

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, March 29th, 1963.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 57, Item 1.

MR. SCHREYER: At 5:30 I was about to conclude what few remarks I had to make regarding the collection of royalties on the extraction of minerals in the province, and actually, the sum and substance of what I was saying at that time was that as far as we in this group are concerned, we felt ourselves duty bound to question the relationship between the net revenue taken in by way of royalty in relation to the total amount -- total value -- of mineral production in this province, and I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that there is really any great difference of opinion. I think that the issue here is really one of degree, even though the Honourable Member for Burrows may have got the impression that we are poles apart in this matter, but I really think it's a matter of degree. We expect from this government, through the Minister, a little more data in future reports of the department and possibly in the estimates, so that when we look at the report we can determine -- we can figure out just what the actual average revenue -- royalty revenue -- is. As I understand it, the average revenue on royalty on mineral production in this province is supposed to be about eight percent. Now it could well be that it works out to that by some computation and calculation, but with the kind of data we've had available to us, it's been almost impossible to arrive at such a figure. I think we should have this more detail of information so that we can reconcile this eight percent, if that's what indeed it is, with what appears to be something altogether different. I was pointing out that on page 151 of the report, when you compare mineral royalty to total mineral production, you get a fantastically low figure -- somewhere in the order of 2/3 of one percent. Now I realize this is on gross value of mineral production; this is not based on the net earnings of the various mining companies; I understand that. But still there is some great discrepancy, Mr. Chairman, because as I pointed out before 5:30 in other jurisdictions the relationship between revenue -- royalty revenue -- and total mineral production is not -- the discrepancy is not that great. For example, and I'll cite just one example, in Saskatchewan last year the revenue intake from royalties was in the order of \$18 million. Put that over a total mineral production of 218. Now on that basis you get a figure somewhere around 8 1/2 or 9 percent, roughly calculated, and in Manitoba for comparison's sake we put down \$1 million over \$159 million, or if the Minister likes, you can put down \$1.5 million in revenue from royalties if you want to include oil, over the \$169 million in total production -- mineral production including oil -- and even on that basis the ratio is still very surprisingly small. So it's not in a spirit of criticism so much as in a spirit of probing to find out how all these discrepancies are to be accounted for, and I hope that the Minister will realize that as far as we're concerned this is a difference of opinion of degree; it doesn't involve absolutes. I hope we can get an answer.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, when I spoke last night, apparently I didn't make myself very clear to the Minister. What I was trying to say to him was this, that there are people that go out and bid on lots that are available, and they speculate. They will buy up five or six choice lots and bid a fantastic high price for those lots. They will start building their summer homes on those lots, then offer them for sale. What I'm trying to say is this, Mr. Chairman, that I don't care how much they bid for those lots, and if they get them that's fine and dandy, but they should have to keep them for a certain amount or a certain length of time unless they have a very good reason why they should leave. If a fellow is working and living in the province here, and gets a transfer, naturally he has to sell his property to wherever he's transferred, but what I'm getting at is this, to have people that buy these lots on speculation, build cottages on them and are doing it for a profit, this is what I'm against, Mr. Chairman, and this is the message that I tried to get to the Minister yesterday.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if he could tell us the different percentages charged to the business people at Falcon Lake. I mean the percentage of their business and how this is arrived at. I'd also ask the Honourable Minister if he could tell us the net revenue from the fees charged at the gate after deducting the cost of policing them. I mean the fees collected at the gate only, less the cost of collecting them. There I don't mean it's the percentage that is charged to the business people there.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, to deal with the first question last. I'll get the figures for the honourable member. I believe they are coming in on an Order for Return which you asked for, a little later on. The cost of collecting of our park entrance fee across the whole of the province amounted to about 21 percent, and the other figures will be given to you a little later.

With respect to the Honourable Member from Logan. We do know that there have been one or two cases where people have purchased lots on the basis that he has mentioned, but from enquiries I have made there have not been very many. We don't feel that the practice is a widespread one. We feel also that it's a rather difficult one to get at because a man may come in and put his son-in-law's name on. We have no way of knowing that John Brown is Joe Smith's son-in-law, and sometimes this type of thing does happen, but from the indications that I have, it does not happen too often in those particular areas.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead was asking how we arrived at some of our royalty figures. In dealing with base metals, we charge eight percent of the mining income, and the mining income is the gross income minus depreciation which can be elected at the choice of the company from one to 15 percent per annum up to a total of 100 percent; and then we must deduct from that gross income, eight percent per annum of the capital cost of processing, and those two costs are taken off the gross income and then we come down to the net mining income, and on that we charge eight percent. During the first years of operation of a mine -- in the case of the International Nickel Mine we charged six percent for the first year of operation and seven percent for the second year of operation and then we go up to eight percent for the third year of operation. I think in the Province of Saskatchewan for the first two or three years they allow a deduction of some \$2 million from the mining income. In Saskatchewan, I think -- and the same in Ontario -- that the mining income is arrived at substantially the same, and in Ontario they have a sliding scale which goes from about six percent to nine percent to 11 percent and I can't recall on what values those percentages are assessed. In Saskatchewan it is 12 1/2 percent. In the case of the revenues of Ontario we understand that a portion of those revenues go back to the town in the form of taxation of some type or another. In the case of Saskatchewan I believe that those revenues are over and above taxes. In other words the mining company will pay the regular taxes inside the province. I think that he must take this into account, when discussing the figures in Saskatchewan, that much of the royalty revenues there come from oil and natural gas, and they are computed -- they're used generally on a basis -- it's a sliding scale in Saskatchewan as in Alberta. It runs up from about five percent, I believe, up to 16 percent, and that is assessed on the numbers of barrels that the well has. The other factor that is involved there is that in Saskatchewan there is considerable Crown land, whereas in the oil developments that we have here in the province, much of our oil is on private land, and the income -- royalty income -- that is derived from oil goes directly to the farmer. If he takes a look at some of the other jurisdictions he will note that there are not the number of mines operating in them as there are here in Manitoba, and what mineral as far as base metal revenue comes from Saskatchewan, basically comes from the Saskatchewan side of the Flin Flon mine where the plant is on the Manitoba side of the border, or from money that is derived from the uranium mines at Uranium City.

I noted with interest the debate that has taken place, and I think that I can say generally in reference to the amount of money that the province has paid that we certainly will -- and I can't agree that we have been complacent and satisfied, because as I mentioned before 5:30 we have been assessing our position, I would say, about every year and a half. We have not just simply assessed it but actually had it studied by the people within our department and within the Treasury Branches. I think as far as maintaining competition; when he mentioned bargaining on royalty rates, we have a fixed royalty rate as most jurisdictions do; we don't go out to bargain with one company against another on royalty rates and I don't believe that was what he meant when he was speaking this afternoon. As far as I am concerned, as the Minister of this department, I would like to see the development of these non-renewable resources now. I am anxious to keep the competitive position of the province such that we will get development of these non-renewable resources now, because I think that it is now that we need them. We need the jobs now. We need the secondary industries that they can develop. And as I take a look at Thompson, the percentage of people that have come from Ontario -- the percentage I am

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) . . . . sorry I couldn't tell him -- but I do think that most of the people that have come over from Ontario may be of the supervisory or the foreman class, whereas other people could possibly come from Manitoba. But there have been, in the case of Flin Flon, several new business opportunities that have come to the people of Flin Flon, the people of The Pas and, of course, down here in Winnipeg. So I am quite anxious to maintain the competitive position of this province in obtaining exploitation and development of the non-renewable resources that we have. But at the same time, we shall never forget that the people of the province are entitled to a fair and reasonable return and I would like to suggest to the honourable member that this factor of capital investment in the townsite is a big one indeed; therefore, if the town or the mine, if something happens to it, that money does not come back as a burden upon the people of this province but it is a capital cost that has been invested by the mining company and it is their loss.

I would like, while I'm on my feet and talking about mining, just to draw to the attention of the committee, for some years we have had a prospector's guide, and during the last two or three years we have been bringing this prospector's guide up-to-date, but in view of the many changes that have been made in the mineral resources and geology of the Province of Manitoba, and the different type of information that is contained in here, we have a new publication entitled "Geology and Mineral Resources of Manitoba." It is not out in quantity yet -- I have more or less one of the very first copies -- but it will soon be available to all in the province who wish to take advantage of it, and it will be available for the price of \$1.00 but in the case of MLA's, since they have just gotten a new increase in salaries, I think we'll charge them 99 cents.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked for some figures yesterday in relation to Grand Beach and I would like to give them to him now. The cost of land acquisition to date is \$256,800 and that comprises \$225,000 for acquisition of the CNR property and other private property at \$31,000.00. The development costs to date since April 1, 1961, are \$220,000 and the estimated development costs to complete what we term "Phase 1" will be some \$461,000, and that will be -- Phase 1 when we complete it will include shore line improvement, marine, camping areas -- and we're starting on the camping area this year -- and some new subdivision activities. The revenue for 1962-63 to the 28th February of this year is \$45,500 and our annual maintenance and operational costs are \$36,000.00. With reference to the Whiteshell Provincial Park, the development cost to date -- and these are going over a long period -- are \$5,349,700. The annual maintenance and operational costs are \$193,000 and the revenue for 1962-63 season to the 28 February in '63 are \$266,300.00.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, speaking as the Member for Elmwood and not for Logan, I heard the Minister say that there are very few cases where there has been speculation. There should be no cases of speculation at all, and I seriously ask the Minister to look at the situation and put in some regulations, that if someone buys a lot that they have to keep it for a certain time unless they have a very good reason, and the Minister can sit down and figure out what the reasons are, and if he wants -- I'm not going to mention it here; I'll talk to him in private and I will give him cases of where there has been speculation, and not far and few between, and I think something should be done about this, because even if there's only one case of speculation, this province and its natural resources are not built for people to speculate on; they are built for the good of the people of this province and it shouldn't make one iota of difference whether you're in the high income bracket or the low income bracket, you should have the same chance, and I would urgently ask the Minister to take a real good look at this because this is a very serious question.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, just to ask a question of detail. The Minister gave a fairly good answer providing figures regarding royalties but I think that even if I look at Hansard tomorrow, or Monday, I will not really find out this particular part that I'm asking, namely, when the sliding scale of six to eight percent is applied. He said it's applied to net income of the mines after depreciation allowance and so on, but is that net income after taxes or not? Maybe it's obvious, but would you verify that? You said it's based on the net income to the mine.

MR. WITNEY: It's six percent the first year, seven percent the second, and then after that it becomes eight percent and it's before taxes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for his answer

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) . . . . that he gave me to last night's question. There's only one that he hasn't answered. I wanted to know the total money, if any, spent in Winnipeg Beach during the course of last year, and then also the amount, if any, of the provincial grant to the Assiniboine, or City Park. By looking over last night's Free Press it would seem that either I gave the wrong interpretation or I was misquoted, I don't know; but I wanted to say at this time, Mr. Chairman, that it certainly wasn't my intention to knock the government for the work that they've done in Falcon Lake or the work done in Grand Beach. That wasn't my intention at all. It seems that things were mixed up a bit. I did talk about -- well, first of all I stated that I was very much against the charging of fees to go in the Falcon Lake area and the Whiteshell area, for cottage owners that was. I felt that these people had paid for the lease; they had paid to buy their cottage -- to rent their cottage -- and they had entered into a contract in good faith with the government and they shouldn't be charged to go on their property, and this was reported correctly.

But then I mentioned the tax and especially the school tax. I felt that, I agreed that people that could afford a cottage should probably help to pay something towards the tax of the area where they were and especially the school tax, but I felt that it wasn't fair that some part of the province the people should be taxed \$150 - \$200 where other areas in -- probably they were in unorganized territory -- they would not pay anything but the \$30.00 that -- the contract that they had \$30.00 for the lease each year. I didn't think that was right and I do hope that the government will look into this. I think that this tax should be distributed a lot more fairly, a lot more evenly than it is now.

