

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 15 April, 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We are on Resolution 72, 3. (h)(1). The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. At the time of the break for Private Members' Hour, we were discussing in generalities the MacGregor incident and, specifically, we were talking about the mushrooming of petro-chemicals into our environment and if they are being used by industry, they are then necessitating some means of transportation.

I believe - and I think that any analysis, even a cursory one, of the situation would lead another to the same assumption - that we are going to see more and more accidents and incidents of the nature that we have seen in MacGregor. The fact is that we have in just the past few weeks seen a number, including one of lesser significance, but significant nonetheless in the fact that it was an unadvised and unplanned release of a hazardous chemical into the environment just in northern Manitoba in the incident involving the hydrogen sulfide, although I'm not certain of the impact of that; I'm not certain of the amounts released. It is something that we will have to determine as more information becomes available.

The point I am making is that we are going to see more and more of these types of accidents and incidents. As a matter of fact, I am looking now at an article from one of the Winnipeg papers. It is a Canadian Press Release, March 20, and it says: "The four western provinces are expected to account for about three-quarters of Canadian National Railway's total volume growth over the next five years, CNR president, R.E. Lawless, said yesterday. He told a meeting of the Western Transportation Advisory Council that the world demand for western resources, such as potash and petro-chemicals . . ." - and I emphasize petro-chemicals - ". . . will likely remain strong and these commodities are ideally suited to rail hauling."

As a matter of fact, they are probably ideally suited to rail hauling. One has to, when discussing this whole question, discuss other options, but I think that one falls back again and again to the fact that rail hauling is probably as safe as any other course of action in transporting these chemicals. The fact is, we are in store for more and more transportation of petro-chemicals and more and more spills of petro-chemicals, because there is a relationship there that one cannot deny. As a matter of fact, we saw articles in the paper last week, or two weeks ago, saying that the railways are spilling about 1 percent of the chemicals that they are transporting.

So it is a major problem. I don't believe that I am telling anyone anything that they did not already understand when I make that statement, but I do want to emphasize that when we are dealing with this problem, we have to deal with not only what has happened in the past, but what could happen in the future and may well happen in the future.

I would ask the Minister, then, to deal with the specifics of the MacGregor incident, because I think it is important to determine what happened there so that we may be able to, in the future, determine better means and ways of going about this. I would ask the Minister at what point the Emergency Measures Organization was first notified that there was a spill at MacGregor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Churchill.
At 2:25 a.m. March 10, 1980, CNR Transportation Control Centre Dispatcher Mr.

Pach, reported to EMO that a derailment had occurred, on their line at Deer Sid-ing, which is the description of the site at MacGregor.

At 2:30 a.m. Mr. Dave Ediger of the Environmental Control Branch was advised of the derailment and the presence of the chlorine tank was reported at that time, which obviously was an error. That was done by EMO. Contact was then made with the RCMP to be assured that they were aware of the situation, again made by EMO.

At 3:30 a.m. CNR Dispatcher Mr. Pach called again to advise that the tank car did not contain chlorine but rather vinyl-chloride. At 3:35 a.m. Environmental Control Branch, the same Mr. Dave Ediger was advised of the new situation.

No further information had been received at this office and no specific re-quests for any type of assistance had been received at that particular time. Our EMO officer from Brandon was advised of the situation and was requested that he now attend the scene and has contacted the local authorities and has learned that no assistance in any form was necessary. Now that's the chronological order of the events at MacGregor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Further to that Mr. Chairperson, what time was it when the first EMO body made it to the scene, the person representing EMO, to actually visit the scene of the derailment? I have all the other figures on a time scale, I would like to know that last one so that I can fill it in.

MR. ENNS: It was the following day, after having been advised by the Environmental Branch that the situation was not of an imminent hazard to the surrounding community. Of course that's what I suppose points up to some of the problems inherent in the structure, that while the Environmental Branch correctly assessed the situation as being not subject to explosion, not subject to imminent danger to surrounding community, then relying further on company officials for methods of curtailing the leakage in the tanks, that with the benefit of hind-sight, the request or the presence of the Emergency Measures Organization to make sure at the earliest possible moment that the municipal officials, the community. But recognizing that this didn't happen in a community, it happened a mile or so outside the community, that an appropriate information system was in place at the very start of the problem, and had that been in place, I think we perhaps could have avoided some unnecessary concerns that the citizens of MacGregor in the ensuing days began to voice.

MR. COWAN: I'd ask the Minister then, in instances such as this, who is responsible for determining whether or not an evacuation is necessary? Now before I put that question to him I'd just like to make a couple of comments in regard to what he has just said.

No. 1, he is talking about us now enjoying the benefit of hindsight. Well, when dealing with the carcinogens, Mr. Chairperson, we don't enjoy the benefits of hindsight until some 10, 15 to 20 years later, so I'm not certain that we can, at this point, make any categorical statements although I don't want to be an alarm-ist about it. I do want to point out that we are dealing with a carcinogenic substance here, a cancer agent, and that it does take a certain amount of time, there's a time lag between exposure and between the period at which one would determine symptoms and would determine that there was actually an overexposure. So we don't enjoy the benefit of hindsight yet, nor will we enjoy it for a number of years at the very minimum.

The Minister said that had there been an information services put in place, that we would have been able to deal with some of the unnecessary concerns of the residents of the area. And I have to agree with him, had there been full and complete and unbiased information coming forward at all points during this epi-isode, that there would have been some concerns that would have been unnecessary. I would not go so far as to say that all concerns, and I'm certain that the Min-ister did not do that, but I would not myself go so far as to say that all con-cerns run - and again one will have to wait a substantial period of time before being able to make that judgement, although there is less likelihood of actual dangers occurring to the residents because of this spill than there is to the workers - but the fact is that concern at all points should have been necessary,

some concerns, by all parties involved and I would include the provincial as well as the federal government on this, and others also.

I would ask the Minister then, once it was determined that there is no danger of explosion and that in their opinion there was no danger of overexposure, who makes the decision as to whether or not an evacuation should be necessary? And who makes the decision if an evacuation is not necessary, as to whether or not contingency plans should be drawn up and held over in case an evacuation should become necessary?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the honourable member will concur that a decision to evacuate, by force of law, citizens of Manitoba, leave their homes, is not arrived at lightly. The provisions that are provided for under The Emergency Measures Act is that the Cabinet passes an operational order and this is something that is also being looked at. This procedure is adequate in the case of emergencies that come at you slowly, such as a flood, as I mentioned earlier. As the member will recall, we had the authority under the operations' order that is passed by Cabinet - the Director of Emergency Measures - to call for the evacuation of residents. We did not have to evoke that order. Even in the big Red River flood, we called upon and we received the voluntary co-operation of the citizens of the Red River Valley, who evacuated in large numbers, totally just about, except for agreed to persons that were left to man the now empty communities. But the actual procedure, to answer the member's question directly, it is the Director of Emergency Measures, under an operations' order that is passed by Cabinet, who has the authority to order evacuation.

MR. COWAN: I'd ask the Minister then if this matter was ever brought before Cabinet for their consideration previous to the March 17th announcement that there would be an evacuation procedure or contingency evacuation plan drawn up?

MR. ENNS: Whereas Emergency Measures upon their involvement on the scene have made provisional advance preparations for an outside possibility of evacuation, the best possible advice that was given to us throughout the spill at MacGregor was that no evacuation would be necessary, and that matter never came before Cabinet.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has mentioned on a number of occasions that they were relying upon the best possible advice being brought before the Emergency Measures Organization. I'd ask the Minister who was providing the Emergency Measures Organization with that information or the best possible advice?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that affords me the opportunity of replying to some of the initial remarks in the direction that the honourable member was taking as we adjourned at 4:30. I let it be very clearly understood that Emergency Measures Organization is contained as it is within Government Services. It never will and does not intend to gather about itself on staff the 101 experts that might be necessary for the 101 different types of accidents, emergencies, that we may face. The procedure is fairly clear, the ones that the Emergency Measures follows. Depending on the nature of the accident, we look to the expert advice of the lead department. Again, I refer, because of the greater experience in this area, if it has to do with water, the Department of Natural Resources with the Water Resources Division in it are in fact the experts that predict the potential level of flooding that tell us what we can expect under these circumstances, that indicate to us when road traffic becomes impassable. When bridges become unsafe, we would look to Highways personnel to tell us that, and we would look to the experts who built the dikes, for instance, around the ring-dike communities of the Red River Valley to tell us when we have to evacuate because they fear for the safety of the people. The same procedure follows, in the case of a chemical spill that involves potential initial hazards to the environment and environment matters, we look to that department as playing the lead role in providing us with the expert advice - wherever they get it from, from within and from without - but being the department that is principally charged with the responsibility and having the expertise in their department to tell us how Government Services, or in this case, Emergency Measures Organization, should respond to the accident, and we

would be advised by them and would await that advice that, yes, there was a potential hazard to the citizens of MacGregor and that we should put our evacuation order into effect.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister is saying, if I am interpreting his comments correctly, that are accepting the advice of the lead department, in this instance, the Environment Management Department, categorically, that the advice as it comes to them stands alone and that they are not seeking advice from other agencies that may be able to provide them with assistance and suggestions. Am I misinterpreting the Minister?

MR. ENNS: No, the member is absolutely correct, to do otherwise would be to invite utter chaos. You either have some respect for the advice given to you by the department that is specifically charged with the responsibility in a particular area, or you don't. I couldn't conceive operating any differently. Again I know the honourable member is talking about chemical spills, but who other than the engineers that built the dikes, or that operate the floodway, should I go to when I'm trying to assess their recommendations and their forecasts about potential flood dangers. There are as many weather forecasters or predictors on the street that offer fortuitous advice, but I don't believe the government has any choice but to rely on the department that is principally charged with this specific responsibility.

Now I would assume, and I am happy to note that in the instance of the chemical accident at MacGregor, the department did not solely lean on the advice that it was getting from within but indeed brought in eminent experts from Montreal as well as utilizing the understandable expertise of the owner of the chemical to glean the widest possible source of information as to the kind of reaction they should be making to that particular incident.

MR. COWAN: Do I understand the Minister correctly, Mr. Chairperson, that either the Department of the Environment or the department responsible for Emergency Measures Organization brought in experts from Montreal to provide them with assistance in this matter.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to speak and cannot speak for the Department of Environment, but it's my understanding, having met the professor involved from McGill University of Montreal, that is precisely what they did.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, I was just wanting to get this absolutely straight in my own mind that it was the department who brought that individual in, that it was the department who selected that individual as being an individual that they would . . .

MR. ENNS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, it was the Department of the Environment.

MR. COWAN: Right. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister then if he could indicate if he feels that it is advisable in a case like this for either his own department or the Department of the Environment to contact recognized authorities in transportation accidents, such as Chem-Trek(?), such as the CTC 24-hour emergency number, that has been put in place to deal specifically with spills of hazardous chemicals, transportation spills of hazardous chemicals; or the United States Coast Guard Agency which has a computer set which can immediately punch out a synopsis of what has happened and from there punch out a projection of what they view would be the potential path that that particular crisis or incident or accident could follow.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think in the development of a state of preparedness, Emergency Measures Organization utilizes all kinds of agencies and sources for information in order that they can have the highest state of preparedness in place. Some of the agencies that the honourable member mentions, both in this country and other countries, are again matters that I would think that the Department of the Environment would have to undertake to pursue. I want to make it

plain, Mr. Chairman, that it's not conceivable that the Department of Government Services Emergency Measures Organization can cease its responsibility in attempting to duplicate or in-house, provide the whole range of experience and expertise that is called for in attempting to cope with some of these accidents - what we are expected to do, and we will be doing our best to do that, is to so structure ourselves that we can, within the shortest possible time delay alert the lead department in whose area of concern an accident occurs, that they have their experts on scene, offering immediate advice, who then in turn start the wheels in motion for bringing whatever additional help is required. EMO's job is to co-ordinate the whole effort and, of course, perhaps one of the most important roles of EMO is - and I acknowledge in the instance at MacGregor, it could have been handled somewhat better in the important process of providing information to the general public but even more important to the specific community involved, so that they know as accurately as possible the nature of the emergency they're dealing with so that no unnecessary exposure to hazard is being invited, but on the other hand no unnecessary alarm and panic is being spread which can, in many instances, cause an equal amount of inconvenience and difficulties.

MR. COWAN: Following upon the Minister's last comments, does the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, believe that any unnecessary exposure to this harmful chemical occurred as a result of the MacGregor derailment, either to workers or to the general public?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that I am qualified to answer that question.

MR. COWAN: Following upon the second part of the Minister's statement, does the Minister believe that any unnecessary panic was generated as a result of this spill at MacGregor.

MR. ENNS: Yes, I believe there was, Mr. Chairman, in the sense that some families felt compelled to leave their otherwise comfortable homes, in what in Manitoba was still the middle of winter; that there is undoubtedly some concern that women who are pregnant have, as a result of a very irresponsible speech and statement made in the House about the imminent abortion of their children as a result of the exposure, I call that highly irresponsible. I call that as dangerous possibly to the mental well-being and the anxiety that is being caused, and that is not a question. That anxiety is there as compared to the big question mark, as to whether there was any exposure to the chemical that was hazardous.

You see, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no evidence - absolutely no evidence at all - that any pregnant woman in the community of MacGregor suffered or will suffer any ill effect from that chemical spill. But as a result of the way this was handled, there are women who are carrying babies for the next four or five months who are concerned and who are anxious, and who in that anxiety in itself may cause or may be the cause of greater harm to the successful birth of that child than the possible exposure to the chemical. And I say, that kind of information has to be a concern to government; it has to be a concern to persons who are responsible for the actions of government and their officials.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Would the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, be more specific as to the irresponsible speech to which he is referring?

MR. ENNS: I am referring to the speech made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Liberal member of this Chamber.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, as I've said throughout these proceedings, both publicly and within the House, I am not an expert in the area of vinyl chloride, and therefore do not wish to make any expert opinions as to medical effects of vinyl chloride exposure on pregnant women, and others, in the MacGregor area, although I would assume that if all the information that we have got to date is correct and in fact full information, full disclosure of the facts, that those women would have very little to fear. Again, not being an expert I don't want to be held categorically to that statement, but knowing some

of the studies and having gone through some of the studies, I think that is a fairly safe statement to make, and if we can do anything to allay their fears, then let it be done.

On the other hand, one does have to realize that vinyl chloride exposure has been linked - under different circumstances - but has been linked with birth deformities, with miscarriages, and that one has to bear that in mind, and that information should be made public. The manner in which it is made public is very important, and I think the Minister realizes that now at this juncture and perhaps realized it before and was just caught up with the events as they occurred and couldn't get a handle on what was happening. But the fact is, that sort of information can best come in a responsible way from those who have access to the information-giving process. And in the future, although I would hate to see an information service used to provide either inaccurate or incomplete information, I do believe that if that information service is set in place so that it can provide full, unbiased and complete as well as factual data, that people will avoid the sort of reactions that we have seen at MacGregor, and I think that that is as important as planning for an evacuation.

But one has to realize that it is the government's responsibility to provide that information, and it is also the government's responsibility to ensure that the information is provided in such a manner so as to be perceived as being correct, complete, factual and unbiased. If the opinion is that the government is only relying upon one source - and I don't want to finger any one source in this because I don't think that's purposeful at this moment - but if the government is relying upon only one source or two sources, both of which might have a vested interest in the process, then the public perception, justifiably, so will be that perhaps they are not getting totally unbiased opinion. Whether that is a fact or not, the perception will be there. Couple that with the fact that there is a tendency on the part of the government as there was, in this particular instance to my way of thinking, to downplay the hazards associated with the particular problem, then that will compound the public perception that they are being fed information that is perhaps not the best available evidence, or the best available information.

So in that instance, there will be a vacuum that is created, and this is what happened in MacGregor. There was a vacuum that was created, because we had comments coming from the Minister of the Environment and from CNR right from the beginning that firstly the hazard was a fire hazard. In other words, because it was first thought to be chlorine there was a mind-set put in place, that we are dealing with a Mississauga-type hazard and in fact we were not. And at that point, once there was no fire, which fortunately there was not, then people tended to believe immediately that the danger was over yet, and they were told. They were told by the Minister in the House and publicly, that the primary danger was from fire. The Minister was not talking about some of the other dangers, which I believe he should have. Because had he been the one to voice those dangers, had he been the one to voice those concerns, people would have said, "Well, that's good. That man is concerned. That man knows about which he speaks and he is concerned for our well-being and he's telling us the full facts, and therefore we can trust that individual." That was not how it happened in this instance.

Then in my opinion, as we got round further and further into this - and if I can just aside for a moment, because I think it's important when talking about this item to try to examine all the impacts - there is a standard mechanism or process by which people react to these sorts of spills. And I could read it from literature for you, if you wish, to show you that it is not my opinion only but that it is an opinion of others, but that is that there is an initial reaction on the part of the people involved in the spill imminently, such as the CNR in this case and the chemical manufacturer in this case, to downplay the attendant hazards. They have very good cause for doing so.

No. 1, CNR does not want people to think that they are behaving in a less than admirable way when it comes to transporting hazardous chemicals. They want everyone to believe, as I would in their place, that everything is under control. And the fact is, they're only spilling one percent of the chemical, so leave it up to others more qualified to make the judgement as to whether everything is under control or not. But they have a vested interest in downplaying the incident.

The chemical manufacturer, any chemical manufacturer - and it could be anyone - also has a vested interest in downplaying it because they want their chemical to have the best possible public image, naturally; so they have to sell it, and if it gets a poor image they can't sell it because people say, "I don't want that stuff in my community".

Now in the instance of vinyl chloride it's very difficult to say, "I don't want that stuff in my community", because it's part of our everyday life and there is a necessity for it, although some think there is more necessity than others. But the fact is, I put a plastic cap on my coffee, perhaps I don't need to, but I make use of vinyl chloride so I am not going to be the one to say, "I don't want it in my community." But I do want the safest possible circumstances if it is going to be in the area. That's an aside again, I'm getting off the subject, and I don't mean to.

The point is that there is a tendency on the part of the vested interest to downplay attendant hazards. If you rely upon those vested interests for the bulk of your information, you are going to be presented with a biased picture, not to say that it is not factual or incorrect, just that it's biased. It may well indeed be not completely factual or not correct, but the fact is it is going to be biased, no matter what.

With that information provided, you are then going to, inadvertently, maybe so, downplay the attendant hazard. That creates a situation, a vacuum, whereby if a person does go in and says there is a major hazard here, okay, that the media will pick up on that - and I don't blame the media for doing so because that is part and parcel of their trade and they have to do that, and they will, for the sake of making this situation known, because there has been an initial reaction on the first part to downplay, they may perhaps pick out the more sensational statements that an individual makes; not to say that those statements are not completely true or factual, not to say that they are, but the fact is they will pick out the more sensational statements because of the way in which the pattern has unfolded. When that happens, there will be a distrust in the public's mind, and when there is a distrust in the public's mind, I don't care how hard you scramble, you are not going to turn it around on that issue alone; as a matter of fact, you won't turn it around for quite some. I think that is exactly what happened in this instance. I think that distrust is still out there and probably, to my way of thinking, it is a healthy distrust, because one has to, if they do anything at all in regard to environmental hazards, one has to question extensively how we deal with them.

So I would just hope that the Minister, when he talks about an Information Service and his colleague, the Minister of the Environment talks about, "We have learned what our mistake is in this case; it was that we didn't have an information service in place," that they are not talking about an information service that feeds vested interest stories to the public, that they are talking about an information service that people can call up and get unbiased, factual, and complete facts.

I welcome, I commend the initiative on putting those information services in place right away. I will reserve judgement on how it works until we actually have a number of cases upon which to examine it, but I am hoping, in a most non-partisan way, which is a difficult way for me to behave, but I am hoping in that way that you are successful in that task because you have to deal with these problems that are going to become more and more prominent in our everyday life.

