreclose some option that we might wish to address in the formulation of the plan. I would think that would be a major kind of a factor to be judged.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I recognize the interest that the Member for Churchill has in this area. It is an important area, it is quite a vast area and I would be very happy to be able to arrange a meeting with the honourable member and with staff and we could discuss this in some detail, recognizing the interest that he has in it as being the member for the area.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would preface my remarks that I am not an outdoorsman as such and not a hunter, but I respect the rights of hunters to go out and shoot animals when they are in season. I would just like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Minister that in an area that I am quite familiar with, down around in the southeast corner of the province close to the Menisino-Piney area, it's quite a good area for hunting, particularly for deer. Again, as I say, I am not really that interested in the hunting of the animal myself, but I respect the rights of those people who do hunt deer in season.

I have had some complaints from some of my neighbours in that area who have suggested to me that maybe they should be given some preference as to hunting rights, particularly with moose - is the plural of moose "mice," I'm not sure - but moose, and they tell me that through the luck of the draw that you have a chance to get a permit to shoot moose. There are few moose in the area, but I was wondering whether the government or the Minister can suggest at this time whether in fact any preference is given to the residents in the area; whether the Minister or his department is doing anything to encourage the breeding of moose in that area so that there will be a plentiful supply for hunters to go out and seek these moose. I have tasted the meat of the moose and I have found it to be quite tasty and I would just ask the Minister at this time if he could advise the House and the hunters and the people in my area whether in fact after they come and eat the alfalfa that grows on my farm, which I don't send any bills to the government for allowing these wild animals to come onto my farm and eat, but whether in fact the people in the area are given any preference when they are selected for permits for shooting these animals.

MR. RANSOM: In general, Mr. Chairman, we do not give special consideration to people from a given area for the hunting of game, although it is a question that we are examining carefully right now as we are in the process of reviewing The Wildlife Act, but in principle the resource belongs to all Manitobans no matter where they live. So in general Manitobans have an equal right of access to it, but in some cases where the demand is greater than the supply, then we have placed some restrictions on how often an individual may apply. If they get a licence one year they may not be eligible to get one the following year and I'm advised that's the case in the southeast.

In terms of the work that the government is doing to increase production I think the factors that are most important are those that relate to the occurrence of fires and the logging operations that have the greatest impact on the production of moose. While they are not beyond the control of government moose management really is not the primary purpose behind those activities, either the forest protection or the logging activities.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to bring to the Honourable Minister's attention that in the southeast corner, particularly this last spring when I went out to visit a particular location which is a half-mile due east of Menisino, I have a friend out there who's got a farm and I was noticing, even though they didn't live there all winter, that there were bullet holes in the living accommodations on this particular farm. I would just wonder whether the Minister has some policy of protecting the farmers in the area, for the wildlife, protecting not only the moose, but the cattle that are being raised in that area. Is it just by extra supervision during hunting season, or does the Minister do anything in regard to hiring additional staff to supervise the area during hunting season; not just in that particular area but I would suggest throughout the whole province? And while the Minister is answering that, if he would just advise whether, when you say the resources belong to all of the people of the province, are we allowed to go north to the Churchill area and get a permit to shoot polar bears - not that I want to make light of the loss of the two polar bears - but would it be just possible for anybody to take a permit, or request a permit to shoot polar bears?

MR. RANSOM: The last part of the question first, Mr. Chairman; no one has that right in the province, so the honourable member has equal opportunities along with the rest of those of us in the province; no one has the right to hunt them

during a sport season. As far as the protection and the related trespass problem and enforcement problem, we recognize that as a problem; it's something that's under active consideration in the review of The Wildlife Act and I think that the honourable member and others will see, when that act comes forward for consideration, that we will have given some attention to the problem and that we will be dealing with it in a more effective fashion than has been the case in the past.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you Mr. Chairperson. It's always a pleasure, by the way, to be able to sit and allow our honoured Chairperson an opportunity to participate in the debate from the other side, so I did not mind the interruption in the least - as a matter of fact, listened with some great interest to his questions because I propose to ask some similar questions later on in the Estimates, so was pleased to have the opportunity to sort of get a picture of what the answers were going to be.

Further to the subject that we were discussing previous to the Member for Radisson's contribution to the committee debates, I'd ask the Minister to now indicate if there are any other terms of reference, or any other criteria which the Minister would take into consideration in determining whether or not an individual or an organization would be allowed use of a part of the wildlife management area. So far, we know that one of the factors might well be residence, that person's residency in that area. Another factor might be the proposed use, and by that I assume, if I interpret the Minister's comments correctly, that what he is talking about is that he does not want to get locked into a program which he cannot, or the department cannot get out of, in case the proposals that come forward from the committee would find that to be an inappropriate use of the land; I would assume that was the intent of that statement.

Would the Minister take into consideration also, when determining whether or not a permit would be issued, whether or not that activity would be in keeping with the general lifestyle, life-pattern and patterns of use of that land, in an historical and traditional sense. In other words, to take it to its ridiculous conclusion, would the Minister allow for an A&W stand to go up there, or would the Minister allow for an operation that would try to, in many senses, be in keeping with the traditional uses of that land? In other words, uses that would involve travel throughout it by historical means; would involve uses that would not take away from the particular beauty of the land and also would not take away in the esoteric sense from the history of that land. Would that be another criteria that the Minister would use to determine, and if so, are there any other that would come to mind very briefly?

And I realize, of course, that perhaps I am putting the Minister on the spot by asking him these questions without actually allowing him time to go through his files to ascertain exactly what the criteria are - so I would also ask the Minister if he could forward to myself any written materials that would reference themselves to the criteria that are used in order to determine whether or not a permit would be allocated to an individual or an organization in this regard.

MR. RANSOM: The honourable member really is asking hypothetical questions of me, Mr. Chairman, since I haven't had the proposals put to me. I don't object to that, but it is rather an academic exchange from my point of view; it may not be an academic exchange from the honourable member's point of view. I think one of the reasons why we've undertaken the development of the plan and to set up the advisory committee is so that we will be able to take that step beyond ad hocery, and that we would be able to say, yes, here's a general plan, here's a set of guidelines of the kinds of uses that would be given consideration within the wildlife management area, and other uses are very likely not to be given consideration. So I'm sure that the honourable member could propose 100 different factors, that I might well say, yes, that sounds to me like that would be a worthy factor to be taken into consideration. So I really can't deal with it on that hypothetical basis, but I would certainly offer the opportunity again, not by way of attempting to eliminate any discussion during the Estimates, but I certainly would offer the opportunity to sit down with the member, with staff, and talk about some

of these, both the hypothetical and the actual problems, if in fact there are actual problems that require resolution.

MR. COWAN: Thank you Mr. Chairperson. I do appreciate that opportunity that the Minister has offered and would hope to be able to take him up on it in the near future. I look forward to that discussion, because he is absolutely correct when he indicated that it is a matter of concern to myself, not only because I represent that area, but also because what we're talking about in this regard as a concept, which I believe is important in the entire provincial scheme of things; it is important to understand how we allocate land, what we are going to allow that land to be used for. There are too many instances of the past, and I'm not going to attribute them to one government or another government because I don't believe that would be of any value at this junction, but there are too many instances in the past where allocations for land use have been allocated in a rather haphazard fashion and I would hope that this concept that we see forming, and it is in the process of formation now in the Churchill area, will provide us with an example and provide us with a concrete measure for future use in order to determine how we are going to allocate land use areas, especially in northern Manitoba, where you have to be very careful because of the fragile structure of the ecol system in that particular subarctic area.

So I look forward and I encourage the Minister in his deliberations in this regard, in order to formulate some of that policy, albeit in this instance of policy specific to one area, I'm certain that we can use it as an example for other areas in the future. I would hope then that in the meanwhile, while this process of overall policy formation is going on, that individuals that come to the Minister's office in the Minister's department - or the Minister mentioned the number of other departments that they could come to in this regard, the tourism department, etc. - that when persons in organizations do come to those departments, or the Minister himself as the final authority in this particular matter, that they will determine, on an ad hoc basis now, whether or not that land is going to put to good use presently and whether or not the use of that land applied for, is going to be in keeping with what they can anticipate the long-term strategies of the local advisory committee in his department to be in this regard.