The main thing, the thing that I suggested, that I certainly would advocate, was this, that the government should take over the City Park, the Assiniboine Park, as a provincial park. This is the point that I was trying to make yesterday, and when I said that I felt that some people living here -- after all the . . . . . population are right here in the city in Greater Winnipeg area, and they haven't a chance; the facilities, many of them in their -- we were talking about slums a few days ago -- and those people do not even know where Grand Beach is, where Falcon Beach is, and I think that they have a chance to go to the park and go to the zoo; that's not costly. They can take, have a picnic out there, and I think they should have this chance. And also for the tourist, because if we want to show off our -- the area around the Whiteshell, I think that the Park is a very beautiful place. Sure, we have a zoo here, we have the flowers and so on, and I definitely think that again, to even this up . . . . . It's all right for the people of Winnipeg to pay for the Whiteshell -- it comes from the general fund -- to pay for Grand Beach. I don't object -- and you can't do everything at once. This is why I want to say that I certainly do not intend to knock the government, the Minister and his department on this, but at this time I certainly would advocate that they look into this very seriously, and I think that the Winnipeg Park would be an attraction for the tourist and the people, at least have the people of Manitoba right in here, and most of the people of Manitoba will come to the Park at least once a year or so. And I would like, very much like to see the department think this over and maybe name or declare the park a provincial park.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the Honourable Member of Elmwood's statement, and I regret that I've been calling him the Honourable Member for Logan. I am quite prepared to speak with him to hear of these cases that he speaks of, and when we were discussing it after the estimates last night, the forestry people advised that they, too, would take a look into this problem, and with the specific cases that he has, I would be happy to speak to him a little later.

With respect to the questions of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, we have spent approximately \$87,000 at Winnipeg Beach in aid of the sewer and waterworks there, and particularly we have constructed the modern bathhouse that is now close to the main beach area. If you didn't -- \$87,000 approximately. He asked if we had made any grant to Assiniboine Beach, I beg your pardon, to Assiniboine Park. The answer is "no", and I think I answered his other questions during my comments this afternoon. He will be able to see them in Hansard, but whether or not he will like them, that I can't guarantee.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Minister a couple of questions at this time? On page 772 of Hansard, in his speech yesterday, he made passing reference to, and I'll quote, "Intensive studies were completed to

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) . . . . determine the effect on wild life on the proposed Assiniboine River diversion from Portage to Lake Manitoba," and the questions I have are to do with the outcome of these studies. Were these studies made by biologists, or what were the qualifications of the people who made the studies? What are their findings? Is there a report and if so could we have this report? And when was the study made, and were there any recommendations? I have another question that is in the general area of Lake Manitoba, and that is to do with the Whitemud River, and I am informed -- and I must say I'm not too sure that this is correct or not, but you could correct me, Sir. Is it true that your department takes fish eggs or spawn out of the Whitemud River for stocking in other areas? The party that asked me to inquire about this thought that this was going on, and also that it was to the detriment of the fish situation in the Whitemud and in Lake Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the study was made, the biological study on the possible effects as far as water fowl were concerned, of the diversion. It was made last summer, and it was made under the guidance of the biology division of the Game Branch, and under our senior biologist, and employed not only our own men but a student biologist from the University of Manitoba. I have no report given to me as yet. I'm not aware whether or not one has been printed, but to date nothing has come to me on the outcomes of those surveys.

On the Whitemouth River, we do take spawn from the pickerel in the spring, but most of that spawn is used to produce pickerel fry, and the majority of our pickerel fry is returned to the lake, to Lake Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on this sum of \$87,000 that was spent on Winnipeg Beach last year, can the Honourable Minister tell me if there was anything under the grant from the Federal Government on this winter work project for the sewer?

MR. WITNEY: That was the province's contribution to the endeavour.

MR. VIELFAURE: I'd like to ask another question again, pertaining to Falcon Lake. I used to go to Falcon Lake to rest, but since I've been elected, it seems that I go there for a question period. One of the many complaints that I have, is there any measures taken to control the level of the lake? A lot of the owners there claim that -- of course last year was an extraordinary year in that the lake was much higher than it ever was for many years, but apparently many could not use their docks and boathouses, and the claim there is that with more water control the lake could have been kept at a lower level. Also, it froze that way, and the information I have is that there'll be extensive damage to boathouses and docks; and the information that's given to me again says that with some help in helping the flow of water from the lake would help to keep the water level lower.

Also another question while I'm here. The owners of Faloma and Toniata Beach, who have been there long before Falcon Lake Resort was, and I'm sure the Minister is aware that they have been asking for an access to the Trans Canada Highway for many years -- I have visited their establishments and I would say that there's a big investment there and they're suffering heavily because they have no access road to the Trans Canada Highway. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if they can hope to have an access road in the near future.

MR. WITNEY: In answer to a question of the honourable member before, the park entrance revenue for '62 was \$71,626.50, and the cost of collection was \$15,486.58. In the Order for Return that he has asked for, that will be broken down into the various areas.

The difficulties which we had with the water levels in Falcon Lake last year were mainly because of a very severe deluge -- I'm sure the honourable member will realize at the time that that took place that it was a deluge, and the amount of water that was experienced in that area is more than has been experienced for some time. I think that the staff down there worked as well as they possibly could to handle the various complaints expeditiously and to reduce what damage there was to a minimum. And I further believe that the water structures that we have there at the present time are sufficient to handle normal water conditions on Falcon Lake and to maintain the lake at a level that is suitable for most of the cottage owners in the area.

As for the people at Faloma Beach: I must confess I'm not too aware of the situation, but I can say that no immediate plans are being made at any rate to have any immediate access from Faloma Beach up onto the Trans Canada Highway.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us just what is being done in Manitoba to promote the development of our natural resources, such as

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) . . . . ore and the like in Manitoba. We know that in the past years our income, as far as the department is concerned, barely pays for the expenses of the department, whereas in our neighbouring provinces we see they develop natural resources and it adds in large part to the income of the government coffers to carry on their programs. I'd like to know from the Minister just what is being done in Manitoba to encourage further development of our natural resources.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, to encourage the further development of our natural resources our forest inventory reports have been issued regularly, and as I mentioned the other night in introducing the estimates, they have provoked sufficient interest that we have now had to add to our mailing list another 500 or more. The honourable member, I'm sure, is aware that during the past year that we have done aero-magnetic surveys of some 30,000 square miles and the reports of that will be available within the spring of this year with the second and the third sections of the aero-magnetic surveys, in conjunction with the Federal Government to continue this summer and the summer following. In addition we have had six ground parties each year along with the Dominion Government parties to do geological work on the ground, and those are being increased by another geological party this year. Those reports are all available to prospectors or to the mining companies who are interested in obtaining information on the province, and we also obtain from them the information that is obtained by them on geophysical or reservations of oil or minerals in the province, and I mentioned yesterday that we have been consulting with the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Independent Petroleum Association for suggestions as to how we can modify our regulations in order to encourage the development and exploration of the oil fields that we have in the Province of Manitoba, and they will be submitting their briefs in a very short period of time.

Those are briefly the things which we do to promote our natural resources. Our annual reports, of course, are sent out to all who ask for them. We maintain an extension forester on the staff of the Department of Forestry to do extension work in forestry, and of course our biologist and people such as that in maintaining the numbers of game that we have here, and fish, because we have them here and people can fish for fish or hunt for game; that in itself is a promotion of the natural resources of Manitoba. And then in conjunction with the Department of Industry and Commerce who take our reports, analyze them and go out on sales campaigns to not only this country but to other countries, to encourage development of resources, I think that Manitoba is actively promoting its resources and I also contend that we are managing them well.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister again to clarify my earlier question. Did I understand you to say that this biological study of the wild life in the Delta area was under the directionship of your head biologist but that it was a student that was carrying out the study?

MR. WITNEY: No, the student was working in consultation with our professional biologist in the Game Branch.

MR. JOHNSTON: Again I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if there were no recommendations or nothing to report on that?

MR. WITNEY: Not as yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 57 -- passed. Item 2, Forestry Branch.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is the Department I should raise this under but I believe it is. Could the Minister outline to the House what policy the government has formulated regarding the fighting of forest fires? Last year I pointed out that there were serious inadequacies in certain areas of this province where there was no policy dealing with the fighting of forest fires, and people, particularly in the unorganized territories, have no ways of knowing what steps to take when a forest fire broke out, and sometimes there were delays in getting assistance to them which could have saved a lot of money had action been taken in the early stages of the fire. What policy has been formulated since that last year in this regard?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think most of the areas that the honourable member is speaking of were local government district areas and we have conducted liaison with the local government district administrators and appointed honorary fire guardians to watch those particular areas in conjunction with the administrator. Perhaps if the honourable member will

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) . . . . realize, we took over forest fire fighting in the local government district lands in 1961. We have had good progress since that time, and I am sure that the difficulties in those particular areas of which he speaks will not be there before the coming season.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is where the recreation areas come in, and I wonder if the Minister could outline to us what he has in mind when he is referring to wilderness areas. He told us yesterday in his presentation that in the area north from the Whiteshell to Berens River that he was considering the establishment of a wilderness park. What are going to be his regulations and what is the outline of the proposal for wilderness parks?

MR. WITNEY: . . . . comment, Mr. Chairman, on the regulations which we plan at the present time, but generally speaking the philosophy of those parks will be one to where a road is taken up to the boundaries of the park and from that point on people can venture into those particular areas by means of canoe. We will be preparing trails over the portages, and we will also have prepared camping places with fireplaces so that people are not forced to make their own campfires in this particular area. We hope to have them spotted so that within one day's journey they will be able to stop, they will be able to camp, and there will be, in those particular areas, sufficient facilities so that no harm is done to the surrounding countryside. The area that we have chosen is quite a wild and remote area, I suppose, and yet it is not that wild and remote that we cannot bring people up to it by automobile and then let them proceed on the rest of the way by canoe. I think it took our men to travel -- they were taking pictures and they were noting where the possible portages might be and where the campsites might be set up -- I think it took them something like two weeks to make the total journey, but for anyone else I don't think it would be quite that long.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is it the intention to prevent any commercial development in those areas that are designated as wilderness areas?

MR. WITNEY: No, the Parks Act which we passed in 1960 contains provision whereby commercial development of all sorts can be accommodated for in our provincial parks only after consultation with the provincial forester to assure that that development will not hinder the development of the recreation itself or be contrary to the aesthetic values of the area in which it will take place.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, Mr. Chairman, it would not prevent the development of, say, fly-in camps in wilderness areas when they're so designated?

MR. WITNEY: No, we have no immediate plans at all; we haven't even thought of preventing fly-in camps in these areas.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister could tell us, Mr. Chairman, when he intends to establish the boundaries of the one that he was speaking about in his comments yesterday, and also if there are other wilderness areas planned for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: The only one that we have been thinking of at the present time in the form of a nature area, or a form of a wilderness area, would be the one which we are looking at now in the Sprucewood Forest Reserve. I think perhaps the honourable member knows that the Sprucewood is the result of a deposit of a glacial river and it's a very interesting area for botanists and people who enjoy that type of activity, so apart from this one the only one I would say that we are looking at with possibilities for wilderness or nature park activities is in the Sprucewood. The other parks which we are having the boundaries delineated, they are being worked on at the present time; I would imagine that we will establish them later on during the year.

MR. MOLGAT: The one in the vicinity of the Whiteshell -- that is the one he was speaking about yesterday, Whiteshell to Berens River -- will we have a definite delineation of that within the next year?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, I think so, Mr. Chairman. I haven't seen the report yet. I've seen some of the photographs that have been taken, 35 millimetre colored slides of the area. I understand that the report is in the hands of the Provincial Forester and the Assistant Deputy Minister. I haven't seen it yet, but when it comes I think that we will be delineating those boundaries quite soon.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I had heard rumours that there were some plans to establish wilderness areas in the far north, in the remote areas, in particular in the Lynn Lake

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . district. Is this correct, or are there no intentions to establish such wilderness areas there now?

MR. WITNEY: No, we have no plans on that area.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, some two or three years ago, the First Minister indicated -- I believe it was in his opening address to the House in fact, although I have not checked this specifically -- that there was some consideration to the establishment of a park in the northern Interlake area, that is, the section north of Gypsumville and before you reach Grand Rapids itself, the new area that was opened up by the highway that was built there. The Minister refers, I think, to a Grand Rapids Park. Is this the one that was meant at that time or was there to be an area south of Grand Rapids and north of Gypsumville to be established as a park?