I would ask the Minister then - and I am going by his March 17 statement that was made in the House - when he put in place a contingency evacuation plan arranged by EMO for the town of MacGregor and farms in the area, was that the first time at which that plan was in place, or was that the first announcement of that particular plan?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, normal practice for EMO officers are well in advance of that specific decision made by the operational order that would bring an evacuation about, well advance in that, EMO officers do much of the preliminary work, that is, to secure places for patients in the hospital, for instance, to be transferred to adjacent community hospitals; to be concerned about where those persons that are not mobile or that are housed in senior citizens' homes, that they have immediate places. All of this was done by our EMO officer, Mr. Davidson, in co-operation again, calling on the resources of the other department, in

this case the Department of Health as far as hospitals were concerned and the Department of Housing, MHRC, in terms of senior citizens' housing accommodations. This was being done on March 15th, in advance of any statements that I made in this House. This formed the basis of that statement that I could make in the House that contingency plans in the remote possibility that an evacuation order would be called for were in fact proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Member for Churchill's abiding interest in this matter but, you know, he does, I think, not do full justice to the situation that we have in Canada. I think we can, in some instances, without at any time taking a satisfied attitude about what is happening, but the member is aware that the previous federal administration was well on its way to enacting a fairly comprehensive act dealing with the transportation of hazardous goods. I was pleased to note in the Throne Speech that the present administration is not deferring that piece of legislation, indeed is giving it some priority, that the governmental responses - and I say this of all governments of all political stripes - are concerned. I would be prepared to acknowledge that that concern is there because of the efforts of members like the Honourable Member for Churchill and others that are concerned about this whole question. While democracy may not move fast enough for the honourable member at certain times, there are very fundamental steps being taken that will at least make it less possible for the railway companies to run the show as they wish to run it, and minimize the problems that will have a pretty fundamental impact on how dangerous chemicals are conveyed in trains. Some of this comes as a result of the unfortunate experience of Missis-sauga.

I know of some of the specific details of the Act. They go far and beyond the immediate problems that the railways have in moving chemicals. The legislation was in final draft stage well over a year ago. I personally participated in transportation ministerial conferences where the details of the act were being vetted with the different provincial Ministers. It involves the farm movement of chemicals; it involves the fertilizer dealer movement of chemicals from fertilizer depots to the individual farms through the length and breadth of the province. It is a fairly comprehensive act by the federal government that I think will be in place fairly shortly. I think in the discussion of this matter, it is not inappropriate to acknowledge that action by both federal and provincial jurisdictions is currently under way.

Allow me also at this point, Mr. Chairman, to acknowledge the fact that . . . I haven't had that opportunity to indicate to members of the committee that Emergency Measures Organization functioned in what only could be described in an exemplary way in respect to the last big flood that we had in the province of Manitoba. The machinery was in place, was working smoothly, and a compliment has to be paid to the Emergency Measures people and all the attendant staff, the resource people of the numerous departments, along with the numerous volunteer services that were called into play, along with the municipal people that were co-operative from day one in that emergency; that enabled us to overcome what in effect was a flood of the proportions of 1950, with all its memories for those of us who can remember, went with a minimal amount of inconvenience, no loss of life, and a minimal destruction of property, both public and private, in the great flood that we had last spring. So I take this occasion to put it on the record to indicate to the senior staff, and through them to the other staff people that have, on those occasions, and particularly on the prolonged emergency, emergency that lasts for four to five to six weeks, it does call on a tremendous amount of dedicated service by the Public Service who are too often maligned but who under circumstances as I just described, performed in a most capable and admirable manner.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, of course there are many on this side and others within the general public who would like to add to those commendations, that would like to agree with the Minister that the Emergency Measures Organization did an adequate and a comprehensive job in dealing with the flood of last year. I only hope that they are as able to deal with the new type of flood, the flood of chemicals into our environment, and that they can act in as commendable and efficient manner in regards to that, because that is the challenge that faces them today.

And again, I wish them well, I reserve judgement, reserve the right to make judgement on how they react to different situations on an ad hoc and on an overall basis, but certainly that is a task that confronts them.

The Minister mentioned that perhaps democracy does not move fast enough for a person like myself. Sometimes, Mr. Chairperson, I admit it does not move fast enough. Sometimes, on the other hand, it moves much too fast for a person like myself. In this instance, I believe the threat that faces us, I believe the nature of that threat demands speedy action and therefore the Minister is absolutely correct; it does not move fast enough for me but that is something that I have to deal with and will deal with by continually attempting to prod it as fast as I can.

The Minister indicated that the contingency plan that was referred to in the May 17th document was drawn up on May 15th. My question to the Minister is then, why was that plan necessary on May 15th and not necessary, or, excuse me, the contingency plan on March 17th that was drawn up on March 15th. Why was that contingency plan needed on March 15th but not needed on March 10th or March 11th when the eminent danger was - if in this respect only - more eminent because we did not have full information available to us at that time. In other words, on March 10th we weren't even certain of the chemical with which we were dealing. On March 11th we weren't certain of the quantity of the spill. I mean, that was a period of uncertainty when one would have hoped that that uncertainty would have been counteracted by a great deal of certainty and forceful action on the part of the government such as drawing up a plan, if not putting a plan into effect, at least having that plan available and letting the people in the area know that that plan was available to allay some of their fear. Because the Minister talked about unnecessary panic. I just lay the responsibility on the government's doorstep for that unnecessary panic because of the vacuum that was created. We may choose to disagree about that; I'm not certain. But the fact is that there was no contingency plan available, yet five days down the road that contingency plan was deemed to be necessary. If the Minister could comment on why the delay in drawing up that plan was necessary?

MR. ENNS: Mr Chairman, the Honourable Member for Churchill touches on a matter that is of concern to the Emergency Measures Organization and perhaps calls on me to acknowledge that we did not have the . . . or there was a communications failure within government at this particular time that allowed for that lapse of time to take place, where the judgement factor as to whether or not a potentially dangerous situation faced us was allowed to be argued within the rooms of senior experts and public servants, and others, within the Department of the Environment. And that I acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, is something that we hope through the organization that we are now planning, will not happen again, and in that event I think the old adage that one should always learn from any situation is very true, that we believe that we have learned something from the MacGregor experience and as the member has already pointed out, he will be the first to judge us - God willing that future accidents don't happen. But I tend to agree with him that they will and he will have an opportunity to judge us as to whether or not we have learned something in terms of tightening up our interdepartmental communications procedure and therefore enabling EMO to be on the scene when it's the appropriate time to be there.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has jogged my memory, Mr. Chairperson, but the last facet of that process that I indicated later where the, first there is a dirth of information and then there is a vacuum and so on, the last final step in that process is when the experts come in, and then we've lost it. Just as again, sort of a general comment, that once the whole process is unfolded, the last stage is when the experts come in and it's pretty well removed from the public's hands because the experts sit across tables such as these and argue their varying viewpoints. And for one viewpoint there is always a different viewpoint, differing sometimes in a great intensity, differing sometimes in a lesser intensity, but none the fact, the conversation becomes muddled enough that it's difficult for the public to make an informed decision.

The Minister indicated that the act that the federal government was anticipating, and of course we assume that it's the same act that was previously discussed,

would deal not only with transportation of hazardous products by rail, but also by other means. It's my information, of course - and I don't believe that there is anyone who would wish to contradict it - that hazardous products are being carried right through the middle of the city today by truck transport, that hazardous products are being carried on planes, that many times radioactive substances are being carried on planes, and in the events of crashes, one has to deal with those hazards also. I would ask the Minister to indicate if his department has given any review as to regulations and perhaps it would not come under his department and if not so, he can inform me what section will carry on this debate in the different estimates, as to regulations dealing with hazardous products bills that may occur because of truck transport in the city and outside of the city and the rural municipalities.

MR. ENNS: The honourable member is correct that it's probably not appropriate that we take this decision too much in this department. The specific departments involved in terms of vehicle traffic would be the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I am aware that as a result of a growing concern, for instance, about the transportation of anhydrous ammonia, for instance, that regulations are being prepared to more rigidly control the transportation of that product. I think also again in the Department of the Environment that regulations can be expected, or at least that department would have the responsibility for formulating regulations that would be applicable to the storage, to the handling of the kind of products that the honourable member refers to. We of course, coming back to Square One, are hopeful that we will be so organized that in the event that there is an accident that knows who to touch face with and the resources of which department to call upon to respond to the accident.

MR. COWAN: The Minister is reported as having said that in specific terms an emergency response team will be put together by Emergency Measures Organization. They will be the first people to the scene of an accident or incident that would necessitate Emergency Measures Organization becoming involved. I'd ask the Minister if any consideration has been given to the types of people on that team. In other words, will they be firefighters, will they be people with specific skills that can make an analysis of the situation or will they be primarily people who will be involved with determining whether an evacuation is necessary and how to best proceed with that evacuation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, when I'm referring to a response team within government, what we would like to get away from and that is to have to bring to an emergency different faces for each emergency which can happen. We are asking in our reorganization chaired and co-ordinated by the senior person within EMO to have, and are now in the process of identifying, not just a position, but a position surely of the person in the different departments and names and, indeed, spending some time with them. So that under non-emergency circumstances they can sit down - a bit of seminar if you like - to simply know that if an emergency arises, that it's not a question of phoning the Minister of Health and asking who are you designating to help us move patients; or phoning Water Resources and who are you designating to look after this; that it's a fixed position and person identified, and that even if the personnel changes, another person coming into that position recognizes, and in his job description, it's part of his responsibilities in that department. We hope that in that way this response team, this bringing together of the Department of Resource people, can be fairly instant rather than what has been the case up to now of going through the appropriate Minister, the Minister checking with his Deputy Minister, and then designating for each specific emergency a person that is available to work on a co-ordinating committee to fight that emergency. We feel it's important that these people have an opportunity to familiarize themselves, and beyond their immediate disciplines. This is part of the problem the member touched on.

I can indicate to the honourable member the bias that he spoke of, attributable to parties that have an interest, whether it's railways or chemical companies, that is also extended within the particular discipline of a public servant. If it's a situation that he has had some part of in developing and supervising,

there's the same tendency to, for instance, minimize the risk that may be involved. So there is a need to apply the expanded training technique that we speak of in the reorganized EMO to this response team, so that the Emergency Measures co-ordinator has on tap, when the calls come in, we have the opportunity of making a fairly instant assessment; that this calls for steps (a),(b), and (c) to fall into place. Steps (b) and (c) may never be required, but so that they're there, and I don't have a Member for Churchill telling me, "Why weren't you there five days earlier or seven days earlier?" in future accidents. Now whether this will work depends a great deal on our capability of organizing in such a way, and if it doesn't work, my Deputy Minister will be looking for a job.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The response team, as the Minister outlines it, sounds to me, and again I'm not an expert, sounds to me that it will be a competent team and the plan sounds well thought out. I would have no criticism of such a team at this time. As a matter of fact, I commend the Minister for taking the action in this regard, of course, reserving final judgement to see how it actually operates. I can assure the Minister that if in the future I am one that does not have to stand up five days later and say, "Where were you?" I hope I'm not always that late in my criticism but sometimes I am. But if I do not have to, after the fact, stand up and say, "Where were you?" I will be on that occasion for one of the few times pleased that I kept my mouth shut, pleased that I was able to keep my mouth shut. So, I hope that this works out. I would ask the Minister if he can just roughly indicate how many people would be on this team and would it be on a 24-hour call?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the team that we are now referring to are essentially people that are currently working in their various disciplines in their various departments, and as such, or would be available on fairly short notice. Indeed, as was the case, and many a Highways personnel or Waterworks department personnel, in Health and others, will attest to the fact that were out on the job at midnight or called to meet an emergency situation in the small hours of the morning. But it is difficult and costly enough to maintain a 24-hour reporting mechanism in the first instance; that mechanism is in place and that will then trigger this response team. It's the reaction that follows that we look for advice and the good counsel from this response team.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Minister for that information. It also says in an article in the Tribune, April 8th, that at the time of the announcement of the establishment of this emergency response team, that the Minister had indicated that amendments will be necessary to the EMO Act. I'd ask the Minister when we can expect those amendments.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we contemplate some amendments that will likely have to be made to the Emergency Measures Organization Act, although we do not, to answer the specific question, see that a necessity with respect to the response team. That is done in-house with the concurrence of the other departments under the direction of Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, just to answer a question that was asked earlier, the question about the occupancy of the new Environmental Lab. I'm informed that one-third of the space of the new facility will be occupied by Energy and Mines, and two-thirds of the new facility will be occupied by Environmental Management under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I indicate that, only that it would indicate to me that the Department of Environmental Management will find itself in considerably expanded space with a considerably higher level of sophisticated equipment to increase its capabilities of responding to the kind of environmental hazards that we're going to face in the future.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. We can only hope that it increases that response time, because having been awaiting soil samples from that lab for quite some time I'm of the opinion that they could be speedier, although perhaps there are other reasons for the delays. The CTC, of course, will be holding a special inquiry into the MacGregor spill. Has the Emergency Measures Organization been requested to attend and present a brief?

MR. ENNS: I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, through the Attorney-General's Department we have been asked to have somebody present at the inquiry and to provide whatever additional information or input we can.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'd ask the Minister to keep me informed on the Emergency response team if he can, as developments occur. I would appreciate being made aware of them when it is the appropriate time, given the fact that there must be some time lag between the actual development and the public announcement. I would not want to be the last to know, although I'm not certain that I should be the first to know either.

Passing on to another spill now. I know that there are more questions that one could ask on the MacGregor spill, and I know that there are more answers that the Minister would like to give on the MacGregor spill. And I don't mean to, by not asking those questions, belittle those questions. As you said, we are working under different time constraints now and one has to prioritize. I've detected a certain amount of urgency on the part of my colleagues to proceed with all due haste, something which I am familiar with from the Labour estimates, so I can deal with that as it may come.

But the fact is, I would like to move on now to the more recent spill of methanol at the C.P. yards. I'll just read a couple of statements and ask the Minister to comment on them if he will: Fire Chief, Jack Coulter, said Monday, "it's 'a matter of concern' that the department was not notified until 11:45, Sunday night, more than an hour after the accident in the C.P. yards." The department he's referring to in that instance, of course, is the Winnipeg Fire Department. Later in that article from the Tribune, "Government Services Minister said Monday, the Emergency Measures Organization was notified of this bill within 80 minutes, but after police and fire officials were called." Another quote from a different paper I believe, is that "Fire Chief, Jack Coulter, said he was concerned over a 'lack of communication' between the Fire Department and the C.P. rail. Plans established by the railroad and the Fire Department called for somebody to call us," he said. Quoting him again, he said, "We got notice in a rather odd manner, Coulter added, referring to a call from a citizen who was not associated with the railway, he said." Now I'd ask the Minister if the Emergency Measures Organization - because this does involve the organization - has investigated these complaints and has come up with any report as to why the Fire Department was not called promptly and why Emergency Measures Organization was not called promptly in respect to this bill, too.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raises a matter that is of concern to us and highlights the problem that you can have; an excellent organization in a state of readiness to cope with any emergency that might arise. In this case, you also have in addition to that - I know that the city of Winnipeg has a well-formulated emergency plan in a state of readiness to respond to accidents occurring within their jurisdiction. But what do you do when the immediate parties involved, in this case, CPR rail officials, on whose property the accident happened, don't report the accident as soon as we would like them to report it? That whole question has to be asked, and perhaps, some attention paid to as to whether or not some responsibility, either through legislation or otherwise is placed on companies, corporations and, indeed, individuals about a responsibility of reporting same. That still doesn't necessarily resolve the problem of somebody that doesn't report when it ought to be reported, but it's a question that will continue to cause us some concern. You know, in this instance, the accident occurred on CPR property again within their yards. I'm not familiar with the procedure that is called for by the railway administration manual in terms of what does a locomotive engineer do when he rams into a train in the siding, or a tanker car in the siding in the yards of the CPR. Has the railway done its job in sufficiently making sure that his immediate response is to phone in to his supervisor, and that the supervisor then clicks in and phones Chief Coulter, who then gets the rest of the action into motion? There is that initial possibility for a breakdown in terms of the immediate step that is taken at the precise time of the accident and in the immediate minutes, and/or indeed a half-hour or hours, after the accident. I would accept some advice as to how to resolve that. Legislation?

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister has turned the tables on me and I'm glad he has, because as I have given him opportunities to say certain things, this evening he has indeed given me opportunity, outside of the normal procedures, to say certain things.

I would not know how one would deal with this matter in a long-term manner. But I would ask the Minister - and it is something that I believe should be done - I would ask the Minister if he has taken the effort to satisfy himself, that in this instance there was no intent on the part of the carrier or the operation responsible for the damage to downplay the incident, to not notify the appropriate departments, such as the fire department and the Emergency Measures Organization, because it does lead to that question, and I am not saying that that was the case. I am not privy to that sort of information, nor am I privy to the mechanism to make an investigation, and that's why I asked the Minister if he had investigated it, because I would be interested if that was indeed the case. Because you can make all the legislation that you wish, but if the people are not going to abide by common sense and not going to abide by the legislation, then one has to build in either investigation mechanisms, inspection mechanisms. And in this instance it would be very difficult because you would have had to have the fortuitous incident of having an inspector right on the spot, or an investigator right on the spot, if it was not the intent of the carrier to report that spill.

On the other hand you can build in penalties, which are after the fact. If a person is caught then there's a fairly severe penalty. These are all legislative mechanisms which the Minister is probably more familiar with than I am, so I don't mean to lecture him on it, I just mean to point out that these are some of the conundrums that he must face. And in order to face those with full information, which is something that we've been talking about, one has to be satisfied that there was no intent on the part of the carrier to either delay the notification or to avoid notification.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can indicate to the Honourable Member for Churchill that in the incident that we are talking about at CPR yards, a senior railway official has acknowledged that there was a serious neglect of practice taken by an individual who has since been reprimanded, not dismissed I'm happy to say, but seriously reprimanded. In other words, it indicates to me in the information that I have that the railway procedure was not adhered to in this instance and the information that I had from this official is that had that been followed, then Fire Chief Coulter, for instance would not have had the complaint that he legitimately has, and that the hour-and-a-half, or the hour plus 80 minutes delay, would not have occurred.

But that points out precisely the matter that the honourable member touched on just a moment ago. We can put the heavy hand of legislation and law on people but if common sense isn't followed, then it will still break down from time to time. I would hope, though, that the kind of debates that we initiate from time to time in this Chamber all help towards the public education and awareness of the potential seriousness of these matters, and that it would encourage procedures that are in place for good reasons, often worked out in co-operation with the safety work groups, the union management, the recognition that they have a responsibility to the general public, that these steps are in fact carried out.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. If I understand the Minister correctly, the situation at the railyards here in the city was not a matter of a call being lost in the switchboard system, as had first been indicated, but was actually a matter of procedures not being followed. Does the Minister know what level of authority the individual who was severely admonished, or reprimanded for this breach of procedures, occupied?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm aware of that but I am not prepared to indicate that to the committee, in public.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I am not trying to find out an individual or name. I'd ask the Minister if he was in the senior level, if he can indicate that. I don't want him to give out any information which might implicate an individual and I would be the last person to ask for that to happen. But I'd

like to know if we're talking about some worker who happened to see it and didn't report it properly, or if it had followed up a chain of command and at a certain point in a chain of command, at a high level, the procedures were broken.

MR. ENNS: Well again, Mr. Chairman, I am not totally familiar with the hierarchy of the railway in what you would call and what the member would call a high level or a medium level or a low level. If you're talking about diversions at South Indian Lake, I'm more familiar with those terms, high level, low level, medium level. But then on the other hand I don't want to draw extraneous subject matters into this debate at this time. Let me simply indicate to the honourable member that it was at a senior level. The information that was passed through was not forwarded.

MR. COWAN: I will make every attempt to resist the barb that the Minister, in referring to a matter within my own constituency, not because I don't believe it's an important matter, but there are other places and other times and I'm certain we will enjoy a discourse in the future on that matter.

Is the Minister assured that the carrier, CPR in this case, has taken action that will ensure that everyone is advised of the proper procedures? Everyone is advised that there will be penalties for neglecting to follow through proper procedures, and that that has in fact reduced the potentiality of this sort of a delay resulting in the future?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again not prolong the debate on this matter, but here we run into one of the problems that we have of jurisdiction. The railways operate under a federal charter, are totally covered under federal legislation, and again I don't use that, as I indicated in some other statement, that that's not meant as any abdication on the part of this government's responsibility for that. But it is not for us to necessarily be the judge of how, first of all, internal practices are being carried out within the railway.