I know the Minister can't fully anticipate what the draft plan, or the final plan will be; if he could, there'd be no need to go through the process of having a committee work on that. But he can, I am certain, in his deliberations, ensure that the uses that might be long-term, or have long-term impact and significant impact on the area, be not allowed until such a time as the final plan has been implemented, so that he is not locked into a position where we are stuck with an agreement that is not in keeping with the final plan.

But on the other hand, that if there is an individual organization that comes forward now with a plan that may be in keeping with the traditional use of the land, that may be in keeping with the Minister's criteria, whatever that may be at the moment - and we've mentioned some of them, such as the residency factor - and also whether or not it will be a long-term project, or a project that will inflict long-term results on the land. I would hope that the Minister would review those and not hold back in those instances, favourable projects, because of the fact that we are going to have a plan come forward in the near future. In other words, if there is a plan that looks viable now and is not going to have a specific long-term detrimental impact, and that's a judgemental call, as the Minister says, before and aptly so, he has to make that decision, but that they just not blanket, say, no, there'll be no development until such a time as this final plan is devised and implemented. I'm certain, from the discussions that I've had with the Minister in this regard over the last few moments, that is what the Minister does have in mind and that is the manner in which the Minister has been working in the previous few months of the previous couple of years, when he's had opportunity to direct the specific program.

So I would just ask the Minister, if that is indeed the case and if so, if he will forward those materials that we requested and we can discuss this at another time. I do look forward to being able to sit down with the Minister, perhaps along with people from the area, if they should happen to make it down here, or we should happen to make it up there together, and have a broader, more wide-ranging discussion on it, with input from various factors. I do look forward to that and

I also, at the same time, have to add, I do look forward to the materials that the Minister has indicated would be forthcoming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, on another section I asked the Minister some fairly detailed questions when I was expressing some concerns about Ducks Unlimited and he thought that he might be able to provide the information under this section, since there was some detail asked for. I wonder if the Minister has that information available yet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, I think Mr. Chairman, that I have the information that the member was seeking. The agreement that we are just in the process of concluding with Ducks Unlimited now, is one that has been under consideration for some years, I believe it would be accurate to say and it has involved discussion with the local Indian band, with local trappers and with members of The Wildlife Association. And others are aware of it. For instance, the farmers in the area are aware of it, although they accept the fact that it's not going to have any direct impact upon their welfare, but at least it does demonstrate that there had been fairly wide knowledge of the type of agreement that was under negotiation. It will be a long-term agreement, and the terms of the agreement will have to be met, of course. If the terms of the agreement weren't met, which includes the licence - it would be issued by water resources for the management of water between given levels - then of course, if those levels are not adhered to, the licence can be cancelled under those circumstances.

The lease itself is anticipated to be a long-term lease running to 50 years, which is based on the expected life of the construction works, and if, during that period of time the government should want to pend the agreement, then it will be necessary to buy back the works, on the basis of the proportion of the unexpended time left in the agreement and according to the amount of area that might be required for some other purpose, depending whether - that could range from a few acres, to the entire project area. That work will be undertaken - I think the capital amount is anticipated to be about \$1,760,000 and of that, the province will be putting up \$360,000 of the capital costs. Ducks Unlimited would be putting up the remainder of the capital costs and then Ducks Unlimited would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the project over the years. There will be an advisory committee set up to deal with how the area is to be managed and the government will have input and such others as the government feels are necessary to have an input on it.

That generally outlines the way the agreement will go. I think it will have considerable benefits for fur production and waterfowl production and probably will benefit moose production as well. I believe it covers some of the area that formerly used to be in the old Summerberry Fur Rehabilitation Block and that somewhat similar types of managements, in concept at least, have been carried out there since the 1940s.

The honourable member raised some question or concern about whether or not the purposes that Ducks Unlimited might have were consistent with those that we should have. I simply would like to assure him that it's only under those circumstances that we would want to proceed with such an agreement, if in fact the purposes are consistent, and we think that in this case it is a type of project that we would find beneficial to go ahead with, irrespective of where the funding came from. But given the opportunity to get funding from outside of government, and in this case indeed, from outside of the country, in order to better manage our fur and waterfowl and moose populations in the area, then we think that it is a very worthwhile undertaking and we are very pleased to be able to conclude this type of agreement with Ducks Unlimited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has the information there in a little bit more detail in terms of the nature of the consultation.

Were there meetings with these various groups and Ducks Unlimited officials, and resources officials, or was the proposal sent to them and they wrote back with their comments? I would like a little bit of detail on this, Mr. Chairperson, because of course the MLA is the one that hears the complaints if things don't work out properly, so I would like to have a real good idea of what was the consultation beforehand with these various groups that the Minister mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, there were meetings, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBryde: Mr. Chairman, my question is, were these formal meetings with the Trappers' Association, a formal separate meeting with the MMF, a formal separate meeting with the Band Council, with Ducks Unlimited people, as well as provincial officials present?

MR. RANSOM: I don't know that there would be meetings with the MMF, Mr. Chairman. The meetings were likely to be held with those people who have a direct interest in the resource, not necessarily according to the type of organization. There were meetings for example with the Band; Ducks Unlimited held the meetings and there were Wildlife Branch staff in attendance. I understand there has been more than one such meeting held over the past couple of years. I believe that the Band are on record - the minutes of those meetings as agreeing to the development proposal. Ducks Unlimited also had consultation with the trappers that would be affected by the development, again handled mainly through the Indian Band at The Pas, where principally the trappers stem from. Some meetings were held separately with the local fur council and trappers who were not part of the band. There were meetings held with The Pas Wildlife Association as well, and though there were not meetings held with farmers of the area as such in contact with the department, they have been advised of the nature of the agreement and the department and Ducks Unlimited assessment of what effect it might have.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that he believes that there was an agreement formalized in some way and to the extent that the minutes of the meeting would show acceptance by the Band Council. I wonder if there is similar documentation in terms of agreement with the Fur Council, with the Trappers' Association, with The Pas Wildlife Association?

MR. RANSOM: I don't think that there are agreements in the sense that there are signatures of everyone involved. It's just that I have the assurance that the meetings were held and that these interest groups have been informed and have been part of the discussions, and that in fact there is agreement on the principle of the project. Now I suppose that it would not surprise me to find that there would be individual people who would come forward and say, "I wasn't consulted," or "I'm not in favour of this," but I would be very much surprised, in fact it's not an overstatement to say I would be shocked to find out that the Band, for instance, or the local trappers were not in favour of this project.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister has a simple summary and a simple map that I could get from him, not a whole detailed one, but if he has a summary of the nature of the proposed agreement and a map showing the area that it's to cover.

MR. RANSOM: I would be happy to make a copy of the agreement available when it's signed, Mr. Chairman, and just generally the area under consideration is that between the Summerberry River and the Saskatchewan River, loosely upstream from where the forebay begins, I believe, up to the confluence or the divergence, I guess of the Summerberry and the Saskatchewan.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, are there any other trappers from other communities that trap up into that area? I am thinking specifically of the Easterville trappers that come quite a way in towards The Pas.

MR. RANSOM: There may be, Mr. Chairman. I would have to take that question under consideration.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I just wonder if the Minister could check that, if there are other trappers from other communities, and I think that there are, that he could also let them know the nature of the agreement before the actual signing of it takes place.

MR. RANSOM: I just want to say that I will undertake to check out what has been done, but I would say that the events have progressed to the point where I anticipate signing the agreement very shortly, and I'm satisfied that in fact we have given consideration to the necessary groups. Now if something should come to my attention that hasn't been done then I might have to reconsider, but at the moment it's my expectation that the agreement will be signed shortly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we get into real detailed questioning of the Minister on this section, and I suppose we've already moved into that a bit, but I would like to make some general comments in sort of conclusion of the polar bear issue. A number of my colleagues have already commented on this and raised their concerns. I would like to sort of wrap up our position on the issue.