MR. WITNEY: The one that we are planning right now is in the general Long Point or Denbeigh Point area across the top of the Interlake country. It's south of Grand Rapids, and of course it's north of Gypsumville. It would be south of Grand Rapids by -- I think it would be some 10 or 12 miles, but it's considerably farther north from Gypsumville itself. The park area -- if you are taking a look at the map there, you will see two lakes called Katimik and Kawinaw, they would be within the park area.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact though, that the Government has given an indication, some as I say, two or three years ago that in this general area there would be a large provincial park established, south from the area my friend refers to?

MR. WITNEY: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. I think the park that we are going to have there is going to be a large area south of Grand Rapids. I can't quite see any confliction in any statement made two or three years ago from what's being done now.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on 2 (f) I see that we are spending some \$468,000 on recreational operation and maintenance. On the other hand, I notice from the Public Accounts that we received last year from Parks and Recreation some \$301,000.00. This \$300,000, would that just be fees or is there any capital in that \$300,000, like it was mentioned here before, lots being sold and reserved in resorts? Is this just fees, or is there something else included?

MR. WITNEY: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the question. Would he repeat it please?

MR. FROESE: This \$300,000 listed in the Public Accounts, that is received from Recreation and Parks. Is that just fees collected, or are there any other items in this to offset the cost of maintenance?

MR. WITNEY: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that is simply revenue that is obtained from various sources, from the rental of the cabins and from the concessions that we have rented out in the areas, and I would believe that the park entrance fees would be included in that too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 . . . .

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): When we were discussing Treasury back two or three weeks ago, there seemed to be a little confusion -- the Executive Council, I guess it was, Mr. Chairman -- as to what constituted the . . . . We were discussing grants, as I remember, grants to various things, and I believe it was suggested at that time that historic sites and recreational areas, roadside parks and so on, would come under this department. Now, I would like to know whether that is so. In referring to page 26 of the Annual Report before us, there is a statement immediately under the heading "Parks and Recreation" that effective April 1st, 1961, the Forest Service assumed responsibility for planning, developing and so on -- page 26. Should we be discussing, for instance, historic markers here or should we not? You can answer that a little later if you prefer, but I have another point here.

When the Cabinet met in Neepawa in June, 1961 -- and I believe my honourable friend attended that cabinet meeting, and I believe, too, that in addition to a brief that was presented by the Town of Neepawa there was a brief presented by the Rural Municipality of Rosedale, in which they were requesting consideration of a development at Kerr Lake; and Kerr Lake is about three or four miles north of Mountain Road. But on November 13, 1961, in reply to a letter that had been written to him by the Secretary of the municipality, my honourable friend drafted a letter to the Secretary of the Rural Municipality of Rosedale relative to the proposed



(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd) . . . . project at Kerr Lake, and the bottom paragraph of that letter dated November 13, 1961, my honourable friend says, "While I appreciate the pride of the local people in the area, the Department must consider the provincial picture as a whole. We are now spreading our roadside park development along major routes in the province following a concentration on the Trans Canada Highway." And then later on -- one year later, November 28, 1962 -- a letter addressed to myself from my honourable friend, the bottom paragraph again in this letter says, "We have many such requests from all over Manitoba from municipalities, towns and non-profit groups with similar proposals as that of the Rural Municipality of Rosedale. Now that our Trans Canada Highway work has been nearly completed, and our roadside park activity is spreading out to other major highways in the province, we are resurveying all of these requests with a view to ascertaining how we can fit them into our park and recreational development program. When this assessment is made, Kerr Lake will also be included."

Now I wonder if the assessment has been made, if we have any assurance that they will take at least a new look at Kerr Lake in 1963. I believe that a proposition was made to him by the R.M. of Rosedale on a cost-sharing basis, and it seemed to me, if I have it correctly, that the Rural Municipality of Rosedale were not making an unreasonable request, because as I recall it they were only asking for a grant not to exceed \$10,000 principally to construct a road into the area itself, and I thought that in view of the small amount involved perhaps my honourable friend could consider it as rather one of those things that he could consider separately, perhaps. I hope that I might have something from him in that regard. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that he personally did visit the area and knows of which I speak.

Now on page 27 of the Annual Report, Mr. Chairman, halfway down the page, "In addition" it says, "40 provincial recreational areas were established by Order-in-Council", and it lists the 40 places at which they were established. And I don't know many of the places here, but it would seem to me that most of them were not on what you might call the major highways of the province, so it suggests to me that despite what my honourable friend says in the letter that they are building recreational areas quite a piece off the major program.

On another subject matter; last year I had a reply to questions tabled and laid on my desk on March 10, 1961, replied to by Honourable C.H. Witney, Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Friday, March 10th, and question No. 1: "What was the provincial financial contribution to the resort area development adjacent to PFRA dam at Rivers?" They give the answer there. And to question No. 2: "What was the contribution or contributions made?" -- answered that there was no contributions made. Question 3, "Is this policy applicable to other similar areas such as Neepawa?" The answer given was "Yes, provided the use of the reservoir for recreational purposes can be reconciled with other purposes which have a priority, and provided the site is acceptable to the department of the Government concerned." Now I suppose that you are referring to the Minister of Agriculture, or to the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. Now, my question is, does this offer still hold good? It's a year old -- it's two years old, pardon me; this was dated March 10, 1961. But it would be in order for the town to make a request? The request would have to be made to my honourable friend and after consultation with the Minister of Agriculture we would in due course get an answer, I suppose.

One other question, Mr. Chairman. I refer to a copy of the Tribune, October 15, 1962. It's headed, "Just think! Horseracing in the Floodway!" And it goes on to list a whole number of items that might be considered tourist attractions or recreational areas, and I wonder should we discuss these under this item, or has my honourable friend made any plans for the Floodway when it is completed? I don't know whether the reporter here interviewed my honourable friend, but it says that it could be used for horseracing, could be used for swimming, for track and field events -- "Don't forget high school football," it says; -- skating races, building baseball fields on the dikes, open it up to sports cars and gocarts, and a whole lot of other things. I wonder if my friend has any plans as in this regard, and if so, I am sure we'd be pleased to hear what they are.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to grants, apart from the one that was mentioned at Winnipeg Beach, we have not made any grants to any other areas outside of, around the province.

On historic sites, I think that the honourable member has a tough time finding this one out each year, and I think that it's in the Department of Industry and Commerce that it comes

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) . . . . under. It certainly doesn't come under me. We purchase land for historic sites such as the one at Flee Island.

With respect to Kerr Lake, the honourable member is right; I did make a trip into that area myself. He referred to the number that we had declared by Order-in-Council that some 40 -- and I would just like to mention to him, that in those, most of the area around about those were Crown lands, and we have thought that we should make all of our developments where we can on Crown lands first, and in the Kerr Lake area, I'm sure that he's familiar with it, he'll know that from the fences that sweep down on the beach that there is private land all around, and the actual beach area is quite circumscribed by private lands. I'm a little puzzled by his mention of the road, because I was able to drive right down on through the beach at the time that I was there after going up on the, up towards the big Ukrainian church there on the mountain road and then turning north.

With respect to Kerr Lake and with respect to his request on the reservoir at Neepawa, I mentioned the other day that in the estimates we are providing a sum with the assistance of ARDA for a consultant to survey all of the applications which have been made to us in the past years from municipalities and from non-profit organizations who are operating parks, to see how best we can fit them in with the provincial parks that we have at the present time. That will be done this summer, and I can assure him that Kerr Lake will be taken a look at again along with the reservoir. But I would like to point out to him that in Neepawa, I believe it is, the Lions Club operate a very fine little recreational area of their own on their own initiative, and while the reservoir does come under the Minister of Agriculture, I think I would hesitate to make any development there that would become competitive to the Lions Club's development at Neepawa. I have enjoyed that development myself, incidentally, and that type of development such as the one which is at Minnedosa and other places all around the country, at Souris, etcetera, they are to be commended. I'm trusting that when we have our report from our consultant that we will be able to find an appropriate means of combining the activities of the province and these various organizations.

With respect to the floodway, we have begun our investigations on the floodway as to what potential it might offer for provincial parks or for opportunities for private enterprise, to develop their various plans which are being submitted to the government at the present time, and those studies have commenced, particularly with the area south of Lockport down to the point where the floodway enters the Red River.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I agree with my honourable friend that the Lions Club recreational area he referred to at Neepawa is a very attractive spot. I have been a member of the Lions Club, and am a member of the Lions Club; I've been a member for 15 years, I guess. But, it wouldn't be competitive -- the other site really wouldn't be competitive. As my honourable friend probably knows, the Lions Club park, or we call it Riverbend Park -- it is a picnic site only, and a certain amount of swimming for the youngsters there, but the park that I referred to south of town at the Whitemud River dam, or Boggy Creek Dam, or whatever you want to call it, it was felt that it would provide boating. In fact, it does provide boating at the moment, and it was felt that it could be developed into a very attractive fishing area. Now you don't have boating at Riverbend Park, at the Lions Riverbend Park; you don't have fishing there; so, in looking at it in the broad sense, it wouldn't be competitive. It would be an entirely different type of attraction area.

Now as regards Kerr Lake, I appreciate the fact that some of the land around there is privately owned. Some of it is; and probably I didn't make myself clear. I think that four or five businessmen in Neepawa have presently purchased a parcel of land on the north side of Kerr Lake, and they wanted permission, I think, to build a road into that. And it was probably for this that the rural municipality at Rosedale was requesting some assistance on a road into this. I believe that it was necessary to cross some Crown land to get at it. But if the south end of the lake was developed -- certainly there's going to be some development taking place this summer on the north side, and I think now is the time to go in and so some planning here, so that it won't become too disorganized.

MR. MOLGAT: Before we leave the Forestry Branch and recreation areas. The Minister gave some figures, I believe, a few moments ago on the revenue from the park fees and the costs, and I'm sorry I didn't get those down. I wonder if he could give us those again, and

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . possibly a breakdown of them as much as he has there.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, other than the total revenue which we had, which was \$71,626.50 -- you got the figure, did you -- and the cost of collection at \$15,486.58, it roughly comes out to about 21 percent but as I mentioned there is an Order for Return which will be tabled quite soon, which gives the further details with respect to each of the areas.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd hoped that the Order for Return would be in before we reached the department, as a matter of fact, but unfortunately we won't be able to discuss this in detail.

In the costs, what does the Minister include there? Just the salaries of the people involved and whatever is required in the way of immediate supplies, or does this also include the capital cost involved?

MR. WITNEY: The costs that are involved here are the stickers and the wages and supervision. It does not include the capital cost.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the minister could tell us what is the situation in other provinces on this problem, like Ontario and Saskatchewan and Alberta. I presume that the government studied what went on in other jurisdictions before proceeding to put on this fee, and I wonder if he could tell us what is the policy in other provinces by comparison to ours.

MR. WITNEY: I can profess knowledge to Ontario and Saskatchewan where in each one of those jurisdictions they have the same fees that we have, \$3.00 per season and 50 cents per car. As for the other areas, such as Quebec and Alberta and B.C., I'm sorry I haven't got any detailed information, but it is my understanding that park entrance fees are charged in most of the provinces in Canada.

MR. MOLGAT: Did the government undertake a study of these other areas before imposing this here in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. WITNEY: They took more or less of a study, Mr. Chairman, on what the Provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan, the adjoining provinces were doing, because we felt that those two adjoining provinces we were in competition with; I can't say that we took any study of the whole picture of the Dominion.

MR. MOLGAT: But there was a study made of the policy in Saskatchewan and in Ontario?

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister or any of his departments that come under his jurisdiction give any consideration to obtaining river frontage in the general area of Winnipeg -- I don't mean right in Winnipeg proper, because there is no land there as far as I know. But I'm speaking of, oh up to 20, 30 miles on either side of the city, to purchase this property with the idea of establishing parks in the future, because it's generally conceded that Winnipeg lacks parks and green belts and that we should do something in this line to create more parks in the Greater Winnipeg area and areas just outside the city. Because what is likely to happen is if these steps aren't taken the municipalities will likely develop these areas and then it'll be impossible for the government to do so in later years.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, we have given consideration to obtaining land to put up some form of campground activity closer to Winnipeg itself, but we have found difficulty in obtaining land. We've recently been able to obtain land over the past two or three years to establish roadside parking places along No. 75 Highway, and that was not an easy chore in itself. At one time we thought that we were going to be able to obtain some land close to Winnipeg, but we were unable to do so, and so far we have not been able to do what we would like to do, is to have a campground a little closer to this city on one of the major highways.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I was referring specifically to areas along the river, like the Red and the Assiniboine, as a park area.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, we have been taking a look for land along the rivers believing that if we were to have a campground closer to Winnipeg that people would prefer to be camping quite close to either the Assiniboine on No. 1, or the Red River on No. 75.