We can put the kind of pressures on the railway that will help to ensure that their internal practice is and that's precisely what we did in this instance and that's how the information came back to us. But the question of corporations or departments of government operating in jurisdictions other than those that the province has immediately jurisdiction over again creates the possibility for things falling in between stools. And I would hope that in our discussions and as we move out in the newly-organized Emergency Measures Organization's planning program, that these are the kind of things that we'll be able to bridge between municipalities, between different jurisdictions, to tighten the liaison between the federal organizations and those that they have jurisdiction over.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm glad the Minister didn't shy away from the jurisdictional matter because he had assured us in the House the other day that he would not do so, and I have taken him at face value on that assurance that the jurisdictional matter, although it is a difficult matter and a dicey matter at times, is not going to be used to forestall any sort of progressive changes.

Can the Minister indicate, and as he is more conversant with what can be done in this matter legislatively than I am, can the Minister indicate if he can, when developing the new regulations which have been addressed to in the House, if they can develop regulations that will take into consideration the jurisdictional dispute? In other words, force CPR or CNR or Air Canada or a federal agency to abide by the jurisdiction, without the approval of such federal agency?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to see the Member for Churchill proceeding with haste in getting the estimates moving along.

Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. I apologize to the Minister if I missed it while I was away from the meeting. I wonder, I'm looking in the area of authority in the field of evacuating a certain area. Does that authority lie with the Emergency Measures Organization or is it a municipal authority, or just who issues the order to evacuate a certain area?

MR. ENNS: The Honourable Member for Churchill can tell the Member for Minnedosa that we just covered that, but I have no problem in repeating it. The authority to order evacuation rests with the director, as it now stands in The Emergency Measures Act, after an operational order is passed by Cabinet. Now that is essentially in place because of our experience with floods, where we have time, days, to contemplate evacuation. Under emergency situations I would imagine that a fire police or a fire chief or a reeve or mayor of a community may well order an evacuation, but there is not legislative authority supporting that action, it would then be done under just common sense. The conditions of the situation would dictate somebody in authority to do that. But it raises a point. The business of ordering people to evacuate their homes is one that's not taken lightly and either the immediate situation is such that there is no questioning of the order; it's more difficult, of course, to exercise that evacuation order when people do not perceive the need to evacuate, which is the case very often when you have a slow moving emergency like a flood and somebody's predicting that the water's going to get that high or that the dikes may not hold and the people that are being protected by the dikes are prepared to gamble with you and say, "To heck, we'll take our chances".

So the order for evacuation, though, to answer his question specifically, the only time that citizens of Manitoba can be ordered to evacuate their homes legislatively, is under The Emergency Measures Act, after what is called an operational order is passed giving that power to Emergency Measures.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's the message coming out of Arnprior to those that are going down taking the Emergency Measures courses that requires municipal legislation to be passed in order for an area to be evacuated. And I felt, when this was communicated to me on the weekend, that there had to be some authority in place in the event of an emergency. Now I don't think anyone would question if they got the word that in 15 minutes their house was liable to blow up that they would get out of there pretty quickly without questioning where the authority was or where the order came from. But I'm glad that there is an authority in place that can be brought to bear very quickly. It could be done in a matter of moments, I understand from what you've told me then, that if there was a disaster or a spill in Minnedosa that within a very very few minutes of the contact made with EMO, that area could be ordered evacuated, with full authority to enforce it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie, I believe, has been waiting for quite some time.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to speak briefly on this topic that we've been discussing here tonight.

I first of all appreciate what the concern that the Member for Churchill has for the people of MacGregor and indeed the people of Manitoba. But I believe he has created undue distrust in many people, particularly the people of MacGregor, in his statements that he has made pertaining to the spill of vinyl chloride. He created this distrust in the people by making undue, unnecessary statements in the House, and I have to say that it could also probably include the media. They just went to the point where they got the people upset there unduly.

About the pregnant ladies of the community, I made some inquiries about the situation there and, Mr. Chairman, as I understand, there was one woman, one of the three pregnant women in the village of MacGregor, she went to visit her doctor and he told her his knowledge of the chemical reaction as far as pregnant women were concerned was practically nil. He did not have any great knowledge on what could have happened. But he did say to this here woman that if she was concerned for her own health, that if she had a place to go, to leave the area, that would be her entirely her own decision. So she did leave. However, the second woman I understand, she left on her own, she didn't bother going to see her doctor. But the third woman, she stayed within the community and as I understand, as far as we know, there's been no serious outcome at this date.

I just want to bring this to the attention, to you and to the Minister tonight, that I think that there was undue alarm created in that community. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, I have to agree with the member that just spoke, that there was undue alarm and it is a matter we went over in great detail and one would attribute it to one particular set of circumstances and another would contribute it to another. But I would just like, if he has believed me to make statements to the media that have been published or statements in the House that were incorrect, that he would bring them forward to me and I can discuss them with him. Perhaps there were, I am not an expert in the field, but I do my research as carefully as most, and would just appreciate if he does believe that I have made statements that would have created undue, or unnecessary alarm, that he would document them more fully. Having said that, I appreciate his concern and that is one of the reason why we've had such a long discussion and I have been trying to move as quickly as possible.

In regard to information dissemination, I believe that if he had agreed with me in different instances that he would agree that there was a problem with the lack of information and that his government had to share some of the responsibility for that lack of information. But I do not want to go into that unless it's absolutely necessary.

I would like to move on to a different situation and that is in regard to the Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment at Pinawa. Can the Minister indicate if he is in contact with the officials at the Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment in regard to Emergency Measures Organization participation in the event that it should become necessary because of an accident or an incident in the area?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that in the normal course of contacting various different groups, industries and other situations where any remote possibility of an emergency could arise, that kind of contact has been made with Pinawa. I would expect that to be, as I have mentioned now for the third time, strengthened when we have an eastern regional municipal advisor in place, specifically responsible for that area; that among the numerous communities, towns, cities that are involved in that eastern region that Pinawa would be a natural consideration that he would make and to have contact established and a basis for co-operation should the need arise.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister been advised by the officials of the Nuclear Research facility or the officials of the Atomic Energy Board in regard to a document known as the Hazard Report, which is a document according to a public relations spokesperson for the facility, which describes the worst that could happen if the experimental nuclear reactor failed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can advise the Honourable Member for Churchill that early on in my career in Government Services, and early on in the career of accepting responsibility for Emergency Measures from my colleague the Attorney-General, the Emergency Measures Organization has elaborate plans for the case of a nuclear holocaust, that there are duplicated essential Government Services offices in a state of preparedness, underground, in a bunker at Camp Shilo. We personally spent some time in those bunkers in our respective offices, not the most comfortable places to spend the long weekend in, but we had a very thorough briefing at that time which outlined the considerably elaborate contingency plans that are in place. It involves an entire communications system that can plug into a specific band on our radios; the liaison that enables the immediate contact with the utilities, Hydro, are in place; and indeed a fair level of emergency supplies are housed in this bunker.

Mr. Chairman, this dates back to the time when it was a matter of national policy to build impregnable centres as they were called, underground, usually associated with a military establishment, that in the event of an emergency - I can recall the Attorney-General questioning the directives, the very specific and clear directions that are stated and written in the manual, that is to say that when you receive the notice you have 20 minutes warning of a nuclear attack; you're to head straight out to Shilo to resume your duties of keeping the government operating. The Attorney-General at that time poked me in the ribs and said "Gee, Harry I don't know how this is going to go over with my wife, honey I'm sorry, it's coming, I'm off to the bunker." But I describe that only to answer the member for Churchill's question that yes, the Emergency Measures Organization

has, in the total scope of things, and I don't say this facetiously, the necessary plans in place that could foresee that kind of a situation happening.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I appreciate that information and I know that it is a difficult subject to talk about and believe the Minister to have handled it quite ably with just the right amount of sincerity and seriousness. At the same time, it wasn't my question. My question to the Minister was, has he been made aware of a hazard report which describes, and I am quoting from the newspaper "the worst that could happen if the experimental nuclear reactor at Pinawa failed" in other words what is happening here is the spokesperson for the Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment at Pinawa is telling us that they have developed a hazard report. Now we know that, because it is necessary with all reactors that you have to have a report that outlines specifically the ultimate ramifications of a nuclear accident at such a plant.

Again, whenever one brings these subjects up one is accused of being either an alarmist or an extremist and sometimes by the Minister himself. The case is that I think it is an important document and I bring it up, not to suggest that such an event is imminent, because I don't believe that it is. And as an aside, Mr. Chairperson, I have to thank the Minister for the information that he has sent over to me on nuclear energy and have not got around to reading it yet, but surely will because it is a subject that one should understand the most possible about. So I know that the Minister understands and shares my concern in this regard as to how we can make nuclear energy the safest possible mechanism, and how we can make informed decisions as to whether or not it is safe. In that case one must have all the information available to them, again we are talking about the whole information process which is probably the most important process in regard to these sorts of concerns.

Can the Minister indicate if his department has been made aware of that hazard report and if that hazard report has been made available to his department so that the Emergency Measures Organization can try to, as much as is possible, in advance what sort of emergency procedures they would follow in the event that the nuclear reactor failed. In the unlikely event that the nuclear reactor failed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that this is the kind of information that Emergency Measures would received. I would imagine also that the authorities at Pinawa, having gone to the trouble of preparing this report, this document, that they would want to make sure that responsible civil authorities have it in their possession. However, I cannot assure him that is the case, I will undertake that question as notice and perhaps he can remind me at some later point and I will doublecheck with him.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Minister for the assurance that he will undertake it and I most likely will remind him in the appropriate amount of time.

I'm going to forego my usual 20 minutes summation after a discourse of this nature. I notice the disappointed look on the Minister's face but I assure him that there will be opportunities in the future for us to discuss this.

That would be all that I would like to say, other than in very brief summation - and I always catch myself when I say that because the Minister quite justifiably relaxes for a moment - but in very brief summation, I share the concerns from the member in regards to what happened at MacGregor, and I believe there was a breakdown in the communication and information dissemination process that created a vacuum that gave rise to statements that would tend to make people apprehensive. Not that they were not justifiable statements, I am not implying that whatsoever, but just that the whole process of disseminating information could have been done much better. In the instance of the Emergency Measures Organization, that the contingency plan for the evacuation which was not necessary, to the best of our knowledge was not necessary, should have been drawn up immediately and it should have been given to responsible people and the public so that they would have known that there was someone who cared and was someone who was preparing contingency plans in case it became necessary.

So I believe there was a failure to No. 1, draw up that document in the first place; I believe there was a failure in communication, as the movie said. I

believe that the Minister is trying to deal with a very complex and a very complicated problem, a very difficult problem, and I do commend him for the initiative, I believe it's a bit belated, but hindsight is always better than foresight, at least we assume that it is always better than foresight. Therefore, that's an enjoyment of a privilege that I can have in this instance that is perhaps unfair to take advantage of, but I do want it on the record that I was not at all satisfied, nor were many satisfied with the way that the MacGregor incident was handled. I believe that there are mechanisms that can be developed; I look forward to reviewing the regulations; I look forward to reviewing the Minister's initiatives, both in theory and in practice, and I can only share his hope that we have as few environmental accidents and incidents as we can, knowing full well that there will be some and knowing full well that if we are prepared, and if we have an intention of dealing with them in the most open and the most comprehensive and the most sensitive and serious and sincere manner possible that we cannot prevent them all, but that we can in many instances forestall some major impacts. That, Sir, is a goal that is well worth seeking and a goal well worth striving towards

So I will hope that the Minister's efforts work out in the way that he anticipates them to, and I can assure him that if I can be of any assistance or my colleagues can be of any assistance to him in the future, from either the discussions like this, or the supplying of instant experts or any way possible, that he would call upon us

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(h)(1)--pass; 3.(h)(2)--pass; 3.(j)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,628,100 for Government Services, Supply and Services--pass.

4.(a)(1)--pass; 4.(a)(2)--pass; 4.(b)(1)--pass; 4.(b)(2)--pass; 4.(c)(1)--pass; 4.(c)(2)--pass; 4.(d) - the Member for Elmwood, 4.(d)(1).

MR. DOERN: I wonder if the Minister can explain, if he can get his brain into gear away from chemical spills, can he explain just what the Land Acquisition Branch is doing these days in terms of what are the main areas of acquisition that they are dealing with. I wonder whether he could also indicate whether the staff is about the same as it was last year or whether there has been any reduction or increase in numbers.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the same number of staff. In the 1979-80 estimates, we had 41.26 staff man years; we are asking for the same number of staff man years in this set of appropriations.

We are spending somewhat less money, some \$2,000 in Other Expenditures - \$95,000 last year and \$92,000 this year. The decrease is due to the Land Titles no longer charging any registration fees to government departments. Registrations completed for MHRC must still be paid for but that has effected a small decrease in the costs in Other Expenditures.

The Recoveries are up somewhat - last year, 1979-80, the branch recovered some \$771,000, as compared to the anticipated recoveries this year of \$820,000, for an increase of \$49,000.00.

The costs of the Land Acquisition Branch are fully recoverable from client departments and therefore recoveries are increased to achieve the Nil vote position, no change in the policy from what has been established for a number of years. From time to time we fall behind in our charges to client departments. Those have been readjusted so that the recovery will be full.

The activities of the branch essentially are unchanged. The Department of Highways is a major client. The Department of Water Resources continues to be a major client; some lessening activity in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. We anticipate increased activity for Manitoba Hydro this year.

For the first time - the Minister occasionally achieves, if he stays in this business long enough, some goals. In 1968, I attempted to convince the then government that all agencies of government should come under the Land Acquisition Branch and more specifically under, which is involved in this operation, the Land Value Appraisal Commission. For years, the major utilities such as Hydro and Telephones, have rejected that position and have in the course of times caused some difficulties. To the average Manitoban, when land is being acquired for government services, some of them differentiate between Hydro or Telephones and/or

any other department of government. That has brought about the situation sometime where one neighbour, whose land is being required for Hydro purposes, is being paid a different sum than the land in the adjacent quarter that is being required for water drainage or for other government purposes such as highways.

To bring about a greater degree of fairness and uniformity in terms of land that is being required and purchased from, or expropriated from citizens of Manitoba, it is my intention to introduce legislation during this session that will make it clear that Hydro's land purchasing activities will come under the purview of the Land Value Appraisal Commission. I am pleased to indicate to the honourable members of the committee that Hydro, under its present management, raises no objection to that.

We anticipate that that will create some additional activity for specifically the Land Value Appraisal Commission, not necessarily the Land Acquisition Branch. Hydro will continue to essentially do the purchasing. They have their people in their land acquisition department that will be out there acquiring and making arrangements for the land, but it will have to be reviewed by the Land Value Appraisal Commission to receive a certificate of value. It is conceivable that there will be considerable activity in this field as we prepare for the western grid connection, which means that the land will have to be acquired from here to the Saskatchewan border in the development of the transmission lines that will heading west.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I gather - was it 41 SMYs here, unchanged?

MR. ENNS: That's right.

MR. DOERN: When I look at the salary figures, I have the clear impression that the Civil Service only obtained a 4 percent increase last year; is that so?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that is so, but . . .

MR. DOERN: I am looking at the figures, \$700,000, to \$728,000; it looks like 4 percent.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that the Land Acquisition people received the same general salary increase, which I believe was of the order of seven-plus last year. The figure here reflects the possibility of changes, some retirements of senior people at higher levels of pay, of bringing in junior at lower levels of pay or, indeed, some leaves of absences occurring within the branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(1)--pass; 4.(d)(2)--pass; 4.(3)--pass; 4.--pass; 5.(a)--pass; 5.(b)--pass - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: There again, I see the salaries - I assume that those salaries are for probably two people - I don't if there are two or three people. Again, it looks like only a thousand dollar increase on \$28,000, which seems again like a piddling amount.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think if the honourable member reflects on the fact that one of the members of that commission is none other than the former Member for Pembina, Mr. George Henderson, who is well known for his concern about the spending of public dollars, that probably has, in its way, manifested itself in this rather modest call for Other Expenditures. He was never known to buy anybody else a cup of coffee other than himself when he was in the Chamber here and I assume that that practice is being carried on in the Commission Board these days.

MR. DOERN: He was also a man of few words, unlike the MLA for Churchill or the Minister. His most famous one, I remember his swan song when he talked about people who nowadays have compassion for the underprivileged and people who are unemployed and people who are on welfare and socially underprivileged and this,

that and the other thing. Then he said in his day they simply called people like that bums.

MR. ENNS: Under what item are we discussing this . . . ?

MR. DOERN: This is the "George Henderson Sub-amendment."

I would also like to ask the Minister who else is on the Land Value Appraisal Commission. I assume that Professor Harvey is still there and that George Henderson is there. Who are the other members and what are their backgrounds, in brief?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the committee consists, under the chairmanship of Douglas Allan Cameron Harvey, who is, I believe, a professor of Law at the University of Manitoba, who has served this commission with distinction over a goodly period of time. He was appointed, I believe, in 1967 by the then Conservative administration, served throughout the period of time of the NDP administration, and continues to serve to this day. I believe that is the case, Mr. Chairman, unless . . . The Honourable former Minister shakes his head.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think the professor, who I believe is an expert in expropriation and teaches expropriation, followed Jack Walker, who was the chairman. He was not on the board at the time that Jack Walker, who is a lawyer, was the chairman. Now, whether he had ever been on the board years ago, if so, it is news to me. He came in in the mid to late Seventies and I think he has only been on a few years, as far as I know. He certainly wasn't on, say, from 1972 to 1974 or 1975, if before.

I asked who the other members are.

MR. ENNS: The other members are Joseph Krutish, who is in effect the executive secretary, I believe, of the board; Mr. Ronald Castles; Miss Helen Unrau; and George Henderson.

MR. DOERN: What are the backgrounds of Mr. Castles and Mrs. Unrau.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Castles is a resident of the city, in St. James, I believe. He comes from the Interlake area, in the neighbourhood of Warren, is self-employed in the insurance business, my understanding is, has been involved as a private citizen in numerous appearances before the board and other government agencies in the acquisition of land during the time that Hydro acquired a great deal of land through the Interlake for the construction of first the Grand Rapids Transmission Line and then latterly the D.C. Kettle Line. I might say about him, he is, although not a lawyer, but has on numerous occasions, I can recall, over the past decade, represented the interests of individual farmers or farmer groups in appearing before the Land Acquisition Branch and/or the Land Value Appraisal Commission in assisting individuals in their land transactions with the branch.

Mrs. Helen Unrau comes from the Transcona area and I believe is also self-employed in the real estate business.

Mr. George Henderson, well, I don't think I have to describe him in any other terms than I already have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could bring to the committee's attention that I did slip by 4 without passing it:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. On a point of order, we haven't passed 5; when you pass 5, then you can pass 73 Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that may be correct, but the fact is that (c) cancelled out; it's recoverable, so it really was not . . . I would think, to be correct; I should have passed that at the end of 4. I need the guidance of the committee, though.

MR. DOERN: Well, why don't we pass 5 and then pass 73?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)--pass; 5.(b) - the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could give us the basis for the remuneration of the commission. I presume it is on a per diem basis, perhaps he could confirm that and tell me what the rate is and the usual number of meetings that the commission would hold in a year.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the remuneration of the said members shall be paid at the following rates: The Chairman shall receive for every hour that he spends in discharging and carrying out his duties and responsibilities, the sum of \$28.36. The vice-chairman, when acting as Chairman, shall receive the sum of \$28.36 for every hour that he spends in discharging and carrying out his duties and responsibilities as Chairman of the Commission, but he shall receive the sum of \$69.19 for every day that he spends in discharging and carrying out his duties and responsibilities as an ordinary member of the Commission. The ordinary members shall receive respectively, the sum of \$69.19 for every day that each spends in discharging and carrying out his duties and responsibilities."

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let me not fillibuster my own estimates but I just give to the members an indication of their activities for the past year. They held some 107 hearings, acquiring some 176 individual properties. Pardon me, not acquiring, but passing a Land Value Certificate on 176 properties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: What was the figure the Minister gave again for the number of hearings, please?

MR. ENNS: 107.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did the Minister indicate that each hearing was a separate day?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, depending on the nature of the hearings, some of the individual applications are substantial and complex and indeed call for a full day's hearing, but there are numerous applications, four or five applications at one hearing.

MR. WALDING: One further question, Mr. Chairman. Will the Minister indicate how many days that would indicate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the brief report that I have from the Land Value Appraisal Commission indicates that on average they meet twice a week. I can indicate to the honourable members that some of the transactions that they have been involved in, particularly the more complex ones involving city property, where extensive legal presentations are made to them, fairly significant sums of money are involved, the hearings take on a fairly complex nature, and in that instance the Commission has a fairly full schedule of work to deal with.