The Minister, the other day, in responding to the MLA for Elmwood, gave us his rationale for having granted the permit, and he mentioned that certain scientists had approached the Department of Indian Affairs and the department had recommended the project to him. The Canadian Department of Environment had recommended it. The Churchill council I believe, had passed a resolution in favour of it, and he seemed to dwell on that one and put a lot of weight on the fact that the Churchill council had been in approval of the project, although I believe even now they would have second thoughts, with the wisdom of hindsight on this issue and I'm not so sure that the Churchill Council may have fully realized what they were approving or recommending to the Minister when they did so.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister has a responsibility for wildlife in the province of Manitoba, and the buck stops with him in terms of what happens to wildlife in Manitoba. To that extent, the Minister is sort of a wildlife ombudsman, so to speak, for the wildlife of Manitoba that can't of course speak for themselves. The Minister must maintain a protection and security of the resource in Manitoba. It is his responsibility to act on behalf of all the people of Manitoba for the protection and security of our wildlife resource, and I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that when there is any doubt at all in the minds of the department or the Minister, that doubt should always be in favour of the wildlife resource. In this case I believe that the Minister may have acted rashly in giving a permit for this particular experiment, given the almost predictable outcome of the experiment, and I believe this is a case of bad judgement on his part in terms of his having awarded a permit for this kind of a experiment to take place.

I listened to his comments on a radio program, As It Happens, in which he was interviewed by Barbara Frum, and I believe he admitted to her in her questioning of him that he would not approve such an experiment in the future. I believe to that extent he has taken a lesson from this case and realizes that it was not a good decision, and in fact that it should not have been taken. Unfortunately, I believe, this is a symbolic case in that it shows the responsibility of this Minister in terms of the wildlife management for the province, and to the extent that a mistake has been made in this case, an admitted mistake, that there is certainly a credibility problem in that the Minister's credibility and the government's credibility will be judged by their handling of this case.

I don't think the government or the Minister can escape that responsibility and I would remind him of a piece of advice which I followed when I was in government, Mr. Chairman, and that is that it is a Minister's responsibility when he is given advice and counsel by public officials, at whatever level, whether it is his own departmental officials or the officials of other government agencies that are advising him, that he is representing all the people of Manitoba as the Minister, and it is as if these people were coming forward to the people of Manitoba in a

wide forum, which of course is impossible to do. But it is as if you could bring all the people of Manitoba together and put this question to them, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that if that were possible, if the collective wisdom and judgement and good common sense of all the people of Manitoba could have been tested on this issue at the time that representations were made for this experiment to go forward, that it would have been a vast majority of people in Manitoba who would have said no, do not award this kind of a permit because of the dangers involved.

So to that extent, the Minister representing all the people of Manitoba collectively on this issue had a responsibility to tell the public servants who were recommending this to him what the public will not stand for, and it is clear from the reactions of the public to this issue that they will simply not stand for this kind of experimentation on the wildlife resource. I would think that the Minister has probably learned a lesson from this case and I would hope that in the future that experimentations of this sort will receive his more careful consideration and that experiments of this particular type that we're discussing will certainly never be approved again.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister, with respect to what programs the department has, or the Minister has, in dealing with compensation, whether the department and the Minister is considering a program of compensation for the loss of livestock due to predators taking livestock in areas of community pastures in the province.

I have brought to his attention, and the Minister is aware of the problems that the northern Interlake has faced over the last couple of years, the area west of Fisher Branch, or east of Ashern and west of Moosehorn, the Sleeve Lake, the Burnt Lake area, where there has been losses of cattle on Crown land grazing leases, where cattle have been mauled and slaughtered by timber wolves attacking the cattle. I know as well that the government has taken some steps in terms of employing a professional trapper to try and at least eradicate the timber wolves that are causing the problem and in as judicious a manner as possible, in trying not to wipe out the entire population, but at least try and pin down the killers in the pack and be able to deal with the problem effectively.

What has happened though, Mr. Chairman, is that in the last year, the area that is known as the Sylvandale community pasture, which is northwest of the community of Arborg, a PFRA pasture that is situated northwest of Arborg and southeast of the community of Hodgson, Manitoba, there have been numerous heads of cattle - I have just received letters from a number of farmers who have had their cattle in the Sylvandale pasture. While there is an insurance fund that is contributed to by the farmers in that community pasture, the fund nevertheless represents maybe, I would say, 10 percent on the basis of the cattle lost. It is a fund where farmers contribute, and if there are few losses in one year, then the farmers who have suffered substantial losses are able to claim more because there would be fewer losses. But in the last year, I think the numbers are in the 20 to two dozen animals, both of fairly yearling stock and full mature cows and stock that have been either so badly chewed up that they have had to be done away with, or actual losses of animals.

I know that there has not been any program that the government has had with respect to compensating losses of livestock due to predators, however, we have had compensation for losses of livestock during big game hunting season, where hunters who have made errors in terms of thinking the animal was a deer or a moose, and shot a head of livestock, then there was compensation paid during that period of time. However, in this case, there is no doubt that the evidence is clear that the losses are attributable to the timber wolf population, or at least, there may not be that many, but there are several killers that are roaming the Interlake and are having a devastating effect on the livestock populations in certain areas. And I've been approached by farmers in the Interlake to ascertain whether the government would consider setting up a fund in terms of dealing with the losses of livestock due to predators.

The department, I know, has been involved in having its conservation officers set up cyanide guns, and have had some success. As well, they employed the professional trapper and I don't know what the success rate, maybe the Minister

has some comments with respect to the matters that were brought to his attention over the last two years, but I specifically ask the Minister to consider the request of the livestock producers to see whether there is some thinking within the department to cover losses of this nature.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman, we're not contemplating implementing compensation for that type of wildlife damage. We do compensate, as the honourable member pointed out, for livestock killed by hunters during a legal season, because the government said some time ago they were prepared to accept responsibility for that. They also accept responsibility for paying damage caused by waterfowl and to some extent, damage caused by big game, because under those conditions, the landowner is not free to take action to defend his property through killing the offending animals. In the other cases of livestock damage by wolves, of course, that's not the case; the individual can take action on their own to try and alleviate the problem.

In addition, it's a very difficult type of event to document and be satisfied that you are paying out, that the claims are legitimate claims. But rather than look at paying a compensation, we have taken some action over the past couple of years to try and deal with that specific problem. As the honourable member knows, it's one that had been developing for some time. The number of complaints with respect to wolves in the Interlake area had risen from 12 in 1974-75 to 24 in 1975-76, 27 in 1976-77, back to 21 in 1977-78, and then up to 32 in 1978-79. But we undertook a substantial program in 1978-79, a control program, and the number of complaints fell to 15 this past year, so it was more than cut in half. We put in substantial additional amount of manpower, it went to up to 132 man days expended on that control program in 1978-79, from 117 the year before and 94 before that. It cost quite a bit of money to implement that, but I think it was reasonably successful, and I'm advised now that as far as the department knows, they probably have killed the last two wolves that were in the area of the Sylvandale community pasture. That's a statistic that may be received with some glad measure by the locals there, but it's not a statistic that's going to be received well by all segments of our society.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland has just spoken of the requirement for the Minister responsible to look after the interests of wildlife, and we're faced on the other hand with protecting the interests of the farmers as well, and so we attempt to strike some kind of a balance between these competing demands. And I think that in this case, Mr. Chairman, the farmers in that area had a legitimate complaint, and I think that the department has moved to try and bring it in hand. I think they have had a substantial measure of success and I can assure those who are interested in the welfare of our wolf population, as I am, and as my department is, that the wolf population in Manitoba is in no danger.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, that's precisely the reason that I raised the issue of the department and the government giving consideration to some compensation program. The Minister, in times when there are heavy losses, is under a great deal of pressure, I realize that, to do something about the losses caused by predators, and in this case, timber wolves. And the fact of the matter is, if the Minister is interested in maintaining the population and knowing that the average farmer, (1) is not equipped to handle this type of a situation in terms of most of them having cattle 15, 20 miles away from home during the pasture season, that they cannot, and are unable to look after the herds; and secondly, if we concerned about maintaining the wildlife species in the province, namely the wolf population, and I accept the Minister's concern that he walks a very thin line in terms of where his, not only priorities, but where his allies are, who he should defend and who he should protect at any given time, but this would be one way, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister could, if he wished to leave the situation as is, it would not be very hard to have farmers provide reasonable proof that damage was done by wolves or by bears, whatever the case may be. The carcasses, if one was to examine the carcasses that were torn apart, you would readily see that it was not done by a human, or a dog, for example, whether it was a case of a dog, it would have to be a very large animal, very vicious, and the tears and the flesh of the animals that survived, the flesh that would be hanging from them after having been attacked, wouldn't be very hard for the

department and conservation officers to verify, that in fact this kind of damage did occur and the animals certainly could be identified with respect to whose animal it might be.