MR. GRAY: May I ask the Honourable Minister whether there is sufficient pulp to meet the demand of the paper mills of this province.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman . . . . . is "yes."

MR. VIELFAURE: And on 2 (c) I mentioned earlier that payments were too slow getting to the people working on these casual projects in forestry. I would just like to remind the

(Mr. Vielfaure, cont'd.) . . . Minister on this subject, if he will check into this for the future. And also, could I ask the Minister if they're contemplating straightening the road between Marchand and Woodridge, because as you know the bus travels to Woodridge now through the forestry. This was started only a few months ago, and I know there have been some demands for that.

MR. WITNEY: The department has been, I suppose you could call it in consultation, or have been writing to the various departments involved in the winter works project to speed up the payments of these cheques that the Honourable Member referred to.

As for the Woodridge road, at this moment at any rate, I don't believe we have any plans to straighten it out as he suggests.

MR. VIELFAURE: Referring to the winter works project, when I mentioned the slow payments to the forestry workers, I was, that is, ordinary construction and repair work going on in the forestry during the summer. I have had many complaints where it took as much as 2-1/2 months for the cheque to get to the worker, like on gravel-spreading and road building, where individuals work, not contractors.

MR. WITNEY: I have had no information up until now, Mr. Chairman, that our payments were slow on the ordinary work of the department, but that will certainly be looked into immediately.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that all the members of the committee were very pleased to learn from the Minister and to observe last year that our forest fire situation was much better in the summer of '62 than it had been in the summer of '61. Now, the Minister, earlier this year, or late last year, indicated that he was very much interested in some suggestions to establish an inter-provincial fire-fighting force, and he's quoted in a newspaper report as saying that the force could mean savings amounting to millions of dollars to provinces like Manitoba that have large forest areas. He said water bombing is a new and effective means of suppressing fires, but too costly for a province to tackle by itself. Well, in the summer of '61 during our very bad fire season, I believe the Minister obtained some flying boats from the Province of British Columbia, in particular, and these were stationed here on, I presume, a rental or loan basis for a period of time. The proposal the Minister is referring to here was to approach the Federal Government to establish such a force within the Armed Services, and this certainly appears to me, Mr. Chairman, to be a most desirable position for the Armed Services to undertake and also for the provinces to co-operate in, because while we may be in a certain year here faced with serious fire problems then other provinces during the same year could be, due to weather conditions, not faced with the same, and if we could shift the force across the country from one province to the other it would mean a saving to all of us. Could the Minister indicate to us the reaction of the Federal Government to the proposal and the request that was made to them to establish such an inter-provincial force?

MR. WITNEY: The request was made -- or the suggestion was made to the Minister of Forestry for Canada, Mr. Chairman, that the RCAF be used as a water bombing force for the fighting of forest fires but we were unsuccessful in the submission. It was felt that the RCAF's role in Canada was not this type of a role and so the request was turned down. The Canso water bombing techniques have been watched -- there have been various improvements made -- the original one started out with outside tanks and resulted in the water being dispersed in small droplets that weren't quite as effective as the new method of carrying the water in the belly of the aircraft. We have taken on a Canso for operation in the province this summer and we will be watching closely the operations of Quebec who have gone into it a bit heavier than we have.

MR. MOLGAT: The Federal Government then has refused the request of the provinces in this regard? Are the provinces following this up to establish this on a joint basis, or an inter-provincial basis themselves?

MR. WITNEY: I can't speak for the other provinces, but I have not called upon the other provinces to join with me in consulting with the Federal Government.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that this policy should be followed very closely because surely the incidence of forest fires varies from area to area and there would be no point in Manitoba having a substantial force just for its own use when we could co-operate with the other provinces. They're all faced with roughly the same problem as we are and I would recommend to the Minister the immediate development of an inter-provincial

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . plan if the Federal Government is not prepared to go along. I really feel that the Federal Government should participate in this project but if they're not prepared to do so then I would recommend to the Minister that he immediately take steps to arrange this with the other provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 58 . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I was waiting to have an opportunity to re-open the question on the recreation field. The Minister, as I understood him this afternoon to deal with the question of the discrepancy in payment between permit holders in the Whiteshell and taxpayers in other resort areas. -- I understood his answer to be that this would be a problem of appealing to the local municipalities. If that was his answer then I gather that he implied that possibly the local municipalities would make some sort of a grant or -- I don't think they can exempt but I presume they can make a grant. Well I'm not satisfied with that situation. I don't think that the answer actually lies within this Department but I suggest that it does lie within the various government departments and should be looked at. I won't press that further. I am interested again in hearing that the plans are to spend close to \$1,000,000 on the development and acquisition of Grand Beach and I would like to get some clarification as to how Grand Beach will be operated as compared with the way Falcon Lake or any other part of the Whiteshell is being operated in terms of occupation -- I presume there'll be no sales, I presume there'll be permits. Just how will people be able to settle into Grand Beach from the standpoint of cottages and occupation of them?

MR. WITNEY: The operation will be basically the same. The land won't be sold, it will be leased and if there is any land available for summer cottages -- the honourable member will realize most of the summer cottages that are there now have been there for a large number of years -- if there is land become available then of course the matter of somebody establishing a cabin there will be on the same basis as it is now. To those people who apply information will be sent, advertisements will be made and they can bid on them in the usual manner. The present summer cottages that perhaps may have signed the lease have to do so, as in other areas, with the approval of the government. Concessions and the other operations of the park will be the same as in all of our parks across the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . indication yet of the amount of the permit fee and how often it will be reviewed?

MR. WITNEY: The leases that we have contain a clause whereby the fee can be reviewed once every five years. We upped the rates I think it was about two years ago so in keeping with the terms of the lease we would not be able to review any increases for another -- it's either two or three years, I'm not sure which way it goes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister inform us as to the cost of the permit?

MR. WITNEY: The annual rental on the back-tier lots in our recreational developments is about \$25.00 -- \$20.00 I'm sorry -- and in the lakefront lots it's \$30.00 and I forget the fee for Falcon Lake but it is up over \$50.00 or something similar to that. We have retained the rentals that were charged by the CNR in the Grand Beach area, and just at the moment I can't think what they were, but they're paying the same that they did under the CNR contract.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . expected that this estimated \$461,000 yet to be spent on development -- incidentally, I was wondering if that came out of the four hundred and sixty-eight in item 2 (f) because it couldn't really come out of item 10, the acquisition, because there isn't enough there. But that's incidental to it. Is it estimated that this additional \$461,000 will pretty well set up that resort area so that the department can turn next year to another development in another part of the province?

MR. WITNEY: Before the province moved in to Grand Beach it had a plan made by some "project planners" I believe they are. They phased it out. The \$461,000 which would be capital cost will bring us to the end of phase one and when we get to that we will then have to assess as to whether or not we are going to go further and of course that will depend upon the use and the pressure of the Grand Beach area.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I know that in the Grand Beach area there are some lots that are vacant now and that they are being saved for people that will have to move from the places that they're at now and they're saving those lots for them. Could the Minister tell me in the future is there some area where they have planned lots that will be available for the public at ....

MR. WITNEY: We have a plan of subdivision for the Grand Beach area but there is no intent to move the people that are there at the present time in Grand Beach. As some lots become vacant at the present time we intend to keep them that way so as to give more elbow room, but we certainly will not be just moving people from where they are now to another area. As the project proceeds and as we begin to see the need for it then we would start to develop the subdivisions in another area.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on this same subject matter, I believe that a group of people at Langruth, probably the Chamber of Commerce and probably a group of organizations, I don't know, but I think they did make a request to my honourable friend for a campsite on the lake immediately east of Langruth, of the town. I wonder if my honourable friend has made any plans, or any long-range plans for the development of a recreational area at that particular point, or any arrangements whereby lots could be leased or purchased by people that proposed to build cabins there.

MR. WITNEY: The situation as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, is that the reeve of the Municipality of Lakeview had been in negotiation with the department re the possibility of setting aside lands in the area for development by the municipality as a municipal recreational development. The reeve interviewed the assistant deputy minister and the director of lands just before Christmas and it was decided that they would have to have a survey of the area involved. There were some special hay permits involved in the particular area. I am informed that the survey has been completed to satisfaction; the survey has encompassed land on which to base a reservation for the development which comprises about 60 acres of land. It has only been recently that we got the description and it is planned now to make a recommendation to the municipal council for reservation of this site for recreational purposes in favour of the municipality without fee and on the undertaking that it may be terminated by either parties with due notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we leave this item I think there's one problem that nobody has mentioned so far and it's a perennial one. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister has had quite a few complaints about it -- and that's the question of permits to local residents, I mean to people who, during the winter months, haven't too much to do and they would like to supplement their low income by cutting some wood. Last year we had some permits as low as ten cords per resident. Now we know that this is very low -- in fact some of them call it ridiculous. I'm not blaming the Minister because I'll come to that yet -- very low, because it doesn't even make up a carload and in several instances some of the wood hasn't been sold for two years because this particular cutter did not want to share his wood, put his wood in the same car with another one and eventually he just left it in his yard; so most of them feel that they should have at least a big enough permit to make up a carload. I realize that the government is interested in a sustained yield and perpetuity of a certain species and I'm not arguing with that; in fact I agree with that, but I really think that something should be done to help these residents. Maybe there is some areas where the product is very scrubby or something, and we could give permits there to completely cut it out; there's a few areas there covered by spruce; if the spruce was removed we could turn that land into agricultural purposes. It has been done in southeastern Manitoba, in several areas they burn up the ground and the moss-peat -- then it makes wonderful agricultural area. Or there may be another suggestion I would like to put here. Some areas which are intended for timber sales and if they are in close proximity to settled areas, I wonder if it would be possible instead of offering them on tender, or limit, whatever you call them, to hold them back if they're close enough to settlers and advertise that there is a certain amount of wood that is cuttable, after a survey has been made, or allowable cuts could be cut, and ask residents to apply, or to make application say for 10, 20, 40 or 50 cords each, and after they have been satisfied give the remaining out as a sale permit. I know that the department feels that in most

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) ..... cases this is not economical because it takes more time and money and effort to supervise the cutting, but I really think that it would be worthwhile because it would really help the settlers to supplement their income during the winter months.

There's something else that I hear quite often mentioned, and that is that spruce seems to be kind of disappearing as one of the most wanted sources of pulp. It is not economical enough. It takes spruce almost a hundred years to mature, while the other species which could be used for the manufacture of pulp, with our new techniques of processing we could use poplar more extensively -- and I understand in the States they are using it more extensively now. We could use jackpine, which is more economical because it only takes about half the time, about 40 to 50 years, to mature. So it could be looked into, I imagine. I would like the Minister to -- just for the purpose of record to explain the policy on this.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the problem that the honourable member has drawn to our attention is one that has been there for some time. We have been quite adamant -- and I am glad to hear him agree to this -- that we must establish forest management plans and sustained yield in the southeast corner. The problems that the people down there face will never be eased until we have done that. During the past year we were able to do that, but we have had to be quite severe in doing it. We are now down to the allowable cut. And on the problem of sales versus permits, I would not like the honourable member to think that we are doing that for the convenience of the Forest Service. The sales and permits are all part of the forest management plan and sustained yields management in that area. Now with the amounts of allowable cut that we have had, we have been in the habit of dividing that amount of allowable cut for permit among the number of settlers who have applied. The figure that he mentions of 10 cords is certainly uneconomical, but in the problem we have had we have felt that in the area they would prefer that every man who makes an application would at least be able to get some wood that he could cut. I am sure if we could reach the position where we could have these people operating on a larger unit that it would be much better for them and for the forest management policies in the area. At the present time I see no relief from this particular problem because we are of the firm opinion that we have sound management plans in the area now and we have been quite relieved that we have been able to -- in the last year -- confine ourselves to the allowable cut on sustained yield, and while it won't be next year and it won't be the year after, and it won't be the year after that, in a few years time the area will come back to what it was and then the forestry will become a very sound economy to the southeast corner of Manitoba.