MR. WALDING: I would just like to ask the Minister's opinion, Mr. Chairman, whether he thinks members of the Commission are in fact adequately paid when I understand that the members of the Land Assessment Review Commission are paid in the region of \$150 a day for working on land and financial matters connected with it. Does he consider that that would be in order?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Vital raises a matter that has been of some concern to us in terms of appropriate and fairness levels of pay as among the various different commissions, boards and review teams that are set up from time to time. I can indicate to the honourable member that as a member of the Treasury Board, this matter has been raised. There is under way an attempt to rationalize the different levels of remuneration that are in

effect. The honourable member will appreciate that in many instances a figure, or what is deemed to be appropriate or fair is struck initially, then particularly a board such as this with ongoing activities as aside from a review team or group that has a relatively short time period with which it has to deal, a report is expected, and then the committee dissolves itself, there is a concern by government. I share that concern as to whether or not some individual citizens are providing a service to the public at one level of pay whereas in another instance another group of citizens are providing another service of government at a different level of pay, whether that is always in the appropriate proportions. It's a matter of some concern to me, and as indicated to the honourable member, not only at my instigation but through other members of government voicing their concerns in this matter, that that is being looked at. I think the honourable member will appreciate that there is a difference between a commission that is there by statute that operates year round, will continue to operate year round, as compared to a review team that governments will establish from time to time to address a particular problem. The one that the honourable member refers to is the assessment review team, hopefully it will do its work within the next year or six months or fourteen months; I don't wish to set its time plan at this point, but there is quite a difference in the nature of the commissions and the type of work that they are expected to carry out.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, a couple of other matters occurred to me as the Minister was explaining his problem in rationalizing these different amounts - I won't comment on them other than just to leave them with him to further complicate his deliberations for him to ponder upon - and that was another well-known lawyer who carried out a commission for the government I understand was paid at the rate of \$75 an hour, another person who carried out a commission received nothing at all, and members of the Legislature who appear at intercessional committees are paid \$50 a day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)--pass; 5.(c)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,588,500 for Government Services, Project Services--pass. 6.--pass - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we are getting near to final remarks here, but I just wanted to get a quick review again from the Minister. He indicated, I believe, the provincial lab, if my memory serves me correctly, may be opened in July; is that what he said? And that the garage may be accessed - was it in the fall or in the summer of this year?

MR. ENNS: In the fall, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Are there any other buildings that are now in the stage of completion or have been completed, that there will be official openings for from, let's say today forward? Are there some regional office buildings or Highways garages or any other new construction that the Minister is going to open in the next few months other than those buildings we've mentioned?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we anticipate that there may well be the opportunity of officially opening The Pas Court House, as indeed the Corrections facilities that are on schedule and under construction at The Pas at the present time.

MR. DOERN: When would that be?

MR. ENNS: That would be towards the latter part of the year, hopefully, construction schedules being met; I believe we have targetted for sometime in December.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.--pass - the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister provide to the committee an outline of what

physical assets he intends to acquire or construct in the coming year and if not, would he give us a breakdown please?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can give it to him in various forms. In a summary form in terms of dollars, 1981 requests that are before you call for some \$8,445,000 to be expended on the carrying on of major projects; some \$2,002,000 will be expended on the introduction of major new projects. In addition to that, a total of \$4,182,000 will continue to be spent on fire upgrading work, although I must indicate that that figure, because of the nature of the work, we could well be spending an additional \$500,000 - or fail to spend several hundred thousand dollars on renovative work of that kind, having to work within time schedules of the client departments where residents or inmates are housed make scheduling that much more difficult - but we are targetting for expenditures of between \$4 million and \$5 million in the area of fire and safety. We have an additional \$3 million worth of work that we identify as minor construction projects involving renovations, principally minor projects, and that builds up to the total of some \$15,779,000 that is involved in acquisition, construction, in this set of estimates before you. To bring to completion the projects that we are completing and commencing with this \$15 million, will require a total of \$30,680,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, if it helps the honourable members of the committee, I can perhaps indicate to them the major new construction projects that will be undertaken by the department in the coming year. The one that has already received some notoriety or publicity, to commence with design work, is the appointment of consulting engineers and prime architects for the new court house; some \$460,000 for design work is included in these estimates.

The major addition to the Assiniboine Community College involving the farm mechanics' building as well as some other additional classroom space will involve the expenditure of \$1,262,000 in this current year. The total cost for that project is estimated as \$6,328,000.00. The major project at Portage la Prairie is the Physical Activities Building, which continues of course with the general upgrading of that facility with the addition of a swimming pool and some \$20,000, pardon me, \$70,000 will be spent in that area.

To complete the work at Portage, this facility will call for the expenditure of \$2,658,000.00. We have in addition to that, the calling for, and have appointed the architect for a 40-bed hospital at Portage, planning and design to proceed in this current year. The total cost of that project will be \$1,395,000.00.

Another major project, although not major in the amounts of dollars, is the provision of satellite fire-fighting training centre at Thompson in Manitoba, which has long been asked for by the people of the north to make it easier for the training of northern fire fighters who now have to come down to the Brandon facility. We will be spending some \$200,000 in building the fire fighting training centre at Thompson.

That gives the honourable members some indication of the upward and onward drive of the Department of Government Services as they turn the corner here in 1980-81.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister first gave me the breakdown, he mentioned \$2.2 million for major new projects. Is the \$2.2 million included in the \$8 million, which he mentioned as the first item, major projects?

MR. ENNS: Yes, I am advised that that is the case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: The 4.-something million for fire upgrading, would that all be at Portage la Prairie?

MR. ENNS: No, the major portions of that are scattered throughout the institutions: The Brandon Mental Health Centre accounts for two projects, one of \$140,000 and the other one of \$246,000; the Portage la Prairie School for Retardates involves the sums of \$199,000, \$100,000, and \$260,000; at Selkirk Mental Health Centre, some \$91,000 is being expended. Further, to the Selkirk Mental Health Centre, another \$90,000 and another \$92,000 is being expended in that facility. Again, at Portage la Prairie, at the Correctional Institute, some \$400,000 is being spent. At the Winnipeg Seven Oaks Centre for Youth, to upgrade

to Fire Code requirements, \$43,000 is being spent. At Headingley Correctional Institution, some \$25,000 is being spent.

There are additional ones. At Headingley, a considerable amount, another \$174,000 is being spent; at South Grove at Portage, \$600,000 is being estimated; the Winnipeg School for the Deaf, \$200,000; at The Pas, the Keewatin Community College, \$34,000; and at various other locations, an additional \$100,000.00. In addition to that, a fairly substantial one involves supplying the Headingley Institute with a new water supply system for some \$600,000 in the current year. The total project will cost \$1,070,000, but we are asking for \$600,000 in this year's estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I think that indicates to the honourable members that again, prioritizing the requirements to address ourselves to those facilities that house people that are either bedridden or who are inmates in the correctional institutions, this is the area where the attention is being focussed on with respect to the fire upgrading work.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that there was a sum, \$1.2 million of a \$6 million project at the Assiniboine Community College, and a further \$34,000 at Keewatin Community College. I notice under the Department of Education that they have Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets which shows some quarter of a million at Assiniboine Community College and some \$84,000 at Keewatin Community College.

Perhaps the Honourable Minister can give an explanation to the committee of why there is money in this particular department for education projects, when the Education Department itself has a similar appropriation or resolution, and it is acquiring or constructing physical assets. Why are these matters split between two different departments?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it is not unusual that departments have additional funds for specific renovations which are not included in Government Services moneys. I am also informed that perhaps I should retract that statement. In many instances, it is in the case of other line departments, a matter of specialized equipment, as it is often in the case of Health or in this case, at the community colleges where it likely is having to do with the technical vocational facilities that they offer, the acquisition of new equipment, which may involve in some instances a degree of renovation to accommodate that equipment, installation costs which the department carries on its own.

I can assure the honourable member, though, that the references to any moneys that the honourable member refers to in the Department of Education are in addition to what is being indicated in these estimates. They do not hinge on the projects that I have identified.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I asked for an explanation of why there should be additional building at educational institutions paid for by Government Services. Does the Minister build new university buildings or does the department build new schools? Why should those things be under the Public Schools Finance Board or the Universities Grant Commission, yet between \$1 million and \$2 million worth of new construction on community colleges be under the Department of Government Services?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in the matter of construction involving community colleges, that it has always been under the jurisdiction of government and is not in the budgets of the Public School Finance Board, and that is a matter of some long standing.

MR. WALDING: While I accept what the member says, that it has been done that way for many years, I don't really think that's a very good reason for doing it that way. --(Interjection)-- Well, maybe tradition stands higher with gentlemen opposite than it does for us. I had a couple of other questions on that. Firstly, was there any carry-over of capital authority from the 1978-79 year to the 1979-80 year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable members are aware, the accounting procedures have changed and there is a lapsing of unspent capital which has created a situation where we don't have carry-over capital.

MR. WALDING: Perhaps the Minister could tell us how much capital authority did lapse in that time, a year ago.

MR. ENNS: I am advised it was in the order of \$1.6 million.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know whether the Minister expects to have spent his \$15 million that he was given authority for a year ago. I realize that perhaps not all of the bills are in or all of the accounting has been done since the fiscal year ended just a couple of weeks ago, but can the Minister give us his best guess as of this time whether he will have spent all of the \$15 million and, if not, how much does he expect to lapse this year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the nature of the kind of construction that we are involved in makes that kind of speculation dicey, but we expect to spend it all and indeed will, as we experienced last year, expend more.

MR. WALDING: I can think of just one other question that I had for the Minister and maybe it would come under his \$3 million worth of minor construction projects and perhaps renovations, whether there is anything within this appropriation for a new washroom on the second floor for the convenience of female Members of the Legislature?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that is under active consideration.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister of his plans for the coming year. If he says that it is still under consideration, I assume that the amount would not be authorized until the next fiscal year, April 1 of 1981, and that's rather a long time to wait for those facilities, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am informed and indeed have witnessed that nobody is waiting for the use of those facilities. But the design possibilities of accommodating the present washroom to more adequately facilitate members of both sexes is in the design stage at the moment. We don't perceive it to be of a capital expense item and we would assume to have the flexibility in our budget to provide that within this set of estimates.

MR. WALDING: I am rather pleased to hear that the Minister is confident that he has sufficient flexibility. I understand from his comments, then, that it awaits a policy decision by him or by Cabinet, or Treasury Board, or whomever, in order to proceed; would that be correct?

MR. ENNS: I can assure the honourable member that it does indeed await a policy decision at the very highest level.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.--pass - the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Having been in the other committee, I am sorry I haven't been able to follow the progress of this committee. I was just wondering, where it says, Improvement to Building and Grounds, has been discussed? It is in Item 2. Field Services. If it has been discussed, would I have to wait until we get to the Minister's Salary before I could ask any questions? Unless, under the department of Acquisition and Construction, to go further on what the Honourable Member for St. Vital has mentioned concerning washrooms, if these washrooms are going to be built in the very near future, I would hope that they would be adequately furnished with urinals and maybe even some "arsenals."

Mr. Chairman, the importance . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my estimates are denigrating, quickly.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, this Minister comes into my committee and disrupts my committees like I have never had a committee disrupted before in my life.

But to get down to something a little bit more serious, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether the Honourable Minister has made any plans under Construction to look at the feasibility of constructing a parking facility close to the Legislature, where we could accommodate all the people who cannot find places to park when the House is in session, particularly. Our staff are looking all over the place for places to park. I know that we are in an energy crisis in this country but I would think that we could endeavour to provide our staff and the members with a truly good, adequate parking facility in this area. I know that years back . . . My honourable friend and I just got back from Grunthal, where we were speaking at a meeting last night, and I know that it has nothing to do with this subject . . . Mr. Chairman, if I can only bang the desk like all the other members, because I am not a good debater and I see how it is done where they bang the desk and they shake their hands, but I will speak very calmly.

I would like to get back to the idea of this parking facility. I know that there have been plans previously and I don't know if these plans are still around, but would the Honourable Minister please make some comments as to whether he will be providing an adequate parking facility close to the Legislature.

In addition, I really wasn't trying to be that funny, but I know that we do have some problems with the lack of facilities for going to the washroom - I don't want to get vulgar about it, although this is a subject that has to be discussed, considering that we have had some complaints from some of the honourable members about inadequate toilet facilities. Would the Honourable Minister care to comment on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.--pass.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, am I to assume that the Honourable Minister is refusing to comment and answer the questions that were directly placed to him just a few minutes earlier? With the no comment, am I to assume that he has plans and is proceeding with a toilet facility for the member who is lacking one, and a parking facility for the people who can't find places to park their cars?

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

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

MR. BLAKE: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, in case the member hasn't been informed. I suppose he was in the other committee . . .

MR. KOVNATS: I don't think that he has a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's my judgement, when he . . .

MR. BLAKE: The facility that he refers to is sitting in our caucus room and will be delivered at a proper opportunity for the member.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the honourable member did have a point of order, and I would hope you would rule that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think he did have a point of order. We're on 6.--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,779,000 for Government Services, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets--pass.

Now we're back to Resolution 70, General Administration, 1.(a) Minister's Compensation--pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think the members on this side have been treated to the spectacle of what a Conservative caucus meeting is like. We're very happy to sit in on one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson on a point of order.

MR. KOVNATS: I would just like to advise the members here this evening that we have just completed the estimates of the Department of Natural Resources, which I chaired, and I had nothing to do with any caucus meetings in the caucus room this evening.

MR. DOERN: I would thank the Honourable Member from Grunthal for his remarks. Mr. Chairman, I want to make some remarks on the Minister's Salary. I wanted to ask a question or two first. We asked before the dinner break if we could get a report on the number of civil servants. Now we had this information last year, and I just wonder if we could have the current figures, particularly last year, compared to the present time.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the figures, as I have them, and I would remind the honourable member that he more appropriately direct this question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, but I did attempt to acquire these figures for the honourable member, and I give him this for his information. In December, 1977, there were some 12,376 members in the civil service which includes term. In December, 1978, the figure was 11,747.

MR. DOERN: Could I have that again, please?

MR. ENNS: December, 1978, 11,747; December, 1979, 11,555.

MR. DOERN: And today?

MR. ENNS: Full-time civil service and term employees, not to be confused with the other classifications of casual as employed by Highways or other departments. This is civil service and term.

MR. DOERN: Do we then assume that is still the existing figure or have there been additions and subtractions in the last four months?

MR. ENNS: I would have to indicate, recalling my information that I see, as a Treasury Board member, that it is fairly constant, there has not been a notable change in the last four months.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister describe the construction of any buildings, since this is the construction arm of the government, that his administration, first of all, conceived, designed and constructed since October, '77. The only one I can think offhand that's new is the Broadway Building which was some \$2.5 million expenditure. Are there any others that come to mind?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let me just once more say, and I think the honourable members are entitled to avail themselves of this occasion to make their general comments with respect to how this particular administrator is running the department. I indicate to them that it's not my intention on the Minister's Salary to answer in question period; I think we have gone over the ground reasonably well in the last few days. But let me make this point very clear, that fully 30 percent of our capital budget is being spent on those unseen but yet vitally important projects, namely, upgrading of our health and correctional facilities in this province, 30 percent of our total budget. I take some pride in that figure. It indicates the seriousness with which we maintain our commitment. As we came into office, I recognize that it doesn't build too many tangible new buildings around the province, but that point should be remembered, that a full 30 percent of our budget is being expended in those areas that in my judgement the moneys are perhaps most pressingly required, in our health institutions, in our mental homes, in our correctional facilities where people are bedridden and/or detained.

In addition to that - and the former Honourable Minister wishes to make a point that some of the projects that have been identified in our construction period are carrying on or a completion of some of the projects that were initiated by his government - I would have to indicate the major one, of course, which now finally sees some steps to completion, namely, the Provincial Judges Building, was initiated in 1966, or '65 even, by the then administration and languished for four years of that administration and a further eight years of the NDP administration and is now to a point where actual moneys are going to be spent for design and the start-up of that building. The other projects the honourable members are aware of, they have been informed of their nature and their approximate cost estimates.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this is where we will disagree on a few points. Yes, the new court building is one of the best announcements the Government Services Minister can make, because it was announced I guess in '65, maybe in '68. I announced it in '74, reannounced it in '75 and the Minister is reannouncing it in 1980. But some things were done in the meantime. We built the Woodsworth Building which was vital to doing something about the court system in Manitoba. That was considered at one point to be the Justice Building and in fact was named for J.S. Woodsworth, because of a broader connotation of social justice which must, I think, be the ultimate goal of the courts. There were many floors of that building allocated to the Land Titles Office, the Crown Attorneys, the Protonotary, and many other people, and that was vital to improving the justice situation. In addition to that, land was acquired for a new building; in addition to that, the Public Safety Building was leased and operated by the province and the renovations to the Law Courts commenced.

So there was quite a bit done in improving that situation. I believe it's because of stalling and delay that you had a worsening of the backlog of court cases in Manitoba. Our Attorney-General, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, fought and was successful by '74 to '75 to get approval for a new court building and then steps were taken to work in that direction and to undertake the planning of a Law Courts' renovation. So steps were taken and the Minister knows full well that when a decision is taken, you do not then the next day commence construction of a building. When you take the decision, then you have to plan the program and that may take a year, and it might take more. In the case of the judges, I think both of us agree that the judges are difficult people to deal with. They are appointed for life; they are not like politicians; they don't have to satisfy a constituency or a Premier, and they tend to have pretty strong views and be highly independent. So I'm saying that I think the Minister deserves credit for the building on Broadway but other than that, all he has done in terms of actual effort is to reannounce new construction and reannounce renovations, but there's been no action on that front yet.

The other thing is, I was happy to see finally, after two-and-a-half years of fooling around, that the Provincial Garage is going to be used. I really think that the manner in which the government handled that facility is deplorable, because that facility was 90 percent completed when the government took over. It was ready to be used in January of 1978, a little over two years ago. Instead of using the facility and moving the staff, which is now going to be done, the building was deliberately, politically, deliberately kept empty in the sense of not used for its intended purpose. This was strictly a political ploy; it was strictly the result of the posturing of the First Minister, who during the election campaign, decided that the previous government had spent money in some areas that he didn't like. He, somehow or other, centred on this particular building, and because he made statements that it wasn't needed, the Minister of Government Services had no choice but to back him up by not needing the building. The First Minister said the building wasn't necessary; the Minister of Government Services said, "I will prove that it isn't necessary by not using it." And, you know, we all know that this was a bit of wasted motion, but it also had a price tag attached to it. The people of Manitoba, because of this I think, had to in effect watch the shenanigans of the government in keeping a building vacant, spending money on heating, lighting and security, maybe even some water had to be run through the piping so that they wouldn't freeze in the winter, and then waste the money on the construction; so that the Provincial Auditor a year ago pointed out that if you were to put a dollar figure on the garage that it was a wasted expenditure of some

\$350,000 per year. That, I think, is a conservative estimate because of the fact that interest rates have gone up considerably; so after two-and-a-half years, finally I guess a decision is made in relation to other government priorities, so that finally about three years later, the garage will be accessed.

If you add that all up, Mr. Chairman, I think you can say that the government in effect wasted a million dollars of taxpayers' money to prove the First Minister right. I don't think the Minister of Government Services had much choice there. It's like having a gun placed against your head and when the person on the other end of the gun is the First Minister, the Minister has to fall in line. This is in spite of the fact that there were considerable inefficiencies in the old building; that there were suggestions that perhaps the building was not up to the fire code; that there were suggestions that the building did not meet the national building code. The Minister told us two years ago that the last time the garage was inspected was in 1974, and I would say that if it was inspected by efficiency experts or fire experts or code experts, they would say, "This building is inefficient and that a new facility is urgently required". And I have to remind the Minister that I didn't invent the new provincial garage. The new provincial garage was based on the program of the superintendent of the provincial garage, who is still there. It was also based on the car fleets. And although there's a lot of posturing by the Minister about the car fleet and what would be done and how there might be leasing and how there might be a different approach taken, that was, I think discarded as being not very helpful.

I think the Minister was proven wrong when he decided to take a policy of using cars for perhaps three years and 60,000 miles - which is a lot of miles and a lot of usage - to extend that to four years and 80,000 miles. I think that proved to be unsuccessful and that there's probably been considerable maintenance expenditures by the department on maintaining the fleet, which would, you start running cars . . .

MR. ENNS: That decision was made by you fellows, Russ, and you know it. Keep it reasonably honest, it's getting late at night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time.