Mr. Chairman, we know, in cases where, during hunting season, animals disappear. I don't believe that the department will pay for an animal, for a carcass that may have been shot during a hunting season, unless that carcass is visibly verified. I'm not aware of cases where a farmer has come in and said, look, my cow or my steer is missing, it's during hunting season, you have to pay - unless we have done this, I am certainly not aware of that. I would think that under those programs, the department does want verification of the loss of livestock, and until such a time as there is verification, either by an ag rep or by one of the conservation officers, a claim is not entertained.

Certainly it would be no different a matter in this case, that the evidence of loss of animal, and/or the mutilation of the animal, would have to be proved by the owner. Although I would have to say that farmers, no doubt, when the losses are fairly great, and some farmers did suffer fairly substantial losses in terms of, I think there were several in the last few years that had lost five or more animals, and when you look at the economic loss of those individuals there is no doubt that it might be to their advantage to be able to set up some eradication program on their own. And I think that would be far worse, Mr. Chairman, if farmers started taking this matter into their own hands and trying to deal with it on their own. I think it far better that the Minister and his department, through the resource people that he has at his beck and call, would be able to set up a program, monitor it and handle it effectively. Or else, Mr. Chairman, do as I am suggesting - in addition to that, set up a compensation program. The Wildlife Population Minister wants to say the wolf population should be well and good, this is one way of not bearing or faring the wrath of the farmer towards the government and him having to sustain the losses that many of them have.

The community pasture, as I've stated, they have had two people that are full-time employees of that community pasture and they were unable to prevent the losses that had occurred. These are men who are the range day in day out, evenings, on horseback and they are there with the cattle practically all the time, and yet a large amount of losses occurred in that community pasture. How is the farmer, some farmers who have cattle over vast areas of land, for example in the Sleeve Lake area, there may be half-a-dozen farmers who pasture their cattle communally, and there are no fences, there are no corrals, they let their cattle out in the spring and they are not brought back till the fall when they bring them back home for the winter feeding season. They are unable to patrol or even attempt to patrol those large areas to be able to take the action that the Minister says is available to them in controlling the predators.

I know that the action that the government has taken likely has cleaned out the trouble makers, but what I am suggesting is that we shouldn't say, stop here; we should say, all right, what are we going to do if this outbreak occurs somewhere else in the province? - in the parklands area, or in the Swan River area, or back in the interlake? Are we then prepared to institute a program and compensate? I would ask the Minister to give serious consideration to this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (a)--pass. (b) Wildlife Management; (1) Salaries--pass, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions here in detail for the Minister. I wonder if he could indicate what his government's policy is with respect to hunting in the parks in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I outlined that in some detail when we discussed the parks item, but just to recap again, we see consumptive uses such as hunting and trapping as being legitimate uses of parklands in concept but that there are going to be specific situations where it is not appropriate. It may not be appropriate because of an area being built up or it may not be appropriate because there's a zone where it's the intention of the park managers to get

a super-density of wildlife for people to see and therefore it wouldn't be appropriate to hunting, but those sorts of areas would have to be identified as such as we go through and develop the master plans that we've been discussing so that we approach it from the point of, yes, it's a legitimate activity unless there's some specific reason why it shouldn't take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister, have we given the SMUs on all of these departments? We had setup a routine where the Honourable Minister was going to give the SMUs . . . --(Interjection)-- SMYs - did I confuse the Honourable Minister? --(Interjection)--
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I can provide it, I believe I did provide it for the administration item when we started last week and I can provide it for this one. It's 17.15 under the Wildlife Management item, and it was 17.15 last year as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . to run down them all? It seems that we have given an open program on asking on any department now.

MR. RANSOM: I can do that, Mr. Chairman. On Item (c) the figure is 4, and that is the same as it was last year; the next one, Item (d), it was 7 last year and 8 this year. I slipped up there, the Biological Services item, (e), was 15; the Habitat Management item was 7 last year and 8 this year; and Regional Management, Item (f), is 11 both years; and the Canada-Manitoba Northlands was 6 in both years; and the Wild Fur Agreement was 9.13 both years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's one of the questions we would have had on this section, so I thank you for your assistance in that. The other question I have is with respect to Wildlife Management. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the status is of the deer population in Manitoba? I don't know if he has made any public statements on this, if so I have not seen them; if he can indicate what the present count is and the status and what type of deer hunting season, if any, the Minister is contemplating approving for the regular season this year.

MR. RANSOM: I don't have statistical information to provide, Mr. Chairman, but I can say that it has been a very favourable winter in terms of survival of the deer population, and we anticipate that we will certainly be having a season this upcoming fall. I have not as yet received the department's recommendations as to the exact nature of the season, but in general things are much more favourable than they were last year.

While I'm on my feet in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I can say that the elk season that was held last fall and winter in the Spruce Woods area was also quite a successful season, with good participation, and the kill was somewhat higher than was anticipated but still within acceptable limits. It provided a very high quality recreation for those people who participated and did also, I think, help to alleviate some of the damage problems that we have in that area in terms of the agricultural damage that the population was doing. And I think it's fair to say, in hindsight, that some of the concerns that have been expressed about decimation of populations and conflicts with non-consumptive users didn't materialize as such.

There is one other item that I would also like to bring to the attention of the members, Mr. Chairman, and that is the plight of the Kaminuriak caribou population in the northern part of our province, and which of course extends into the territories. I think that the situation with respect to that caribou herd has probably reached a critical stage and that it's going to be necessary to achieve the full co-operation of the native hunters and of the provincial and federal and the territorial governments to attempt to arrest the decline that is taking place in that herd and that has taken place over the past few decades. It has declined from an estimated 150,000 animals in the early 1950's to less than 40,000 today. And whereas in the earlier years it used to extend from the Churchill River to Chesterfield Inlet, a distance of some 750 miles, today the herd barely penetrates

into our province. Now this is a very complicated issue, of course, because of the traditional uses that the native people have made of the herd. It is complicated by the number of governments that are involved and it's complicated by the sheer fact that when you want to sit down and talk about the problem it is necessary to sit down with native groups who don't speak the same language and it is necessary to translate or interpret the proceedings of meetings into the different languages of the native groups that are involved, who have a vital interest in the herd.

I simply point this out, Mr. Chairman, as something that the members of this Legislature should be aware of. It is something that we are attempting to deal with, but the history of the problem over the past few decades indicates that should the present trend continue, it might only be a very few years until that herd reached levels that for all intents and purposes would mean that it had in fact been destroyed. So we expect that there will have to be some initiative taken by all governments and with the full co-operation of the hunters if we are going to be able to address this problem satisfactorily.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a related question to that of populations. I understand that the Minister instituted at least partial if not a complete buck hunting season for deer last year. I wonder if the Minister can indicate if there have been concerns raised with him with respect to this type of season? I recall when this issue was raised before, that members of his own caucus had indicated that in rural areas of the province in particular, people were concerned about having a buck only season for deer hunting and the concern they raised was that there would be wastage of deer; that is, hunters shooting indiscriminately at whatever deer they saw would be killing the does and fawns and would therefore leave those in the bush when they discovered their mistake. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he has heard those concerns, if in his opinion they still exist as valid concerns and if so, what his future plans will be with respect to these types of seasons in the future?

MR. RANSOM: Certainly those concerns exist, Mr. Chairman. People hold fairly strong views when it come to hunting and how hunting should be carried out, and there are those who maintain on the one hand, that irrespective of the numbers of animals that are available, it's really only sporting to shoot the males, or shoot the bucks, or the bulls, or whatever; there are others who hold that it results in waste, as the honourable member has pointed out, if we attempt to be selective in that fashion. But I would have to say that on the basis of the contacts that I have had, and I think that the department has had as well, that the season was received quite favourably, especially taken in light of what an alternative might have been, if the alternative had been to close the season instead of to have a bucks-only season, then there is no question in my mind that the bucks-only season is a far more acceptable one.