I am interested in his comments about spruce for pulpwood because I think the problem here is simply that the mills want spruce rather than jackpine, and as an indication of this I would point out to him that the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company who have to produce a quality product of paper in order to maintain their competitive position with other products, particularly products from the southern United States, that they are using in percentage some 74 per cent spruce pulpwood, some 8 per cent balsam and only 16 per cent jackpine. The Flakeboard plant at Sprague is able to use poplar and jackpine, and I think that the utilization that they are able to make of this species has eased to some extent the problem that the honourable member mentioned. But at the moment, the mills to whom these people are selling their product seem to prefer the spruce over the jackpine and I'm afraid that as long as they do, that's the product that will be marketable. I might say to him though that the plight of the southeast corner, and this particular case that he recognizes, is recognized by us -- is not recognized not only at the top but is recognized by the regional supervisors and the men in the field, and we are trying to deal with it in the best manner that we can.

MR. CHERNIACK: I just wanted to ask, who operates and pays for the operation of the school at Falcon Lake?

MR. WITNEY: The Department of Education operates the school at Falcon Lake and the people pay some sum -- I am not sure what it is -- but I could get the information for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 58 Passed. Item 3. The Game Branch. Passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I am one of those very concerned over the rapid decrease in many species of our game. For instance the duck -- we have the canvasback and the redhead, which is causing considerable concern to our sportsmen and wild life authorities because the numbers have decreased so rapidly in the last few years. The same situation applies to all our species of duck, although not quite as drastically -- and I am convinced that unless some action is taken that there will be no ducks in the next 10 or 15 years. I would like to advocate that we abolish the duck hunting season. I know it's impossible to suggest that this government take these steps unless they get co-operation from the other provinces and the United States and Mexico. But unless this is done, generations coming behind us are not going to know what it is to hunt the duck. I've had the privilege of hunting ducks ever since I was allowed to hold a gun and it's just incredible to see the difference in the amount of game that was around when I started shooting compared with what we have today. I know a few years ago it was nothing for me to go out on the opening day and get a limit within the hour. Today, unless you happen to be in a particular area where there is a flight, you don't get your limit; it's a rarity now when a hunter comes home on opening day with a limit where a few years ago it was the exception if somebody didn't get his limit. There are two reasons for this as far as I am concerned, the increasing number of guns and the decreasing amount of land where the duck can breed.

I know in previous years when I have spoken on this subject the Minister has indicated his sympathy towards this problem and I'd like to know when I take my seat if he would indicate to us what steps he has taken, if any, to encourage other governments to try to curtail the hunting of the duck until the numbers grow again. I think that steps must be taken to find and purchase land which will allow the duck to breed, because over the years -- and I'm as guilty as any of them; I've advocated drainage in certain areas -- but these steps are largely responsible for the decrease in the birds because of lack of water, consequently they are not reproducing as they might in years gone by when there were sloughs all over the province. It used to be said years ago -- I recall Minnesota used to say, "Well, we're not too concerned because Manitoba will always produce the duck; there's lots of breeding ground for them there." The situation now is so serious that we don't have any breeding grounds. I know in the Interlake, where I am quite familiar, there are very few sloughs compared with years gone by. I think that the government should implement a program to buy rough land where there are a lot of swamps and create game reserves so that the duck can breed, and try to restore the numbers of this bird.

I know that one of our biggest problems is the Mexicans. I am advised that these people allow huge limits -- as much as 25 birds a day -- and that they have been known to even shoot the bird for commercial purposes. I know that there's going to be a lot of criticism of me for advocating that steps be taken to abolish the hunting of the duck for possibly a couple of years, but I think if those people are interested in the game itself they will realize that these steps must be taken in order to prolong the life of the duck. A few years ago we used to have the passenger pigeon and they roamed the North American continent in countless millions. It was said that for every robin there was there were 30 passenger pigeons. Today, Mr. Chairman, there isn't a passenger pigeon alive anywhere, and this same situation can happen to the duck if steps aren't taken to correct it.

Another situation I would like to bring up is that of the deer. Last year, for reasons unknown to me and perhaps the Minister can explain why, I know in the Interlake they had the deer season open on two separate dates. The area north of Ashern opened earlier and the area south of Ashern opened two days later. This caused a tremendous concentration of guns north of Ashern. People that would normally have hunted south of Ashern all drove north of Ashern to hunt, consequently the number of hunters in one particular area was tremendous. There may be reasons for having two seasons but I don't think in an area like Ashern you should have the boundary line. I think that this area should be all opened at one time.

Another thing I'd like to advocate to the Minister and that is the changing of the opening of the deer season. Last year the season opened early in November and it's a disgrace to think of the hundreds of deer that died as a result of being wounded and the hunters were unable to find them because they couldn't track them. I think that this government should open the season late again, about the 25th of November, as they did in years gone by when we are almost certain



(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . to have snow. I know of many hunters who stumbled upon deer lying badly wounded in the field and in the bush and they were so sick from the injuries they received the only thing the hunter could do was destroy them in mercy. This is a waste of our game and I think that -- it is true that if you open early you get more people hunting, but unfortunately we are getting a lot of people going out after these deer that shouldn't be out in the field at all. They have no conception of how to handle a gun, they go past a farmer's yard, they're shooting towards his farm buildings, they're shooting animals. I know of one instance in the Mulvihill area the hunter shot a little girl who was riding a pony. This is absolutely ridiculous. These men are going out into these areas and they don't think twice before they use their guns. They're shooting at cattle, they're shooting at horses and something drastic must be done to change this situation. We had a tragic situation in the southwest of this province where a little boy, I believe it was, was killed when a stray bullet crashed through his home and killed him instantly. There is no excuse for this type of thing and hunters that are responsible for this I think should be charged with a criminal offence. After all, if they don't know what they're shooting at they shouldn't shoot, but too many of these hunters that are going out today have no idea how to handle a gun and have no regard for the people living in the areas where they're hunting, and I think it's high time that some drastic steps were taken to correct this situation. If I'm not mistaken I believe last year the number of guns in the Manitoba area was about 45,000 -- now if my figure is wrong the Minister can correct me. This is a tremendous increase from previous years. I think that in the interests of safety and in the interests of our game that if the season was opened later in November we'd have fewer hunters going out, we'd have the genuine hunter going out after the deer and not a lot of fellows going out just for a good time and who really don't know anything about hunting at all. Some of these fellows are picking up war surplus weapons with army ammunition and going out and they have no idea how to handle these guns.

One item I meant to touch on when I was speaking about the ducks. I understand that this government had an agreement with other provinces, including Saskatchewan, about the opening of the duck season and if my information is correct, the Saskatchewan double crossed this government by opening earlier than they had previously agreed. I think this is a most unfortunate situation. I understand the Minister was annoyed over it and I certainly can understand why, because if governments can't keep their word it's certainly going to make it most awkward for people like the Minister and other conservation officers who are interested in the game problem.

Another problem that's causing a lot of concern to my people in the north is that of the moose. Since the road to Grand Rapids has been constructed hunters have easy access to that area and the number of moose that have been taken out of there is tremendous, and although I'm not opposing the hunting of the moose, I think we've got to take a close look at the situation so that we don't kill them right off. Anyone that knows anything about the hunting of the moose knows that they're not too difficult to shoot; they're not nearly as wild as the deer. I know of one instance last fall where three men from Winnipeg went up north to hunt the moose and they saw the moose tracks crossing the highway; they followed them for a short distance and saw three moose just standing there in the bluff, they made no effort to get away and they shot them all. This points out the situation, how easy it is to get these animals. They don't reproduce as rapidly as the deer and I'm very much afraid that if some steps aren't taken to watch this the moose will be destroyed and I think that some steps may be taken to consider putting a game preserve in this area because as the situation is today the game guardians in the area find it very difficult to watch the situation as it is.

When the Minister replies I wonder if he could tell me what consideration is being given to the destruction of the predators. I know in years gone by when the skunk was worth something, his fur was worth something, the Indian and other trappers readily went after them, but today since the long hair is of no value the numbers of these animals have increased rapidly as has the fox and they're causing a considerable problem to the upland game. I know there are some people feel that if the government is spending money in the interests of game preservation, that possibly they might consider spending money to try to go after the skunk and the fox which is destroying the eggs and the small birds in the spring. So when the Minister replies I'd be most interested to hear what steps he has taken and what his hopes are in this connection.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, we've just heard the Honourable Member for St. George say that he thought in his opinion that if they made the season later for hunting deer that there wouldn't be so much slaughter of deer and of human life. I think what has to happen here, Mr. Chairman, is this, that everyone that buys a rifle -- it doesn't matter which time of the year you open the season -- they'll go out as long as they can go out and buy a rifle, and they don't know how to handle it. People that drive a car have to go and pass a test to get a driver's licence. I see no reason why people that go out hunting shouldn't have to pass some sort of safety test of how to handle a weapon, be it a shotgun, a rifle or any other -- maybe an air pistol. It doesn't matter what time you open the season or close it. That's not going to stop the people that are going out. What has to happen is this; you have to educate the people that are going out and every year we get more and more people that get interested in this way of life, that they want to go out and hunt. Years back there were people that probably couldn't afford to go out; they couldn't afford to buy a rifle, and today, like I mentioned last night, you can go to a surplus store and buy a surplus army rifle for \$9.95 and you can buy ammunition at a very low rate, and the people don't know the potential of that rifle, they don't know what it can do; they don't know how to handle it. All they need is \$9.95 and they can get it, and this is the problem, Mr. Chairman, that we've got to educate the people, and if we have to get a licence to drive a car, licences for every other thing, I think that the same thing should apply to people going out hunting. They should be able to prove to the people that issue licences that they know how to handle that firearm. I know of a very sad case of a fellow that I work with, that shot his own son -- because he went out and he didn't know how to handle the firearm that he had. And this is the problem, Mr. Chairman, this is the problem that we have to face up to. It doesn't matter if you open it up in October, November, December or January or February; that won't make any difference; the difference is you've got to teach these people how to handle these firearms.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood has said it doesn't make any difference what time you open the season. I disagree with him strongly because if you open the season later, say in the latter part of November, the weather is a lot colder, there is snow and it's only the real hunter, the man for the most part who knows how to handle a weapon will go out, because when you open a season early, in November as we did last year, you're having a lot of fellows who are going out, or duck hunters and fellows who are just going out for a joy ride, lightly clad and it's a lot easier going hunting at that time of the year; but if you open season late in the year when there's a lot more snow, at least we hope there's a lot of snow and the roads are not as easy to get around on, I sincerely believe you'll have a lot less hunters. And also, as I said before, by opening the season later in the year the chances of having snow are greater and we'll have a lot fewer deer wounded and left to die because the hunter was unable to locate them.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the House last evening when the Honourable Minister made his statement on this Department and I do wonder whether he did touch at all on the fire safety probe or the Commission that was appointed or the probe that was established for firearm safety. I checked fairly carefully in the Hansard that we received today and I may have overlooked it but I couldn't see where he did report on it and probably, probably the Committee has not reported to the Minister yet, but in light of what has been said by my honourable friend for St. George and my honourable friend for Elmwood, it does indicate that we must take a pretty close look at this subject matter and do something to reduce the widespread increase in the number of accidents. Now, I am a little surprised that this government of action was not first in this field. I hate to refer to our sister province to the west as my honourable friends do now and again, but I wrote to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in Saskatchewan two or three months ago and asked them if they did have a firearm accident report and if they did, to kindly send it to me and I would forward the necessary fee for it. They didn't charge me anything for it, and I was very happy to receive it, because it does, it does provide us with quite a little bit of information. Probably my honourable friend is acquainted with it, and probably he has one on his desk, but it says on page 3 that the Province of Saskatchewan introduced a hunter safety program in 1959, about four years ago. I'm surprised that my honourable friend would let Saskatchewan "put one over on him" like that, because this is a government of action, according to our honourable friends opposite. I was surprised, too, that

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . Ontario introduced a hunter safety training program -- well sometime prior to 1957. But referring to the report from Saskatchewan, they say that "in 1959, the game division of the wild life branch initiated a hunter safety program. This program, primarily aimed at the youth of the province, has been designed to overcome ignorance with respect to the handling of firearms, and to develop an active awareness of the fundamentals of safe firearm handling in hunting. Results from agencies in many parts of United States has shown that an extensive long-range educational program will ultimately lower the firearm accident rate." And I was informed that in 1961 the Province of Saskatchewan appointed a Director of Hunter Safety. I don't know whether that is the name they attach to him, but I guess it could apply. They pay him something like \$18,000 a year, and he manages this entire hunter safety program.