MR. DOERN: You could reverse those decisions at any time.

MR. ENNS: We are reversing them.

MR. DOERN: Well, what are you reversing it to?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: I didn't want to say anything.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, so I say that I think the Minister has been proven wrong and the government has been proven wrong on a whole series of projects. I think they've wasted a lot of time on studies in regard to the car fleet. Their freeze on the law courts boomeranged and backfired in that by freezing the construction, they built up a backlog and now they have to pay higher prices to construct. I think the Minister told us they have \$10 million in the kitty for a new law courts, but I would be astounded if you can build your requirements for that amount. You may have to go to \$15 million; you may have to go to \$16, \$18 or \$20 million when all is said and done.

The provincial lab was frozen and there was, again, a wasted effort in trying to decide whether or not to sell acquired land, where property had been expropriated, where a foundation had been put in to sell a site with \$700,000 worth of construction. That I think was wasted, and I think we've been proven right again, that that lab was needed to meet present and future requirements. And now, now more than ever - I hate to mention this because I'm afraid the Member for Churchill might come running in and make another two-hour speech on this and the Minister will respond over a period of a couple of hours - that because of all the

chemical spills and all the concern about chemicals and environment and transportation and all this endless talk about rail relocation and health and safety and everything else, that again, it's been proven that that lab was needed.

The couple of observations that I make, Mr. Chairman, I wait to see if there's a response. If there's a response I'll make another response. But I simply note that this department, which is crucial to the government, it reflects the needs of government. Buildings are not built to build buildings. Buildings are built to physically house programs. There are no programs that I am aware of where people just sort of operate out of the sky or operate out of their cars - I suppose there's some AG reps or something - but essentially civil servants work inside buildings because it's cold outside and it rains and there are other reasons why buildings are necessary.

I just note that this department, in spite of all that the Minister says about capital, in spite of all that he says about maintenance, in spite of all that he says about his programs and his EMO, that this department is only increasing its expenditures by 2 percent - which means, in effect, from going from 46.4 million to 47.4 million, \$1 million on 46 million, a little over 2 percent. Compared to the costs of inflation, one can only conclude that this department is not advancing but rather going backwards, or not advancing, that in terms of the total package of what the Government Services department does, that in terms of its capital expenditures and maintenance expenditures, it is not keeping up with inflation. It is in fact being wound down rather than being wound up.

The final point that I make, Mr. Chairman, is that there's been a devastating effect as a result of the government's program in this department, and that is on the construction industry and the average person doesn't understand that; that the construction industry is one of the largest industries in the country; it's one of the largest industries in the province; it's not No. 25; it's not No. 85; I think it's about fourth in terms of all industries in the country. And when you consider the effect of the government freeze over the last couple of years on architects and engineers, on contractors, on skilled tradesmen, it has been devastating.

Today, and I now quote the Winnipeg Construction Association and Gervin Greasley: 27 percent of that industry, in terms of skilled tradesmen, are unemployed today; 9,500 men, in effect, sit idle in the province of Manitoba. Architects, you can talk to architects, they are in a sorry state. There's been a collapse of all kinds of firms in the last few years. There's been mergers. They've been selling their buildings, sub-leasing their buildings, they've been moving into smaller quarters. Many of them have left the province. Some of them are continuing because they are taking work outside of the province. The graduating classes are going out of Manitoba, they're going to other provinces; the engineers, the same thing. --(Interjection)-- No, it's simply much worse. I recognize the voice first of all, and then the person of the Member for Wolseley, who's trying to do something about construction by encouraging bigger and better bars in the province of Manitoba and I can't think of anything to say in addition to that at the moment. But if he'd been here earlier he would have seen one of the best comic interludes ever recorded in the history of the Legislature in my experience. Laurel and Hardy, eat your hearts out. --(Interjection)-- Well, you have to be the skinny one in this case, Stan Laurel.

And I also say in appreciation that the two members who were here, your caucus chairman and the Deputy Speaker, are two of the best stand-up comics in the business. I mean, they don't have to take a back seat to any professionals. They're the best when it comes to humour and story-telling and I eagerly await their annual contributions at the Hotel Association and the Chiropractors' . . .

MR. ENNS: Order, Mr. Chairman. Order, Mr. Chairman, we're discussing my salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson on a point of order.

MR. KOVNATS: I don't think that you should be criticized for not bringing the member to a point of order because another member suggests it. I think it's your prerogative to rule on points of order rather than listening to other members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood has the floor.

MR. DOERN: Thank you. Everybody is trying to get into the act, as Jimmy Durante said. So I say that the architects and engineers, they are in a sorry state. I don't know what it's like for the Minister now. I can tell him when I was Minister, they came and they cried and cried and cried and cried in front of my desk. They must be doing the same for the Minister. They must be coming in and simply . . . his rug must be replaced every few months because it's simply rotting on the floor from all these tears.

Contractors, a lot of contractors have gone bel y-up. One of the biggest bankruptcies - and I mentioned today that the booming businesses that your Minister of Economic Development has found for the province since he's been Minister are in the bailiff area, and you would be able to concur in that, and in collection agencies. That's where the action is in Manitoba, up 400 to 500 percent. And in those statistics are small contractors who have been going out of business.

And skilled tradesmen, I just read you the figures: 27 percent unemployed; 9,500 people; many of them have left the province; many will never come back, and so on. So I say that I think that the government has to be condemned for freezing projects that were necessary and for the devastating effect on the economy of Manitoba. I think that it's time to look at the needs of the government, of the public and to bear in mind at all times, that this department and this Minister has a considerable impact on the construction industry and on the employment picture in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I just have a question or two for the Minister and I hope that I won't duplicate anything that happened earlier on.

I wanted to ask the Minister, with regard to insurance on provincial government buildings, if he can inform me as to who carries the insurance this year.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the tradition continues that we are self-insured.

A MEMBER: Totally?

MR. WALDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to refer the Minister to a Department of Finance news release of two years ago where the Minister of Finance proudly proclaimed that the insurance on government buildings had been put out to tender and that the firm of Reed Shaw Stenhouse Limited had secured the contract for the coming year. And he indicates at the bottom: "Terms of the coverage remain the same as in past years. The government itself assumes the cost of the first half-a-million of any loss with a policy covering up to \$5 million in excess of this". Now if there has been any change to the degree or amount of coverage, perhaps the Minister would enlighten the committee. And I tell him for his benefit, that the following year after this, it was MPIC who was the successful tenderer for coverage and the question I raise with him is, who is carrying the insurance for this year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I should not have answered that quickly. We are self-insured over any amount in excess of \$500,000 and that has been a long-standing policy that has been carried on by several administrations. My understanding is that MPIC is the present insurer of the buildings and has again been successful this year for acquiring that amount to \$500,000 and under.

MR. WALDING: Could the Minister inform us, first of all, could he confirm that the amount of the premium is in fact paid out of his appropriations? And secondly, could he indicate how much the insurance premium is for this year as compared with last year?

MR. ENNS: The amount is not in my appropriations. I believe it would be housed in Finance, therefore I can't give him the exact figures. I can undertake to find those figures for the honourable member at some later date.

MR. WALDING: Well, I thank the Minister for that. If he could confirm which department it is in I can raise the same question with the appropriate Minister.

Can I ask the Minister whether it is this department or him, as Minister, who in fact tenders out for the insurance on government buildings. The point being, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that the next time this comes up for tender how will the Minister ensure that there is no conflict of interest when he is the Minister for MPIC which is attempting to sell insurance, and he is also the Minister of Government Services which is buying the insurance?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to consult with my colleague, I believe, the Minister of Finance, but if I'm not mistaken - perhaps the Member for Elmwood can be of some assistance - but if I'm not mistaken the Department of Finance has traditionally handled this matter. I can't recall, for instance, the first instance that the amount was ever in my estimates or that the Department of Government Services as such was involved in the awarding of or the going out to tender for the insurance. I believe financial matters of this nature are handled by the Department of Finance. However, I undertake to confirm that for the member at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Two brief questions just to wrap it up. I wonder if there are any plans to expand upon the legislative grounds to become a sort of photographers haven and I wondered if there were any plans to put a floating dock or anything in the vicinity of the Legislative Buildings. There doesn't seem to be any place along the Assiniboine River anywhere where the boating public can pull up and take pictures and load and unload people, and I wondered if there were any plans, because the former minister had a floating bandstand or something planned and I just wondered if there is a floating dock planned or anything for the riverbank portion of the Legislative grounds?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the member has made that suggestion to me, I think both privately and publicly on another occasion, and I believe the matter has merit and we'll ask the department to take a look at it.

MR. WILSON: I thank the Minister very much and I wondered - the other suggestion is I believe in the members' dining-room downstairs there's a very expensive sound system, or the makings of it. I wondered if there's any indication to have piped in music in the members' lounge? I mean, is the infrastructure there, are the speakers there, is it any great amount of expenditure to put that taped music in?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am just being informed, I was about to answer in the affirmative that the system was in place but it has been indicated to be that is not the case, the partial system that may have been there was removed several years ago.

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

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Wolesley brings up a point concerning the floating dock. I would think that maybe people could drive into the Legislative grounds and park in the Abe Kohnats Parking Garage and walk over to this floating dock and get onto the boat, but that's not the point I wanted to make.

A little earlier I wanted the opportunity to speak on the Department of Forestry and I don't see it here at all, and I didn't get a chance over in the other department. But seeing as there are trees in the Legislative grounds I think that the question that I am going to pose to the Minister, or the remark that I am going to make to the Minister, will be quite appropriate.

I think that I would like to join with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in complimenting the Minister on the good job that he has been doing, and I would

also like to present my own compliments to the Honourable Chairman of this Committee who has just done a wonderful job. Just as a last remark, I think the Minister should be complimented because on checking the trees in the area of the Legislative grounds we have found there are no termites and the Minister has done a wonderful job in seeing that termites have been eliminated from the trees in the Legislative grounds. I think that we will all compliment the Minister for the good job that he has done in removing the termites from the trees in the Legislative grounds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)--pass; 1.(b)(1)--pass; 1.(b)(2)--pass. Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$845,000 for Government Service General Administration--pass.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 75 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources, Resolution No. 100, Clause 1., Item (1) Minister's Compensation--pass - the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Chairman, when we left the Chamber at 4:30 to go into Private Members' Hour, I had one second with which to speak and I wasn't able to finish my remarks so I have to pick it up from here.

But the Minister was good enough to supply committee with a resume of what happened in terms of the Crown's position and the hotel at Grand Beach and I'm, Mr. Chairman, appreciative of some of the Minister's problems and I also am aware that I can't from this juncture and with the information that he's given, really assess what has occurred. But I do want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister has a legal opinion in writing with respect to the steps that had to be taken. I'm not going to ask him to give me the legal opinion; he may wish to give the House the legal opinion, but I would ask him to take it to the Attorney-General to assess the legal opinion from certain points of view, Mr. Chairman.

My impression is that the Minister said that there was a lease on Crown land, that a private person had a mortgage on the lease; that as a result of having this mortgage on the lease he put one or two caveats on the property - to me that doesn't matter because a caveat doesn't establish any rights to property, it is merely a claim to property; that the lease was terminated and that the Crown then tried to remove the caveat, there was litigation both ways, and the litigation was settled by payment out to the caveator - that is the person who filed the caveats of \$14,000.00. In addition I think the Minister told us that the Crown paid the municipality some \$76,000, and I really think that must have been, not a legal obligation, but perhaps something that the Crown felt that the municipality should have and I would like him to clarify that. If the Crown felt that the municipality should have this money for reasons best known to both them and the Crown, then that's one thing. I don't know that there was any legal obligation on the Crown to pay the municipality any money and if there is that suggestion, then I think that the Minister should supply us with that as well.

My point is simply this, Mr. Chairman, and again I'm speaking at a disadvantage and I'm not sure of my grounds but I am fairly sure that a lease --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I was quite sure of my grounds, quite sure, and will, Mr. Chairman, to the member, take my case to a higher authority who will be able to judge whether I did or did not have grounds. In this case, Mr. Chairman, there was a lease on the property, there was a breach in the condition of the lease and the lease is forfeited. If the mortgage is against the lease then there is nothing to have a mortgage against; I mean, the mortgagee cannot get more than what the mortgagor had and if the mortgagor was not paying the rent and not paying the taxes and the Crown had the right to terminate the lease then all that the mortgagee can have is a right to foreclose on what is no longer there. That is the lease, I think, and other people who are perhaps more learned in the law are nodding their heads. Now I'm not certain because there are

all kinds of crazy things happen in law. Some of the best cases turn out bad, some of the worst cases turn out good. I think that the Minister should ask the Attorney-General whether the steps that were taken, and the legal opinion that was given, is consistent with what our rights were in this connection because I do not see how we have to pay off a caveat on a lease which has terminated when the mortgagee's interest cannot be greater than the lease. He had no interest in land, excuse me, he had an interest in the lease on land and if there was no longer a lease then I don't think he had any interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to debate the legalities of the situation at all because I am not qualified to do so. All I can tell the honourable member is that I am advised that the legal basis for Mr. Micay's claim was an interest in the lands by virtue of the caveats and mortgage of the lease which did not cease with the termination of the lease in 1976.

On his other point, with respect to the payment of taxes, there was no legal obligation to pay those taxes.

MR. GREEN: The prudence or not of paying the taxes I am not going to go into with the Honourable Minister. I would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, because it is a problem, I would appreciate the Minister obtain from members of the committee the legal opinion under which Crown moneys were paid and I would ask him to do so because I do not know how a mortgagee of a lease has a right to lands when the lease has been terminated. I wonder whether the Minister would have any difficulty in providing us with that.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to discuss it with the Attorney-General and see what he recommends, all I can assure the honourable member is that is the legal opinion on which the decision was made. That came from the Attorney-General's Department and I am not in a position to debate the merits of that recommendation.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am still somewhat confused after all of the legal opinion as to why the province had to participate at all. Wherein was the obligation on the part of the province to become involved with this property and I am speaking now of the building. Wherein lies the obligation to pay the \$14,000.00, unless there was a legal opinion that indicated that the province had to do that, on the assumption of course that the province had some immediate use for the property on which the building was situated. If that is the case then what is the intent of the department with respect to the location. What do they intend to do with that site if they felt that it was necessary to pay that kind of money for something that has been closed down for several years, something that has never been viable. On what basis would one want to start to renew a venture in Grand Beach after that kind of history, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RANSOM: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet will probably recall that in my remarks before closing this afternoon, I pointed out that one of the options which the management committee had made to the previous government was that they take no action whatsoever. I suppose if one's objective was to have a half burned-out hotel property in a park, that you would take no action at all. If the objective was to clear away that physically as well as legally, that problem, and be in a position to provide facilities within the park, which was the original intention, Mr. Chairman, then it was necessary to take this action and the action was a settlement for \$14,500.00.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am not at all convinced as to the position that the Minister is suggesting to the House as being the right one, that there is some legal obligation. I am rather more - well, I guess I should say it, Mr. Chairman - suspicious that this happens to be a way out for some people who invested some

money, and that the people of the province of Manitoba are going to pay the bill. This is really what I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman. That's why I think it is important that the Minister provide this Assembly with sufficient data confirming that indeed the province was legally obligated to do what it had done. I think there is an obligation on the part of the Minister to confirm with the Provincial Auditor whether, in his opinion, the expenditure of \$14,000 in the acquisition of the building, which was worthless, Mr. Chairman, and in the payment of the taxes, whether those two were obligations of the department or of the people of Manitoba.

The Minister did say that it was discretionary as to whether the department paid the taxes. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the municipality had a right to lien the building, if it had any value; if it was worth \$14,000, did the municipality of St. Clements not have a first option to lien that facility and to exercise on that lien, so that it would have not cost anyone anything to acquire the rights to that property. After all, the municipality had a \$76,000 lien on a building that was totally worthless, and continues to be worthless.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, what is puzzling is that the Minister suggests that he may have some use for the site and that may be in the form of trying to entice some other entrepreneur to re-establish. I don't know why, Mr. Chairman, we want to re-establish, given the history of that facility and given the fact, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years there has been another private facility established not too far away from this location. I don't believe that there is room for a re-establishment of a hotel operation, in any event, because there is no room for two facilities in that same area. There is a fairly adequate facility on the highway, not too far from the beach area, that is operated privately.

I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that the department has no intention of rebuilding, on that site, that kind of facility and that kind of operation. I don't know why the Minister doesn't want to admit to that. He is trying to leave the impression that there may be a need on the part of his department for that site. Well if there is, I'd like to know what it is, Mr. Chairman. Further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether or not Mr. Micay is the owner, the person that is holding the mortgage, or is he acting as a trustee on behalf of other interested parties? Does the Minister know, in fact, who the interested parties are, Mr. Chairman, who the principals are?

MR. RANSOM: I've answered that question, Mr. Chairman, that Micay was the holder of the mortgage. If the honourable member had wished to raise the matter with the Auditor, he could have raised it in Public Accounts. Perhaps he did during the last few days, because this amount of money was authorized and paid out in January of 1979.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I merely asked the Minister whether it wouldn't be prudent on his part to determine from the Provincial Auditor whether or not it was his responsibility to assume this financial burden, a burden that really in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, was not necessary to assume on the part of the province. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it's becoming more and more obvious that this indeed is a bit of sweetheart deal to bail out some private investors who had no other recourse to recover their money. Mr. Chairman, I think that unless the Minister is prepared to tell us here tonight that he will give his legal opinion, the basis on which he made his decision; unless he's willing to do that then, Mr. Chairman, I think that an inquiry would be worthwhile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cut off that particular line of questioning if the Minister wants to answer, but I asked the Minister some questions before the supper hour in regard to the land sales, Crown lands, and the Minister gave me some figures. I believe he said that there were 744 applications; 576 in process; 106 approved; 62 rejected; 15 commercial and 5 rural. I did believe I asked the Minister if he could provide the committee with the number of acres involved in these particular applications; well, at least the ones that are in process and the ones that have been approved. I wonder if the Minister would be able to provide that particular information.

MR. RANSOM: No, I don't have the information with me, Mr. Chairman, and the honourable member can refer to the Orders-in-Council for those items that have been approved.

MR. ADAM: Fine, then, we will have to do that but I want to ask the Minister, in processing these applications is there any requirement that surveys be done on these particular transactions? When an applicant comes in to purchase a parcel of land, who does the surveying or is there any surveying done in these particular transactions?

MR. RANSOM: The purchaser.

MR. ADAM: I didn't hear the Minister's answer. I wonder if he'd care . . .

MR. RANSOM: The purchaser, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. I would like then to refer to the matter of the Grandview Dam. I wonder if the department has looked at any method that the structure could be redesigned in order that the town of Grandview could be assured a supply of water and that the problems of the present design which is flooding out a number of farmers; whether or not a redesign, or restructuring or rechanneling of the water source would alleviate this problem for the people in that area.

MR. RANSOM: All those possibilities have been examined.

MR. ADAM: Is there no way then to rectify the problem there? Is that what the Minister is telling me?

MR. RANSOM: When the new reservoir is constructed as we discussed previously in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, then I would imagine that the problem will be taken care of.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, getting back to Grand Beach. Could the Minister explain why he found it necessary to also pay the arrears on taxes on behalf of property owners who own cottage lots in the same area.

MR. RANSOM: We didn't find it necessary, Mr. Chairman, and we haven't.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister will correct me then. The figure he gave us the other day was a total of \$83,098.02 involving \$68,000 arrears on cottage lots, \$72,613.66 for the hotel and a business tax of \$3,636.09. Is the Minister saying that he did not pay the arrears on the cottage lots?

MR. RANSOM: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I--pass the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister used the rationalization that he wanted to take this area out of the school tax area of St. Clements and into the Provincial Park and that was his reasoning for paying the tax bill for the hotel. Now I want to ask him whether that reasoning doesn't suffice for the other cottage owners in the same area. What is the difference between the two, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RANSOM: In the agreement, with the municipality, Mr. Chairman, the municipality agreed to the entire package of the province paying taxes on the Grand Dome and then to remove the area from the jurisdiction of the municipality. It is simply the municipality's responsibility to collect back taxes from cottagers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1-pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, since almost a year has passed since the department has paid out the money to purchase this facility by repaying the mortgage or part of the mortgage that was owed against the facility, as well as paying off the back taxes, I wonder if the Minister can indicate to us what exactly over the last year his department has been doing with the site. Are they making any plans to remove the facility; to put the site in some shape for a new development; are they making plans for the future to call for proposals from interested individuals or companies with respect to the old building - whether it can be refurbished; or whether or not a new facility has to be constructed on site? What are the objectives of his department in this regard? Is their objective to re-establish a hotel in the Grand Beach Park; is it to be a full hotel with beverage room facilities and so on; or is there some other type of facility planned for the area?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I believe we dealt with that item when we were discussing it previously. I informed the honourable members of the fact that the proposals would be called for the development of facilities. If the honourable members wish to take exception to that or to offer some other direction, fine, but I believe I have adequately described the action that the government intends to take.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I understood the Minister to say precisely what he just repeated to us now. My question is one of further explanation on that objective of the government. Are they planning to request proposals to do something with the existing facility and if so, what? What are they planning to do with the existing facility? There must be some plan or objective in mind, I mean, you don't just say, all and sundry give us all your ideas and suggestions with respect to this facility. Surely the Minister and his department have devised some objective to put in terms of a tender or a proposal call to interested individuals, and who exactly are they planning to invite to tender on such a proposal? Will this be an open public tender available to anyone to make a bid on a facility or will only certain interested specified individuals, as yet unnamed, be requested to provide tender information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (a)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are entitled to know what the department's objectives are with respect to this site. I mean, people in the area I am sure would be interested to know if the government is planning to re-establish a hotel in the park; or the people who frequent park in Grand Beach would be interested to know what the government's plans are with respect to that particular facility. And I would like to know what procedures the Minister is going to follow in following his announcement that he will be calling for some type of tenders or proposals.

MR. RANSOM: When the prospectus is prepared, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to provide a copy to the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I think one of the reasons why the Minister is getting a lot of questions on this is that as MLAs we get a lot of questions raised to us by members of the Grand Beach Campers Association. I am pretty sure the Minister must have received their submission; I am pretty sure he must have looked at some of their questions asking what is going to happen to Grand Beach. Is it going to be upgraded as a provincial recreational facility? Because although there is a tendency to always photograph the dunes early in the springtime and use those photographs for all our our tourist brochures, halfway through the year, you find that the sand is not looked after. It is not looked after in the way that the beaches that are far worse in natural terms are looked after in other places like Falcon Lake. The people there feel that the reason why

there is a decline in the maintenance of Grand Beach is that generally medium and lower-income people use it, and far more people use it than use any other public facility and they feel discriminated against. The government isn't doing anything. There have been plans there for some time now with respect to a golf course, with respect to other recreational facilities. I think that the government should come forward now to say whether in fact it is launching some major development project for Grand Beach Provincial Park.

I think the Minister would have to admit, it probably on weekends gets more people there visiting it than the rest of the provincial parks combined, on weekends. If in fact it has that type of clientele, if in fact it is that popular, surely it is incumbent on the government to do a bit more and to be much more positive in terms of coming forward with what it is going to do.

There have been a number of people who have come forward over the last years asking specifically if they could have purchased that hotel. It was never clear from the government as to what prices they were going to charge. A lot of people who wanted to buy it privately felt that they should not have to pay the \$14,000 mortgage on it. --(Interjection)-- Well, why would they have to pay a mortgage for something that in fact couldn't meet its taxes. If it was a private piece of property, it would be sold as a tax sale and you wouldn't be talking about paying off some mortgage. You could have put the sale up, you could have put the land up for tax arrears and someone would have come along and purchased that, I am quite certain.

Right now, we have a situation where, for some reason, the government did pay off \$14,000 in a way that they can't justify and the people are going to be concerned, those people who in fact came forward, and I think the Minister must have in his files, or his Deputy would have in his files, or the Assistant Deputy would have in his files, names of people who indeed did come forward asking if they could put in a bid for that hotel and asking what the government was looking for in terms of clearing it off. The government at that stage was quite confused and it kept saying, "We have this mortgage; we have to in fact pay off those people who lost money on this venture in the first place."

The point is, and that raises the question: Was there any type of connection between the people holding the mortgage and the government? --(Interjection)-- You know, we have this little boy who has been elevated into a Minister of Highways; he is trying desperately to be a little boy, and he is succeeding. We are in fact talking about expenditure of public money. If the Minister of Highways wants to make fun of that, that's fair enough; that's his prerogative, because the people at Grand Beach don't think that these types of things are that funny. In the summertime when the people are at Grand Beach and they see the Lady Selkirk floating around 300 yards off-shore, with a whole bunch of people sitting on the decks of the Lady Selkirk, drinking booze and diving off the boat and swimming around and they start asking whose boat is that, and we say, "That was a public facility at one time but it's not longer a public facility because this government sold that boat to its friends at a ridiculously low price," they don't laugh about it at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We are swaying off the topic under discussion, which is Natural Resources.

MR. PARASIUK: Precisely. I believe that parks and recreational facilities fall entirely under this appropriation, and the boat used to be a public recreational facility, as was the hotel. It is part of the park system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Be seated, please. I made mention that the topic under discussion is Natural Resources, and the remark that I made to the honourable member was anything pertaining to Natural Resources I have allowed to be debated. The part of the debate that I had made mention, concerning the Lady Selkirk, is not under this department.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I believe that the item, Parks, is under this department; is that correct? We are talking about facilities in the park; we are talking about a hotel in a park, which is a public recreational facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you are taking a great latitude, to the honourable member. I don't find a comparison.

MR. PARASIUK: I believe it is possible to talk about recreational facilities that have in fact been alienated from the public domain, under Parks, because it was the express policy that the Lord Selkirk and the Lady Selkirk in fact be public recreational facilities under the domain of Parks. There was a contract arranged between the Parks Department and Manitoba Development Corporation regarding the Lord Selkirk and regarding the Lady Selkirk.

I raise this point, Mr. Chairperson, because the Minister of Highways kept saying that alienating these public facilities from the public domain, to him, if we raised complaints about it, was somehow hitting below the belt. I was pointing out to the Minister of Highways that the people in that area who use that facility, who feel that it should be upgraded, are terribly disappointed when they see something like the Lady Selkirk floating offshore that has been alienated from their use, and alienated from their use in a questionable manner. Then when you look at something like the Grandome, their suspicions are increased because precedents have in fact been set. --(Interjection)-- Well, if the Minister of Highways wants to say that the sale of a boat for \$18,000 is a slanderous accusation, he is completely wrong. There was a contract established between the Parks Department and the Manitoba Development Corporation regarding public recreational facilities, and the Grandome is another one, and the people there are asking what is going on. Why is it when some of them went forward to check out the Grandome to see if they might be able to purchase it, they in fact were told that there was a \$14,000 mortgage that they had to pay off and they felt that was unfair and unwarranted and they didn't proceed.

We have in fact asked the Minister for justification of that and he hasn't been able to provide it; he hasn't been able to provide it. And the Minister of Highways wants to keep speaking from his seat on this matter. --(Interjection)-- It's a source of intelligence, I'm told by one of my colleagues. Frankly, from his comments, I am starting to believe that. --(Interjection)-- Not at all. If the Minister of Highways wants to partake in the discussion, he possibly could, but I don't think he would probably have anything to add unless, in fact, he was involved in this particular case.

The point is that the people at that place feel that there has been confusion over the last three years as to what is going to happen with some of those public facilities. They are confused right now with whether in fact the approach is going to be a public approach or a private approach, and right now, when my colleague asks, "What type of development proposals are we talking about?" the Minister says, "When we develop a prospectus, we will let you know." Is the public going to take the lead in this development or is it going to be private development and, if so, on what grounds, because those are the questions we're going to be asked.

This is our opportunity to ask those questions and the Minister isn't in a position to answer them. And, Mr. Chairperson, when we ask some of these questions in question period and we want some detailed answers, we are told that we should use estimates as the process whereby we should get those detailed answers. So that's what I'm trying to do. I'm just trying to ask the Minister if he has dealt with the questions put forward to him by the Grand Beach Campers' Association; if in fact he has notified them and other people that the Grandome Hotel, in fact, will be developed by the province; if this means that the overall recreational facility at Grand Beach will be developed? Those are fairly simple straightforward questions and I'm wondering if the Minister is in a position to answer them.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have seldom been treated to such a display of self-righteous hypocrisy as has just been put forward by the Member for Transcona. For over four years, Mr. Chairman, for over four years they had that burned-out hotel in the park. They had proposals put forward to them by their own Management Committee. The Member for Transcona was a senior bureaucrat in the operation at those times. They did nothing, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, the Minister of Natural Resources said that I was a senior member of the operation, he said Management Committee. I was never a member of Management Committee and I think the Minister should get his facts straight.

MR. RANSOM: The Member for Transcona was at the time a senior bureaucrat in the operation, that those members were running as government in the four years that they allowed that facility to remain in a burned-out condition in Grand Beach Park. He now comes in here and says, the people are asking questions, what are you going to do with that problem? We resolved the problem, or we're moving towards resolving the problem, Mr. Chairman, and they stand up and say, I'm suspicious. We let it sit for four years. We did nothing about it. But I'm suspicious now that someone else should move to settle for \$14,500 on a recommendation that was made in April of 1977.

Mr. Chairman, I don't recall that the Progressive Conservatives were in government in April of 1977. Now if that's the kind of recommendation that was being made by civil servants in the government when those members opposite were in power, then I can't be responsible for that. And if he wants to say that he's suspicious, fine. We've heard them express their suspicions about candidates running in Rupertsland. We've heard allegations made that those members couldn't back up. They've never been able to back up one of their allegations yet, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Transcona says people want an opportunity to purchase it. He said that if they didn't have to pay the \$14,500, they would have paid the taxes. The taxes were \$76,000, Mr. Chairman. Can you imagine why someone would be prepared to pay the back taxes of \$76,000 but say that they couldn't deal with the \$14,500 that was necessary to clear the titles to the property, in order that something can be done? Mr. Chairman, that doesn't make sense at all. When I say that that's a display of self-righteous hypocrisy that hasn't been equalled in the review of these estimates so far, then I mean it and I'll put it on the record again. And when that problem is entirely cleared up and we're able to get the prospectus put out as to what kinds of developments we want to see take place, then we'll provide the honourable members opposite with that information, and we won't have let another four years go by with a burned-out hulk of a hotel remaining in one of our park facilities. If that's the way they wanted to manage their parks, then they should put their program before the people.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister put the question, "who would be stupid to pay \$76,000 in arrears on somebody else's taxes." Mr. Chairman, we found out who would be stupid to do that because he told us that's what he did, Mr. Chairman. That is correct. That is a correct analysis. There isn't anyone else that is stupid enough to do it except this Minister; \$14,000 in favour of someone who knew he could never collect a penny, Mr. Chairman. Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes. I don't believe that the cheque has gone to the municipality yet, Mr. Chairman. Would the honourable member recommend that we not make that settlement with the municipality?

A MEMBER: Good recommendation, Sammy.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows full well that the municipality had recourse against that asset if they wanted to use it. I don't know whether that asset has any value. My presumption is that it has none. That's my presumption. On the basis of that, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why this Minister would pay \$14,000 for it. That puzzles me. He did explain in his earlier comments, Mr. Chairman, that he wanted to bail out the municipality and that was a

discretionary decision that he made. But, Mr. Chairman, wherein lies his judgement on \$14,000 for a facility that's worth nothing that nobody else would buy? In his own words, Mr. Chairman, he said it was not saleable. But somehow he found it within the wisdom of his department to spend \$14,000 of people's money in favour of someone who held a mortgage on that piece of property and could never realize on it, Mr. Chairman. That, Mr. Chairman, leaves much to be desired and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is room for an enquiry to determine just what the connections are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet doesn't seem to wish to answer, of course he doesn't have to answer because it's not his estimates that are being examined. But I believe the record will show that, Mr. Chairman. He doesn't wish to accept the statement that I have made in terms of the recommendation from the Attorney-General's department to proceed with the settlement, a recommendation that was made in April of 1977, before we even came into government. All the honourable member wants to do is cast further unfounded, baseless allegations against the government, the same as some of the other allegations have been made during the review of these estimates, and when the members have been challenged to substantiate their allegations, they've been unable to do so.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's rather amusing. It's the Minister who said that he was going to buy this defunct facility in order that it may be made possible for him to interest some new entrepreneur in re-establishing this facility so that there might be a potential for some service to be provided to people that visit the park. Then he went on to say, Mr. Chairman, that there isn't a soul that would be interested on the basis of having to pay \$14,000 for a burnt building and on the basis of having to pay the arrears of taxes, arrears that should be paid by people who are operating the facility. Mr. Chairman, within the \$76,000, some of those arrears are not even arrears on the building tax, they are arrears on business tax during the time that the business was in fact in operation, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister wants to hide behind the fact he's benevolent to the municipality and, therefore, this should get him off the hook with respect to why he should have paid Mr. Micay \$14,000 and why he should absolve all the responsible people of their financial obligations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Sports and Recreation.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I just want to very briefly commend the Minister for his actions. When I took over the particular department in the fall of '77 this was one of the nagging problems. Mr. Chairman, I don't mind saying I have received many letters from citizens in the area, as well as cottage owners and people in the area. They said, "Why is this facility sitting there rotting, why can't you do something about it?" We went ahead and asked the department officials to put something together. They said they had been trying to solve the problem for the last four or five years and nothing had been arrived at. If the Minister has been able to clean up the thing for \$14,000, and that we at least now have a hope of something happening out there and settle up the problems we had with the municipality on this particular thing, I think it's well worthwhile. It's one of these festering things that has happened that needed to have some resolution. Otherwise the facility would have just sat there and we would not had any control over it and the municipality would have kept on having problems with it, as well as people who are going out there. So I hope that the Minister now, finally, after all these years getting control of the facility we will be able to either interest somebody or clean up the facility so that it isn't an eyesore out there and isn't standing vacant.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Minister alleges that he is going out of his way in order to provide some tax relief or financial relief to the Municipality of St. Clements. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the government made a

decision to withdraw certain areas from school taxation throughout the province and this happens to be one of those areas. As I understand it, to make it consistent throughout the province and I'm not sure if it is completely so, but that's his rationale for doing it. Now he is trying to threaten the opposition that if we question him he is going to withdraw payment to the municipality. --(Interjection)-- Yes, that's what he was saying, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what he's saying, Mr. Chairman, and therefore he is threatening the municipality on the basis of questions that are put to him and that he doesn't like to answer, that they will be treated differently than other municipalities with respect to school taxation. That's really what he's saying. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to him that he re-examine his thoughts on that one.

The obvious fact is that the Minister chose to pay one Mr. Micay \$14,000 and it's \$14,000 more than anyone else is prepared to put up for that burnt-out facility. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept his rationale for doing it if he would agree - and he hasn't said he would agree - to table with us the recommendations that he has received from the Attorney-General's Department. It may very well be that we would concur with them, Mr. Chairman, but he has refused to agree to give us that information. On the basis of that, Mr. Chairman, then I don't know how he can expect anything but criticism from this side. There has to be something wrong with that decision if the Minister is not prepared to table the evidence as the basis for his decision as provided by the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get on to one more subject before we proceed further to the next department and that has to do with the Minister's role in the area of Dutch elm disease control. The Minister is perhaps aware that there is a wood-cutting operation under way in the East Selkirk community, part of the CIL property and part of the public properties as I understand it. I would like to ask the Minister just what does the project involve? Where are these trees being hauled away to and how are they disposed of, Mr. Chairman? There is a project under way at the moment and I happened to notice a number of piles of logs in the area. As I understand the environment attitude on it is that they should be burnt and that they shouldn't be transported and so on. So I would like the Minister to indicate just what is the plan with respect to the disposition of trees that are infected with Dutch elm disease.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members have further detailed questions of that nature they could put them on the record. I'll answer those that I happen to have information available with which to answer at the moment and the rest I'll be happy to provide them with the answers later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I want to ask the Minister, since he's prepared to pay \$76,000 in back taxes to St. Clements municipality, if he's now in a position to commit his department to deal with the outstanding matter relating to some \$60,000 - I think it might even be more now - in back taxes owed Springfield municipality and really owed Transcona-Springfield School Division. They are owed that amount of money in back taxes by the concessionaire in Birds Hill Provincial Park. There is a dispute brewing between the school district and the school division and the municipality on this item. Right now the school division is in a situation where it's thinking of suing the municipality and I think the matter could be solved if the province has established a policy of clearing up these back taxes that are owed municipalities by private entrepreneurs who are operating a facility in provincial parks. I'm wondering now if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether his department will deal with this particular matter which is surely as pressing as the Grand Beach one.

MR. RANSOM: It's already been dealt with, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PARASIUK: Glad to hear that, could the Minister indicate how it's been dealt with. Has the money been paid in fact?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member has a number of questions that he wishes to place, perhaps then he would place them and I'll deal with them in groups, as it were.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I think this question arose in the course of the answers given by the Minister to questions posed by my colleague the Member for Lac du Bonnet and I think that when he said that he's in a position to pay \$76,000 in back taxes to St. Clements, I think it is a fair and a reasonable question to ask if the Minister is in a position now to pay the back taxes owed the municipality of Springfield and the back taxes owed the school division of Transcona-Springfield? It is a pressing problem. It's been bandied back and forth now, I think, for about two years. The Minister says it's been dealt with and I'm asking him - well this is what I've come across as an MLA. The Minister keeps laughing and raising points that might have existed beforehand. I am a Member of the Legislature now and I'm in a position to ask those questions of the Minister in the estimates process. They are his responsibility and he is accountable for them. He says he's dealt with them. Let him tell us how he's dealt with that particular problem. This is my opportunity in estimates process to find out about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass; (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, on the issue that was raised by my colleague, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I believe I recall when we were discussing this during the estimates process, that the Minister indicated he had recommendations in writing from the Attorney-General's Department regarding his decision on the hotel facility in the Grand Beach Park and that he possibly could make this documentation available to us. I wonder if he has that documentation available to table with us tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have advised the Honourable Member for Inkster and other members of the House as to the nature of the recommendation that we received from the Attorney-General's Department and I undertook to further review it with the Attorney-General and I am sure that we will provide whatever kind of substantiation of the position as is required. As I said, there is a long history and I outlined that this afternoon.

The issue with Birds Hill, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting again to hear the Honourable Member for Transcona refer to an issue of the last couple of years. This is another of those situations, Mr. Chairman, where the back taxes go back to 1974 and it was only through the action of our government that we have arrived at an agreement with the municipality to withdraw it from the park and to bring the back taxes up to date.

MR. BOSTROM: On another question, Mr. Chairman, which I believe the Minister should be able to answer. I would just like to get a comment from him on his recruitment process. I recall during the estimates that we had requested the Minister to indicate how they had proceeded to recruit, select and appoint a Director of Parks. And I notice in his information to the House that he has over the past year or so appointed a new Director of Fisheries, an Executive Director of Operations, a Director of Regional Services, and also an Assistant Deputy Minister. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there were competitions for any of those positions and if so, if the Civil Service Commission was involved in the process of recruitment, selection, and appointment, or if some other process was used.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I know that we've been on the estimates for some time now but surely the honourable members will recall that these items were thoroughly discussed earlier on in the estimates review.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I can thoroughly recall the estimates process and these questions were not directed to the Minister and I am simply asking him

what process he used in the recruitment, selection, and appointment of the positions of Director of Fisheries, Executive Director of Operations, the Director of Regional Services, and the Assistant Deputy Minister. The position we specifically discussed during the estimates was the director of parks and we received answers on that but not on the ones I am posing at this time.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Minister is entitled to not answer. I think the record should show that he is refusing to answer how the government goes about the recruitment, selection and appointment of senior officers within the government. These are new appointments. In order to make some of these appointments, the incumbents had to be moved out, either dismissed or moved over to other positions, so I would think that the Minister could answer at least how the government goes about their business.

As far as the Minister's general comments tonight in his discussion of parks and his response to members on this side and our questions of him, and he talks about hypocrisy; well, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that this government and this Minister certainly are bordering on the charge of hypocrisy regarding park policy, when during the election campaign in both resources and parks they were certainly proclaiming that they were going to bring about policies that were in keeping with what people in Manitoba wanted to have.

I recall having a discussion during the election campaign when the Minister was present talking about resource policy, and as we learned during the estimates process over the period of time that we have been discussing this department, we find that, after two-and-a-half years of Progressive Conservative government, there are still no definite plans to present to the people of Manitoba as to the government's intentions regarding the Whiteshell Park, and that's at least two years after the condominium proposal that was discussed in here when the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was the Minister responsible for this department.