There also is no question in my mind, that it does result in a somewhat higher level of wastage than would be the case in a season where either sex was legal game. But the objective in having a bucks-only season of that nature was to provide recreation to Manitobans and to bring through a larger number of female deer that would produce fawns in the spring of 1980 than would have been the case if there had been even a limited season on deer of either sex. We think that that was accomplished, and the estimated harvest, just for information of the members, the estimated harvest was slightly in excess of 10,000 deer during the 1979 season, and there were some 30,000 licences sold, so the success rate was estimated to be a little better than 34 percent. I think that that would be regarded as quite a satisfactory level of success in many other jurisdictions where deer hunting takes place, indeed for situations where either sex might be legal game.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it was a successful season, and if the necessity is there, if the department recommends that sort of restrictive season again, then I would see no reason why that should not be proceeded with.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether there are intended any changes in respect to the waterfowl compensation that the province has had for a number of years with respect to the increasing values of the crops as they are on the market, whether there are any changes contemplated with respect

to the compensation paid to farmers for damages that they incur as a result of ducks and geese?

MR. RANSOM: The honourable member may be aware, Mr. Chairman, that we increased the amount of compensation last year from \$25 to \$50, and that's what was in place in the fall of 1979. We were just really in the process of paying out those compensation claims, and they amount to some \$285,000, which I believe is a substantially lower figure than we've experienced in some years. At the moment, we do not have an agreement, as I understand it, with the federal government, for 1980, and it is perhaps questionable at this point what type of agreement that we will be able to negotiate. So I think that's the first problem that has to be addressed by us before we look at the possibility of further expanding the program beyond the increase that took place last year.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that there is no agreement with the federal government. As I understand it, the ongoing agreement is of a 50-50 nature with respect to between the province and Ottawa. Could the Minister indicate what the problem is that there is no ongoing agreement, or is the agreement of a year-to-year nature, or is it a three-year agreement, or five-year agreement that has expired, and where is this process at?

MR. RANSOM: The last couple of years have been on a year-to-year basis, Mr. Chairman, and I think we would like to look at something more longterm than that, because we do believe that the federal government has a responsibility in this year of damage compensation and we certainly will be pressing that case upon them.

One point of clarification, the honourable member asked if the cost-sharing was 50-50. That is true, except in those situations at Oak Hammock and at Marshy Point where the province agrees to pay 100 percent of the damage claims because of management activities that have been undertaken there that have precipitated the problem. In other areas where a damage problem is considered to be part of the natural sequence of events, then the government does not accept full and complete responsibility, but in those two situations, we have been.

MR. URUSKI: I thank the Minister for the information. Could the Minister indicate, with respect to Oak Hammock, and I think he said Marshy Point, areas, where the province is involved 100 percent in the compensation there, would the federal people have not been involved at all during the length of time the province has paid compensation; and if they have not, would they not be obligated to participate in at least their share of an ongoing program where they would, up to a limit, do they not put in funds up to what their statutory or their agreed limit is in other cases, and would they then not be obligated to put their share into these programs? Could the Minister indicate how, and he's given us the total compensation picture across the province, for last year, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. Committee will resume at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

Committee rise.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Mondays, the first order of business is Resolutions. The first Resolution on the Order Paper is Resolution No. 19.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere. Resolution No. 19 moved to the bottom of the Order Paper.

RESOLUTION NO. 20 - REGULATIONS UNDER THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Virден, that:

WHEREAS certain regulations made by The Manitoba Liquor Control Commission

- (a) create an economic hardship on hotel proprietors and other licensed premises by requiring a minimum of 13 square feet per chair in determining the seating capacity of licensed premises;
- (b) prohibit patrons in licensed premises from transporting their alcoholic beverages from one table to another;
- (c) prohibit a licensee from selling and dealivering alcoholic beverages by the bottle to patrons and particularly to tourists visiting our province who wish to enjoy a quiet evening in their rooms and who are not interested in attending any of the entertainment provided by the licensee;
- (d) unduly prohibit local liquor advertising on television which if permitted could create new jobs and raise additional revenue for the province particularly in view of the fact that liquor advertising is extensively carried and viewed by cablevision subscribers in the province;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. THAT the government of Manitoba amend the relevant regulations under The Liquor Control Act to
 - (a) remove the 13 square-foot per chair requirement to determine the seating capacity in licensed premises;
 - (b) permit patrons in licensed premises to transport their alcoholic beverages from one table to another provided it is carried out in an orderly manner;
 - (c) permit a licensee to sell and deliver to a patron or tourist occupying a room in a hotel, alcoholic beverages by the bottle for consumption in the room; and
 - (d) remove the restriction on liquor advertising on local television.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I bring forward this resolution after having given considerable thought to many of the problems that affect our provincial image, and the job we have of attracting people by alluding to our lifestyle in this fine prairie province. I appreciate that the government has set up a committee, but I have been one, since 1975, that has been attempting to have changes made and have been led to believe that even when the review committee comes forward with their suggestions, it will not be for another eight months to a year, and I believe we are falling behind. I believe that in trying to change the urban liquor laws, that we've got to look at a more modern approach, a more liberal approach, we've got to go with the trends of the '80s and the public demand that seems to be out there.

I looked with interest on the advertising from British Columbia, in which they claim that their laws encourage a lifestyle which is acceptable, together with the mountains, together with the beauty of the province in itself, that the lifestyle of the people brings together people, friendly people in the communication aspect that can only be attributed to what they call freedom of choice. For instance, you have a number of segments of society. We all know that any changes to the liquor laws always meet with a very stern lobby from the temperance group. We all know that any changes that don't involve hotels are subject to a strong lobby from the Manitoba Hotel Association, and I say that if you are to look at freedom of choice, if you are to look at a demand for a lifestyle in the '80s, of the people of all age groups, and certainly the age group that I represent, the 30 to 50 age group, we're demanding that changes come about, and changes that make sense. I look upon these changes in the part of the resolution and I talk about the 13 square foot requirement - I guess I should deal with them in some type of order - and that particular requirement prohibits the type of thing that we have and what we call the stand up community bar, the disco or the well-decorated establishment.

I had the privilege to be in Toronto not too long ago in an establishment with four separate types of lifestyle drinking establishments. In the one was a Saturday afternoon jazz combo in which people were allowed to come in with their tennis

clothing, that type of attire, and designer jeans - the blue jean era is now up to about \$60 a pair - but certainly the type of casual dress and the type of musical entertainment that had people be able to communicate in a very fine decor. Obviously it was acceptable because the four different types of decors have four distinct types of clientele. You have the English pub scene and it's been alluded to the peanut bars which are very famous south of the line where we used to have what we call the men's only beer parlour in the past, but these are ones in which tap beer is served like in an English pub, and popcorn and peanuts are given to people for an after work relaxation.

I think if we're to get rid of the 13 square foot . . . We have a new establishment in Winnipeg, that Gene Telpner refers to called Brandy's, in which there is an aquarium and all types of plants. There is a tree in the middle of the establishment and there is an indication that there is a great deal of capital investment ready from eastern, local entrepreneurs, ready to go into these particular establishments, these types of establishments, if they can reach the political arena where these regulations are shot down as being archaic and not modern and sort of built in to protect a certain, in my opinion, certain segment of the sales industry, namely the hotels. I think it is a healthy thing if the hotels are given competition, because these entrepreneurs will build the type of establishments that meet the public demand. And who knows, maybe the hotel people will realize that they are in a free enterprise market and have to give the people what they demand, and that the type of quiet decor, the first-class decor, with working man prices.

I think of the happy hours, I think of the type of singalongs that are so available in the legions and some of the other establishments that could be given a little bit of modernization and I think of how ridiculous it is to have a stand-up bar that people want to communicate that would hold 50 to 75 people in a space without too much trouble because of the 13 square foot requirement, it just doesn't make sense. In other words, instead of communicating, they then become a spectacle to the patrons who are seated.

Before I go on to the next one I wanted to really look at the advertising section, Mr. Speaker. Because there was a czar in the Liquor Commission, a Mr. Frank Syms, on October 1st, 1974, he sent out a letter and it was called to all the manufacturers of spirits, wine and beer and it is a liquor control directive on advertising from Mr. Frank Syms. I was unable to get a copy of it because I do not have the secret files, or access to the secret files, that obviously Mr. Syms took away with him, but I am sure that many of the people could come forward with the contents of that letter. And this letter was probably a shock to the Member for Elmwood, who I think of as probably one of the more liberal thinking members of the members opposite. And that letter said in effect that we don't want to have any liquor advertising that shows a group of people; that shows anybody being happy; we don't want to associate the consumption of liquor with lifestyles; and we don't want to show on television any consumption of the liquor; and we don't want to have any personal endorsements; we don't want to have the Guy Lefleurs and the Bobby Hulls and the Morris Lukowiches endorsing a personal product on television. Only Mr. Syms could endorse that product and it had to be probably Uncle Ben's. But it also said, it went further than that, you couldn't have any happy jingles or songs; and you know what the breweries did? They forgot about Manitoba. When they forgot about Manitoba, there was an exodus of a few individuals to other jobs, and there was an exodus of people in that industry to Ontario and Alberta where the liquor laws are more liberal and more modern. And because of the cost and the expense of advertising cost to put one of these things together, that in itself meant that industry in Manitoba suffered, and those jobs went to Ontario and Alberta, those dollars went to Ontario and Alberta, and they should come back to Manitoba because like Ontario and Alberta, we have a conservative government.