On page 2 of the same report, it does point up that you've got to get these people young and train them at an early age. It says here that: "first it was obvious that the cause of the great majority of accidents, hunting and gun accidents could be traced to ignorance, carelessness, and both. In 1959 hunter survey conducted by the wild life branch showed that approximately 12% of the total hunter population fall in this age category." They're referring to the young fellow. "In the year 1959, 52 of the 82 firearm accidents" -- and they have in brackets, 63% -- "the shooter was of an age under 20 years." Now I'm not suggesting that that would naturally follow in Manitoba, but I suspect that it would -- "that in 63% of all hunter accidents the hunter was under 20 years of age. In 1958, 42 of the 66 accidents, 64% involved a shooter under 20. In 45% of the accidents which occurred in '57, the shooter was under 20 years of age."

Now Neepawa, I believe, that is the Neepawa Junior Rifle Club, under the sponsorship and administration of the Neepawa Game and Fish Association, more or less pioneered in the field of hunter training in this province, I believe, and as my honourable friend knows, the Junior Rifle Club now at Neepawa has something like 100 members there. I believe my honourable friend was out to a presentation that was made a year or two ago. I believe that he was invited out this year and couldn't make it, but I attended, and every year I am simply amazed at the good work that they are doing in this regard. They have, Mr. Chairman, about a 100 boys and girls ranging from about age 10 to 16, 17 and 18, and they train them all winter long in the, in the safety measures, how to handle a gun, what to do when you're out shooting, and all this kind of business, and it is a wonderful program indeed. Now I know, I know that my honourable friends feel now that there is a need for this, because they have appointed the firearm safety probe and they have listened with great interest to the various briefs that were presented to him. I know that my honourable friend is in possession of a brief submitted by the Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish Associations that was made to the firearm safety inquiry in these buildings, and I would like to hear him comment on what he thinks of the program and the recommendations outlined in this brief, and in particular one other brief that was presented to the commission by the Manitoba Stock-Growers' Association. I believe that they met with us the other day, did they not, or was that the same organization. They had something to say in their brief just the other day, and I hope that my honourable friend will tell us that they are making great strides in this and probably he will tell us why Ontario and Saskatchewan got ahead of him on this very worthwhile project of hunter safety.

MR. WITNEY: In dealing with the question of ducks, I'm pleased to see that the honourable member has retained his interest in waterfowls. He has expressed it every year. This year we feel that conditions are a bit brighter than they have been, although the conditions are still nowhere near what they were in the 1950's. I had the pleasure of flying with the United States wild life service again this year on a trip that took us from Winnipeg across the Glenboro marshes, across the Whitewater Lake in the Turtle Mountain, and up through the Neepawa pothole country, down over the big grass marsh, back down over the Delta and across the Lake St. Francis marshes back into Winnipeg. And from the year before, when I had been out and the biologist had shown me potholes that he had never known to be dry after flying the country for a period of over 10 years, most of those potholes showed at least at that time of the year, that they had retained about, they had half-filled again, that's what I am -- I am trying to say.

I think in the federal-provincial wild life conference that it is quite safe for me to say

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) . . . that the members of our Game Branch have been considered leaders in this problem of waterfowl control. We have simply said to the other provinces and to the United States that we will go as far as you people will go in taking action on hunting, bag limits, etcetera in season in order to maintain duck population. But we have maintained that it must be equality all across the line, because if one province recognizes the problems and the others do not, then the whole problem of waterfowl decreases is lost. We came back with a lower bag limit this year, and we altered some of our seasons. The Wild Life Conference will be held around April 18th and 19th, and if the House has risen by that time, I will be in attendance at that conference to watch the proceedings, particularly when we come down to negotiating on the various seasons to be held in the various provinces. I do recall that one of the provinces after making a commitment down there, did not, for their own reasons, and I'm not in a position to be critical of them, but the fact is that they did not retain the original position they had, but Manitoba did, despite the fact that it came under rather severe criticism at that time.

The honourable member mentions land purchases, and we have been continuing our land purchasing throughout this province of waterfowl habitat as much as we can get hold of, and I think one of the big steps forward that we were able to make during the past year was the 21-year lease with Ducks Unlimited in the Saskeram area, where there will be, I believe it is some \$300,000 of works instituted to maintain the area at water levels that it has normally enjoyed over an average of say, about 10 years. The structures are not such that it will control drought conditions or flood conditions, but simply maintain the Saskeram area as it has been more or less, I could say, historically.

We have in the estimates this year too, in conjunction with the ARDA program, the provision for another biologist who will be assigned to the problem of wild life habitat inventory. It is something we feel that needs to be done now, and as this man begins to take an inventory of the habitat that we have and the habitat that will be a good potential for purchase of land for these particular areas. We were able also to buy some land this year for the establishment of some duck resting areas in the Delta marsh portion of Manitoba, and in that area we conducted this past year an experimental program on the control of skunks and racoons. We injected eggs with strychnine. We had the adequate signs that are necessary to warn people that these nests that were in the area were poisoned and the program achieved results and I expect that on the basis of the results that we had this year, that we will be continuing them.

I think we have had some very major purchases, they have not been extensive in area, but some major purchases in the Delta marsh and in the Netley marshes over the past few years. I can assure the honourable member that the department is very much aware of the problems of waterfowl. We will continue to watch the situation very carefully and we will continue to drive for the hunting seasons and bag limits which we feel are necessary when we meet annually at the Provincial Wild Life Conference which this year will be held in Ottawa.

He referred to the two deer seasons in the Interlake country. We opened up the northern part of the Interlake country earlier, by I believe it was about a week, in order to draw off some of the pressure in the more settled portions of the province, such as the southwest corner, and we were successful. The number of deer that have been killed, just to give him a review over the seasons: in 1959, 25,400 in round figures; in 1960, 22,400; and in 1961, 23,100 deer have been killed. The reports that I receive are that the deer populations in the province are not at a low ebb at all at the present time. We have done more flying on deer inventory and we have improved the methods of obtaining deer counts by aircraft during the past year.

With respect to the early opening, I go back to a rather vivid time in my career as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, when we had an exceptionally early snowfall, and at that time I was being pressed to open the season "now", not to go by biological or management considerations at all, but simply to open the season and to shoot off the deer because at that time the deer were feeding on the farmers fields. We were using all kinds of devices to keep these deer off the fields, even to some sort of a smelling material which we put on a small tent affair of cardboard in order to try to keep the deer away from the fields. It was good when the weather was warm but when the weather dropped below zero the smell wasn't there, or didn't affect the deer as it had done, and of course it was of no value. We had been receiving representations also that in Saskatchewan the deer hunting seasons have been, I

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) . . . believe, over a long period of years, opened earlier than they were here in Manitoba, and following the 1959 season it was felt that we had the deer, that it was good management to have them on an earlier opening. Since that time we have had hardly any snow cover during the period of time that we have had our early openings for deer and we are now considering, for the deer seasons in this year, just what the honourable member has suggested, that they be at a later date.

He refers to moose in the Interlake country, and I think that possibly he will be interested in the figures too. In the season of '59 in round figures, 1,600 moose; in 1960, 1,900 moose, and in the season 1961, 2,200 moose. But once again, I forget the number of miles that we flew this past year in inventory of moose -- I have it here in the book somewhere -- but it was quite extensive, and again the report has come to me from those who make these counts and are responsible for management, that the moose populations are at a good level. In some portions of the Interlake we still have too many moose, but these moose are basically a fair distance away from the Grand Rapids highway and rather difficult to get at. But there are over towards Lake Winnipegosis some populations of moose which I believe the biologists feel could be thinned out with a hunting season. In connection with skunks, skunks are not a protected animal. We have -- I believe it was in 1960 that we put on the staff of the Game Branch a Predator Control Officer to work with municipalities and local government districts and individuals in ways and means that they themselves could help to control the skunk, because if we are to cut down the numbers of skunks we will need fair numbers of people and we could do so by utilizing the talents and the energies of the local farmer who is affected, or the local municipality, given some technical advice as to the best manner in which to do so. We did carry out a program in the southwest corner. We hired a trapper down there to kill skunks in the Virden and the Oak Lake areas, basically because of a rabies outbreak.

The comments with respect to hunter safety -- I don't wish to make any comment on that right now because I feel that I should wait until the Kimball Committee report is in my hands. That report is being written at the present time. It held hearings here in Winnipeg and in Brandon and up at The Pas -- hearings that were well advertised and were well attended, with some very reasonable, very interesting and instructive briefs from municipalities, from the people that were mentioned by the Honourable Member for Neepawa. I expect that we will be having the report quite soon. I, too, would like to pay respect to the Junior Rifle Clubs across the province and I am happy to hear the Honourable Member for Neepawa do so because I think he realizes that that was one of the major spawning grounds for the Junior Rifle Clubs and they have now spread all across the country until we also have them in the north country. The people from the north country have been taking these youngsters down to the annual meetings that are being held by the Junior Rifle; the interest of these young people is high and the value of this type of work certainly cannot be measured in dollars and cents -- it can only be measured in the future.

I have been also interested in attending some of the Game and Fish Association safety programs that have been held, not only here in Winnipeg, but in other areas. We have co-operated on the matter of hunter safety with the Manitoba Game and Fish Association on the visual acuity test. I'm happy to say that I passed the visual acuity test but I am not so happy to say that I was unable to pass the Junior Rifle Corps test. It would be very interesting to know if the adult members of this group tonight, and particularly those who have been speaking about hunting, would be able to sit down at that piece of paper and go through the various tests that these youngsters go through and come out with flying colours. So that is all that I would like to say at this moment about the question of hunter safety, pending the report of the Kimball Commission. I would be remiss though if I did not thank the various groups and associations across this province who took the time to prepare briefs, and the time and the trouble and the expense to send representatives to these various hearings that were held throughout the country, and after the formal proceedings were held to sit down with this man and talk in an informal manner, as I understand they did at Brandon with a great deal of benefit to all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Minister correctly, he said there had been pressure from the farm groups to open the season earlier because the deer were going after the crops. I can't see how that would be a factor by opening the season earlier in November or later in November because by and large all the crops are pretty well in

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . November, aren't they?

MR. WITNEY: At the time that this event took place, the crops were under the snow. The snow had come early before most of the people had been able to get their crops off. Since that time we haven't had, I believe, much of a snowfall or an early snowfall, and it so happened that it took place at a time when we had abundant numbers of deer in various parts of the province.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate to the Committee what is the reaction or what is the feeling towards closing the duck hunting season entirely for a year or two across the whole of North America. Has this matter been discussed, or what is the reaction of the different organizations and different government members that attend these conferences that the Minister attends?

MR. WITNEY: I have not been at a conference where the recommendation was made to -- or was discussed, at any rate, to close the season, so I am unable to answer that question. But I think in general most of the provinces feel that while duck populations are low that it is not quite necessary to go that far, and they have been prepared to reduce bag limits drastically, but speaking from the information I have gleaned from the men who have come back, it seems to me that they have not desired to take that final step. Although this province has said that if the rest of them would do so, we are prepared to do so.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . I don't think that reducing the duck limit is the answer because every year the number of guns is increasing. I think the Minister will agree. And although each one is allowed to take fewer ducks there are more hunters taking them and, therefore, I think that this isn't the answer. A few years ago a hunter was allowed to take 10 or 12 birds when there were plenty of ducks and a lot fewer hunters. Now we're allowed to take -- what is it -- four or five birds and you've got three or four times as many hunters going after them. And for this reason I feel that reducing the bag limit isn't the answer to this problem.