And as I reminded the Minister, people are still concerned about this topic, still very much concerned about it and the government still has nothing definite to propose to the people of Manitoba other than a study is under way and it will come about some time later on. Mr. Chairman, that, after two-and-a-half years of Progressive Conservative government, is simply not good enough if they think that they are going to continue on without having policies to present to the people of Manitoba with respect to park development. If we're looking at the facility at the Grand Beach Park in particular, Mr. Chairman, this is, as the Minister described, a facility which was not successful when the former owners, a number of them had it under their jurisdiction, it was a bankrupt business that could not even pay its bills to the municipality, and now the Minister is talking about re-establishing the operation in some form.

I might point out to the Minister that as far as the people in that area are concerned and many of the people that frequent the park that I talked to, they are not of the opinion that a hotel facility should be re-established in the Grand Beach Park. The hotel facility that was there before caused a number of problems, one of the more serious problems within the park on a day-to-day management basis is the drinking problem in the campgrounds and a general rowdiness in the park during the heavy-use periods.

Mr. Chairman, the people in that area and the people that frequent the park would not be happy to hear that the Minister and his department are considering re-establishing a hotel facility, if that's their purpose. I would point out also, Mr. Chairman, that since that hotel was operating and has ceased to operate in the Grand Beach Park, there is another facility that has been established down the road from the Grand Beach Park, namely, near the community of Victoria Beach. There is a new hotel facility there which I might point out to the Minister, is not doing that well; that one could reasonably expect that another operation could be feasible in that general area. There is simply not room in that general area for two hotel facilities.

So if the Minister is considering putting together a prospectus to send out to potential investors, I would suggest to him that the objective that his department should be following is not one of re-establishing a hotel facility in the Grand

Beach Park. If they are considering some other restaurant or service facility on the location, that may be desirable and feasible, but certainly a full beverage room type facility is neither desirable nor feasible.

As far as the Minister's comments regarding allegations about Abitibi, Mr. Chairman, the plain facts are that the charges which have been made with respect to the kind of agreement that this government and this Minister has signed with that company have not been refuted by this government. They have not been able to refute those charges because, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this government is guilty of signing an agreement with a company, which is neither desirable for the people of Manitoba, nor desirable for the people of that area. The agreement is such that it reduces the revenues over a 20-year period to the people of Manitoba, at the same time giving control over the management of our forest resources in the area to a private company, which is an irresponsible action on the part of the government. It is an abdication of government responsibility to manage the resources for all the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there is no apparent economic reason for the government to have signed this type of agreement with that company, giving them a lower rate of royalties and at the same time, more control over the resources over a larger area of Manitoba because, Mr. Chairman, they didn't require the company to provide any guarantee of increase in employment or any assurance that they are going to do any new capital investment in Manitoba. Those are two of the excuses that are usually used by Progressive Conservative governments in rationalizing gifts to corporations like this. But in this case, Mr. Chairman, there can appear to be no other reason for the Minister and his government signing the agreement than to pay off a political debt to Abitibi.

I can point out to the Minister that it is certainly on a good basis that that kind of a charge on my part can be made. At a meeting in 1975 in the Manitou Lodge, at which time I met with the directors of the Abitibi Paper Company, one of their directors, in conversation with me, admitted that their objective was to defeat the New Democratic Party government, and he said to me point-blank, Mr. Chairman, and I quote him, "Next time we're going to beat you." There is no clearer indication than that, that a director of Abitibi was out to defeat the New Democratic Party government. Mr. Chairman, their objective clearly was to elect a Conservative government. Mr. Chairman, they have been well paid for their efforts, because over the 20-year agreement that this Minister and this government has signed with Abitibi, it will mean many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars in savings on royalties to the Abitibi Paper Company, as well as the other objective which they had in mind, which the government gave them, more control over the resources in the area.

Mr. Chairman, they were not successful in upseating the MLA for Rupertsland. They may have been successful in providing financing to the Conservative Party, but they certainly didn't influence the election in that particular area of the province. It wasn't for want of trying, however.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's handling of the proposed changes in the fishing licences demonstrates the competence of the Minister in handling resources licensing where he has to deal with a client group of his department. He seems to be fine in dealing with a major corporation like Abitibi where the decisions are made behind closed doors, but when it comes to dealing with individual people in the province of Manitoba that are the small businessmen in Manitoba, in this case the fishermen in Manitoba, his handling of these proposed changes in policy and regulations has been a disaster. He has lost credibility in the eyes of the fishermen and even in light of the best example of his lack of credibility and a lack of support, in fact, the direct example of the fishermen's opposition to this should be obvious to the Minister; the federal election should have shown him that his policy in this regard is a disaster politically for his party. A number of federal seats were certainly influenced by this Minister's disastrous handling of this proposed fishing licensing policy.

Even with that information, however, this Minister seems content to continue with some kind of fishing licensing policy along the same lines as he originally proposed to the fishermen. Even in light of the fishermen's almost unanimous opposition to this and the fact that the proposed policy of the Progressive Conservative Minister, in this case, was so completely rebuffed by the areas of Manitoba that could be influenced by fishermen during the last federal election, he seems

to want to continue and implement some type of policy that resembles the original one which he has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I said during the estimates that I believe the Minister should pull back on that policy and go back to the fishermen, either directly himself or through his staff, to discuss with the fishermen the kind of policy and regulation changes that they want to see, not something that is dreamt up by his and his Cabinet colleagues behind closed doors.

The Minister's handling of the wildlife resource in our province, as symbolized by his handling of the polar bear issue, certainly demonstrates another case where the Minister and the government's credibility has been seriously questioned. When he was questioned on this issue in the Legislature by a number of my colleagues, he refused to acknowledge that this decision on his part was a mistake. I believe he should have admitted that it was a mistake and he should have explicitly stated that this type of experiment will not be allowed in the future.

If we look at this issue in relationship to the management of wildlife of Manitoba as a whole, I believe that the Minister's credibility with respect to the handling of wildlife management in other areas is called into question. Certainly his reputation as an ombudsman for wildlife in the province of Manitoba has been seriously questioned. People will be asking what he will do next time he has a serious decision like this to make. If there is a doubt as to the safety for the resource, will the Minister give the doubt to the resource, in favor of the resource, or will he, as he did in this case, give that doubt over to the bureaucrats and the so-called experts that were supposed to be advising him?

We look at the reorganization of the department, Mr. Chairman, and we discussed this during the estimates last night, the reorganization that has come to our attention and that the Minister has in fact admitted, resembles the fishing licence proposals in that people in the middle management and field level of his department, I'm sure, feel something like the fishermen in Manitoba in that proposals for reorganization were simply foisted upon them without any discussion or any kind of consultation to see if the structures that the Minister is proposing were suitable for the kind of work and efforts that the field level of the department have to carry out. Mr. Chairman, even during the recruitment process it was so badly handled that five of the applicants for four positions had appealed the decision to the Civil Service Commission and the information we have is that is just one example of the deterioration in morale in this Minister's department.

Mr. Chairman, if the government handles their reorganization and continues to handle this reorganization like they handled the fishery licence proposal, it's safe to assume the Minister will have some serious morale problems in the department in the future. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in a copy of a letter which a conservation officer sent to the Minister, which was also sent to the opposition, the conservation officer commented as follows and I quote from the letter "For the first time in two decades fear of loss of employment was coupled with attempted totalitarianism".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a Point of Order.

MR. RANSOM: I believe that the honourable member is quoting from a letter and I wonder if there is a signature on the letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would hope that the honourable member would have a signature on the letter when he has made the quote.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to a letter a copy of which was sent to the Minister and a copy of which was sent to the opposition. The letter was signed "A Concerned Conservation Officer". Mr. Chairman, in the body of the letter the conservation officer in question explained why he or she was not prepared to sign the letter and it's because of the kind of reorganizational activity that was carried on within the department.

Obviously the conservation officer in question was intimidated by the whole process and in the letter - it was a very eloquent letter - it was appealing to the Minister to check out the facts that were proposed in the letter. He was appealing to the Minister, in fact he sent a copy of his letter to the Premier, requesting that certain allegations that were made in the letter be checked out

with senior officials in the department and the problem that was identified during the estimates process with respect to the recruitment of people within the department. It was appealed by four senior members of the department. That was mentioned in the letter as well. In fact, that was one of the central problems outlined in that letter. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from the information in that letter and other information that's come to our attention that there is definitely a morale problem within the department.

Apparently the Minister's handling of the reorganization process has made many long-service public servants feel that they are being ignored in the reorganization of their department, just like the fishermen were ignored in the proposals for fishing licensing regulations in Manitoba and, Mr. Chairman, there is no better way to undermine the morale of a department if one does not show some measure of respect for those that are working within the department in any kind of a reorganization process like this.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister should be taking a careful look at that and ensuring that there is proper consultation and proper discussion with the department when reorganization is taking place. I think that one of the main changes in the direction of the department that the Minister has made and that the Progressive Conservative government has made, which has affected people in the resource areas of Manitoba, is that this government and this minister and his predecessors in this department have changed the direction of the department. The New Democratic Party government had directed the Department of Resources to be a development-oriented department, one that would assist resource base communities in northern Manitoba, particularly those that were facing high levels of unemployment, to work toward developing the resources around their communities for the benefit of the community's employment potential.

Mr. Chairman, in every area that we have examined in these estimates and in other departmental estimates, the government has either cut out completely or reduced any programs that were designed to assist in that process of resource development. In almost every case, Mr. Chairman, there has been almost a complete elimination or a very serious deterioration in the level of support for resource development programs. Mr. Chairman, the development orientation of the department has been changed to one of being a reaction department.

In other words, if a community is interested in resource development, at the present time they must call the department and maybe if they have the resources someone will go in to meet with them. Mr. Chairman, the experience of the communities over the last couple of years has been dismal in that respect and when they call the department for assistance, very little assistance of any kind is given. On the important side of that question, Mr. Chairman, in the area of being able to assist those communities, not only from a technical point of view but from a financial point of view, to do resource development the programs that were in place to assist in that process are no longer there, they are longer there.

Mr. Chairman, the department has changed its thrust from one of a development oriented department to one of being simply a policeman and a so-called guardian of resources. It is obvious that the Minister's priority is with the companies like Abitibi and it is certainly not with the small business person that is involved in the forest industry or in the fishing industry or in other resource-based industries.

If we look at northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister and his colleagues were presented today with a proposal submission of the 3M Committee on Unemployment in Manitoba, and this was presented to the government of Manitoba and the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Northern Affairs. In that document, Mr. Chairman, the 3M Committee of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, Manitoba Metis Federation, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour presented statistics showing the serious unemployment problem in northern Manitoba and it is something that we have been trying to impress on this government. It is something that in every department that we have talked about. Where there is a potential to assist in the development of jobs and opportunities in these communities, we have been pressing this point, and, Mr. Chairman, the overall results from the government in working with these communities and helping them have been very very dismal.

Mr. Chairman, the document which was presented to the government shows clearly that there is a massive unemployment problem in northern Manitoba, that there is

approximately 45 percent of the labour force is unemployed, approximately 45 percent; and that a large proportion of that unemployed labour force is forced to exist on welfare from the federal and provincial levels of government. And that welfare assistance, Mr. Chairman, amounts to many millions of dollars. For the fiscal year 1978-79 the federal expenditures for on-reserve assistance just in the northern region of the province amounted to \$7,625,000.00. The provincial expenditures in the NorMan region and in the Thompson region combined, were \$3.5 million, for a total of \$11.1 million in welfare expenditures. Mr. Chairman, we'll be shortly getting into the Minister of Health's estimates where we can examine this problem more carefully.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Manpower and the Minister of Resources are not taking action in assisting these communities to create employment opportunities for themselves through resource development, then the one that has to pick up the slack is the Minister of Health, Mr. Chairman, or perhaps it's Community Services now. But, Mr. Chairman, the money must be paid out in the way of straight welfare grants to people and the people that made this presentation to the government emphasized to the government, as we've been emphasizing to the government, that these people want to have employment. They don't want these handouts from the government. Even if some of these resources, some of these welfare funds were made available to these communities in the way of assisting them in resource development, that would be a step forward.

But what do we see, Mr. Chairman? We see the Communities Economic Development Fund cut back. We see the SNEP program practically eliminated, which was to assist northern communities in employment projects related to resource development. We see the Minister of Resources and the Minister of Manpower cut back on all those programs that were to assist communities in developing employment opportunities; and at the same time, Mr. Chairman, this document points out that there's some \$15 million, almost \$16 million paid out in that fiscal year, 1978-79 in unemployment insurance premiums - almost \$16 million, \$15,935,000.00. So, Mr. Chairman, this is a shocking situation. In any other place in Canada or in Manitoba a 45 percent unemployment rate would be cause for crisis action on the part of government, and yet this government seems to sit on its hands and do nothing about the situation except pay out the welfare dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the 3M committee recommended to the government that they establish programs to assist communities in resource development, as we have been pressing this government to do since they were first elected. But Mr. Chairman, it's obvious to us that those words fall on deaf ears when you talk to the Minister of Resources, you talk to the Minister of Manpower, you talk to the Minister of Health or any of these Ministers; you talk to the First Minister, he's more inclined to tell them to eat cake or something. There's certainly no concrete action on the part of the Progressive Conservative government to do anything about the serious unemployment problem in these northern communities. These communities have resources, they have timber resources, they have fishery resources, they have wild rice resources, they have fur resources, and Mr. Chairman, this government has taken the position that all they're going to do is supply some technical assistance at best, and some long distance advice, without taking any serious effort to get into those communities and actually assist them in the field at developing that resource, developing viable resource-based industries in those communities to take up some of this slack in the unemployment picture in the northern communities.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we can feel very confident at all that this government intends to do anything in that area. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think that the only way in which there's going to be any action taken on the unemployment problem in these communities and in other areas of Manitoba where there is a problem of unemployment, is to replace this government, to change the government. Mr. Chairman, many of the northern communities have, I think, seriously and conscientiously tried to work with this government. They have said to me in discussions that I have had with them over the last couple of years, we want to give them a chance, let's see what they're going to do. But Mr. Chairman, they've given them a chance for two and a half years, and they've seen nothing but deterioration in all the programs that were important to them. They have seen the incredible disastrous handling of the fishing policy by this Minister of Resources, and they have absolutely given up hope. They have stopped getting on

the Canada Manpower list for employment. They have stopped looking for work; they have thrown up their hands in despair, because they feel that this government is simply not interested in them.

Mr. Chairman, the only option they have, and they're beginning to realize that more and more clearly all the time, the only option they have if they want to progress, if they want to develop their resources, if they want to improve their employment picture in those communities and their opportunities for employment even outside the communities in other areas, they have to replace this government. And they showed that, Mr. Chairman, in the last two federal elections. The prospects for the Conservatives in northern Manitoba and in the northern rural areas of Manitoba became dimmer and dimmer. In fact, the federal Conservative member who was the incumbent in 1974, dropped to third place in the election of 1980. Mr. Chairman, in the space of six years, thanks to this government, as I'm prompted by my colleague from The Pas, thanks to this government, the prospects for the New Democratic Party picked up considerably in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, somebody said on my left, the Member for Kildonan, don't tell them, they may smarten up. I don't think there's much fear of that, Mr. Chairman. In fact, as responsible MLAs representing that area, we sincerely hope that the government does smarten up and does attempt to assist those communities to develop their resources and to improve their opportunities. But, Mr. Chairman, we, as the members of those communities, have to realize that the possibility of that happening, the possibility of that kind of conversion taking place . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. BOSTROM: . . . is very limited. Very limited. Mr. Chairman, I'm winding up my remarks, I won't need the five minutes. I realize honourable members opposite don't like to hear these things, so I think that we have made our case and I believe that the lesson is there for the Conservative government to learn if they want to learn. But, Mr. Chairman, they are very slow learners, and even when slapped in the face with the last federal election results, the government still does not appear to be learning very much, and in fact the Minister of Labour and Manpower tonight on television said, well, if somebody in the north wants a job let them go to the mine. Mr. Chairman, that Minister and this government isn't doing very much to assist those people in that activity. They're not assisting them very much to relocate, to assist them to fill the jobs that are available in northern Manitoba. That would be a useful objective of this government but they're not doing it. And, Mr. Chairman, that is, I think, a serious condemnation of them and they will pay for it dearly in the next provincial election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I have but one question. In listening to the earlier debate, I would like to understand, if the Minister would perhaps explain, is it the case that what the government now has established, if someone in my constituency should have the misfortune of having a fire in an apartment block that the government is making a commitment to pick up the shortfall of the insurance, and should there be any taxes owing on that property, that the government is undertaking to pick up the shortfall of insurance and pay the arrears in taxes?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if the property is within a provincial park and if we need the property for the development of the park and if the previous administration before us had been ignoring it for four years, yes.

MR. BOYCE: I don't see the case of it being in a provincial park. It may well be one of the condominiums that's being developed by Jarmoc or something else, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the earlier debate, I was following it quite closely because I was interested in the precedent which was established, and I really don't know what the passage of three years does to bad advice. It's not incumbent upon the Minister to take bad advice unless there is something in the Attorney-General's report which brings in some nuances which we

haven't covered in debate. And the Member for Lac du Bonnet raised the question, would the Minister share with us the advice of the Attorney-General's office, upon which he is now basing a precedent, and I suggest it is a dangerous precedent, because if we go back to the first instances the province owns all land, albeit held under Torrens Title.

So it may be, in the Minister's choice of words in responding to my question, that he doesn't take my question seriously; but it is a serious question because it is, with the information that I have before me at the present time, a dangerous precedent, that the government is undertaking to pay to a private individual a shortfall in insurance and tax arrears. That's the principle which is being established by the Minister's actions. Now it may well be that there is legal nuances which haven't been covered, so to clarify this point, perhaps the Minister would undertake to table in this House the recommendation of the Attorney-General in this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.--pass; Resolution 100--pass; The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Back to that burned out hotel in Grand Beach, it would seem to me that there ought to have been a rental agreement entered into between the Crown and the individuals who constructed that particular hotel. That rental agreement should have made provision for what happens when a hotel burns down. That rental agreement, it would seem to me, would have made provision for taking care of that property. So I'm just wondering exactly what this April of 1977 recommendation from the Attorney-General's Department was, and I'm wondering whether the Minister could provide us with a copy of that recommendation, as well as a copy of the lease agreement. It would seem to me that if the lease agreement is similar to other Crown leases, then that agreement would have had a provision under which the Crown could immediately cancel the lease on any provision of the lease not being kept up by the tenant. And if that is so, if this lease did have such a provision, then I am wondering why, in taking possession of this property, the Crown would have paid out \$14,000 to some other private individual. --(Interjection)-- Yes, plus taxes of course.

I am also wondering whether there was any appraisal done, and if so, whether we could be given a copy of that appraisal; and finally, wondering whether there are any criteria which this government has developed with respect to the acquisition of burnt-out hotels. I can think of another one at Powerview. It's been burnt-out for about three or four years, and possibly the owner of that hotel might be interested in precisely how this government goes about acquiring hotels.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Robert Anderson (Springfield): The Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I said a few words on this hotel and I guess it's maybe because I was wrestling with the problem for a year and a half and wasn't able to resolve it and this Minister wasn't, it causes me some concern, too.

I think one of the things that all the members over here should do is drive up to Grand Beach and have a look at the hotel, because that's what I did. Mr. Chairman, if you have a look at that hotel, you will see that it's a beautiful old structure. The part that burnt is separate from some of the motel units. What was happening was that there are a number of motel units that were sitting idle and that we couldn't touch and weren't being used, that have never been touched by fire, that weren't burnt. They were just standing there and virtually rotting for the last six or seven years. It is right along the boardwalk, if you walk there. The cottage owners in the area, as well as many of the people that went down there were concerned about the vandalism and the problems in that particular area.

I would say to the members opposite that one of the problems we have in our provincial parks system is that of precisely what we have been talking about here today, is the problems of the people who own motels, who own riding stables, who own these different facilities and have put in capital money and then go to the banks and try to borrow for those different facilities. What has happened is that the banks are relatively reluctant to loan the amount of money on those particular

facilities when you don't have title to the property. That's a real problem in all our provincial parks.

So what has happened here is we had Crown land, we had a main hotel area which burned, however, there were a number of units on the side which have been sitting empty for years and haven't been of benefit to anybody. If the Minister, by spending this \$14,000, has now got ownership of that particular property and can clear up the problem with the municipality, I think that's a step forward. I think that the members opposite have to realize that something had to be done to clean this thing up, and the Minister has done the responsible thing.

The problem of people running facilities in our provincial parks is one that has been growing over the last number of years, and I would like to urge the Minister, on a matter that is not related to this particular facility but related to other entrepreneurs within our park system, to have a look at the rental charges or the concession fees that are charged to owners that operate facilities within provincial parks. I believe there is something like a 3 percent charge above some of the other charges that are levied against the owners in provincial parks; the 3 percent is based on the sales volume of that particular individual and what happens is that when you are selling products like cigarettes, which has a very low mark-up, it really isn't worth their while to sell that particular thing if they have got to pay three cents.

MR. DESJARDINS: Lottery tickets.

MR. BANMAN: Lottery tickets. You have gasoline, which is now \$1.10, \$1.20 a gallon out there. You have a margin of 10 cents a gallon; if they have got to give the government 3 percent and a person happens to buy with a Chargex card and they've got to give the Chargex company another 3 percent, that leaves a very very small margin for them to operate.

We have to appreciate that the problem that these people face is that they can only operate two or three months of the year, and if they have some bad weather, they are in real trouble. I know in my own particular constituency out at Falcon Lake, which is one of the bigger and busier resort areas, the hotels in that particular area have really struggled and the major hotel in there right now is closed again because of the owners going bankrupt. It has become a real problem and I would urge the Minister to have a look at the fees levied against the different people who are operating these facilities in provincial parks. People have to work hard; there are a lot of dedicated people who work there with their families and it becomes pretty tough to etch out a living.

I think that the services that they provide in these particular resort areas are ones which all Manitobans enjoy and I would not like to see any policies established which curtail the sale of certain items which people would like to buy, just because the margins are, if I can use the term, marginal with regard to that.

So I say again that if the members opposite want to have a look at that hotel, have a look at it. You will see the dilemma that the previous administration was faced with, what we were faced with, and I think this is a compromise that has been arrived at and all Manitobans will benefit from that, because it is a problem that has been cleaned up and hopefully we can look forward to brighter days and some utilization, if not the removal of that eyesore from that area, which has caused the cottage owners in that area, as well as the vacationers, some hassle over the last number of years.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly agree that there are many operators in our provincial parks who are hard-working individuals and certainly there may be some ways of assisting them, as the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport has indicated.

However, what we are talking about here is the acquisition of a hotel which is not being utilized. Again, I'm not saying you shouldn't acquire that hotel; I'm not saying that all. What I am asking is: Was the hotel acquired at a reasonable price? In order for me to be able to determine that to my own satisfaction, I would like to see an Appraisal Report; I would like to see the rental agreement; I

would like to see what that rental agreement says; I would like to see the Appraisal Report, the recommendation from the Attorney-General's Department in 1977, which the Minister referred to.

It seems to me that when the hotel burned down, there was an insurance recovery to the owner and now the public of Manitoba winds up paying \$14,000 to a mortgage holder. Maybe that was perfectly reasonable, I don't know, but what we are trying to find out is whether it was reasonable. If that rental agreement was similar to other rental agreements entered into by the Crown with people who own cottages, then I would suggest that there was a breach of that agreement when the hotel was left in a dilapidated state over a period of years. At that point in time, the Crown had the right, the absolute right, to terminate that lease and there would have been no need to pay that \$14,000.00. I don't see any real reason for it, and if there was a reason, I would like the Minister to explain it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports, and I think that he tried to explain the concern. It doesn't mean that I necessarily agree with everything he said. I felt that he, as a former Minister responsible for Parks and so on, felt that he had a contribution, I guess it is only fair that somebody else that had that responsibility might have a contribution also.

My remarks won't be lengthy but, nevertheless, there are certain questions that I would like to ask.

The present Minister has a style all of his own, and he has a right; nobody should deny him that right. He is quite political, partisan, and every opportunity that he has, he takes advantage of it. Earlier, a couple of hours ago, he made the statement when he was queried, and he did that before the dinner hour also, which is fair game, he got up and thought that he would put somebody on the spot and said, "Well, I don't think that cheque has gone yet," which I don't really believe. Anyway, he said, "What would you do; would you ask us to withhold that cheque, to cancel that cheque?" Well, that is fair game, but it is also fair game and it is reasonable, because we are here, we have a certain responsibility. It seems that the government gets insulted if we mention certain things. We are doing our work, that's why we were elected. Whoever is in opposition, that's why there is an opposition, that's why you have a session once in awhile. I think it is good. It keeps everybody on their toes, or it should, and it helps to keep them honest also, and we have the right.

If the Minister wants to say - and I'm ready to accept this challenge - he wants to say, "Well, what would you do?" Then I think that we should have the same information that the Minister has, and apparently, it seems that this has been asked of him repeatedly and so far he has refused to give this information. We would like to be privy also to the recommendation made by the Department of the Attorney-General.

I think this is very important. My colleague also mentioned a lease. I think that we should also be given a copy of the lease. I think it is very important. My understanding is that when you have a lease, it works both ways. You have certain commitments to make. I know it was a problem; it was a problem during our time too and it's been a problem of long-standing. Nevertheless, if we are challenged to say what we would do, I think that we should be able to get the information and I would like to know what that lease says. You know, the description that we have of the government and this Minister, under Parks, it says: Provides for the establishment, planning, development and maintenance of a resource-based provincial park system for the healthful enjoyment, cultural, educational and social benefit of the people of Manitoba.

If these people have a lease with the province, certainly they must have a responsibility to deliver something. I don't think that anybody can have a lease and sit on it for any reason at all without producing. I think our contention here, we want to know, we want to get enough information to see. That, as I say, is our responsibility. You know, it was said once, "What's a million?" and they might say here, "What's a few thousand dollars?" But it is not my money and it is no more the money, the funds of the present Minister or the government. You know, we administer this but we have to answer for this.

I think that before anything can be done for partisan purposes or whatever, that you start doing these things, you have to know if you have a responsibility. The laws are there. We are governed by the same laws and the people have recourse through the courts also if they are not satisfied or if they feel that the province owes them some money. I would like to know what the recommendation was, and I would like to have a copy of the lease and to see because you need two parties to have an agreement. It doesn't seem realistic to me and maybe it is, maybe it's the fault of the former administration but I would like to know and I'd be the first one to admit it.

But the lease, as far as I'm concerned, is for somebody that they . . . All right for a certain amount of money or for a certain percentage, you have this property and you have to do certain things with it. The Minister said himself too that it had been going for a number of years now. After a sufficient time to give somebody a chance to rebuild, to open up to do something, if that isn't done I don't think . . . Can the Minister tell me now, or can he show me a copy of the lease that said that there is nothing that could be done for any number of years, that they didn't have to deliver anything, that they didn't have to bring any revenue or enjoyment to the people of Manitoba or maintain it. It says maintaining also. Well then I guess maybe we were in difficulties as expressed here earlier.

But I would really like to know before I can accept the challenge of the Minister and say what would you do, would you hold the cheque back? And it is ironic and the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport was quite open about that. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon. Well I thought it is. If the Minister wants to correct me, because I am asking this very seriously. What is not the same issue?

MR. RANSOM: The payment of the taxes. . .

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

MR. RANSOM: Well I am clarifying a point for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The \$76,000 paid to the municipality for back taxes is separate and apart from the \$14,500 that was paid to Mr. Micay to clear the caveats from the property.

MR. DESJARDINS: My main concern was the \$14,000 that was paid to . . . Well, both were mentioned by different people and this is what we were talking about. The taxes are something else, but it would bring something else and the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport explained the situation. There has been some contention as the necessity of a hotel there and we can come back to that, but the Minister said: We're in a predicament; we needed these facilities; we've got to do something about it. And he said, and he was quite candid: When I was there I was stuck, I didn't know what to do.

It would appear now - I don't want to put words in the present Minister, or any members on the side, I don't want to put words in their mouth - but it seems now that the coast is clear, that the province now has the title and the way the Minister explained it, that a private operator has difficulty because he starts something and he can't . . . We're not naive enough; we know that those businesses, the way they operate, they have to go to the bank and he says, without owning the property it is quite difficult.

I think the Minister, and I want him to follow closely and to shake his head if I'm wrong, is saying, now the coast is clear, we could go ahead and operate the hotel ourself because we now own the property. --(Interjection)-- All right, tear it down. That could be done in an easier way, because I know any zoning that you have is something that is not occupied and it's going out and if you're right . . . The Minister said, drive there. I've done that before, but I must admit that I haven't been there in the last two years, but the picture that is painted, the place is falling apart, it's rotting and so on and I'm sure you can instruct people to turn it down, or if not, you can turn it down yourself and charge it to them, I know that.

But the Minister at least wants these options and I'm not criticizing him for that, he says that we can go ahead and either operate, or build the hotel ourselves. But I remember very vividly, Mr. Chairman, that just a few years ago, the

wholesale changed, that we have to move on this side and many of those that were on this side move on the opposite side. The first session the question of the hotel at Hecla Island was ridiculed by many members and they said that we had no business, and they were practically hoping that we were going belly-up. W explained that this was done. I remember that we were talking about the millions of dollars that were spent by the province of Ontario in - where is it? - Minaki, I think, and so on and it was felt that we had to do something to promote tourism. We haven't heard anything about that since then, or I haven't and the Minister now, all of a sudden, is suggesting that maybe should be done.

I'm not that worried about a principle and say, okay, this is an ideology, we don't want this, but I think that they should be recognized because that again seemed to be an example, Mr. Chairman, of a complete change in philosophy, or abandoning a philosophy, or saying, well, maybe this is what should be done. And I know that the members of the Conservative Party said, well, all right, we do believe . . . They say this reluctantly, but they say, we do believe that the state, in certain areas, might participate, for instance, something that is needed but that can't pay for itself, like the transportation system - there's always grants and I don't think that they're denying that, their transportation system in a city and so on, they feel that there is an obligation and they might feel that this is the same case.

Mr. Chairman, I would would like to, if the Minister is serious in challenging us to that, I would like to have this information and then I'll stand up and be counted; I might be wrong but at least I'll stand up to be counted because the Minister doesn't want to give us this information, then it is unfair, its style is unfair. If he wants us to make a decision, with all the background information that he has, that's fair enough. And it's no use just criticizing if we're afraid of being counted, but if they withhold information from us, then it is unfair and this is also his right. I know that certain things are done internally, but then the Minister should not issue such a challenge and try to be purely partisan.

Mr. Chairman, leaving that and of a different tone, I'm interested in knowing and I would like to have the opinion of the Minister on this: For a number of years now, there have been discussions with the experts in parks about what kind of policies you should have and that's all over the world, it's not only here, it's all over the world. There was a movement, and I think that the federal government was also of that opinion, that you would try to do away with any commercial ventures inside, in the boundaries of the park. I think that - and we were, it's true - we were responsible for government at the time. I remember the federal government start saying out of program and they were going to close certain things in with --(Interjection)-- No, in the federal park --(Interjection)-- Yes, Clear Lake, in those areas.

Now this is not, Mr. Chairman, - the Minister might be surprised for that - I'm not asking that in an idea of criticizing, but I'd like to know where it's at. I kind of admit that I've lost touch, to a degree, I haven't had this responsibility for a number of years and I've had other responsibility, even in government, since then, but this is something I would like to know where we're at.

The idea was, for instance, that you would have a park and in the boundary around the park there would be an area, so many miles around the park, where you would have all your commercial thing and you would not have the problem that we're discussing now, because they would own the land - and that's where the commercial thing - and it would be a strictly private enterprise. They would have to stand on their own two feet and it would have to be a viable operation.

I know that it was felt by the department and I had a director of parks that I thought was unique in this in Canada; I think he was so dedicated, so sincere, opinionated in many ways, mind you and I'm talking about Mr. Danyluk, who I thought was more knowledgeable than anybody that I've come across in that field. Now I'm not saying that he was always right . . . He was in charge with a policy, with the political reality of it, but I think he was a dedicated man and I think he knew what he was talking about. I used to think that he knew every tree in the province and every blade of grass.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I visited parks when I was in charge with the responsibility of parks. In different countries, I remember, for instance, in Parc Nationale de Valois, that's an international park, part of it is in France and part of it is in Italy, and there, there is nothing; they're really going back to

nature. It seems that this is what we're looking for; there's more and more people that want that kind of facilities now. They would have an area there, like I said, where you would have the commercial ventures, but in the park you could not remove a blade of grass, a flower, or shoot any game, or birds, nothing. That was left fairly primitive; there weren't too many roads in a certain area and they had some different shelter group that the government would put there. Some of them were not attended, the people would come in, make a fire a leave a certain amount of money; it was on trust and they had to protect it, if they wanted to use it. They knew that if they abused it, they wouldn't exist very long.

I wonder what we're thinking here in Manitoba, in which direction we want to go. I know that it's a little difficult. At one time they were talking about freezing any more cottages inside the provincial parks. I think that it is difficult for the people that are there now, but they are profiteering by the work that's being done by the province. For instance, if you have a road that would go to a certain park or if you have certain facilities, well then it is not only for the people dropping in there, but is the residence or something. I'm sure that the Minister will agree with me, because look at the cottages that are, for instance, in the Whiteshell and see what they're worth now and it doesn't matter if it's a shack, the property is.

Is it politically too difficult to move in that direction? Is there just a freeze, or is the idea to gradually, or at least develop new parks? Maybe it's impossible now, there's so many cottages in these areas, but does the government intend to develop new parks where new policy will be in effect? I know, it's very difficult. There was no planning and I'm not blaming the present government for that, but I still think the ideal park would be that, just a park that would be left as natural as possible and where you can go and hike and communicate with nature and then you would have an area around there that would be commercial and you wouldn't have the problems that we have now.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us if there has been a policy; if that is being done or if there is no policy, or it might be a different policy. If my memory serves me right, I think that not too long ago, the government seemed to announce - maybe it was in the days of the now Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports, that they were going to open up more provincial parks for cottages. I'd like to know where we're going on it and what's going to go on that?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have to point out with respect to the Grandome Hotel, I don't plan to engage in the legal arguments but I simply want to put it on the record, because it went on the record this afternoon in the Hansard that will appear separate from all the discussion tonight. In response to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Rossmere, I would like it to be on the record that the sequence of events and the advice from the Attorney-General's department was outlined this afternoon and is on the record.

I also undertook to consult with the Attorney-General and see what sort of information, legal opinions, that the Attorney-General would want to see released, but I have put the recommendation and the reasoning on the record. The matter of park policy, Mr. Chairman, I think we discussed that at some length during the review of the Parks Branch, but I can just generally say to the honourable member that it's not our intention to make provincial parks into wilderness preserves. We have some 2.5 million acres of park in Manitoba for a million people. We think that all of the demands that people would place upon our parks can be accommodated within them; it's a matter of proper planning to be able to accommodate it. Some of the demands that people have require commercial developments. That does not mean that it is not also possible to have the kinds of low-density uses, wilderness type experiences that the member refers to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I received a note. I think it's a poem that maybe I should read at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if I misunderstood the Minister; I was told that the Minister had refused to give the information that the Attorney-General, the recommendation that he'd made. Now I will accept his explanation and I will read Hansard and as far as the policy is concerned, again, it's difficult when you have two different committees going at the same time. I did realize that suggestion had been made. Maybe then I was ready to discuss with the Minister. The Minister made a statement that it was impossible to have this kind of density and so on; I

don't agree; not, certainly, in Manitoba, when you have so much land and there's so much beautiful lands and lakes. But if that was discussed, then I will refrain from doing so at this time and, instead of reading this aloud, if anybody wants to know what it's all about, I'll be glad to tell them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I just wanted to raise a few comments in relation to what the Minister for Fitness and Amateur Sports said. I've been out and looked at the facility at Grand Beach. It's a brick building with some side buildings. It's a brick structure. I think there are about 16 motel units. I think unfortunately the doors were open, so it is being run-down, it's not being adequately protected. There probably could be a fence put around it. I think it has some value and I think it has some potential.

I did want to follow up on comments raised by the Member for Rupertsland with respect to the economic and social development potential of the National Resources Department, because we are leaving this department in the estimates process here in this Chamber, going on the the estimates of the Department of Health and the estimates of the Department of Community Services. We'll be talking about massive costs in those areas; we will be talking about massive costs for Indian people and when we get into those departments we'll find that a major issue is whether, in fact, the federal government is paying it's fair share of those costs. In fact, some people have estimated that the federal government's share of those costs - and many of them are welfare costs of one form or another - are something in the order of \$50 million or \$60 million. So it's a very large amount that we're talking about, not just the maintenance, health maintenance or income security maintenance, we're talking about the welfare maintenance because of a dependency relationship. We're talking about the welfare maintenance because of a dependency relationship. We are talking about the costs that are incurred by the Alcoholism Foundation. We're talking about costs that are incurred by the corrections facilities in Manitoba. Those are very major costs. The only way you start breaking those down is to quit pouring money into welfare and in the short run put more money into economic development. And that's what the Member for Rupertsland was saying. That was the approach of the previous government. There were negotiations under y with the federal government. We were trying to get the federal government to pay its fair share with respect to welfare expenditures, a fair share of something of that \$60 million dollars that they aren't paying annually right now, which is adding to our deficit, and use the money that was gained for economic development purposes. And the reason why the department of natural resources is so important . . . this was highlighted by the comment by the Minister of Labour when he said, "well if they can't jobs, if they have 45 percent unemployment, let them go work in the mines."

Historically, that hasn't worked out well. Where you have an opportunity is if you get Indian people to work in those areas that they are comfortable in and those work areas that they are comfortable in. And if you look at the resources side, you are talking about forestry, fisheries, wildlife. That will require public investment. There has been no venture capital. There has been very little capital investment for economic development for Indian and Metis people in northern Manitoba. And it is because they don't have an economic base that we start picking them up through the welfare system, through the corrections facilities, through the correctional programs, through the alcoholism programs.

So when we start complaining, as I am quite certain the Ministers will do when they start getting into these big expenditure departments, I am saying that one of the reasons why they have high expenditures in those areas is that this government isn't taking a sufficiently strong development approach with respect to economic development, which will save them money in the long run. I think that's a tragedy for this government. I think it's a tragedy for the northern people because once they loose even more faith in the system that dependency cycle will increase, the spiraling will increase and I would expect that we will not be talking about 50 or 60 million dollars in disputed moneys from the federal government for health and welfare expenditures, we'll be talking about \$100 million and \$120 million. Their birth rate is much higher. They are moving from those areas in northern Manitoba where they feel they have no economic opportunity, into the cities, ill prepared

and they are being picked up by the correctional facilities or other facilities like that. I think it is a tragedy that this government has cut back on the economic development programs because their cutbacks will indeed lead to increases in the next two departments that we'll be discussing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 1--pass; Resolution No. 100--pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$436,700 for Natural Resources, Executive Administration, \$436,700--pass.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a couple of short questions before you wind it up. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting here for a week now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask, as I said a couple of questions and it pertains to lots. The member sitting next to the Minister knows very well the trouble we have with cottage lots in the Flin Flon area. What they are doing, for instance they opened 19 in Snow Lake, and you put your name in a hat and you draw it out which is very unfair because some of these men have been working up there since 1959. If anyone deserves a lot they do. But it is quite possible a person there a week could draw a lot over that or less.

Another fault on these lots, Mr. Chairman. When you go to the Flin Flon area you are going to have to open up more than 19, say 50 or 60 lots, and they have them adjacent to each other and some of the lots have steep shoreline. How are you going to live with kids there and conditions like that? Now what I am suggesting to the Minister is to open up - you know there are thousands and thousands of miles of shoreline. Why can't a man go out and stake off his own lot, 100 by 200; get it okayed by your department and build a cabin? That's the only questions I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the honourable member really was making a statement rather than asking a question. If he is suggesting that those people who happen to live in an area should have the priority for getting a lot over those who don't live in the area, then I'm afraid I can't accept that because as a matter of principle anyone in Manitoba has an equal opportunity to apply for a lot when it comes available. The only way that we can deal with that question is to see that there are enough lots made available to satisfy the demands that people have because we have said a number of times that this province has a lot of opportunities for cottaging which had not been met previously and we are moving now to meet that and I would trust that the people of Flin Flon, Snow Lake, whatever in the north will have an opportunity and that there will be enough lots so that everyone who wants to can have a lot for a cottage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.