Well, I'd like the Member for Elmwood to say that it is not true. Mr. Syms said the only time that liquor advertising could be shown was from 10:00 o'clock in the evening to 7:00 a.m. in the morning. That meant that all the liquor advertisements had to be saturated and driven at the people between 10:00 and 11:00 o'clock in the evening and that was unfair. The time slot from 10:00 to 12:00 was so crowded that the breweries and that just opted out. And yet you

could turn on your television and look at Miller's High Life at 4:30 in the afternoon. You could look at a team of people coming off work enjoying a Miller's beer, or you could look at a gymnastic team coming off an event and relaxing with a Miller's High Life. But Mr. Syms didn't want that in Manitoba.

Let's talk about some of the things that we are now funding with taxpayer's dollars that could have been funded by the breweries. I remember for years the Morris Stampede . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think that it is incorrect, if I follow the member, that he is suggesting that the limits on liquor advertising in the province were set by the former chairman of the Liquor Commission. My recollection is, Mr. Speaker, that they were set by the Legislature of Manitoba in the late 1960s.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member did not have a point of privilege. The honourable member might have had a difference of opinion which does not constitute a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: On a matter of privilege, I ask you whether it is not correct that if it can be demonstrated that a member is making a statement that is not factual and is attributing a policy or remarks to somebody that they did not make, if that is not in fact a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member, he read his rules. Matters of privilege rarely occur in the Legislature and can be dealt with only by a substantive motion. A dispute between two members as to allegation of fact is not a point of privilege. A member can rise later and categorically deny it. He can enter into debate at a later date.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the honourable member wishes to argue with the Speaker, I am sorry he cannot argue with the Speaker. There is only one way he can challenge the Speaker's ruling.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, you ruled on a point of privilege, and I'm talking on a point of order. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very much out of order, I suggest to you it is very much out of order to blame a civil servant for legislation that is to be enacted in this House by the Legislature and I think this is wrong and I think you should call him to order immediately. This is not a question of different interpretation. The law is there. We are responsible to bring in the legislation and the acts and there is no point in accusing somebody else who has not that responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to a letter by the former government, that a civil servant by the name of Frank Syms, sent out October 1st, 1974, and if they want to deny that that letter exists, then they're taking all the fun out of being able to stand up and refer to that letter and offer some suggestions. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would not take away from time because I think I have some worthwhile changes, and I am sure that the Member for St. Boniface will enjoy the balance of his life better if these changes take place.

I wanted to talk about the Morris Stampede because the Morris Stampede for years received financial support from Labatt's; the Golden Falcon at Falcon Lake received financial support from Labatt's; The Grey Owl at Wasagaming, Clear Lake received support from Labatt's; Molson's - the Whiteshell Fishing Derby. And let

me explain what happens, because, Mr. Speaker, they donate the trophies, they pay for the cost of printing and everything, and they bring their product forward and some of it is complimentary, but others are sold in booths at the Morris Stampede, at the golf tournaments, and at the fishing derby. But along comes the former government and says, oh, no, Uncle Ben has to share in this bonanza. We want 15 percent of the liquor consumed at the fishing derby to be Uncle Ben's, even though the public didn't like the taste of Uncle Ben's. And that's what I call government interference. If you were allowed the changes in the advertising law, if our government would make the changes, we could get on with the job of supporting the Winnipeg Jets, of supporting a lot of these worthwhile functions that we the taxpayer are picking up under either a Lotteries Grant or some other grant and I don't think it's necessary.

I think if it's left to the advertising and you want to see a good advertisement of how are modern liquor laws work, there's a place called Bogart's over in the Townsite there, over in that section. If you go to Bogart's any night of the week, you'll see two or three liquor inspectors harrassing the owners and making sure that they don't have more than 200, 300 people in there even though it holds 500, because of the 13 square foot requirement. And you walk out the door and you see 25 people at the Leland Hotel lying in the streets. You see the cabs lined up and you see the people with two 12s of beer under their hands unable to cope with the - been over stuffed with alcoholic beverages and the liquor inspectors are not concerned about that particular phenomena.

I wanted to talk about the second part. I talk about patrons in licenced premises being able to transport their beverages from table to another. I think the stand-up bar and I think the live music that is there in the particular establishments calls for and suggests that people who are happy, people that are moving about communicating, that are drinking less by moving around, that are being able to turn around and move with their alcoholic beverage, are up dancing. They're up enjoying themselves and they are not going home plastered. It's a fact. You can look at a Manitoba cabaret and you can look at one in Toronto and it's like night and day, and this is the cause of the fact that we are made to sit down at a particular table and consume one glass, down the hatch, before the other one is set on the table. I think it would be an advantage, and I can't think of some of our socials that sell tickets and the table before the place closed you sometimes have five and six drinks in front of a patron and they're never drank. They're poured down the sink. Or the tickets aren't used, and this becomes a benefit, this becomes a benefit to the reason that the social was being held. The proof is in the thing that one drink in front of you at a time doesn't work, you should be able to get up and move around.

I think that anybody that comes in town from the north country and checks into a hotel, he shouldn't have to be able to dress up, put on a suit, to be able to have a drink in his room. There are many good television programs on, the NHL Stanley Cup; there are lot of good things on television, a lot of sporting events, that people should be able to buy from the hotel, and not the bootlegger, a bottle, and be able to have the hotel make a little bit of money on that and be able to consume that alcohol in your room.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged, when the PCYF wrote up about my efforts on two different occasions, and I had talked about the plastic glass aspect that should be invoked as a regulation in some of these hotels like the Leland, like the Occidental, where so many injuries have come into the Health Sciences Centre on Saturday evening, are caused by alcohol-related violence which could be avoided if these people did not have a weapon in their hand, namely a glass beer bottle. Many socials are adopting the plastic containers; the hockey games at the arena pour your beer into a plastic container, and I'm looking forward to the thought that that be given to troublesome spots in the city, that type of thing. Because there is a saving. And I invite anybody in the industry to give me some additional suggestions.

I did talk about lifestyle, and I wanted to close with what I consider the right of the person next to me to his type of enjoyment. You have people that get involved in sports, besides nightclub entertainment and gatherings, and I would like to see us not get too involved in regulations, whether they be at horse races, whether they be at the beaches, I could see if you had plastic containers and coolers, I see nothing wrong with people being able to have a beverage, which

they are already doing anyway, let's not kid ourselves, on the beaches in this province, and modernize the type of thing so that no matter where you go - if a person is a non-drinker, he can get in on the fun by drinking 7-Up or Perrier Water, many people that attend these functions today, there are many non-drinkers in the world today and they want to go where the lifestyle is, where the good times are, and it's a known fact that most establishments sell Perrier Water, they sell soda with a twist of lemon, they sell 7-Up - it doesn't necessarily mean because I'm advocating these changes in freedom of movement, these changes in allowing the liquor laws, it's a case of lifestyle, it's a case of getting with the '80s, it's a case of having some fun in life, and it's a case of putting Manitoba back on the map as a place people want to come to. We are spending all this money on tourism dollars, and I can't for the life of me see - we can get people from the Twin Cities to come here to the horse races by the plane load because we have a pari mutuel betting, which they don't have down there, but we've also got to have that little extra, what happens before and after the races, what happens in their extra week that they're going to be here.