MR. WITNEY: The men, when they meet in the Federal-Provincial Wild Life Conference, and the American people meet with them at that time, they have before them all of the latest inventory figures of ducks that have been compiled by the United States Wild Life Service, the Canadian Wild Life Service, and the information that is obtained by the various provinces themselves. Those figures are assessed very carefully and I gather to date that most of these people have felt that the figures are not such that the complete prohibition that the honourable member recommends is necessary. But certainly the desire is there not to reduce the duck population to the point that the honourable member is afraid they will go -- to the point where we will have nothing; and I am quite sure that if these men -- and they are all I think -- well, I'm quite sure, men who are conservationists at heart -- if they felt that that was absolutely necessary then the action would be taken.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what I am very much afraid of, and I'm not attributing this to the Minister but I'm attributing it to governments in general, that they are too interested in the almighty dollar, the money they derive from the licenses -- because if you open the season, even to allow a bag limit of 2 or 3 birds, they get their money for the license. I think that governments are -- this is what's stopping governments from taking this action -- they want the money they receive from the licensing fees and until such time as they forget this I don't think they will ever abolish it because there is no doubt about it, they'll lose a lot of revenue from the licenses which would not be purchased if they had no season. There is no question about it, I suppose some of these big companies that manufacture the shells are certainly not desirous of doing it; but I think if they take the long range view on this they would be better off by closing the season for a year or two because it will benefit them for many years ahead.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Province of Manitoba is not taking into consideration when dealing with ducks the money that it gains from its revenue. I can't really agree with the honourable member that other governments are. There are other factors, such as duck depredation, which takes place in some areas which is of concern to not only this jurisdiction but other jurisdictions as well. As for the ammunition companies, whatever I have seen of them, they have always seemed to me at any rate to be quite prepared to abide by what conservation measures are needed, and indeed have helped to foster some conservation activity.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister in

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd.) . . . reference to the upland game matter in the Interlake area and in the northeastern part of the province, there seems to be a lack of grouse in these areas and there also seems to be a certain amount of reluctance on the part of the Game Branch to encourage the raising of little chicks in order to try and populate these areas. Now, is this due to the unsuitability of the area, or is there some other reason on the part of the Game Branch? Now I know that the Honourable Minister mentioned that by having two seasons restricted for the hunting of grouse in the southwest part of the province there was a marked increase in the grouse population, but it seems to me that a program such as has been sponsored in Saskatchewan and in certain parts of south and southwestern Ontario, in conjunction with the various game associations who are very much interested in making available enough upland game for hunting, and I think that surely there must be some way of increasing fees and extending this hunting to a larger number of people but making sure that we provide sufficient birds for this purpose, and I have it on very good authority that the Game Branch has always been most reluctant in this matter and I was wondering if the Honourable Minister might shed some light on this and the reason for it.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

MR. WITNEY: The upland game bird checks -- voluntary highway checking stations were maintained at Langruth during the open portion of the upland game bird season for the second year. We got excellent co-operation from the hunter and we examined more than a thousand birds. The species of sharp-tailed grouse and ruffed grouse and spruce grouse, particularly sharp-tailed grouse, the count that we have made are that they have continued at a high level throughout most of the Manitoba range in 1962. There has been a decline in the numbers in the southeast corner of Manitoba but that was attributed to bad weather which affected the breeding of the grouse at that particular time, but the numbers that we lost there were compensated for by an increase in west central Manitoba and southwestern Manitoba, and the numbers of the sharp-tailed grouse in southwestern Manitoba increased during this past year. The ruffed grouse and the spruce grouse are reported to be at high levels throughout most of the Manitoba range.

With respect to the other point that the honourable member raises of the Game Branch being reluctant to encourage people to raise chicks, I'd be rather curious to know where they got the chicks from, because as I understand the situation the nests of these birds are not to be molested and the bird must come from the egg so where the egg came from I'm not too sure, but we also were rather interested in not having importation without control of various species. Possibly this was a matter of where these eggs had been imported from other jurisdictions, I'm not sure, and I find myself a little at a loss to answer the particular question or comment that's been made by the honourable member.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I think that I can say to the Honourable Minister quite authoritatively that there are sufficient eggs and chicks available in the northern parts of the U. S. which are comparable to our species in Manitoba. They are available; they could be brought in; as a matter of fact I myself have in company with others brought in several hundred of them at various times. They have come across very nicely and they develop to be a good shooting bird, and the thing is that this is something that can be encouraged. It would mean bringing in people from the outside. It would also encourage more shooting, and this would, of course, bring more revenue, not only from the sale of licences but it would bring in more revenue to the less populated areas of the province, and these eggs and sources of chicks are available, and of course you just can't have all the quantities you want at a moments notice but on a year, two three or five-year program you can have available all you want.

MR. WITNEY: Well I'll talk with the Game Branch about this particular matter that the honourable member mentions, but I think that I'm beginning to see perhaps why there is some reluctance upon the Game Branch. However, I will speak to them about it and ascertain for sure what their reasons are.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that this is the item that we might discuss the duck feeding stations, and I would be interested to hear from my honourable friend whether he has any new ideas, new plans or programs in this regard. I think that I can safely say -- and I believe that he will agree with me -- that the duck feeding program that has been carried on in the last three or four years, particularly in the Langruth area, has been a very successful one. I believe that a certain amount of experimenting has been done in the last two or three years as to the best method to keep the ducks and sand hill cranes out of the crop. I would be interested to hear what he has to say in this regard.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have learned a lot in the past three years about controlling ducks and sandhill cranes, and it's rather interesting to note that our men are now able -- through the use of the zombanger, through the use of men and through the use of scarecrows, and through the use of artificial feeding stations -- able to herd thousands of these species into a quarter section of land. We have been experimenting with a new type of the zombanger which has been produced by the Canadian Wildlife Service, and we have provided more money in the Estimates to buy more of this material for the coming year. I might add too that we have had the assistance of the Canadian Wildlife Service in this particular problem.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when travelling across the line down south I noticed a lot of pheasants out there. I would just like to know whether the Minister could inform us whether the pheasant is also on the increase in Manitoba or not.

MR. WITNEY: No, the pheasant is not on the increase in Manitoba. There was, for a period of years, experimentation done to try to bring the pheasant into Manitoba in numbers so that they would be able to adapt themselves to our type of habitat as it changed over the



(Mr. Whitney cont'd) . . . . . period of years with the development of agriculture, but I can't offer any encouragement at all for the pheasant, although we are tentatively thinking of some plans with respect to pheasant in the Souris wild life management area when we have it established.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, speaking earlier today and again this evening, the Minister spoke and gave his respects to the Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish Associations, and I would certainly like to add my comments and commendation to this group. I suppose that like most of the other members of the House, I belong to one of the associations. It's not the biggest one in the province but it's one of the very active ones in Waldglen. In fact we had the pleasure of having the Premier of the province address us in that group some few years ago on his ideas on game and fish. Now, the Minister spoke very highly of this group and I quite agree with him. Here is a group made up of volunteer associations throughout the province and they've done, in my opinion, a particularly good job in the field of hunter safety, and we were discussing a few moments ago this particular topic. From the very beginning of the federation in 1945, they set up one of the offices on the executive as the Provincial Safety Chairman. Since then they've conducted a number of programs. The Minister mentioned some of them: the eye vision test which was carried on in '61 with the Manitoba Optometric Society. He mentioned as well the junior hunter program, which I think is an excellent one. This is the course that they put out; it's a tough course; the Minister said he was unable to pass it himself, and I would agree with him that probably a good number of those here could not. This is given now in some thirty areas in the province on a volunteer basis and the association is doing a marvellous job in training young hunters. In addition to that the federation has had hundreds of meetings with safety films and lectures right across the province, has a poster program across the province. It's set up its own insurance structure so that members of the federation have insurance in case of damage that they cause. These are all programs that the Manitoba Federation have established to assist in this matter of safety.

Now the Minister says that he thinks very highly of them, that he goes to their meetings, and I agree with that, but I don't really think that the Minister listens to this group sufficiently, and this particular case is this matter of hunter safety where, if the Minister had been listening to the association, I think we'd have been much further ahead in the Province of Manitoba on this question of safety, because for some time now the Federation has been making recommendations to the Minister. For example, some time ago they made recommendations on colour of clothing, and this they did as a result of tests in the United States. They recommended the blaze orange, and so far the government action has been partial only in this regard. A second recommendation that was made some two years ago was for the banning of the use of steel jacket bullets. Two years ago, and yet no government action.

Three years ago they recommended that we should build up information every year on the causes of shooting accidents, because quite obviously, if you're going to take some action to prevent shooting accidents then the first thing you must do is determine what really are the causes of these accidents. Well this is three years ago and I don't believe that the Minister has acted upon this at all. Similarly, some three years ago the Federation recommended the establishment of a full-time safety director, and the government can say, well, but this would cost money. The Federation was willing at that time to see an increase in the licence fee, and I believe recommended that, provided the government would be prepared to establish this office, that they would be prepared to promote an increase in licence fees for this, and yet there was no action from the government in this regard. The government only acted finally last fall when there was a most tragic accident in the Province of Manitoba and when it happened to be during the course of an election campaign. Then my honourable friend rushed off, got himself an expert from the United States and proceeded to have an investigation. If the Minister had listened to the Federation for the past three years and acted upon some of these suggestions of theirs, I think that the Province of Manitoba would be further ahead now in the field of hunting safety and I suspect, although we haven't got the report, but I would be willing to suggest that the recommendations that we will get from the investigation conducted by this special investigator from the United States will be pretty well down the line of what the Federation has been recommending for the past three years, because here we have a group of volunteers in the province, people who are dealing with this problem day in and day out, made up of people who are . . . . .

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . concerned of this matter of game and fish. They've made these recommendations on the basis of intimate knowledge of the problem. So I would suggest to the Minister, I agree with him; the Federation is doing a good job; but let's just quit patting him on the back; let's also work with them and listen to some of their recommendations.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to describe to the Minister a situation that occurs near my constituency and I'm wondering if this is very general across the province, and it is this, that there has been a chap come up from the States and for a fairly reasonable price he's bought a small piece of property near the Delta Marsh, and on this property he has good enough buildings that with very little investment he's set up quite a -- what I would call a boiler shop type of operation where he imports his guests from the Minneapolis area, charges them three or four hundred dollars a week, and they haven't got enough land but they do all their hunting on his land and they are up and down the road allowances and all over the place, which is possibly their right as much as any other hunter's right to do so, but at the same time this chap is making a big profit out of a natural resource that belongs to all Canadians, all Manitobans in particular. There have been reports that these people have not limited their bags when they're shooting on their own land, and there's a lot of hard feeling in the area about this commercial type of operation that's not only exploiting our natural resources but is also right up alongside a wild life refuge, and they are cashing in on the hard work and the efforts of the people who are footing the bill and doing the work trying to encourage the duck population. So I was wondering if there are other operations like this in the province, and if your department were going to take any steps against this type of thing.

MR. WITNEY: Is the honourable member suggesting that we should ban the sale of private shooting licenses?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I'm not suggesting that, but I'm wondering if these commercial lodges should be made to go to a little more remote parts of the province perhaps. I don't really know the answer, and I'm wondering if you do.

MR. WITNEY: The private shooting lodges, Mr. Chairman, are all on private land in these particular areas, and it is private land, I don't think I would have any jurisdiction to tell them that they would have to leave that particular area and move to another one. As I understand the problem that he mentions, I think it is prevalent in some other parts of the province, yes. The only way, if I got it correct in what he is saying, I think the only way that we can do it is with our field staff to continue to check in those particular areas, and if he likes to draw my attention to the area or tell me where the area is, we'll have a good look at it this duck season with our conservation people.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, what I was wondering if there should be legislation to limit the number of commercial lodges in a given area, or to limit the number of people that can hunt off, say, a square mile of land. In this particular case he has probably 20 guests a week, and he shuttles them in and out, and -- although it's legal and everything, I don't think it's right that, especially some of them outside of Canada, should be allowed to exploit our natural resources in such a manner for profit, and at the end of the season he goes back home to his home across the line and that's all he has contributed to the economy. I have no objections to the American hunter that comes up and lives off the Canadian economy and is dispersed around the area, which is only natural, but I do object to specialized operation like this. They fly in, do their shooting in a week, and they're replaced the following week by others, and this particular operation is taking a tremendous toll out of that area.