Even in tour packages, they call the post-convention activity and the pre-convention activity. I was on the board of directors for the Convention Centre for years, and we have free liquor laws there, people can move around, people can stand up and drink, and I haven't seen the police morality squad pouncing on the Convention Centre and arresting a pile of drunks because they don't exist. People are well behaved, I put my faith in people, I put my faith in the owners of these establishments, and I tell you, with the new capital investment in this province, the new, fresh dollars coming into this province, the new attitude, the new hard dollars that are going to come in from the north, there's going to be enjoyment in the '80s, and I look forward to closing the debate on my resolution with some very good, additional suggestions.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed any further, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have seven senior citizens from Thompson, Manitoba. This is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be very long, but with respect to the specific motion, 1.(a), of the Member for Wolseley to suggest that removing the 13 square feet per chair requirement, the Member for Wolseley has referred to how this adversely affects stand-up bars, which, Mr. Speaker, the Commission brought in very recently, in fact in September of last year, I believe was the first time that stand-up bars were allowed and at least four or five licences have been issued. I think is a step forward, Mr. Speaker, in improving the range of licences that may be issued. But in stand-up bars, Mr. Speaker, the present regulation of the Liquor Control Commission is not for 13 square feet per person, but 6 square feet per person.

Item (b), Mr. Speaker, refers to permitting patrons in licensed premises to transport beverages, etc. Mr. Speaker, this is actually not prohibited under Liquor Commission regulations. The member raises a matter in item (c) which would allow a hotel to sell a bottle of alcohol to occupants of rooms. This is something that is under consideration, it is included in the terms of reference in the Ministerial Review Committee, as well as item (d).

On that point, Mr. Speaker, I point out to the member, as I am sure he is aware, that the Ministerial Advisory Committee was appointed very recently to look at a number of matters which have been, I think, well spelled out in the past, classes of licences, occasional permits which he refers to, enforcement, advertising, prices, regulation of premises; there had not been any overall review of the

liquor control in the Act and regulations, in the administration of the Act since the Bracken Report in 1955. The commission has now settled in, I believe it has invited, Mr. Speaker, submissions from individuals, it has met with a number of individuals, it's met with the Commission Licensing Board, it is proceeding on a schedule of holding public hearings throughout the provinces in order to receive comments from people interested in this area. The commission has been instructed in the Order-in-Council to look at the advisability or inadvisability of amending the Act and regulations and administration. I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that the final report from the committee will be some time this fall, quite possibly in November. I think, despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one of the items referred to in the Member for Wolseley's resolution, item (b) is not correct, and in fact his concern with respect to (a) really is with respect to stand-up bars, there is a different requirement for stand-up bars and the 13 square feet, the other two matters are matters that are being looked at by the Ministerial Review Committee.

I would propose an amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it would, in essence, refer this matter to the Ministerial Advisory Committee. I would move, seconded by the Member for River Heights, that Resolution 20 be amended as follows:

By deleting the words "government of Manitoba amend" in Paragraph 1, and by substituting the following:

"Ministerial Advisory Committee consider the advisability or inadvisability of revising."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that the Minister and the government is not sympathetic to the proposed amendments of the Member for Wolseley, and as my colleague for Kildonan says, "that's an understatement". Dead against, might be more correct.

I wanted to comment on some of the remarks by the honourable member. He's one of the those who seems to favour endorsements by prominent people in regard to liquor, and I can say that I am not in favour of that. I don't want to see pictures of members of the Cabinet standing up and drinking Molson's Beer, or endorsing some local brew in an attempt to encourage sales. I think it's true that young people are influenced by such things, and maybe people who are impressed by so-called public figures, or people in the movies, or personalities like Margaret Trudeau, who get paid vast amounts of money for simply lending their name to something, whether or not they use that particular item.

I have to tell him that when he said that Frank Syms, who was the former Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, was the man who set particular limits to advertising on radio and television, and possibly in magazines, or in the press, I don't know, but that that decision was not taken by Mr. Syms. I recall, as would some of the members opposite, the Minister of Government Services would recall a debate in the late '60s in which there were some amendments put to the Liquor Control Act, and I think it was the former Premier, Douglas Campbell, who was the one who put forward an amendment limiting advertising on television in particular, to after certain hours, and maybe in other cases it was ruled out entirely. So that it is not true, when the Member for Wolseley says that it was Mr. Syms who made these decisions in regard to advertising. --(Interjection)-- Well, he may have signed the letter, but I assume that in the letter he was simply drawing out, drawing to the attention of somebody what was the law in terms of the laws of the province of Manitoba as passed by this particular Legislature.

Now, if there are regulations, again, I assume that the regulations must be consistent with the legislation, that they were proposed by the Minister, in that case the Attorney-General, and that he was simply carrying out government policy. I want to say, in defence of Mr. Syms, who is now a citizen of the province of Alberta, that great bastion of free enterprise and prosperity. I noticed the other day, there was Premier Lougheed sitting with some people, trying to decide what they were going to do with all those billions - they have a serious problem there, they don't know what to do with all the money that they have. We have the opposite problem; we don't have enough money; they have too much money. Well, Mr. Syms is now a resident in Alberta. And he did make improvements.

I want to remind the honourable member that there were some advances made in the treatment of alcoholic beverages in Manitoba in the last decade; that some of the older ideas from way back, when you had bootleggers; and before that - most of us aren't familiar with speakeasies, but in the Twenties they had speakeasies - certainly, and up to the Fifties, they - that's right, "vo-de-o-doh-doh" and all those other old sayings, the "cat's meow" and so on and so on. So Mr. Speaker, there were advances made.

I remember how you always had to sign these little statements and how they were finally eliminated. The liquor stores were the drabest, ugliest places you could possibly find, and how we slowly evolved from there into a more modern self-serve variety, etc. So there were some improvements made.

Now the member says he'd like to see sponsors; he'd like to see more liquor companies sponsoring sporting events. I have to say that I don't favour that; I don't like the idea of high schools, athletic clubs and so on, being encouraged in whatever they're doing by companies who are putting up big signs, handing out free booze or T-shirts, etc. I don't know whether most athletes drink heavily; there's only a few athletes I ever read about who were heavy drinkers and yet taught professional athletes. I remember Chris Chataway, who was a friend of Roger Bannister's, he used to smoke cigars and drink a lot of beer - Tony Galentto, or Galentto? --(Interjection)-- Galentto, the big, fat, tough --(Interjection)-- beer-barrelled Tony who was a boxer in the Thirties, I suppose --(Interjection)-- Babe Ruth, he was a hot dog addict --(Interjection)-- no, he wasn't a chocolate bar; see, the young Minister thinks that Babe Ruth is simply a chocolate bar, he didn't know he was a real baseball player - Fidel Castro, who gave his name to a cigar --(Interjection)-- Harry Enns, the parking structure that will still be built.

And so Mr. Speaker, when I see a sign in a gymnasium sponsored by Coke and so on, I don't especially like that, because I know, that although it's good that these people got a free sign and maybe they couldn't get it out of the budget, that it's nevertheless a form of commercialization. And in some areas, I think it's better that there is commercialization and so on. Well, you know, I like the Great Root Bear, and I'm just hoping that you won't dunk him in some oil for some experiment still to come. --(Interjection)-- He eats greasy hamburgers; that's not quite the same.

Mr. Speaker, one thing the member brought in that certainly has to be rejected out of hand, is that there should be no seating requirements, in the sense of limitation, on the number of patrons. Surely the member has not thought that through. I mean, would he argue that, say if you had 2,600 square feet, after you deduct the kitchens and the passageways and some of the back rooms and so on, that you're left with 2,600 square feet. According to Manitoba liquor laws, you would then be entitled to 200 seats. Now the member says, let's get rid of that, it's a barrier to business. So, if he had his way, you would have maybe 400 or 600 or 800 or 1,000 people jammed into this room. The first thing you would have, Mr. Speaker, is you'd have a dangerous situation. In terms of fire safety, you would be in a hazardous situation. You would have a massive crowd of people, that if any problem broke out - like some idiot in Quebec who put his cigarette lighter up to a decoration and set a hall on fire and caused one of the greatest tragedies in our nation's history - you would have an explosive situation. And I say that I think he might argue effectively that that's too high a ratio; namely that instead of say, one person or one chair for 13 square feet, maybe he thinks that ratio should be changed. I think that would be a valid argument. To argue that it should be eliminated is simply a dangerous suggestion. And he likes the idea of being able to walk around with liquor in your hand and you know, that is a two-edged sword. One of the problems you get into when you have people walking around in pubs and nightclubs with liquor, is you have people spilling liquor on other people. --(Interjection)-- Right, absolutely. You have people bumping into one another. --(Interjection)-- Well, it is if it's a man and a woman. And the result is, when you get into a situation where people are transporting liquor, there is a problem of fights and there is a problem - you know, I'm going to say this again when we get to Bill 27 - I remember being in the arena, I think at a track meet, or maybe a hockey game, and a couple of characters had beer, that they put glasses of beer in plastic containers in front of them on this concrete runway, whatever it was, and during one burst of excitement they stood up, their hat