MR. WITNEY: We are not permitting any more commercial shooting lodges around the marshes in southern Manitoba, such as the Netley and the Delta marshes, because we feel that we have sufficient. And the other control we have against the type of thing that the honourable member speaks of is in the bag limit itself. I think actually that is the best type of control that we have, is with the bag limit.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister, I know, has had considerable pressure over the years from rural municipalities and certain other organizations for a program to pay for damages received by farmers to their crops from wild life in general. I think they recommended that the license fees for hunting, fishing and trapping and so on be increased to build up a fund that might be used to pay for damage done to crops etcetera; and about a year ago there was an item appeared in the Tribune headed; "Farmers to receive

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) . . . . . pothole pay, " and I believe that this announcement was made by the Federal Government. I'm unable to find the clipping at the moment. I had it here awhile ago, but I can't find it now; but I think the Federal Minister made some announcement that they did intend in the future to pay farmers to leave these potholes, as they called them, on their land and they would receive some pay in consideration for doing that. Has the government a program of any kind, or have they done any more thinking along these lines?

MR. WITNEY: There's a program, Mr. Chairman, for compensation to cattle from hunting, which has been in operation for several years. With respect to the potholes that the honourable member mentioned, I mentioned that in my remarks this afternoon, that discussions had been held in Saskatoon on it recently, and I understand that it is on the Resources Minister's conference agenda to come up later on this year.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, there was no suggestion made as to compensate the farmer for the loss of crops or anything of that kind, nothing done in that regard?

MR. WITNEY: No.

MR. MOLGAT: Page 54 of this year's report under "Game" indicates and says the following: "A heavy moose population exists in the area which will be flooded in '64 to become the forebay of the Grand Rapids Hydro-Electric power project. Special regulations may be necessary to insure adequate harvest of these moose and reduction in their number before the herd is forced out to surrounding areas already well populated with moose." Can the Minister indicate what steps will be taken, because if something will be done about this it will have to be done in the Fall of 1963?

MR. WITNEY: We had an early moose hunting season in that area last year, Mr. Chairman, and the position has been assessed by the Game Branch at The Pas; just what they will recommend with respect to this in the coming season, I'm not sure yet.

MR. MOLGAT: One of the increasing problems in the big game field is the increase in posted land and I certainly can't criticize the farmers who do post their land, because certainly there have been many abuses during the course of the hunting season. On the other hand, if this continues, it will be a very difficult problem in the field of game management. It seems to me that one aspect that is not sufficiently publicized -- the law does exist now -- is for assistance to those farmers who lose livestock that are shot during the season. I don't think that too many farmers know that this assistance does exist. I've run into a number of cases where it was complete news to them that there was a possibility of compensation from the government. I would recommend to the Minister that he make more use of publicity of this particular aspect, and that he should so advise the farm groups in the province, and have a wide publicity campaign on this. It may assist them in reducing the amount of posted land.

I would like to ask the Minister now about the matter of night-lighting, and what steps are being taken. I recommended to him last year the use of aircraft to do this. I suggested that the Manitoba air services could be used for part of the year, at least, to reduce night-lighting. The air services are very busy at certain times of the year and not quite as busy in others. It seems to me that in many areas of the province, the only way we'll control night-lighting is by air control. I've seen the Game Branch officers and the RCMP attempt to do it from the ground, but in many of our more sparsely settled areas it's simply an impossibility. I'd recommend this to the Minister again.

Going on, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what his position with regards to Indians and the Game Act. There was a case came up in the Fall -- I'm referring now to a newspaper report on the 19th of October, when some Indians who had been apparently hunting at night, were -- the case was dismissed, and subsequently the Appeal Court said that it should not have been dismissed, and recommended that they be charged. The Chief Justice at that time said that there was an apparent conflict between the Game and Fisheries Act and the Manitoba Natural Resources Act. I wonder if the Minister's taking any action to correct the conflict between these two acts, and settle the matter so that these people will know exactly where they stand.

MR. WITNEY: With respect to posted land, Mr. Chairman, one of our men in the southwest corner had an interesting operation under way. We provided signs "Hunting by Commission Only" for the farmers in that area, and we were successful in having quite a number of the farmers come to us to ask for these signs to be posted in the regular manner. We were

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . . . kind of hoping if we could get some more of these signs for the coming year that more farmers will take advantage of it and the improvement in the hunter-farmer relationship should result as a result of that.

With respect to the livestock killed by hunters, we've had in the year 1959, 64; in the year 1960-61, 10; in the year 1961-62, four; and in the year 1962-63 we have had eleven. We are unable to use the government aircraft for night-lighting, because the aircraft are only licensed to operate during the daylight hours. Our aircraft are also equipped only with skis and floats, and the night-lighting takes place in areas where we generally are not flying with the aircraft that we have.

I think that answers the points that were brought up by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Has the government established yet a policy in the matter of the commercial raising of game birds? This matter was discussed last year, and I believe the Minister indicated then that he was considering a change in the act in this regard. Has he made a decision on this yet?

MR. WITNEY: We did amend the act to provide for the commercial raising of pheasants for sale into stores, and the regulations were brought down. I think perhaps the honourable member is speaking about commercial shooting reserves, and knows they are being given consideration at the present time.

I neglected to answer the question with respect to the Indians. The Indians are protected under the Game Act by, I think it's called Paragraph 13, of the memorandum of understanding when the natural resources were transferred from the Dominion to the Province. And with respect to the particular case that he had in mind, it has been referred to the Supreme Court by the Indian Affairs people, and we will have to wait to see exactly what they have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 59, item 4 passed, item . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the fishing, the Minister yesterday, when speaking about the rough fish plant, said in his comments that apparently one of the reasons that such plants were not established previously, is that they were found uneconomical, principally because the technical methods of catching these fish were such that volume could not be attained. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the past, one of the complaints was that there was much too great a quantity of rough fish being caught on many of our lakes, and that because the price was so low, that there was no incentive whatever for the fishermen to either transport them or ship them to a plant where they could be processed, that they were simply left there on the lake to rot. I don't recall that there was any shortage of rough fish. The problem was getting the rough fish from the place that they were being caught in the net to the processing plant. Now from what the Minister says, there is an actual shortage of them. Is this correct?

MR. WITNEY: We don't think there is a shortage of rough fish, although we did have an unusual circumstance this year, where the trap nets in the experimental operation only caught 100,000 whereas the year before they had been catching about two tons in one night's lift. The gill net, while it did catch a lot of rough fish, as far as the fishermen were concerned, when you consider the volumes that are going to be required for a rough fish plant in order to compete with the fish meal that was coming in from the West Coast and from the Atlantic Coast, and in some cases from Mexico and Peru, large quantities were going to be needed in order to meet that particular price, which was -- I forget what the prices were but it was selling at quite a number of cents cheaper a pound here in Manitoba than our own rough fish which were being caught off our major prairie lakes. Now, with the volume that we can obtain, and it's considerably in excess of what was obtained by the gill net from the trap nets and the trawl nets, we feel that it has brought these plants into an economic operation. Because there is another factor involved, and that is the factor of quality. Up to just a few years ago I think it was accepted by most of the people dealing in fish meal that you just ground the fish up and you made it into a meal and you fed it to the mink, but now the mink ranchers are saying that that fish has to be only a few hours from the time that it is caught in the net until the time it is processed if they are going to be able to maintain the quality of the fur, and of course quality, once more, of mink has become a very competitive factor. The Honourable Member for Selkirk was referring today to this very subject, and I would like to say here -- he is not here in his seat tonight -- but so that he would be able to read it in Hansard, that the gentleman that he was

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . . . speaking about has made application some months ago to the government with respect to rough fish along with other operators, but I would like to point out that he is not the only private enterpriser in this field. There have been others who have been trying to make a go of it for a number of years.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what the Minister says insofar as the quality in the summertime, but in the case of the winter fishing, which is the major fishing on Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis in particular, and still a sizable item as well on Lake Winnipeg itself, and on the northern lakes, surely there is no problem there of quality, is there, because if the fish is frozen immediately, which is no problem at all, then the quality control is simply a question of moving them before there is any possible thawing? Is this not correct?

MR. WITNEY: Of course there is a problem of quality in this respect that with the gill net if storms arise on the lake and men can't get out to their nets, these fish die in the gill net, and fish begin to deteriorate rather rapidly from the inside out with bacteria. And fish that are left overnight in the net, and perhaps one day and then two days by the time they are lifted, even though it may be 40 degrees below zero outside, that fish is thawed fish by the time it comes out on to the ice.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman . . . say a word in connection with this item on the estimates. Now I don't know whether the point that I am going to raise is a question which deals directly with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or whether this is a whole combination of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and possibly another department as well.

Now I note in reading the report of the department on page 49, mention is made of joint consultation between the fishermen's representatives and the government insofar as some of the problems of the fish industry are concerned. Now it seems to me as I read economic reports of the fishing industry of Manitoba, that it leaves considerable to be desired. We had some reference here this afternoon, I think from my colleague the Honourable Member for Inkster, as to the high price of pickerel at the present time, and I think this is related to the questions which I wish to ask at the present time, and again if it's not within the premise of the department under review at the present time I will be glad to take the matter up with another department. But it does seem to me when I read the report of the department on page 49, reference is made of fishermen's representatives together with the President of the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen travelling to Vancouver and Prince Rupert in British Columbia to view at first hand a co-operative organization and its inter-relations. In the article, the report goes on to state that the Prince Rupert Co-op has expanded rapidly from a small collecting agency to a multimillion dollar organization, and fishermen spoke with justifiable pride of their achievement.

Now I am wondering, and I ask the Minister, what guidance and leadership -- if it is within his department -- is his department giving in consultation with the fishermen in the important field of co-operatives in the fishing industry? It seems to me that I've heard from numerous sources that one of the major barriers to the efficient operation of the fishing industry in the Province of Manitoba is the lack of facilities whereby the independent fisherman can take his product and have them stored in such a manner which will preserve the high quality of the fish. It seems to me from what I have read in connection with this, Mr. Chairman, that all too frequently the independent fisherman catches fish and then has no place really to store and preserve them in order that they would be considered as a first class standard product. Now I note that in the estimates of the Fishery Branch that there is an item of some \$11,790 dealing with the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement. Now I would like to hear from the Minister comments as to exactly what this means. Does it mean through the co-operation of the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa, or the department that's responsible for ARDA Agreements, that . . . . . and assistance will be given to the fishermen in the Province of Manitoba to set up co-operative storage plants, or co-operative agencies or areas, where the independent fisherman in the Province of Manitoba will be able to take their products in order that these products will eventually reach the consumer market in first class condition? And also I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a field worth while developing, because if memory serves me rightly, the independent fisherman receives nothing in comparison to the high prices that are being paid for fish in the consumer market, particularly here in the Greater Winnipeg

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) ..... area.

Now I don't know if this is correct or not -- possibly the Minister might be able to answer this -- but it is my understanding at the present time that in respect of pickerel the fisherman is receiving somewhere in the neighborhood of 45 or 50 cents a pound for pickerel fillets, and as my colleague from Inkster mentioned this afternoon, by the time they reach our table -- before being cooked -- it's somewhere in the nature of \$1.70. It seems to me that this is a great price spread, and I am wondering whether or not it would be to the advantage of the fishermen themselves, and also naturally to the consumer, if within the department itself and through the co-operation of ARDA and like organizations in sponsoring fishing co-operatives, that the consumer, the fisherman would benefit, I am wondering whether the Minister can give me any indication of any area of co-operation in his own department towards the establishment of co-operatives here in the Province of Manitoba. This matter, I am sure, has been raised on numerous occasions before, but I still think that it is a very pressing and important one to insure to the fisherman of the Province of Manitoba a reasonable and just return for his efforts and at the same time giving to the consumer within the province a product -- and we are all mighty proud of our fish products in the Province of Manitoba, notwithstanding all of the discussion that we have heard this evening and this afternoon on rough fish -- I don't think that there are any fish caught anywhere that are comparable to many of the fish that are caught here in the Province of Manitoba, and I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can give me briefly -- and I note the time is getting on -- briefly, some indication as to what is happening in this particular field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBILIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.