loaded, hit the cups and they went flying - two great, big cups of beer all over 7 or 8 people in front of - these guys are so stupid, they couldn't care less. And that's one of the problems; when you allow people to move around and it's crowded and they're bumping into one another, the first thing you get is a spill; the second thing you get is a punch; the third thing you get is a riot. So there's a problem in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have too much more to say on this particular bill. There's no question that I certainly couldn't support this series of recommendations, and I don't think any of my colleagues would. Is the Attorney-General suggesting we vote it down right now? And that clearly the government itself does not favour this kind of a liberalization, although I see some overlapping and the overlapping is on the amendment that will allow more liquor sales in the Winnipeg Arena. As I say, I'm pretty leary of that recommendation that the Attorney-General is going to put, and I think we could debate some of these things. I find it very passing strange; the member says that he doesn't feel that people should have to wear any clothes in their hotel rooms. I don't know whether we want to be concerned about nude tourists coming to the door and shocking the bellhops, or the liquor salesmen who are delivering these orders, whether the member wants to think that, or whether he wants a minimum of a towel or a cover charge - a cover charge, that's what the Minister of Corrections says, that's clearly correct; that's the bare minimum.

So I think when it comes to Section (a), nobody in this Legislature can pass a blanket removal because of fire conditions, because of crowding; some of the other suggestions may be valid, but I think there would be a mixed opinion and in general, a lack of support for the proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to stand up and speak to the amendment, which I cannot support because I really feel that we're in a competitive situation with the rest of western Canada and certainly with a lot of young people today, who are influenced to a great degree by the amenities offered in a community, and I referred to them earlier as lifestyles. I would think that the temperance lobby would appreciate that I have said that I'm well prepared to support the rights of the other individual. I've also indicated that these more liberal-thinking approaches and the changes that come about now are because of that competition and because of the public demand for change. The Member for Elmwood talks about the influence on the young people. It would seem to me that influence would be events like Klondike Days, the Calgary Stampede, the Bathtub Races of Victoria, and we could talk about a number of events which attribute a lifestyle. I know of a large reunion that takes place across this Canada - I know the the September long weekend up in Valla, in the Muskokans north of Toronto, there's a massive sporting community type of volleyball tournament, which is sort of a reunion for the Winnipeg people of the Toronto area. I think of the Invermere section of British Columbia, which has a large summer gathering of ex-Winnipeggers. People from Winnipeg have a tendency to congregate together across the nation, and I think it's time to say, why have they left? And we should be having a congregation of people from Vancouver meeting in Winnipeg in the summer months, because we have a lifestyle here; we have an economy that is such that with the new hopes we have for the Eighties, that we can do a selling job. There's nothing like selling the product you have at home. And I look to, what even Gene Telpner said in his article, when he was talking about stand-up bars and he was talking about the effect on tourism. He said in London, England, the bars are great places for conversation, meeting new friends and a stranger from across the sea feels welcome in these places. I can assure you, you don't have to go to London, England, to feel that warm, friendly type of approach. You could walk into a number of places. I talked about the ports in Toronto; I can think of the Ranchman's in Calgary, where you can walk in there and so long as you've got a cowboy hat on, they don't ask you what you do for a living.

What we've done is, we've got laws of envy, where you have at the Winnipeg Arena the elite few sitting up in their boxes with their fridges full of alcohol and hard stuff and mix; where the working man, who I'm involved with down at

Wolseley, we've got to go there and we do get beer spilled on us occasionally, as the Member for Elmwood talks about, but it's low alcohol stuff. I suggest to you that it doesn't make any difference whether it's real beer or light beer, or whatever, that a person who is unable to handle his alcohol may be very well lying out in front of the Leland, or he might be getting sunburned at Grand Beach from drinking too much; or he might be unable to control his particular behaviour at a sporting event. And I think that's what is known as supplying security guards. I don't want to deal with it because you can always point to exceptions. But I do think Mr. Telpner hits upon the thing when he says that when regard to the stand-up bars, he says, it would appear that the response from the public, the line-ups that are there, and it also becomes a type of community bar for a certain segment of our population. And I know of many community bars in which segments of our population gather as a place where they know they can meet somebody that they can have conversation with, and I think it's one of the greatest things that prevents the type of lifestyle that leads to depression, this leads to a want to move out of the province, and other particular more serious type of things that can happen with loneliness, lack of fun. And I think that he hits it right on when he says, apparently the rules say that only a certain number of people can stand up at a time. This means inspectors have to come in and start counting heads, and who may be hiding in the bathroom and so on and so forth. What a priority, what a production for civil servants.

And I really don't see anything wrong with the advertising and promotion of the products. I don't have the time, but there are figures to prove here that in 1954, the revenue from radio advertising was \$93,000.00. In 1975 it was \$3.1 million. Television, there was no revenue in 1954, and from beer alone it was \$9.8 million in 1975. This was just at the same time the Chairman of the Liquor Commission was putting out his directive which drove so many of these advertising dollars out of the province, drove them down to the cablevision companies south of the line, and I think this is the type of thing that serves no useful purpose.

I honestly believe that coffee and soft drinks do more harm, healthwise, to the individual, than wine does. And yet we have a revenue of \$1.5 million from wine advertising in the province. I think our laws pertaining to regulations regarding advertising are out of date, I think we just have to simply take the letter of October 1, 1974, hold it up in front of us, and rip it in half. That's how easy we could get rid of Mr. Syms' directive, because I do not believe it was the policy of the government of the day to be that rigid. I think Mr. Syms had a handle on things in such a way that the former Attorney-General possibly did not handle the gentleman in as firm a manner as he should have handled him.

I don't agree that these particular changes in the liquor laws will happen overnight, but I can't support the amendment because I sense that my own government is afraid to call for a free vote to have the question dealt with now. We should have a free vote now, because what we are doing is having a large group of people, sitting down and having presentations, when we know, basically, some of the simple things we want changed. Let the committee meet and deal with the more exotic things like wine in the cheese stores, like possibly beer in the grocery stores, and some of the other things pertaining to hard liquor for the working people at the hockey games as well as the elite in the boxes up top. I'm talking about the fact that we, as leaders of this community, should be able to make the decision to change some of these things like removing that letter from the former chairman, allowing Molson's, Labatt's, to get behind the Stampede, to get behind the Grey Owl, the Falcon, the fishing derbies, I even think of a friend of mine, Bob Armstrong, who has some exotic beer drinking contest every year.

These obviously could not take place without the support of the breweries, and these are fun things. These are community interaction things, and I think that we don't have to hide behind - I'm prepared to stand up to the temperance people and to the hotel people in my community and say, this is going to be a benefit to you, because there will be less people with problems, because with the increased revenue, we might support a Hazeldale, we might give more money to the Alcoholic Foundation. We might be able to treat alcohol as a medical disease and get it into treatment through Medicare, and type of things like that. When you don't have a cover charge, there is no fire hazard, as the Member for Elmwood talked about. It's only when you block exits to collect a few bucks cover charge that you run

into problems. And these are part of the building codes and any particular thing could be overcome.

And no particular operator is going to stack his particular bar to the extent where his help cannot sell the drinks on which he makes money to pay his rent. That, to me, is the marketplace, why there is a particular lineup at most particular establishments. And why is there a lineup at the most successful operations? (a) Good dress, good behaviour, good music, good atmosphere, nice furniture, and a happy atmosphere created in such a way because there isn't the big brother of government hiding behind a curtain with an adding machine to see if there are so many people standing up at the bar and how many are in the men's or ladies' wash-rooms. And I really feel that I can stand up in Wolseley and tell the particular people who are concerned, the temperance people, that it's proven that a large percentage of people that go out for interaction, to sporting events, to religious beach gatherings and everything, drink 7-Up, they drink Perrier Water, they drink wine, which is good for them, they don't necessarily drink alcoholic beverages. It's the rules that drive people to sit down and because they are being looked at by other people, they have to have a drink. If you are allowed to walk around, you can turn around and buy what you want and you can't tell me the difference between a gin and tonic and a soda and water.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this subject next arises, the member will have eight minutes.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday).