

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 22 March, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): We'll call the meeting to order. We're on Natural Resources, Page 101, (g)(1) Salaries—pass; (g)(2) Other Expenditures

The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): I just wanted to make a point. There were some of the members that actually were hoping to make a few comments on it, but under the circumstances, they're not here so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, on that item there is a substantial rise from \$69,000 to \$236,500, perhaps the Minister could give us some detail as to the rise in those expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Chairman, the funding and staffing levels voted in the 1981-82 Estimates for the Wild Fur Management Program are not sufficient to provide for services highly valued by trappers and considered essential by the department; therefore, for the 1982-83 fiscal year, additional funds in the amount of \$330,200 have been approved for the following activities: Included in 1981-82 Estimates are 3.13 staff man years for Trapline Officer Services, however, as a result of reductions made for the 1981-82 Estimates, funding does not exist for the salary or operating costs of the Trapline Officers. In effect, since 1961 the Trapline Officer Service is currently maintained in ten northern communities. Withdrawal of the service would occasion a marked negative reaction by northern residents. With the province's commitment to the introduction of humane trapping systems and a complete reorganization of the Registered Trapline system, the Trapline Officers Service is to be restored to its original level of 14 officers. This requires an additional 3.39 staff man years beyond their 3.13 in the approved 1981-82 staffing component for Appropriation 12-9 Wildlife.

Funding has been approved also to enable restoration of Trapper Education Services and the development and promotion of alternate humane trapping methods. This will require one staff man year for a term of one year at the Resource Extension Officer III level - and then the note I have is anticipated expenditures on the 1982-83 Wild Fur Agreement will be cost-shareable on a 50-50 basis under a five-year agreement presently being negotiated with the Federal Government.

MR. ENNS: So there will be 50 percent recoverable monies from the Federal program?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. GERARD LECUYER (Radisson): Yes, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would give us some explanation as to what is the Grant Assistance for?

MR. MACKLING: That, Mr. Chairman, I'd earlier indicated was to the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association. It's a funding grant to assist them in the work of the association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(g)(3)—pass; 9.(h).

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Arthur, has already spoken to this matter, but I would like to make some additional comments.

Again, to the degree that we have successful damage control programs in place, in my estimation, will be concurrent with the kind of acceptance on the part of the agricultural farm community in the support of wildlife. I know that the figures will show or indicate that the overall loss by agriculture, as a result of crop depredation, is not extremely high.

It would certainly lead environmentalist friends of mine like the Honourable Member for Inkster to say that's an acceptable cost. I think, Mr. Chairman, you may have the figures, or I may have forgotten the figures, the overall cost is not much more than 1 percent or 1.5 percent of agricultural losses as a result of wildlife, principally waterfowl depredation. The difficulty though, Mr. Chairman, is that that 1 percent is not generally distributed across the agricultural community; that 1 percent can mean very substantial 50 percent, 60 percent, 80 percent loss to one individual farmer or group of farmers.

I think, Mr. Chairman, you were told this afternoon of individual farmers that, at this moment, feeding herds of up to 100 to 200 deer. I really ask of many of my so-called environmentalist friends how many of them would be prepared to lay out that kind of support. You know, it's easy to speak of environmentalists and naturalist desires when you're safely precluded from having to put out in a very real way, and moreso, there are, of course, specific areas that the department encourages, such as, the Oak Hammond area which is I think one of the singular success stories of man's management of a waterfowl nesting and staging area, but it has brought with it some problems to adjacent grain producers; and to the extent that reasonable damage agreements and compensation monies are paid, to that extent these programs can continue to be successful.

I regret that the Federal Government has seen fit not to enter into a longer-term agreement. I think the fact that this agreement has to be negotiated every year from a first position is regrettable. I think resource managers within the department ought to be able to

plan longer than one year in this instance and that the kind of dollars should be available to make sure that an unhealthy antagonism is not allowed to be built up as a result of failure of this program.

So, Mr. Minister, I leave it at that point. I encourage you to continue to press Ottawa for a longer term agreement and for a more generous agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I would like to just take the former speaker, Member for Lakeside, up on a couple of his comments and a couple of his almost allegations about his naturalist friends.

I am speaking to this simply because I concur with many of the Member for Lakeside's concerns, that there is a relatively few number of farmers who the damage is perpetrated upon through our waterfowl. I think that is the very reason wildlife management errors were started and declared into legislation a few years ago, that they've bought such things as lure crops around them. The idea of the lure crops was to try and cut down on the compensation payments that had to go to the farmers in the area, to try and get the lands immediately surrounding the wash areas, the nesting areas and the staging area, so that the geese when they're flying out they're more likely to land on Crown land, which the government by the way pays farmers to plant for us, so the water fowl will then be preying upon the lands that the government owns and has paid to have seeded. So they are not going beyond that distance.

Now unfortunately it's not like animals that are limited to the distance they can jump through fences and that sort of thing, so you cannot fence in geese and ducks and other migrating water fowl.

But I would like to say that in this general area we should be looking beyond just water fowl. We should be looking into compensation for farmers for depredation on some of their crops, for elk, for deer and also for some of the farmers with depredation if it can be proven — and in very few cases is it proven definitively at all — on the predation of any livestock via coyote or wolf. So I think we should be looking upon some sort of compensation arrangements, trying to extend them and they should be costed more like on an annual basis.

But there are also some obligations on a farm community, Mr. Chairman, and that is to plant crops or if they're located near an area, like right now around the Spruce Woods area, some of the farmers are starting to move into corn. Well, corn to elk is like candy to kids and if you put that in right next to the fields or plant your fields with a very lucrative crop for the wildlife within that park, then you are going to be that much more apt to have high losses. We should be looking towards some joint efforts, if you wish, or some co-operation and some public education back and forth between the Crown and the landowners adjacent to these various — be they parks, be they wildlife management areas or refuges — and we should be looking most seriously at trying to mitigate the damages as much as possible caused by the wildlife. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a few points. I get a little nervous when the Member for Inkster starts making reference to the fact that the farming community has certain obligations.

The farming community knows what their obligations are in terms of wildlife and ducks, etc. I'd like to illustrate a few examples.

The Member for Inkster was stressing that the farm community had certain responsibilities. The farm community fully well knows their responsibilities. There's a certain abuse that goes on there from time to time. It's not that many years ago we had a wet fall, we had a bunch of barley laying on the fields. The hunting season happened to roll along and ducks and chickens were congregating on these fields. The fields were posted, the hunters came and they just flocked all over those swamps and what have you. They dug pits without permission, etc. These kind of things. The farmers take many of these things in their stride and fully accept the responsibility that you'll have a certain amount of wildlife, fowl, waterfowl, anything like that that is going to deplete to some degree the crops that they have. I think they accept that to some degree.

One thing that I take exception to is the Member for Inkster, without having been involved with the farm community, makes all kinds of recommendations . . .

MR. SCOTT: I have been involved in the farm community. I've worked on farms. I've come in the first generation off the farm, and to have any kind of indication that this member here can say that I have nothing to do with farms and no interest toward them. I think he is totally out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: If I have somehow offended the Member for Inkster, he can take that with a grain of salt. At the present time he's not making his living off the farm and if it irritates him the way I make my statement, that's his prerogative. —(Interjection)— I am, yes, my friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Would the Member for Emerson continue please, we're having difficulty tapping for Hansard.

The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the Minister, I would like to recommend to some degree that the item we're on is Manitoba Waterfowl Damage agreements. I'd like to encourage the Minister and his staff to possibly look in the future towards expansion of some of these programs.

For example, many of the farmers have pot holes, ponds, wetland areas, this type of thing, which are natural breeding grounds for ducks, waterfowl of any nature and there's certain criticism and pressure that comes on these farmers that they should not necessarily drain these areas, that they should leave them for that purpose of waterfowl and I agree.

But the thing is when we talk of taxation, for example, that a farmer has so and so many acres, he gets taxed on the basis of the assessment on the land and he should be —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I am

addressing the Chair and the Minister. If the Member for Inkster wants to get into a personal debate, I'll certainly do that as well. But I think, Mr. Minister, what I'm suggesting . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Member for Inkster has had his say. I would hope you would contain your remarks until he's done.

MR. DRIEDGER: What I'm trying to subtly suggest to the Minister is that maybe in his deliberations with his staff for the future to give some consideration for some of these farmers that are sincerely retaining, let's say, the wetlands area, the sloughs, the ponds, without draining all this area for waterfowl and that possibly in the future somewhere along the line, some kind of a compensation, a tax concession, whatever the case may be, could be worked out so that they would continue to do this.

At the rate of taxation with the tight expense situation that the farmers are running into, you cannot blame the farm community when they try and drain every acre that they can to try to make it productive. I'm just suggesting that these are things I know will not happen overnight. But some of these things should be possibly considered in the future to enhance the fact that we can maybe retain certain areas for waterfowl breeding. If it's not being done, if there's not going to be any compensation, the farmers like anybody else, they are business people, they will assess it and if they cannot see any value in leaving it in wetlands they'll try and drain it and make it productive. I'm just throwing that out as a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, so I hope the Minister keeps that in mind.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I think at some length, we went into the question of philosophy of protection of our natural resources including protection of wildlife habitat and wetland, and I indicated then and the honourable member was here, my concern that in order to provide this incentive to landowners to continue in some cases, but in other cases to restore land to wildlife habitat and to wetland, there has to be some incentive. I sympathized with the position that many farm folk find themselves in where they're hard pressed to pay for their farming operations to try to develop their land to the maximum, and if that means encroaching on what otherwise would be marginal land, that otherwise would be wetland or forested wildlife habitat, often that happens and that is a pity.

Now, in respect to the item under consideration of the Canada-Manitoba Waterfowl Damage Agreements, this is a recurring cost item; it's nothing new; it's a damage prevention agreement shared 50-50 with Ottawa. It's a good program. The money voted last year was entirely used for compensation for crops damaged by waterfowl. It includes costs for casual wages and for miscellaneous equipment and for lure crop purchases. What lure crops involve is planting of a crop designed to encourage the wildfowl and waterfowl to settle on a crop planted specifically to attract them and therefore to entice the waterfowl away from the regular fare that would otherwise be available by consuming important cereal grain production.

It's a short-term agreement because the Federal

Government insists on it being a one-year agreement. The previous administration and I'm sure the administration before, sought to get longer-term agreements and will continue to do so, but so far we have been unable to convince the Federal Government to go beyond a year-to-year agreement.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the members would join me in welcoming these Boy Scouts from St. Andrews 66th Winnipeg Division, who are 16 boys and 3 leaders and they're under the charge of Jim Ray. Join me in welcoming them.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, one final question on this appropriation: does the department have any final figures in for the actual monies paid out to farmers for crop losses in this past year? I appreciate that some of these claims are not necessarily concluded at this time, but do we have a good estimate as to what it costs under this program? In other words, was the \$600,000 fully expended?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that the expenditures for '81-'82 Damage Prevention Program will total about 300, and \$396,000 for damage compensation.

MR. ENNS: \$300,000 for damage compensation and some \$300,000 for prevention. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(h)—pass. Resolution No. 109.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,638,000 for Natural Resources for Wildlife, for the year ending the 31st of March, 1983—pass.

We now go on to Surveys and Mapping.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, before you read the Resolution I'd like to introduce you to Alan Roberts, the Director of this division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Provision of a central provincial service in legal and control surveys, topographic and geographic mapping, remote sensing, and the maintenance of a provincial air photo library and operation of a central map office. (a)(l) Salaries.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, at the outset of the consideration of these Estimates I indicated through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister that there were two particular areas, not necessarily in terms of scale or size of monies that I'd hoped to see some increase in; one being in the important area of forestry, in the forestry division, some enhancement of our nursery program, some enhancement of our reforestation program.

While this division of the department is not of major consequence to the overall Estimates before us, it's a department that has with it certain responsibilities that in my judgment requires some additional attention and some additional funds.

The very important maintenance of our surveys throughout the province are really beginning to show, I suppose, some negligence if you like, and you can certainly charge that to past administrations including the one that I represented; but more important, perhaps, show the wear and tear of intensive land use, development taking place, of markers being destroyed.

The consequence of that has been that those who have experienced the requirements or the needs to have survey work done can very often face wildly fluctuating costs. I must admit, sometimes you learn just because of personal experience. I found it difficult to believe surveyor estimates ranging from \$600 to \$3,000, \$4,000 and \$5,000 to survey a particular lot out in the country and it was only in investigating the matter further that one found out that the reason being is the deterioration of our survey markers throughout the province.

It has been my hope, Mr. Chairman, that some beefing up of this program could be entertained during the coming year. There is, I believe, some joint responsibility of matching that with some additional funds in the Attorney-General's Department, their legal Land Titles Office, etc. I don't know precisely the Estimate that it follows in there but I can recall that discussions were underway with the then Attorney-General to see whether or not we couldn't jointly, in this division and in the AG's Estimates, come up with some additional dollars that could embark this branch into, at least, a program, a 5 or 10-year program of renewal, renovation if you like, of the surveying requirements of this province.

So, Mr. Chairman, I indicate this because the Estimates certainly don't indicate anything other than a very stand-pat budget. I draw this to the Minister's attention in the hope that it has also been drawn to his attention that perhaps some supplementary efforts can be applied in this particular area. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I didn't give an introductory statement to any one of these sections, preferring to allow the members to make their observations first. But, let me indicate that although this is not a high-profile, glamorous area of government, it is nonetheless very important because it does deal with the careful recording of vital statistics that are the base for many operations, not only of this department, but other sections of government.

Let me indicate what this department does among other things is provide studies, make recommendations and legal descriptions for conveyances, leases and permits of Crown lands, mines and minerals; prepares the Minister's orders and consents under the Municipal Act; conducts toponymic research for the approval of 500 or more geographical names; provides toponymic data for quality control of map products; maintains and updates name-card files and name-location maps; compiles the annual directory of Manitoba Geographical names — and I could go on and on in respect to that.

Also under this department if we're looking at the global aspect of this section, Mr. Chairman, are the extensive duties in respect to survey in this province. The honourable member has touched on just a portion of the activities that this department is involved

in. All plans of survey in Crown land are being processed as received. Survey information is supplied on a daily basis to requesting persons; 39 surveys for requesting departments; 11 surveys to maintain the survey fabric; 23 contract surveys under our backlog program; cottage-lot plans are being processed; surveys under the Northern Flood Agreement and Indian Reserve Land Exchange Programs in hand.

As part of the program is the establishment of retracement surveys, the retracement of the original sections of quarter-section corners established under the authority of the Government of Canada prior to the transfer of resources in 1930 and subsequently under the Surveys Act is being initiated during the '81-82 fiscal year. This action is required to offset continuing deterioration of the Provincial Land Survey System which is causing an inordinate cost and inconvenience to both the private and public sectors.

The total cost of this program is estimated at \$7.5 million over 20 years. However, optimistically predicted new technology could reduce the program length and cost. Funding in the amount of \$50,000 was provided in the '81-82 Estimates for the initiation of this program. It is anticipated that approximately six township outlines will be retraced during the current fiscal year with data for pertinent section corner monuments recorded in the appropriate government records. For fiscal year '82-83 additional operating funds of 50,000 have been requested for this program.

In respect to the Control Surveys and Maps Section, this section provides technical and administrative support to the Canada-Manitoba Flood Reduction Mapping Program. It provides a consultative service to all government plants on control surveys in mapping matters; provides an assessment of the quality of existing positional information and upgrade where required; complete an inventory of existing positional information in Manitoba and make same readily available to all users; develop a joint Federal-Provincial program with respect to extending survey control in Southern Manitoba. I could go on about the Secondary Integration Program dealing with surveys.

In respect to Geographical Mapping, there is extensive mapping undertaken by this department in respect to individual plans from data supplied by land surveyors; an atlas of Manitoba; big-game regulation maps; flight information maps; road and recreation maps; new forest tower maps; survey control maps; wild rice lease area mosaic maps of which I'd like to have a copy; reprint key-to-Winnipeg map; new fishing area maps, that's the commercial fisheries;— new MTS mobile communications map; maps of provincial electoral boundaries which the honourable members are always interested in; a compendium of provincial maps; an update of air-photo library with approximately 25,000 prints, and so on; very extensive activity in mapping and aerial photography, remote sensing and, I think I'd leave the generality of my remarks there, Mr. Chairman, a very extensive underlying service work in respect to the basic requirements of confirming land particulars both by maps and by survey to facilitate government and private use.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, during the past several years the surveyors in the province, I am now speaking about those who are not directly engaged by

government, have from time to time petitioned the government for work. Partially I suppose the lack of economic activity generally in the province has brought about a reduced workload, and I'm told by the association that they have expressed concern to the then government about the number of surveyors who found it possible to continue their profession in this province. Can the Minister indicate to what extent the government is taking their plight into consideration in any of the additional survey work that the Minister just mentioned? Does the government intend to continue to use where possible, I know it isn't always possible, to go out to tender for survey requirements?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that from time to time it is necessary because of surges in workload to provide for surveys being done by private land surveyors and apparently that has been a continuing government practice. I think one has to weigh that carefully against hiring fulltime government surveyors because there is a cost-benefit ratio that you have to watch carefully. But, I understand that provided in the current Estimates is for some \$150,000 worth of expenditures on surveys that will be carried out by private surveyors within Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Can the Minister give me any comparison figures as to how that \$150,000 compares to, say your prior figure.

MR. MACKLING: It's approximately the same, apparently, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have series of questions and comments on this department that I'd like to bring to the attention of the Minister.

First, I'd like to say he might refer to this area of Surveys and Mapping as unglamorous, possibly it is, but I think it is also very necessary and crucial. I'd like to address some remarks under the portion that applies to The Municipal Act, where the survey requirements at the present time are creating certain problems, even at the time when I happened to be Reeve of the R.M. of Hanover at that time we were running into certain problems. Since that time though I've had the occasion to be involved in various problems from time to time, the fact that government requirements terms of legal survey plans have created many problems for many individuals from time to time. I'd like to cite a few examples just to illustrate the problem that has come about especially in the southeast area. Some of these people still have deeds; they don't have titles. Now the requirements on The Farm Credit Corporation Act are that you have to have a title, not a deed. Now on the application of some of these cases where an individual has made application to change his deed to a title one of the requirements, depending on location and depending on how much land is cut up and how many parcels there are, is that a title has to be there and in making application for that, this is the requirement, the cost factor is something that just boggles one's mind. I have to express concern that there is not more money available under this section

in terms of updating the survey requirements across the province, especially in some of the more remote areas.

I would like to cite the example where an individual trying to change a deed to a title to qualify for a Farm Credit Corporation loan, his estimated cost was \$6,000 just for the legal survey to change that and Land Titles insisted at that time that he had to have it surveyed

Now, what happens is, if you are fortunate enough to be in an area where somebody has surveyed at a certain time and had borne the cost, or maybe a municipality has surveyed or highways have surveyed, somebody has surveyed and established certain poles. If you happen to be close to that, then fine; the cost is a fraction of it. But if you happen to be in an area where this has not taken place and you sell a parcel of land, whatever the case may be, then the requirements are you have to file a legal survey plan. Then, if you go and ask for an estimate from the survey crews, you're looking at some exorbitant prices. In some cases actually the cost of the survey has been higher than the value of the property sold. I think it is a very important section that we're looking at here.

I think the province, the government, has a responsibility in terms of making survey poles available at certain areas. I know it's a very costly, long-range type of thing. That's why I'm concerned that the Minister does not have more monies available in this section here. It's a dramatic problem that's going to surface more and more as we in the more inhabited areas require to get a building permit, this kind of thing, that you have to have a legal survey plan etc., etc. We're running into major problems because you cannot use — well I suppose we have to use the same rule — but it is not fair to apply the same rule to all these places, because in some cases it's a very, very costly type of project for certain individuals that cannot bear that type of cost. Like I say, I regret the part that there's not more monies being expended here. I'm sure that Mr. Roberts, the gentleman that's in charge of this section, must be pulling out his hair from time to time. It certainly changed colour I see and it's probably for a reason. — (Interjection) — Well, we'll see what happens in the next four years, you know why the amount of monies that are being requested here; it will not necessarily change that much.

I would ask the Minister to use a certain amount of rationale in this respect and maybe with the Land Titles Registration Office, that they use a certain amount of discretion in some of these cases because there are hardship cases that are coming up from time to time.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's certainly refreshing to hear the honourable member, first of all taking a bit of a swipe at the legal profession, and I'm not sensitive about that, and about those private surveyors in the province who, poor fellows, are trying to make an honest living. I'm not at all defensive about the lawyers. You see, what the honourable member is talking about is that in some parts of the province there is land that's still under what is called the old system and you have a deed, you don't have a Torrens title. Anyone that's fortunate enough or unfortunate

enough to have that land, and I guess he's fortunate to be able to own land these days, if they had that land in it's old system, he has his choice. He continues to have it and we maintain a registry system in this province at considerable expense so that people that have old-system title can continue to retain it, but if they want to convert it to new system it does cost money. It costs them some legal expense because invariably they have to go to a lawyer to prove the chain of title, and where survey is required, yes then they have to foot the bill for survey costs.

Now, I think the honourable member is suggesting that the taxpayers should pick up the costs of providing surveys at cost to people who own land that's under the old system. That may be a very attractive proposition, but I just wonder if that would find favour with the general taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba.

I can tell you that any private homeowner anywhere in this city is faced with a bill for now for \$150 or something like that for a survey of a small lot in the city. It might only a 25 or 30-foot by 90-foot lot in the city. There's no difficulty finding the survey markers in the city, but it costs \$125. So, when the Honourable member — (Interjection) — or \$150. So when the Honourable member pulls my hair or tries to pull Mr. Roberts hair on the plight of the individual farmer in respect to the costs of survey when land is being brought under The Real Property Act, he has my sympathy but I do not weep profusely. — (Interjection) — Sorry, I'm missing some of the humour.

But, Mr. Chairman, we do facilitate the transfer of property from the old system to the Torren System. We don't recover our costs I'm sure in the Land Titles Office operation that doesn't come under this department, so I think we are subsidizing the individual landowner when we transfer that property. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that when a farmer or a landowner gets Torrens title as against an old-system title, he has a much more marketable security. I'm sure he recovers the costs of his expense in getting Torrens title immediately that he has it because if he went to sell it, he'd be able to recover his costs.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the point I'd like to illustrate here is the Minister is saying it costs somebody in the city \$150 to have his lot surveyed. The value of the lot might be \$30 or \$40 or \$20 or \$1,000 or whatever the case may be. I'm talking of cases where a quarter might be worth \$6,000 or \$7,000 and it's supposed to cost that amount of money to have it surveyed, so the relationship is not quite the same.

I might suggest though to the Minister possibly, that in all fairness because I don't think it is fair to have some of these people bear the heavy costs of some of these surveys that are required to change some of these things for their, you know, if they want to borrow money or sell etc. Why could not a level be established up to a certain point where there's certain compensation made after that. I don't think the Minister would agree that it is fair to have these people bear the total cost in some of these cases. It is a real hardship case.

I'll tell you something just to illustrate a fact, when there's a 65-year-old gentleman out there who's been

doing nothing but working hard all his life trying to eke out a living, and finally he's to the point where he's trying to pass on his 160 acres or little holdings down to his family somewhere along the line, before he can do that, all of a sudden he's strapped with this. He hasn't got a Torrens title and he's strapped with the fact that he's got to have a legal survey done in order to be able to transfer. I think that is unrealistic. That's why I'm asking the Minister to use a common-sense approach in these things and it happens. Yes, it does happen. If the Minister shakes his head, he says no, I'll give him examples on this. — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DRIEDGER: We could have a wild open debate here on this thing. I want to draw to the Minister's attention, there are cases like that right now. If he wants examples, I can forward those examples of things that have happened that way. So it is not just because of borrowing, it is also in terms of constant poverty to your family if you want to. I would caution; this is a very important section and I'm sure the municipal people and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is sitting right here and he should be very active in promoting additional monies to be expended for this improving or upgrading of this survey plan.

I want to continue a little further, Mr. Chairman, in regards to the surveys when the previous administration was selling Crown lands to individuals. Now, might I ask the question, were legal surveys required in the terms of transfer from the Crown to the individuals, except for buying Crown lands?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and the applicant paid for the survey and so it should be.

MR. DRIEDGER: Okay, then I have a further question. In all cases, did the applicant have to pay for the legal survey plan?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the survey was required, he did have to pay for the cost of the survey.

MR. DRIEDGER: Was a survey required in all cases where there was a transfer?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the land has been subdivided and there's a quarter section or half section or section description, no additional survey would be required, not ordinarily.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, if it was not a total quarter, let's say over a period of time there were 5, 10 acres taken out as happened in the LGD where they put a certain amount of land aside for a nuisance ground, etc., and the balance of it was being sold as Crown land to an individual, is a legal survey required and who paid for that?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you wouldn't want the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay for the legal survey costs of a private individual who's buying land.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, we're going to have some interesting times in the future, because I can work on some of these examples where there has been no legal survey required; in some cases it was a straight transfer. Again, when an individual transfers to another in the case of a sale, a legal survey has been required, so that is something that I just want to illustrate to the Minister that will be coming up in the future and I certainly want to pursue that, but I want to, at that stage again, come up with examples to the Minister so I can back up exactly what I'm saying.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the previous administration did things different ways, I'm not certain of that. I would assume that government would not want to have passed on to the taxpayers of Manitoba generally, the additional costs that are attributable to one individual or one private individual obtaining Crown land.

MR. DRIEDGER: I have a little problem with the attitude of the Minister in regards to this because where you have a definitely unfair situation developing, not just necessarily with Crown lands, but with other cases, the Minister is saying, well, tough luck. You pay your shot. This happens to be the ballgame. And this is what I was trying to caution the Minister about before. I hope he does not use that approach. I hope he uses discretion in some of these cases and I know the Minister has the right, together with the Attorney-General's department, to sort of use a discretionary approach with Land Titles in terms of how you indicate to them, how the Land Titles people should register, whether they have to demand a legal survey for all transactions or not. I want to have that on the record and I'd like to have the Minister's position on that.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by Mr. Roberts that in most cases, at least, The Real Property Act would require a survey to be made before the transfer would be accepted for registration.

MR. DRIEDGER: That is the problem, exactly, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, in most cases, obviously not all cases, which leaves a grey area and that is the one I'm concerned about where you have a hardship case developing. You know, is it mandatory? And I think the Minister just indicated there was a grey area. In most cases, he indicated these were the rules. If it is not going to be a standard rule all the time, then I would say, use discretion. If it is a standard rule, then I caution the Minister and say, listen, let's try and get this thing backed off a little bit somewhere along the line because it's creating a lot of problems and the Minister will become aware of these and I will bring up the cases that I am aware of. I'm sure many people around here in the rural area have run into this situation.

I'm certain that the Minister of Municipal Affairs must have run into these cases from time to time. At least if he's meeting with the people that have concerns, I'm sure he's run into that and I would like to think that the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be here pounding the table saying, "We have to have more money, we should do these things." If he does

not, he is not accepting his responsibility. But we'll deal with his Estimates later.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I've tried to indicate to the honourable member that where a legal description, where it's a clear parcel of land that is not irregular in shape, has no exceptional withdrawals from it, the legal description therefore is one that is relatively simple; that is, it's either a quarter section, half section, or one-half of a quarter section, and so on. There's no problem in respect to registration of such documents and transfer, but where the honourable member refers to five acres being taken out for a garbage disposal site and it's in leaps-and-bounds description, or whatever, then certainly a survey may be required by the Land Titles Office acting under the authority of The Real Property Act and that is only proper because the taxpayers of Manitoba guarantee the title under this system. If we guarantee the title, then we had better be right in the description.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to caution the members our girl, Cynthia, is having problems recording for Hansard, so I think we owe her the courtesy of allowing her to do her own job. So try and keep your comments down.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I hope that doesn't refer to me, keeping my comments down. I get a little agitated once in a while, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as there is only one person agitated at a time, it's okay.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you very much. I have a further question to the Minister then, Mr. Chairman. Does the government have crews that go out and establish survey markers, every township, every sixth township, whatever the case may be? Do we have crews that are in the field doing this? If so, I'd like to know is that the area we're looking at under (b), Legal Surveys, is that how much money we expend with crews to go out and do the legal surveys?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, that's right.

MR. DRIEDGER: That to me, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, does not seem like an awful lot of money when you consider that certain individuals have to pay individually, \$6,000 for one parcel for the government to expend less than \$446,000 for salaries for that kind of work seems minute.

Anyway, I think I've registered the point and concern and, I'm sure some of the other members want to do the same thing. Just to prove to the Minister that I'm not totally negative all the time, I would like to indicate to him that I had the opportunity to visit the mapping department the other day and was very pleased with what I saw there, what is available — (Interjection) — No, but I'm certainly looking at buying some of those things. But I would encourage the Minister to maybe put out an information pamphlet about the availability of maps to farmers, real-estate people, hunters, etc. I think the work has been done. The maps are available and many people don't really know that. I had an eyeopener when I was in that

department and I would encourage possibly the Minister through their very capable government information services and otherwise to maybe make this information available that the maps, topographic maps, aerial maps. There's a lot of material available there at a minimal cost I think, at a fair cost, and I think many people would be prepared to take advantage of that. I just want to say that I think that department is doing a good job. The maps seem to be relatively current and if people knew this I think more people would be taking advantage of that. I think this stuff is available. You can go in and tell them exactly which area that you're concerned about and they'll pull out the maps and show you this material and I think it's tremendous. I think it's a good department there.

With that I'll close, Mr. Minister because I just indicate that there are some good things happening too, not all negative.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to note that the honourable member has some good things to say about government enterprise and I will often remember that, when I hear him saying something to the opposite.

I might indicate to him that there is an informational pamphlet as to maps that the department puts out and a copy of that will be on display here as soon as it comes down. I think that's all I want to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a great deal of sympathy with some of the questions that the Member for Emerson has raised.

In my area especially we have a lot of villages south of the Town of Winkler which were established many years ago. We find after many surveys and so on that if you start surveying from the south end of the village and you go north, you come up with different boundary lines than if you start from the north and you go south.

Some of these villages have been surveyed many times and these surveys have been paid for by the individuals over there, it has cost them a great deal of money and we still have not resolved the situation. I think at a time such as this, I think the government should take some action and once and for all decide where the boundaries are going to be. I think by and large you're going to find that the people are going to be happy to say okay, this 13 feet is yours and whatever and make amends. But it's very confusing if you're going to try to get a legal survey on this especially where a death is concerned and where the property is passed on to another member of the family.

This is not my major concern at the present time, Mr. Chairman. On reading Item 10 on page 101 it says, "Provision of central provincial services in legal and controlled surveys, topographic and geographic mapping." I understand all that. I am rather confused when we come to "remote sensing." I don't know what "remote sensing" is. I would like to have an explanation of this, I see that later on down the page. We're going to pay \$408,000 of money on Remote Sensing. I

wonder if we could have an explanation as to what is remote sensing?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll answer that last very good question first.

Remote sensing is photo interpretation using mechanical means. There is extensive aerial — well, the honourable member wants an answer — I'll give him the answer.

There is extensive aerial photography taken of the province. If you want details of that I can spell that out a bit more. We have a library of photography in respect to land — a library of 20,000 to 25,000. No, I'm sorry, the material is updated as photography is required, approximately 20,000 to 25,000 photographs annually.

A rapid search microfilm system has been developed for easy access to aerial photography coverage information. The following projects have been undertaken to demonstrate remote sensing techniques:— white tail deer habitat mapping, wood buffalo site selection and mapping, mapping of wildlife areas, mapping of leafy spurge in the Sprucewoods Provincial Park.

Approximately 5,000 line miles of reconnaissance photography will be flown for requesting agencies namely, Municipal Assessment — the Honourable member wants the answer — Municipal Assessment, Agriculture, Water Resources, Parks Branch, Wildlife Branch, etc., extensive work in that area, Mr. Chairman.

Now the honourable member was concerned about lost monuments or boundaries and so on. Where the department is faced with a situation where there is a conflict between boundary markers in a situation where he indicates there's a problem in the town or community, then that matter through the Registrar General's Office under The Real Property Act can provide and request for a special survey to rectify the problem.

As a matter of fact I suppose there are special surveys the Honourable Member for Lakeside will remember going through the Executive Council month in and month out requesting authorization for the Registrar General to have carried out and probably through either this department or if this department is extensively engaged by hiring private surveyors, to provide a special survey of the community involved and this is commonplace.

But part of what the work that is being provided for in these Estimates is \$50,000 in that ongoing program of retracing boundaries and markers that I elaborated on earlier. That was a very extensive program, a \$7 million program for over a 20-year period to update boundary markers and monuments and so on, to correct the problems that the Honourable member has been talking about. But in addition to that as indicated, special surveys are taken under the aegis of the Registrar General of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BROWN: I thank the Minister for his answer and I'll be getting back to some of these communities to see whether some of the problems have been corrected indeed because it's about two years ago when this was a major problem in some of those areas and we were trying to correct them at that particular time.

I also thank him for explaining the remote sensing. I was very much aware of the air photo library because I had seen my entire farm in the air photo library. I'd seen the maps they had done. I was not aware that they were going into the leafy spurge and the deer count and so on but I thank the Minister for his answer.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring to the attention of the members now that here is a sample — at least I see it's tartan, it's is not red, white and blue on the cover, Mr. Chairman — of the index of maps that the province does put out. — (Interjection) — no there's no Minister's picture in here. I haven't interfered with it. It's a very interesting catalogue of the various kinds of maps that are available through the department. This index is supplied on request. As you can see it's a pretty expensive looking piece of material so we're not making them by the hundred thousand and adding the Minister's message or anything like that on it. It's available as an index. — (Interjection) — No pictures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions to ask before we complete this segment.

In the various surveys that are carried out, in the aerial surveys is the scale in nautical miles?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it's now metric. I didn't hear that, what was it?

On the humorous side, Mr. Chairman, we have gone metric at that.

MR. GRAHAM: That was the second question. Everything is now being done in mapping in metric. Is that correct?

MR. MACKLING: Correct. Right on.

MR. GRAHAM: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of clarifications or some questions on policy for the hiring of contract surveying. The Member for Lakeside raised the point awhile ago that some of the Association of Surveyors had indicated to him that there was lack of opportunities for surveying. I was wondering what is the policy for contracting out for provincial surveys?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the practice of the department has been to rotate them among the private licensed surveyors. Two would be selected for a project at a time then after that work is completed they would have had their participation and they would go to the bottom of the list so there would be a constant rotation.

MR. ADAM: Is this not done by tendering to the different surveying companies so that you can get a lower tender?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry, I misdirected the Committee on that. Two surveyors are selected at a time. The two bid and then the lowest bidder would get the job, carry it out and the other one would go on the bottom of the list again.

MR. ADAM: So not all surveyors are given an opportunity to bid on a particular job?

MR. MACKLING: Not on a particular job, no. In time, all of the surveyors are given an opportunity at public work.

MR. ADAM: The reason I raise this, I believe it was in 1979 and 1978 or 1980-81 — I don't remember exactly what year it was — but we had drainage surveys on waterways north of Ste. Rose, and one of the surveying outfits was from Alberta and the following year it was a surveying outfit from Saskatchewan.

In view of the fact that the Minister is raising the question that there is a lack of opportunity, I'm wondering why are we having outside surveyors come in — and I appreciate that they should have a right to tender — but if we are going to allow outside of province surveyors to tender work in Manitoba, at least all the surveyors in Manitoba should have an opportunity to tender, if that's the policy. That's why I raise this because I know it is a problem.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am advised by Mr. Roberts that there are surveyors who are Manitoba surveyors but they also survey in Saskatchewan and Alberta and have offices there, so that they do work in all three provinces.

MR. ADAM: Then the Minister is saying that no surveyors in Alberta that have licence to survey in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, those are not surveying here, where their head office is in Alberta. Is that what the Minister is saying?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. They operate in Manitoba, are licensed and qualified to operate as licensed surveyors in Manitoba, even though they might be headquartered in Saskatchewan and Alberta, they are authorized here. They have to be licensed though in Manitoba.

MR. ADAM: Of course. I fully understand that in order to survey here they have to have a licence here, but it raises the question, when we do not have enough work for our own surveyors here, why we allow surveyors in Alberta to tender and we exclude some in Manitoba from tendering. That's the point I'm raising.

If all the surveyors in Manitoba are allowed to tender along with outsiders from Alberta, even though they have a licence to survey here, if they're all allowed to tender that is fine and at least they have a chance to bid and if they're lower they can be accepted. But if they're not invited to tender, then it begs the question of, what's going on?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the question the Honourable Minister raises is an interesting one. I'd be prepared to look at it.

I think what we're involved in here is professionals that are licensed in more than one province. I assume that a Manitoba licensed land surveyor headquartered in Manitoba can obtain licensing in Saskatchewan and do work there, yet he has his head office in Manitoba and providing he's licensed in Alberta, can do work there. It appears that Saskatchewan headquartered surveyors, providing they are licensed in Manitoba could do work here. It's the same with the legal profession, it's the same with doctors, it may be the same with accountants.

Professionals may be enabled to so long as they're qualified and licensed, practice in more than one jurisdiction. Now that apparently is a long-standing practice, to the extent that impinges upon those professionals who are headquartered in this province as against merely being licensed in this province, it's an interesting question. But apparently it's been a long-standing practice not to make that distinction.

That practice does not eliminate the surveyor headquartered in Manitoba from participating at some time, because he goes on a rotating list, as I explained. Sooner or later he's going to have his opportunity to bid.

MR. ADAM: Then I understand it that the Manitoba surveyors go on a rotating list in competition to surveyors in other provinces who are licensed to survey in Manitoba. Is that correct?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that policy providing that all Manitoba surveyors have an opportunity to bid. If you are saying we're going to allow two surveying outfits in Manitoba to bid or tender on a contract and we're going to allow others in Alberta or Saskatchewan to tender as well, I'm saying that all Manitoba surveyors should be allowed to tender.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I only have the one question. Is the metric system now in all provinces of Canada in the mapping surveys branches of all the governments of the provinces across Canada, are they all metric now?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roberts will not confirm they are 100 percent but they are about 90 percent metric now. There may be some jurisdictions that are not completely converted yet. I don't know whether I can give you much more than that, Mr. Chairman.

For example, I could ask him about individual jurisdictions. Alberta is 100 percent. The reason that Mr. Roberts has to qualify that a bit is because there's an implementation process and it may not be fully complete, but all jurisdictions are committed to it or are in the process to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): I would like to ask the Minister a few questions regarding aerial pho-

tographs. How frequently are these photographs taken throughout the rural area, in particular?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has already volunteered one of the answers. If there's an area that has an infestation of leafy spurge and a Conservation Officer in that area deems that it would be appropriate to update the progress of the leafy spurge in that area, there will be a request for aerial photography and that will assist in determining that.

As I understand it, it's on an as required basis. There is some systematic continuous photography, though, of upgrading our —(Interjection)— for mapping. But for individual surveys or anything like that it's on an as required basis.

MR. MANNES: Have there ever been requests from Ottawa, and I'm thinking specifically of the Canadian Wheat Board, to work together towards crop surveillance in any form?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, the last program that the department recalls any involvement with was in 1970. I believe that the Federal Government does have some industrial and agricultural survey capacity on crops and minerals and so on through satellite viewing.

MR. MANNES: Yes, 1970, of course, would be tied into the year of LIFT when they were probably wanting to determine the acreages of summer fallows and seeded crop. I guess the reason I asked the question is because the Wheat Board, again, is proposing another type of quota system where they may want to look closely at the actual seeded acres and they may want to attempt to identify this sort of thing, and I'm wondering if they, in fact, need to approach the Provincial Government for support in this way or do they have the capabilities themselves; and if they did support the Provincial Government, what attitude would they take towards working with the Wheat Board.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this is not the Estimates of the Federal Department of Communications, so I have no idea what the Federal Government's surveys, aerial or satellite, involved; the department has no involvement. I have indicated the last time there was any involvement of this department with the Federal Government in respect to the areas of concern that the honourable member had, was in 1970.

MR. MANNES: My question, 1970, yes, that was to surveyal, farm, farm plantings. I'm saying that system may come back again and I want to know if this Provincial Government is prepared to work with the government in that regard.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we don't know anything about that; they may be using satellite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MR. PHIL EYLER (River East): I was wondering about the private surveyors that are hired by the province; the employees that work for these, are they generally,

unionized, non-unionized or a mixed bag?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the private surveyors are professionals, but staff in the areas, as we understand it, are not unionized. There would be a relatively small number of staff per surveyor.

MR. EYLER: So they're not unionized at all; there's no distinction between unionized surveyors and non-unionized?

MR. MACKLING: Not to the knowledge of the department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, this question may have been answered. Does the department utilize any aerial survey, aerial photography, other than Government Services, that provided by Government Services planes. In other words, do you contract to private individuals to perform aerial survey?

MR. MACKLING: I am given to understand that all the aerial photography is done by private companies.

MR. ORCHARD: 100 percent done by private companies? And that is done by an open tendering system, I take it?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand that some of the remote censusing is done by our own branch, but other than that the aerial photography mapping is contracted out.

MR. ORCHARD: Not having the figures that you're spending per year on actual aerial surveillance, could you break down what percentage is done by in-house staff utilizing, I assume, Government Service aircraft versus the volume of work which is tendered out to private service providers?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say, that this department is not a department of surveillance; maybe it was some time ago, but I hope it's not called that now. What we're involved with is reconnaissance photography, and approximately 5,000 line-miles will be flown for requesting agencies, namely, municipal assessment, agriculture, water resources, parks branch, wildlife branch, etc. Now, where we have a specific aerial reconnaissance photography required to determine, or assist in determining, compensation under a flood damage program, or so on, then the work is tendered to private aerial photographers. I couldn't quantify what that means in dollars in the previous year. I imagine that we'd have that information somewhere. We could obtain it I suppose if it's really important.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would very much like the Minister to provide that kind of a breakdown. Now I would assume from his answer that the 5,000 line-miles that are flown are in-house. It's in-house staff probably —(Interjection)— fair, over-house. I

assume you're referring to them being up in the sky. Now, I would assume that 5,000 line-miles are done by staff and I would assume also that they're done utilizing Government Air Service aircraft. Would I be correct in that?

MR. MACKLING: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: And that you would undertake to provide the volume of work which is contracted out privately; just the dollar volume of work that's contracted out privately?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Obviously there is some concern that we ought to be doing that in-house and we'll certainly look at it and quantify it.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, quite the contrary, I suspect this Minister will probably end up doing everything in-house, that's why I want to know where the break-out is now, so that we can have a look next year.

Mr. Chairman, do you have a mailing list, does the Minister have a mailing list of people who are invited to tender on the work that was undertaken by private firms?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Then anyone who has that capability, if he isn't on the list, could get on the list so that he receives the nature of the work required and could enter a tender to undertake that work, if he were on that mailing list?

MR. MACKLING: The question is, can someone who is in this business get on the mailing list? Certainly, I might indicate, Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the honourable member and others that, to the department's knowledge there is only one aerial reconnaissance photography private company in Manitoba. There are others in Western Canada and the bulk of them are in Eastern Canada.

MR. ORCHARD: Who is the single company in Manitoba that can undertake that kind of work?

MR. MACKLING: Airquest Surveys Limited.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, has the department had need or would they envision need to undertake any infrared surveillance of our resources, particularly say our forest resources or has it only been I assume, black and white photography?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand the 5,000 line miles includes infrared, black and white and colour.

MR. ORCHARD: Can the Airquest group provide infrared capability for the department?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Do you have a highly technical requirement? I'm trying to determine from what height do you require your aerial surveys to be taken? Are

you aiming at a square mile shot or are you aiming at four square miles?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it depends, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside would point out, whether you're looking for leafy spurge or whether you're looking to determine the extent of flood damage in an area or just what it is you're endeavouring to map, so the height may be 1,000 feet, it may be 10,000 feet.

MR. ORCHARD: It's not a proposition simply of all filming being done from one level and just doing more of it if you have to cover a bigger area. I take it if you have to cover a bigger area you require them to go higher to cover a larger area with one shot?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I return to my earlier question. It depends on the purpose for which the aerial survey is required.

MR. ORCHARD: But if someone had the capability to undertake the departmental needs they would be offered the opportunity to tender on that private business, I take it. Can the Minister indicate whether Airquest receives that business on an hourly bid basis or is it a competitive bid with the suppliers of that service from other provinces offering a bid as well?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry. Could the member repeat the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you repeat that, the Member for Pembina?

MR. ORCHARD: When the department undertakes the nature of work which requires a private individual to provide that service in aerial photography, does the department routinely ask for and receive tenders from Airquest in the province but also from other providers of services, say, in Saskatchewan or Alberta, or wherever they exist?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the short answer to the last question the honourable member mentioned was yes. The work is put out for tender to the companies known to be capable of doing the work that the department requires whether those companies are located in Western Canada or Eastern Canada.

In respect to the work done in houses against work done outside, apparently, the honourable member may be concerned about some aerial photography that was requested in respect to a firm in Carman, Manitoba for some interpretation in respect to forestry or some other area and it was decided that the work could be done inhouse. The firm wasn't available in a time frame that the administration thought was adequate so the work was done inhouse.

MR. ORCHARD: To recap then, should a firm have the capability needed by the department they would be with welcome put on the mailing list to tender on all work undertaken by tender in the department?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we have firms that are capable of doing the kind of work we

need to have done then certainly we would be interested in having them participate in a tender. But in respect to the work being done by the Carman firm, they didn't have the capacity to do the work we required.

MR. ORCHARD: Who would one contact in the department to determine the technical capabilities, whether in fact they could pursue work for the department?

MR. MACKLING: Through the Minister's office, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: The Minister handles all of these sorts of things routinely himself then?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the previous Minister and the Minister before, I'm sure, was the conduit through whom all inquiries are made.

MR. ORCHARD: That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa). Mr. Chairman, I just have two questions. The 5,000 line miles that are conducted in aerial mapping each year, is any of that done with the detection of cannabis plantings as the main reason for — I know why the Member for Pembina is so interested because that valley is a pretty good spot and I know they run quite a number of aerial mapping surveys there but I don't know whether it's done by the RCMP or by your department — I take it there's none that is contracted by your department for that particular purpose.

MR. MACKLING: I'm not aware of it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: Well, one more question, could the Minister tell me if any of their aerial mapping has been done with the infrared photography to detect heat loss on various villages and towns?

MR. MACKLING: Not yet, Mr. Chairman, but we'll have to look into that.

MR. BLAKE: That's right, it's energy, but this would be the natural department probably to undertake it seeing as they have a mapping — (Interjection) — that is a very very accurate method of detecting heat loss and if they're interested in the insulation program, as long as they are not using UFI Foam or whatever the correct term is but I just wanted confirmation that it's not being done to any great extent.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we'll take those suggestions under advisement but I assume that if we had our equipment operating now flying in the proximity of this room, there would be considerable evidence of heat loss.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I'm quite serious, Mr. Chairman, because that's an excellent program that could be undertaken

in smaller towns by one of the service clubs because it's not that expensive. If the government was prepared to provide the service, I'm sure there would be some takers. In fact, some of the insulation people might even kick in a few dollars and have it done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm still intrigued by this Remote Sensing. I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to be listening in on this conversation.

About 20 years ago, leafy spurge was just about wiped out; it was on a couple of quarters, I would say, south of Winkler. A couple of them were condemned for quite a few years in which the municipalities, along with the Department of Municipal Affairs, carried out very extensive leafy spurge control and I would say it was very successful.

However, since then they have curtailed this program of controlling leafy spurge and I notice now that leafy spurge is in the ditches all the way from my area into Winnipeg. Leafy spurge came from the United States originally and it's creeping its way farther north and it's a very bad weed. We all know this, it's very dangerous. It's a poisonous plant and if the cattle eat enough of it they're going to die.

We have another equally bad weed, milkweed, which has become very predominant and I don't know if Remote Sensing is also sensing milkweed. I would like to know if we have any reading on the distribution of milkweed at the present time?

MR. MACKLING: That's in the Agricultural Department's Estimates I'm sure — the control of noxious weeds — but I'm sure if there is a specific request for this department to map the spread of milkweed we would undertake that aerial survey.

MR. BROWN: I would just like to point out to both Ministers, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that both of these weeds are getting to be a big concern with the municipalities all the way from Winkler up to Winnipeg because we see occurrence of leafy spurge and milkweed throughout the entire area and I hope we will receive co-operation from all the Ministers responsible in trying to curtail these weeds.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the honourable member that we will co-operate in any survey or study that is necessary to control those terrible weeds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(a)(1) to 10.(d)(1) were each read and passed.

The Member for Radisson.

MR. LECUYER: Just a question for my own observation here. In the Estimates that we've dealt with so far, in regard to Natural Resources, I gather that the people of Manitoba stand to gain, in terms of revenues, whether it be from the Crown lands, park, or irrigation, or forestry, or wildlife. You, yourself, said a while ago that one item alone, that of the wild fur, had a return of \$10 million to the trappers and had \$10

million, \$50 million worth of spinoff to Manitoba. I'm just wondering if the Mapping Division represents revenues, and I gather it does, and could I have some idea of what kind of revenues there are derived from the Mapping Division?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that from our sale of maps the previous year, about \$145,000; anticipated this year, about \$165,000.00.

MR. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm also wondering whether, I gather obviously Manitoba doesn't do any satellite photography?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, too expensive.

MR. LECUYER: If Manitoba has needs in this respect, they would then be contracted from Ottawa?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we'd purchase it from Ottawa.

MR. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that last answer, that would be purchased from Ottawa, but that I assume would have to be NASA Landsat Information, nothing that we have in capability in space would undertake that; is that not correct?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, apparently the information is received in Prince Albert from an American satellite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10.(d)(2) to 10.(f)(3) were each read and passed.

Resolution 110.

RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,676,000 for Natural Resources for Surveys and Mapping for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983 —pass.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, before we get into the next item, I have copies of the Construction. Mr. Chairman, I assume that everyone has a copy now in front of them. Anyone that doesn't have a copy, we'll try and accommodate you but there are the appropriations. As you can see, a good many of them are a continuing appropriation. Mr. Chairman, we will arrive at the detail of that item under No. 13, apparently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we're on No. 11, Engineering and Construction.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when we get down, as the honourable members will look through the Estimates, there is Engineering and Construction, that's Item No. 11. No. 12 is Regional Services and then Item 13 is Construction of Physical Assets and that's the detail that I have given you now, itemized.

So I would prefer if you would go through Engineering and Construction, and so on, and we can deal with

the detail of the capital programs under Item 13. But you have it before you now so that you can look at it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, a few comments before we proceed. Firstly, you indicated to us, Mr. Minister, that the Director of Water Resources was on holidays. Can you indicate to the Committee whether Mr. Weber will be available to us tomorrow?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can have him here.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while the capital items indicated in the sheets that you just passed out for portions of the departments, particularly dealing with the Wildlife portion, or the Forestry, are specific enough but, Mr. Chairman, I must indicate that the projects that this Committee, and certainly members of the Opposition are keenly interested in are the Land Drainage Reconstruction Programs and one global figure of 2.8 million simply doesn't tell us anything as to where those works are to be undertaken. My question is, are they available, can they be passed out to us at this time as was indicated?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, fuller detail will be available tomorrow including a map, I'm given to understand, but this gives you at least some earlier indication of what's involved.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I really feel that we have had very little opportunity to even acquaint ourselves with the proposals before us. I was hoping that perhaps, particularly, the Land Drainage Program would be in our hands at this time so that we could have some intelligent discussion about the projected expenditures in the coming Estimates. I would ask the Minister or the members of the Committee whether they would entertain Committee rising at this particular point to enable us to, at least, acquaint ourselves with what was just passed out or we can, of course, carry on.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, to accommodate the members, we aren't on the item at all but I provided this information so that you could have some preliminary review of it. I'm accommodating the members of the Committee, I didn't have to. I've been answering questions earlier on in some detail as to specific items. During the course of the Water Resources portion of the Estimates I did indicate in answer to some honourable members that, yes, there was a specific in respect to the capital item and elaborated on that. Certain aspects of the Construction Program I have already articulated in fair detail. What we're doing here is giving you an outline; tomorrow we will have all of the detail, we can spend as many hours or as many days as the honourable members want in respect to it. I can't see why we can't go ahead with the next section of the department.

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

MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, to the same point the Minister was addressing I share the

concern with the Member for Lakeside that when we get to Section 13, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, we would want more detail on some of these large-dollar items which are, in themselves, substantial programs with a lot of individual detailed projects. However, since we're not at that item yet I appreciate we will want an opportunity to examine that in advance of debating it, I would certainly be willing to suggest that had we reached that item we should not proceed with it at this point, but since we still have a page-and-a-half to go and two Resolutions, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we can continue on the Engineering/Construction item. If we were, by any chance, to get to 13, I would be prepared to move Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lakeside on the same point.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, there seems to be a natural order to these Estimates that would commend itself to us and that would be simply to discuss with Mr. Newton present, who is in charge of carrying out the Capital Projects and do the Engineering Construction, the item that we are now on along with Section 13. I was going to suggest the Regional Services, which is really quite different; it is the enforcement arm of the branch. In other words, what I'm suggesting we are prepared to consider the Resolution 11, Engineering/Construction along with Resolution 13 all in one package and then come back to deal with the Regional Services.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't been arbitrary or difficult in respect to the order of determining the Estimates. I believe that I've exhibited flexibility in respect to this. But, we have staff here now, staff will be here tomorrow when we get to capital, and staff will be here in respect to Regional Services tomorrow. We could deal with Engineering and Construction tonight; that deals with general administration, the specific capital items will be dealt with at as long a period of time as the honourable members want tomorrow. I would just like to make some progress. We have about 10 or 12 minutes. These are purely administrative Estimates, why can't we deal with Item No. 11?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to pass that right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11.(a)(1) to 11.(c)(2) were each read and passed.

Resolution 111. RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,134,400 for Natural Resources for Engineering and Construction for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

MR. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): The

meeting will come to order.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we begin, I'd direct the members' attention to the gallery. We have a group of Boy Scouts from the Lac du Bonnet Constituency under the direction of Mr. Jim Ray. These Boy Scouts are represented by the Minister of Government Services.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS Cont'd

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Resolution 117, 4.(a) The Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. BRIAN A. RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I wonder just going back to the Special ARDA Agreement for a moment, if the Minister could advise the Committee of what he considered to be some of the shortcomings of the existing agreement that's expiring the end of this month?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Basically the shortcoming in that agreement was the fact that it expired at the end of March and we need a new agreement. When we went about to negotiate the new agreement, the Special ARDA Committee was asked to provide some recommendations which they did. They expressed some concerns about timing in respect to delivery of some of the programs and they also suggested that there were some other features that they would like to see built into the program which we will no doubt be discussing at the time when that program is put in place through a signing ceremony of the new agreement.

MR. RANSOM: I gather then, Mr. Chairman, that the Special ARDA Agreement which was in place was largely satisfactory and that we'll look forward to seeing more or less a continuation of the same agreement.

I wonder if the Minister then could tell us what his priorities would be in terms of the new Northern Development Agreement?

MR. COWAN: Well, I just want to comment on the Special ARDA Agreement first. There may be a number of changes which we see in the new agreement but, by and large, the concept certainly was satisfactory and those changes which we will see, while significant to the persons who are affected by that agreement, will in fact be, I would suggest, minor in nature; they will be an improvement upon the existing agreement.

In respect to The Northlands Agreement, I've handed out a book which in fact provides an overview of the consultation process and the results of that consultation process. I can suggest that I agree in most part with the priorities that were outlined in that particular consultation document. That's not to say I agree with all of them, but I think we do have to look towards human development programs, programs which take

into consideration the need for support services to Northerners as they attempt to enter, as much as possible, into the economic mainstream. We also need some programs that facilitate their movement into that economic mainstream through support services to allow them to gain employment and to maintain employment once they have done so.

Again, we want to see some of the money spent on infrastructure as has been done in the past. This will include sewer and water services, community roads, and airstrip upgrading. Now, that's what we're going to be discussing in more detail as we go through our negotiations.

And, finally, I think it is extremely important that there is an ongoing consultation mechanism which allows for an extensive sharing of information and sharing of ideas and criticisms and comments which will enable the agreement to grow with the experience of those who negotiated the agreement and also with the experience of those who are being affected by the agreement.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise the committee if there will be programs dealing with reforestation, for instance, fisheries management, or caribou management? Can the Minister advise us whether he has given consideration to having those types of programs in the new Northern Development Agreement?

MR. COWAN: I can inform the Member for Turtle Mountain that we have suggested that those sorts of programs be included in the agreement. The agreement is now under negotiations and there is, at this time, no definitive answer as to whether those programs will be included in the agreement; but we are certainly promoting them.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister then could advise us a little more of the substance of the programs that he's promoting; the programs that deal, for instance, with reforestation, or with caribou management, for example?

MR. COWAN: Some of the existing programs which have been in the Northlands Agreement in the past and which we would like to see included in the new agreement include those activities. We're also discussing continuation of a number of other programs which fall under the general categories which I addressed previously, BUNTEP being one of them; AESSES being another one which has gained some favour with recipients of the program; airstrip development; some internal roads, forestry roads leading to resources where applicable; community wildlife management which would allow for Northerners to become more involved in the management of wildlife in their own area; wild rice development; community resource planning, which could include some of the activities which the Member for Turtle Mountain is addressing; forestry resource development which certainly would include some of those; the New Careers Program, an ongoing program which is one great favour and has been used as an example in many other areas as well; employment services; the Youth Core as was in the program before; Youth

Travel; Business Management Advisory Services, which is a program which will allow Northerners to develop some expertise in management skills that will enable them to take greater advantage of those economic activities which are ongoing in their own area; Channel Area and Moose Lake Loggers, of course; and local government services.

These are all priority areas and areas which most likely would be included in the New Northern Agreement if, in fact, we can reach some sort of satisfactory conclusion in negotiations with the Federal Government. We are certainly promoting these types of programs within the new agreement.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I find it somewhat interesting that when we used to sit on the other side of the House and the Member for Churchill sat on this side of the House, we used to be able to get all kinds of information out of the member when he was just the Member for Churchill. Now that he's the Minister, with Ministerial responsibility, we seem to have a little more difficulty getting some information out of him. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister of Finance says he has noticed that too. That's fine, I can appreciate that perhaps he doesn't wish to talk in too much detail about these programs, but from what I have heard so far I really haven't detected any difference in the content of the new Northern Development Agreement that is under negotiation now. I haven't detected any difference from what we were putting forward in government for a new Northern Development Agreement over the past months. If there are some differences, I would certainly like to hear about them from the Minister because it appears to me that there really aren't any differences at this point.

MR. COWAN: Yes, the only difference I think is we anticipate getting the agreement.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, we anticipated getting the agreement too. In that case then, I wonder if the Minister can advise us the amount of money that he anticipates going into this kind of program? Where do we see the total amount of funding that would be going into a new Northern Development Agreement and what would the cost-sharing formula be?

MR. COWAN: What we are requesting is a 100 percent figure of \$22,289,300.00. That is our request; that is \$22,289,300.00. —(Interjection)—

Perhaps I can. Oftentimes, as the Member for Turtle Mountain, the previous Minister of Finance, knows the way in which the funds were split up was 20 percent in Finance and 80 percent of the funds were allocated in Northern Affairs. So, if you use the 80 percent figure then you have a \$17,831,400 figure but if you use the 100 percent figure, which is what we're actually requesting and it's split up between the two departments, then you get the \$22,289,300 figure.

MR. RANSOM: What would the federal proportion of that be, Mr. Chairman?

MR. COWAN: I'm afraid the Federal Government has yet to confirm what money they are going to be putting in and what different ways, into a Northlands

Agreement, so I couldn't answer that question until we've had an opportunity to reach an agreement with the Federal Government.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, even assuming then that the Federal Government put in approximately 60 percent, then the federal contribution presumably would come in the range of a little over \$13 million. I would remind the Minister that in 1980-81 that the federal contribution in these areas of programming came between \$17 million and \$18 million and, given the inflationary figure that could be applied to that, just simply to keep pace with what was spent the year before last, which was the last year in which the full agreement was in place, then the federal contribution alone should be in the range of the amount of money that the Minister has just advised us is being considered for the total Northern Development Agreement. If that's the case then clearly there are going to be substantial cutbacks in services from what were available the year before last.

MR. COWAN: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that last year the Federal Government had \$29 million budgeted but of that amount they had delivered \$14 million directly which meant in fact that they were only delivering \$11.5 million roughly through the agreement. It is my understanding as well that they will be looking at some direct delivery of the programs and services once we have a new agreement as well. So, not all the items are cost-shared.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, my recollection could be faulty but my recollection was that in 1980-81 the federal contribution in this area of programming was something like \$17 to \$18 million and that is the base that was being used as we entered into negotiations a year ago to try and negotiate a new agreement. I must say at the time that we first met with the Federal Minister that there was every indication that level of funding could be made available again and it was only as the year progressed that it became evident that level of funding was not available. So, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that already, as the basis of negotiation, that the government today is negotiating on a much lower base than was being considered even a year ago and I would think that can only lead to a cutback in services in some areas in programming where it had previously been delivered.

Mr. Chairman, one of the concerns that the Federal Government had of course expressed to us was that they weren't getting credit for their contributions; there wasn't enough visibility. In fact the Federal Minister put that in writing. I'm sure that if the Minister cares to look through the files he'll either find it in his files or the files of the Minister of Finance where the Federal Minister says that indeed, because there wasn't satisfactory visibility on the part of the Federal Government that they weren't prepared to proceed with some of the programming. I wonder how he has been able to satisfy that yearning on the part of the Federal Government for visibility.

MR. COWAN: Only time will tell if we've been able to satisfy it, but I certainly have tried to be more cooperative with them and I think they respect that. I

must add that if one looks at the five-year agreement and looks at the cost-shared monies as well as the direct delivery monies on the part of the Federal Government and the Provincial Government which will enter into that agreement, you will find that if we reach the type of agreement which we're talking about now, we will actually be spending more money over that five-year period than was spent in the previous five-year period. That's the basis upon which we're conducting our negotiations but I think it's important to note as well that we are involved in negotiations right now. As a matter of fact, we are involved in very active and intensive negotiations right now and I can't address many of the questions, although I would like to, but simply because I have not been able to prophesy what the Federal Government will do in respect to our offers and proposals and they have not been able to do the same in respect to their offers and proposals, so we are discussing the matter. I can assure the member opposite that we are doing so in a very sincere and, I believe, a very vigilant way to ensure that those programs, which in fact, have served Northern Manitoba well will continue, and to ensure that wherever possible we will have cost-sharing of those programs where it is deemed to be advisable and appropriate. So we are involved in those negotiations, we are continuing those negotiations and the member knows full well that I am not trying to be evasive in the least. However, we are involved in the negotiations and when those negotiations either succeed or fail and the case may be either way, then we will sit down and be able to discuss either how we succeeded and where we were able to reach an agreement, or how we failed and where we were unable to reach an agreement.

MR. RANSOM: I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister doesn't want to deal with details of what he's negotiation but surely it's possible to say how the government plans to deal with that basic expression of concern that the Federal Government had that they weren't getting credit for what they did. And that was not something that they applied simply to Manitoba that was a concern that they had across the country. I know when I was Minister with some responsibility in this area, we couldn't get the Federal Government to say what it was that they really wanted and, in fact, I couldn't get an opportunity to even meet and discuss it with the Minister. I'm wondering how successful this Minister has been. I know the Minister of Finance is experiencing some difficulty in getting to meet Federal Ministers and getting them to answer his letters and he's still smiling about that, but I expect a few more times and he'll begin to feel some frustration too. I'm just wondering whether or not there has been that problem with the Federal Government, has it been addressed and does the Minister think that he has some solution to it?

MR. COWAN: Again, I can only suggest that time will tell whether or not we have reached a solution, but to answer his specific question in respect to how we attempt to deal with their concerns I think this afternoon's session was a classic example. We did not want to talk about a joint agreement, an agreement which is under negotiations - details of those agree-

ments - without having had an opportunity to have a joint announcement with the Federal Government. So in spite of some questioning on the part of the members opposite, we suggested that was a matter that was more appropriately addressed in a joint way at the appropriate time. It's through those sorts of overtures, and they are overtures indeed, that we are attempting to bring a form of co-operative federalism back to Manitoba in general, and in respect to northern agreements in specific. I have had the opportunity to meet with the Honourable Pierre De Bane when he was through town. I have also had the opportunity to meet with the Honourable Herb Gray; as a matter of fact, I have to inform the member opposite that the Honourable Gray made much of his time available to me that evening. We had what I consider to be a very productive meeting over dinner starting early in the evening and continued until 10 or 11 at night through consultations, and a brief discussion after that. So I have not had any difficulty whatsoever in meeting with the Federal Ministers when we both have felt those meetings to be necessary, and I hope, bearing in mind, that from time to time, our respective schedules will not permit those types of meetings to happen on every occasion, we will continue to have them wherever it is possible.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that the Minister is able to have that kind of discussion and I wish him well in concluding an agreement. I have some concerns at the level of funding that's before us but, so be it.

Would it be the Minister's intention to spend that entire amount of money, irrespective of the response he gets from the Federal Government?

MR. COWAN: I believe we will be spending the majority of it on priority programs. Certainly, there are certain programs which must continue because of their acceptance, because of the value which they provide to the development of Northern Manitoba. Whether we will be spending the full amount or not, or more than the full amount, or a bit less than the full amount, would have to be determined at the time we've reached the stage where we felt that an agreement was not forthcoming. I, too, have some concerns about the level of funding and hope to ensure that we are able to get every penny possible from the federal treasury to provide joint funding for many of the projects, and we are attempting to do that. Whether or not that will happen remains to be seen, but we are driving a fairly hard bargain in this regard and we are not, by any stretch of the imagination, just agreeing to a reduced Northlands Agreement with having giving it our best shot.

I'm not so certain that we would agree to an agreement if we did not believe that the funding contained in that agreement for cost-shared programs was of significant advantage to the province. One has to bear that in mind throughout the negotiations. Cost sharing is a beneficial process, but there is a stage when it is less beneficial than it is somewhat detracting from the programs. We have to try to determine, as a province, what that point will be. We have to convince the Federal Government of our sincerity, they have to convince us of their sincerity, and if we can accomp-

lish that, and that's what we're working towards, then we will have the type of Northlands Agreement which we all want to see put in place.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give any indication of the amount of money that's estimated to be flowed in '81-82 in this general area of programming in Northlands or Northern developing programming?

MR. COWAN: I'm told that approximately 11.5 will be spent provincially in programming under that process.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, that strikes me, by quick analysis then, that's a little more, the provincial government spent a little more in '81-82 than the Minister is proposing to spend in '82-83, given that the Federal Government has a 60-percent cost sharing.

MR. COWAN: I'm sorry. I may have, inadvertently, given the wrong figures to the Member for Turtle Mountain. Let me just go through it one more time and I'll rely upon my staff to jump in if, in fact, I'm not giving the proper figures. In '81-82, it is my understanding that \$11.454 million was spent in total as part of the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement. We are proposing to spend, in total, in '82-83, a total of \$22.3 million, I'm told.

MR. RANSOM: The figure that the Minister gave then was for federal and provincial expenditures. Recently the Federal Government announced some changes in their structure, or their economic planning for the country. It was my understanding from listening to the explanation of that new structure that had been put in place that there would, in fact, be a new economic . . . put in place in Winnipeg perhaps, certainly in Western Canada. Has the Minister any indication yet how that change in structure on the part of the Federal Government will affect their co-operation or delivery of programs with the Provincial Government?

MR. COWAN: I believe they're still going through the throes in Ottawa of attempting to reorganize the departments as they had suggested they would do a while back. Things aren't really clear there yet, to my understanding. Consequently it's difficult for us to tell here what effect that will have in respect to the provision of these types of programs and other services. Without having had an opportunity to review the way in which the changes are going to be implemented in a more specific way and over a longer period of time, I would hesitate to suggest that any one effect is going to be accomplished over another effect. We will watch it very carefully and we will make known any concerns we may have at the earliest opportune moment.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister entirely answered my earlier question with respect to how he was dealing with the visibility problem that the Federal Government had. One of the solutions that they saw to their problem was that they would deliver more programs directly, and I'm wondering if the Minister can advise us of any indication there may be from the Federal Government, whether or not they plan to move into more areas of direct program deliv-

ery. Their concept of an agreement as the sequence of events unfolded was not so much an area of programming where the province would be the lead agency and deliver programs that were being monitored by a joint committee, but that rather the province would deliver some programs on a 100 percent basis, and the Federal Government would deliver some on a 100 percent basis. If the experience in the other provinces such as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia I believe, held true, then it would turn out that the Federal Government wanted to deliver those programs which seemed to be most acceptable and have the most visibility publicly and that some of the other programs that are perhaps even of greater necessity but weren't as colourful and didn't have the same political appeal, would be left for the provinces to deliver. I wonder if the Minister could give us any indication of what this agreement, this new Northern Development Agreement might have by way of delivering mechanisms?

MR. COWAN: The Federal Government certainly is suggesting that they want to become more involved in direct delivery of programs. It has to be said that the Federal Government in some instances can probably deliver certain programs better than the province. It has to be said in some instances the province can, in fact, deliver programs better than the Federal Government. So, there is a role for direct delivery of certain programs based on the conceptualization of that program, who it intends to serve and how it intends to serve.

On the other hand, there are many programs which are better jointly delivered. That is why we are involved in negotiations at this particular point in time. I'd suggest if we wanted to have two separate programs in place, one which the Federal Government delivered and one which we delivered in an interface at certain selected points in a minimal way, an agreement would be easily reached. That's not what we want. We have said categorically that we will not have a Northlands Agreement just for the sake of having a Northlands Agreement. We have told their negotiators that. We have said that we want to have a Northlands Agreement that does, in fact, provide for appropriate joint delivery where that joint delivery is needed and where it is beneficial, and at the same time allows for direct delivery where, in fact, we both agree that direct delivery can best accomplish the goals of those services. So there is some disagreement at this point in respect to the way in which the programs will be delivered.

We are not prepared to allow for a large opting-out of the Federal Government in respect to the Northlands Agreement in delivery of programs. We are negotiating the best possible joint-delivery structure which we believe we can get and we will continue to do that. If we can't get that sort of structure in place then we're going to have to look at different options. The fact is, there's some question and that's what negotiations are always about. If there weren't those types of questions there wouldn't be negotiations. Of course, it would make my job easier and your job easier because I could tell you exactly what was in the program because there would be no need to negotiate it, but the fact is we are going to have to sit down and

undertake, and we have sat down and are undertaking, those types of intensive discussions so that we can come to a meeting of the minds. That means a bit of give and take on both parties. We're prepared to give as well, we're prepared to demand that which we think is appropriate.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to advise the Committee when he thinks that the agreement might be signed?

MR. COWAN: I would care to if I could, and I just would not have any date in mind at this time. We are not at the stage where we could provide a date at this time. Both the Federal Government and myself have given a commitment to attempt to finalize this agreement as soon as is possible with the least possible disruption of service; that's exactly what we're attempting to do. But we are negotiating, and when one negotiates it's difficult for one to be able to provide a specific date as to when they expect those negotiations to be accomplished. I could put a deadline on the negotiations and say either we have an agreement by such and such a date or we don't but I believe that would be counterproductive. What I am saying is that we are involved at this point in active and intensive negotiations to try to sort out any disagreements which may exist between the Provincial and the Federal Government in respect to the Northlands Agreement, and we will continue those negotiations as long as they are productive.

MR. RANSOM: I realize all those things are true, Mr. Chairman, but the present fiscal year expires at the end of this month and the new fiscal year is going to begin. I suppose before the end of the month we're going to be passing Interim Supply to authorize the government to begin spending money. It would be nice to have some knowledge then, whether or not the Minister is going to hold programming within this department until an agreement is signed, or whether or not the Minister plans to proceed to begin to spend all the money that's shown here to initiate all the programs on the hope that the government, the Federal Government, will eventually sign the agreement. So, I think there is some urgency to conclude an agreement or at least to know when the Minister hopes to see an agreement concluded and if it's going to be for some time then the second question that follows is: will the programming which is provided for in the Estimates before us commence with the beginning of April?

MR. COWAN: Yes, the program which is provided for in the Estimates will commence regardless of whether or not there is an agreement in place. Whether or not all of those will continue throughout the year is a factor that would have to be determined after a specific period of time, but we certainly do, as I suggested earlier, intend to continue a number of programs which have been found to be beneficial and extremely useful to the northern residents, regardless of whether or not there is a Northlands Agreement. We would hope to continue them under a Northlands Agreement. We anticipate continuing them under a Northlands Agreement, but they are of such extreme impor-

ance and value to northerners that we are prepared to continue them with or without that agreement.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, I know how important some of those programs are, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister must realize, of course, that by committing himself to undertake those programs that he does in fact make it more difficult for himself to negotiate the agreement, because the Federal Government knows full well then that if the province is committed to that level of funding that they can take the funds they had intended to put in and do something else that has a higher profile. That's a danger that he's going to have to face up to. I think it's something the Minister of Finance had a similar sort of problem in committing to provide sufficient funding for the universities, to keep the universities from having to raise tuition fees prior to knowledge of what kind of cutbacks were going to come from the Federal Government by way of post-secondary education. But I recognize that the Minister has to face some serious problems in this area and I wish him well in his negotiations with the Federal Government.

Arising out of the First Ministers' Meeting in Victoria last August was a commitment or an agreement, I believe, to have the Ministers responsible for DREE, for negotiating or maintaining contacts with DREE, to meet all 10 provinces or at least the 8 or 9 that have any sort of significant contact with DREE. Has that sort of meeting taken place to the Minister's knowledge?

MR. COWAN: First to address the Member for Turtle Mountain's first question. Certainly my having to stand here and say that we are going to continue those programs regardless of the Northlands Agreement does create difficulty for me. I would have far preferred not to have to do it, but since the member asked the specific question knowing that it would create difficulty for me, I felt that it was necessary for me to provide him with the fullest possible answer and I did that, knowing full well that it does not help the negotiations. I don't know what kind of negative effect it will have on the negotiations because we've made it fairly clear all along that many of these programs are extremely important and we would not want to see them dropped.

However, even although it does make it more difficult for me to provide that sort of categorical statement, it would be extremely more difficult for Northerners if I didn't provide that sort of categorical statement; it would be extremely difficult for those in BUNTEP not to know whether or not that program would continue on because I refused to give that sort of a statement; it would be difficult for those in the New Careers Program, in the Employment Services Program. Government would grind to a halt in many areas because they did not have an indication whether or not that money could be spent.

So, in fact, while the statement which was required to answer the Member for Turtle Mountain does create difficulties, I really don't fault him, because it was really not a question at all. We must do that, and we must continue to negotiate as well so we are prepared to do that, knowing full well of the problems, and the serious problems, which any party faces

when they go into negotiations; but also knowing full well the serious problems that would be created if we did not give some sort of a commitment to the continuation of those programs.

In respect to the specific question as to whether or not a meeting has been held between the Ministers responsible for negotiating significant DREE-type agreements, to my knowledge, it has not.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, just for a moment there I see the flash of the old Member for Churchill coming back as he begins to try and hang the horns on me for asking him the question about what he planned to do on the 1st of April, and I think he knows full well that it wasn't because I asked him the question that he had to make the decision; the decision has to be made because programming either goes ahead or it doesn't go ahead; and he knows full well that the areas that he mentioned such as BUNTEP, were those that were agreed to previously with the amendments that were carried on during '81, and '82. I would be more interested in those areas of new programming that are being talked about. Does the Minister plan to proceed with those programs?

I assume some of the areas in Community Wildlife Management and Fur Programs and Business Management and Reforestation and perhaps, even the program called Inland Fisheries Enhancement, if that's included in the negotiation, will those be held in abeyance, then, until there is agreement with the Federal Government?

MR. COWAN: I think I can safely say that we will not be going ahead in any sort of a general way with new programs until such a time as we've had an opportunity to finalize our negotiations, either positively or negatively, as the case may be.

In respect to the question about the Ministers responsible for negotiating DREE Agreements, maybe I can provide just a bit of elaboration to the Member for Turtle Mountain. While I have not attended a meeting, and to my knowledge a meeting has not been held to date on that, I did receive a letter from the Minister of Rural Development in Newfoundland suggesting that such a meeting be held and I have indicated my willingness to attend such a meeting, once it is held. It is not a matter of not wanting to attend a meeting or not being informed of the meeting, it's just my understanding that the other parties involved have not been able to bring that meeting to fruition yet. I'm prepared to attend; as a matter of fact I'm looking forward to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister made mention of a figure of 11.454 million '82-'82 funding which I believe the Minister indicated was not the provincial contribution but, in fact, the federal, plus provincial contribution. Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to indicate how that clarifies with some 19.243 million that is in the last year's print of '81-'82 spending.

MR. COWAN: Much of that funding was dependent upon a Northlands Agreement being signed and,

because there was only an amendment, not an agreement, that money was not spent although it was the voted amount.

MR. ORCHARD: So then it's safe to assume that the federal portion of the 11.454 million, the federal portion that's included in that figure, represented carry-over funding commitments by the Federal Government on such major undertakings as the Norway House bridge and internal roads and those types of programs for which the Federal Government, because of delays in design, etc. had originally committed funding to but we were unable to cash flow. Is that a correct assumption?

MR. COWAN: Perhaps, to provide further detail to the Member for Pembina, I can provide him with a breakdown by sector and he will see where that money flowed. There was \$17,000 spent in sector A which is Resource and Community Economic Development; there was \$8,975,300 spent in Human Development and Community Services, I would believe that would be the BUNTEP access programs; there was \$2,462,000 spent in Transportation and Communication, I believe that would be the sector which the Member for Pembina is addressing his attention to right at the moment.

MR. ORCHARD: Then the \$11.454 was in the approximate breakdown of 60 percent, 40 percent. Now, the Minister also made a comment, and I want to make sure that I followed him on what he was saying, that in totalling there would appear to be, on the basis of his budgeted amounts for this coming fiscal year, an apparent reduction in the total size of the new agreement that he anticipates signing, and I fully appreciate that he can. Now he indicated that there wasn't; that by the time you totalled the funds expended over the past five years that the anticipated spending, should he be successful in re-negotiating a Northlands Agreement, basis the feeling he has for successful completion as of today, that there would be more total dollars spent in the next five years than in the previous five. I believe the Minister made that indication and if it needs clarification I'll . . .

MR. COWAN: Perhaps it does, because as the member can appreciate, we are now involved in those negotiations and it's difficult to paint a picture of how one would expect those negotiations to end. However, there is certainly a strong possibility that, given direct delivery programs by the Federal Government, and direct delivery programs by the Provincial Government and cost-shared programs between both governments, in a package, under the Northlands Agreement, the money would be more, in total, than it would be for the five years previous. However, it could be a bit less, it could be a lot more, it could be a lot less; that will only be able to be determined at the time when we, in fact, have completed our negotiations. We are certainly asking for as much, and more.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister's staff indicate what the past five years have given us in terms of a breakdown between federal spending and provincial spending bearing, in mind

the three categories the Minister had indicated, i.e., direct federal cost-shared programming at 60-40 and then the direct provincial funding. Could the Minister provide us with an approximate breakdown of the total package, the three-category split as to federal and provincial funding?

MR. COWAN: Maybe, if the member wants to follow through, I can give him a six-year figure which includes the amendments: SEEC programming from Canada over the six years, which is 100-percent direct delivery by the Federal Government, was \$5,516,000, none by Manitoba; Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development funding which is 60-percent DREE money and 40-percent DIAND money, but is 100-percent Federal money nonetheless, was \$18,983,000 and none by the province; DIAND Human Development money which is 100-percent DIAND money was \$7,400,000 and none by the province; the Province of Manitoba programming which is 60-percent Canada and 40-percent Manitoba money was a total of \$131,017,000 or by breakdown, \$78,610,200 Canadian dollars, 60 percent; and \$52,406,800 Manitoba money, for a total of \$162,916,000.00.

MR. ORCHARD: Then there was no value of direct provincial funding that one would attribute in the last six years?

MR. COWAN: The cost-shared money was \$52 million, we did not break out an agreement as a specific figure provincial direct-delivered programs.

MR. ORCHARD: Then if one would do a quick calculation on the total program, you've got 165 million, rough figures, and then you've got of that 52 provincial so that you've got more in line with a 67-percent federal funding, 33-percent provincial funding. Would the Minister anticipate that overall percentage of shared funding to be in place in the next five-year program with the Federal Government through direct delivery providing some 67 percent of the total funding package?

MR. COWAN: I couldn't say at this point because we're involved in negotiations at this time, as I indicated earlier, but I certainly will attempt to get joint funding wherever it is deemed that joint funding can provide a better mechanism for the provision of services, and if that's what the percentage figure to which both the Federal and Provincial Governments can agree comes down to then that is what we shall have.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify something to make certain that I understood what the Minister said. There was a figure of 11.45 million I think it was flowed in 1981-82; that was only then for programming included under amendments 3 and 4, but in the '81-82 printed Estimates there was approximately 30 million of programming which the intention had been at the time that it would be negotiated into a Northern Development Agreement. It ends up that out of that 30 million-and-some, only a little better than 11 million was actually put within an agreement under the amendments, which leaves \$18 or \$19 million worth of proposed and actual programming

that the province was let holding the bag for. Some of that programming went ahead because, as I recall, even things like Community Wildlife Management and some of the Wild Rice Management, some of the Construction of Forestry Access Roads, things that were pretty basic to the economic life of some of the remote communities in the province were not included in the agreement and the province went ahead with them.

So, I'm now interested in knowing if the Minister can give even an approximation of how much money is in the '82-83 Estimates by way of a comparable figure to that 30.7 million that was in the '81-82?

MR. COWAN: Perhaps, to make the task a bit easier for the Member for Turtle Mountain, we can send over a detailed list which shows the estimated sharable provincial expenditures for 1981-82 and what specific programs were proceeded with, if that would assist him.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, but I'm interested also in knowing what the comparable figure would be for '82-83 because where this shows an amount of sharables for — I guess this deals with the amendments, Mr. Chairman, okay. There was one that dealt with the initial proposals in '81-82, a whole range of programs that totalled some \$30 million. Some of those items were subsequently negotiated for amendments 3 and 4, others were not; but the province proceeded with them. Things like some of the Community Wildlife Management Programs, some of the wild rice work, some of the community planning work, some of the local government money, indeed, had to come directly out of the provincial funds. I'm interested in knowing now, Mr. Chairman, if some of those things which the province had to undertake on their own in '81-82 are now being considered for inclusion in the agreement in '82-83?

MR. COWAN: The member is asking for some detailed information which I will try to have broken up and provided to him very soon, at our next sitting hopefully, but I can give him a general figure if he would require that at the time.

The 1981-82 funding request for the Northern Development Agreement totalled the \$29,303,500.00. Of this amount, \$4,193,200 represented proposed new programming which in fact was conditional to the signing of a new agreement. Now, I believe those were \$100,500 for Co-operative Development which included assistance in establishing retail stores operations, co-operative fishery ventures and credit unions in northern communities through the provision of feasibility studies and management advice on training capabilities. It was anticipated that the establishment of those operations would provide permanent employment opportunities. That was not proceeded with.

The Herb Lake Mine road, which was the construction of a road that was intended to facilitate development of gold properties in the area through the Department of Energy and Mines, a \$200,000 project, was not proceeded with.

The Split Lake Gillam road, while it was proceeded with was done so not under the agreement, which was

a \$900,000 item in that \$4 million figure which I gave to the member earlier.

The South Indian Lake Ferry, which was a \$75,000 item, which would have provided ferry access from South Bay to the community of South Indian Lake was not proceeded with.

\$1 million for Northern Highway infrastructure, which included unidentified or unspecified northern highway infrastructure development, was not proceeded with.

There was a \$100,000 commuter program in the Department of Labour and Manpower, which was a pilot project to assist northerners to commute from home communities to mine sites and other places of employment opportunities, was not proceeded with.

The Northern Youth Employment Program which was to assist youth of ages 15 to 24 years to find and establish themselves in places of permanent employment, a \$50,000 program was not proceeded with.

The Inland Fisheries enhancement, which does not have a dollar figure next to it but was designed to develop and implement a program of pickerel enhancement, habitat, rehabilitation and management including development of rearing ponds, and improvement of natural spawning streams, was not proceeded with.

A technical services program under the Department of Northern Affairs, which would have provided technical support, including feasibility studies to individuals and enterprises wishing to explore development opportunities in Northern Manitoba was not proceeded with. That particular program had a price tag of \$155,000.00.

Enterprise Development Fund which was to provide financial advisory and management assistance to a variety of initiatives that could have an impact on economic development in Northern Manitoba was not proceeded with and that figure was \$1,612,700 for that program.

There were also a number of other programs totaling \$3,399,700 which were not conditional upon the new agreement being signed, but were not proceeded with either. Those include \$719,700 for mineral resource development, \$591,000 for parts infrastructure, \$149,000 for surveying and mapping and \$1,940,000 for highways construction for a total of \$3,399,700.00.

There are a number of others which I don't have directly in front of me which were not proceeded with either I understand; or were reduced I'm informed.

So I hope that information is the type of information which the Member for Turtle Mountain requires.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Well, there's only one thing that I want to clear up in general now is, are there items that were 100 percent funded by the Provincial Government in '81-'82 that are now being negotiated for inclusion in the agreement in '82-'83?

MR. COWAN: Not to my knowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chair-

man, I'd like to ask the Minister whether there's anything in here for northern nursing education programs or other northern health programs, particularly in the education sphere?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: We are looking at some of those programs. We've had some very intriguing and interesting proposals brought forward as the member will probably recall from his own 10 years as Minister responsible for Health, asking for those types of programs. We are including them in our proposal, I would believe, in our negotiations. We'd like to see them go forward, and that's the status of those programs at the time being. They have been brought to our attention. They are intriguing and interesting and worthy of consideration and we are attempting to convince the Federal Government of the benefit of cost sharing those types of programs.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While I welcome that information, I wonder if the Minister could advise the Committee as to the extent of the spectrum of that kind of programming. Is it envisioned that the request or the application or the initiative to the Federal Government in this sphere would encompass northern nursing education, for example, mature students programs, perhaps at Keewatin Community College in The Pas, community health worker instructional programs and the like, and the funding support for continuation of new careers programming which could be, would be specifically designed to inject community health workers and counsellors in such fields as alcoholism and rehabilitation into programming areas in the north? Would the spectrum that is under consideration by the department be that broad and, if not, would the Minister give consideration to making it that broad?

MR. COWAN: My recollection of the situation is that all of those proposals or the bulk of those proposals have been brought forward in one form or another. We are considering all of them. I can't say as to whether or not they will be developed as part of a Northlands Agreement or outside of a Northlands Agreement or developed at all. However, I do share the member's enthusiasm for those types of programs and believe that there is a place for them and a place for that provision of that service either through a joint-shared process or through a direct delivery program on the part of the province or the Federal Government as the case may be. We certainly want to see those sorts of programs developed because they as the member knows, are crucial to maintaining health professionals in northern communities.

I might add that the program which was brought forward under his government in respect to encouraging northern residents to get into the medical profession was that type of program. Although it was not exactly the same as some of the programs which he has outlined just previously, it is that style of program which says, yes, we have a problem maintaining health professionals in northern communities and who should be better suited to provide that sort of service than northerners. At the same time, they rec-

ognize that there has been a limited opportunity for northerners to participate in those programs, so these are the type of affirmative action programs that enable people to enter into those specified employment mainstreams and to provide the type of service which he knows is so necessary and I agree is so necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that the Enterprise Development Fund would not be proceeded with, that it was taken out previously as a matter of fact because the Federal Government would not entertain that particular item within the Northern Agreement.

Is there going to be some process with the Federal Government, because they indicated that they would like to deliver the program of enterprise development in Northern Manitoba, is there going to be any structure set up whereby there's a group of business people from the north; a group from the Federal Government; a group from the Provincial Government that would make the final decision as to what enterprise development would happen in the North? Will the Provincial Government have any input into the enterprise development or economic development in Northern Manitoba?

MR. COWAN: Yes, to clarify the record, what I said was that was one of those programs which was included in a \$4,193,200 figure for 1981-82 fiscal year which was conditional upon the agreement being signed and for that reason did not go ahead. I did not mean to imply that his government or our government stopped it.

The specific answer to his question revolves around what the Federal Government is calling their one-stop centre in Northern Manitoba or a regional centre which provides the type of service which the member is addressing. It is not as definitive at this stage as it could be, or perhaps it is as definitive as it could be given the timing of it; we don't know all the details about it, but we are discussing, and it is a part of the negotiations; provincial participation in that program. Now, whether that be monetary participation or decision making participation remains yet to be seen. I believe we are approaching our participation from both aspects I believe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions . . .
The Member for Swan River.

MR. D.M. (DOUG) GOURLAY (Swan River): Yes, I wonder if the Minister indicated that the negotiations are under way right now with respect to a new Northern Development Agreement and also negotiations for Special ARDA Agreement? Are these being negotiated together and rolled into a new combined package or are they kept separately?

MR. COWAN: No, they are being kept separate, because they in fact provide two different types of service to Northern Manitoba.

MR. GOURLAY: The negotiations as I understand it

are still going on locally with the federal civil servants and your own staff members. After the final negotiations are completed here, then I presume it goes to you and federal counterpart to sort of come to a final decision. Could you give us some indication at this time as to the negotiations with staff locally and the federal counterparts as to the date when that final package will be put together?

MR. COWAN: I think we're fast approaching the day when it will involve Ministerial decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes the items under No. 4.(a). We can proceed to 4.(b), Agreements, Management and Co-ordination. No. 4.(b)(1), Salaries and Wages.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I would just, really I think my question comes under No. 3. with respect to the Northern Flood Agreement. Does the Minister have the schedule of activities that are proposed under that agreement for the current year?

MR. COWAN: There's a fair number and perhaps I can start out by saying that if you noted the paper today you will be aware that Claim No. 11 has been satisfactorily concluded. Perhaps I can provide just a bit of background information to fill in the newspaper account of that particular claim.

The community of Cross Lake suggested that the low water levels as a result of the Hydro project in the area had reduced their ability to engage in their traditional forms of recreation. When this situation was first brought to my attention I discussed it with a great number of people and the solicitor which works for the Department of Northern Affairs in regard to arbitrations and decisions under the Northern Flood Agreement suggested that I should read the transcript of the arbitration hearing which was held in Cross Lake. I had opportunity to read a fair amount of that transcript and was convinced personally by the eloquence and the sincerity of the individuals providing their testimony, that in fact their traditional recreational activities had been curtailed as a result of the low water levels. As a result, they were asking for an indoor arena and some other recreational facilities built into that infrastructure. I believe at the time they were asking for a swimming pool as well inside the indoor arena; artificial ice and a swimming pool.

They were also asking that environmental studies be carried out to determine ways by which the water level might be increased and the environmental impacts of those particular projects. My immediate recollection includes a weir being constructed or there was even a suggestion of putting balloons in certain waterways that would then block those waterways and back the water up. They wanted an overview done of those particular options and the environmental considerations of those options taken into account as a part of that overview. So, they brought this matter to the attention of Manitoba Hydro; the Federal Government; the Provincial Government, who are the signatories to the Northern Flood Agreement along with the Cross Lake Band as one of the five Bands. That proceeded through arbi-

tration; that is why I had the advantage of reading the testimony which was quite instructive and if the member opposite feels as if he has the time to read through that — it takes a couple of hours — I would suggest that he contact the departmental solicitor and suggest that I had recommended that he read it and have a copy given to him. — (Interjection) — Yes, it is good reading and it does provide one with a very real sense of what's happening there.

I might add that Manitoba Hydro and the province and the Federal Government were convinced as well by the eloquence of those persons giving testimony, and while the claim had entered into the arbitration process, it never had to be arbitrated because an agreement was reached on the part of Manitoba Hydro, the Province of Manitoba, the Federal Government and the Cross Lake Band. That agreement by the way did not include the indoor swimming pool to my understanding, but it did include the indoor skating rink and the other facilities and the environmental study. That agreement was reached just yesterday I believe, or last week; very very recently, if I'm wrong on the specific date, and I'm pleased to be able to tell you that that settlement will mean an enhanced and expanded recreational facility for the community. It also, I think, provides some further insights into the problems and the environmental overview and the study which will be accomplished as a part of that agreement, will in fact, provide us with a type of information which we need to make better decisions; when I say we I mean the four signatories to the agreement. So, I think it's a very good decision.

Now to answer your specific question — objectives and outputs of this particular section of the department are to survey severance lines in the five communities by October 1982 at an approximate cost of \$275,000, as well the intent to negotiate the exchange of five parcels of land and establish four hold areas at a cost of \$30,000 in the upcoming fiscal year. Of course, we will be represented on the NEYANUN Incorporated Board of Directors and that will be a cost of \$1,800 to the province. We hope to participate in 12 meetings of the Wildlife Advisory and Planning Board and 12 meetings of the Community Liaison Committee and 12 meetings of the Employment Task Force in 1982-83 at a cost of \$219,000.00. Those Committees were set up as part of the continuing process of dealing with some of the effects of the Hydro projects in the area.

Those Committees are expected to develop a Conservation Officer Training Program for a number of Band members, to provide an information workshop on a variety of subjects, and to accomplish training and employment program recommendations which will meet the need of the communities and the objectives of the Northern Flood Agreement.

We expect, as well, staff to meet monthly at the local level and semi-annually at a four-party level and that will not be an additional cost factor to the province, that is included as part of the normal cost of salaries.

We expect that we'll have to pay expenses of an arbitrator for the Northern Flood Agreement at a cost of \$125,000 to the province, 50 percent of which is recoverable. And, of course, we are obligated to pay our provincial share of legal council fees for claimants in the arbitrator's process, as the member is aware we

have that responsibility under the agreement.

There are 18 claims under the Northern Flood Agreement — I'm pleased to be able to amend that, there are now 17 claims under the Northern Flood Agreement, and, believe me, every claim that we are able to successfully conclude is of benefit to all the parties of that agreement. Do any of the members opposite wish me to go through the claims on a claim-by-claim basis, it will take five minutes if you care to hear that detail?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I wouldn't mind.

MR. COWAN: Claim No. 1 - the claimant is the Cross Lake Band, the respondent is the Province of Manitoba and the claim issue is the ownership of islands in the Cross Lake area. The status of that claim is that the arbitrator has ruled that he has jurisdiction to hear such a claim and the province is in the process of appealing that jurisdiction. If at any point you wish more detail on any one of these claims and I will try to provide the background information.

The second claim is the Northern Flood Committee Incorporated as a claimant, Canada and Manitoba as the respondent, and the claim issue is a ratification of a cost overrun as part of the process of the agreement, and a claim has been filed and a defense has been filed.

Claim No. 3 — again between Northern Flood Committee Incorporated, but this time the respondent is Hydro, is revolving around what is an alleged delay of remedial work funds and Hydro was ordered to pay \$124,294.32 as a result of that claim.

Claim No. 4 — is again the Northern Flood Committee Incorporated as a claimant, this time the Government of Canada as respondent. It concerns an alleged delay in payment of a grant to the NEYANUN Incorporated and Canada was ordered to pay, in this instance, \$2,273.97.

Claim No. 5 — is a claim brought forward by three individuals of the Cross Lake Band, the respondent is Hydro, the issue is their alleged loss of taxi business. They have filed a claim and a defense has been filed as well.

Claim No. 6 — is a claim brought forward by the Cross Lake Band, the respondent is Hydro, the issue is the provision of electric heat to the homes in the area. There has been a claim filed and a demand for particulars by Hydro has also been filed and that's the status of that particular claim at this time.

By the way, all these status reports are as of January 1982 and so, therefore, there may have been some progress made and it has not been included on this, but I'm trying to give you a general overall picture. I don't want to be held to the status reports specifically just in case there has been some progress made since the time this information was filed and forwarded to me and my now having the opportunity to provide it to you.

Claim No. 7 — is a claim brought forward by the Norway House Band, the respondent is Hydro and the claim called for the construction of a transmission line to the new fish station and that claim, to my understanding, has been dismissed.

Claim No. 8 — is a claim brought forward by the Cross Lake Band, Hydro is the respondent, and it

involves in a very general way hunting, fishing and trapping activities in the area and that claim has been discontinued.

Claim No. 9 — is a claim brought forward by the Cross Lake Band, Hydro, again, is the respondent. This claim involves a water supply in the area — the claim has been filed and Hydro has demanded the particulars and they are awaiting those particulars before the claim is proceeded with by the arbitrator.

Claim No. 10 — has been brought forward by the Cross Lake Band and has named three parties as respondents; the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Canada and Manitoba Hydro. What they are talking about in a very general sense is the implementation of the agreement and some difficulties and concerns which they have about that. The claim has been filed and Hydro has asked for particulars and that is the status of that claim.

Claim No. 11 — is a claim brought forward by the Cross Lake Band. Again, three respondents, the same as previously mentioned, are involved. It involves recreational uses at Cross Lake, and although my status report says a hearing is in progress, I am pleased to tell you that we have reached a satisfactory decision in that regard.

Claim No. 12 — is brought by the Northern Flood Committee Inc.; three respondents involved, the same as previously mentioned, and it involves mercury contamination in the area, suggested mercury contamination and testing for such. An interim consent order is in effect and it's dated June 30th, 1981.

Claim No. 13 — is a claim brought forward by the Cross Lake Band, the respondent is Hydro. The claim revolves around community trapline compensation, and the status is that the claim has been filed.

Claim No. 14 — concerns the Nelson House Band, the respondent is the Province of Manitoba. The claim revolves around navigation concerns at the Footprint River Causeway and a claim has been filed.

Claim No. 15 — is brought forward by the Nelson House Band, the respondent is Hydro. It suggests that there should be greater remedial works accomplished in the community by Hydro and affidavits have been filed in respect to that claim.

Claim No. 16 — is brought forward by the Norway House Band and the Fishermans Co-op, as a group, and some Co-op members. The respondents are Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro. It concerns the Play-green Lake Commercial Fishery and a claim has been filed.

Claim No. 17 — has been brought forward by the Nelson House Band. The respondent is Manitoba Hydro; it concerns a Notigi portage and the claim has been filed.

The last claim which I have on my list, to date, has been brought forward by the Northern Flood Committee Inc. The respondents are the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Canada and Manitoba Hydro, and it is the Lake Winnipeg control and Nelson River Study Board recommendations, and a claim has been filed. If the member wants specific information, or any other member wants specific information on any of those claims I will attempt to provide it this evening. I may have to ask for your indulgence until tomorrow to get the exact detail if it is determined that you need that.

MR. GOURLAY: I'd like to thank the Minister for that information. Earlier he indicated that some of the activity would include the location of severance lines, I believe, in five communities. That has been an ongoing kind of a process. Have any of the severance lines been completed in any of the communities? I understand that, in the case of Cross Lake, has that been completed or almost nearing completion?

MR. COWAN: It is my understanding that some work has been undertaken; some discussions has been undertaken, but there has been no finalization, as of yet, on any of the severance lines; some we hope to see accomplished in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(b)(1)—pass; 4.(b)(2)—pass; Item 4.(b)(3)—pass; Item 4.(c)(1) — the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: The Minister had wanted to get the floor here and I was just wondering if he had some introductory remarks to make at this point?

MR. COWAN: Well, we've pretty much discussed the Special ARDA Agreement under different sections, but I would like to provide an overview, and if there are any questions at this point I'd be very glad to try to answer them. That's always the danger of discussing items under different sections; you sometimes end up repeating yourself when you have the overview presented, but I think it's important that we have a concise statement in the record in respect to these agreements. The Special ARDA Program is a federal-provincial cost shared Native orientated economic development program. It's been in existence in Manitoba for about 10 years now. The initial agreement was signed July 20th in 1971. It was subsequently followed by an extension agreement to March 31st, 1977. On March 9th, 1977 a new 5-year agreement was signed; that agreement expires on March 31st of this year, as was indicated earlier in the Estimates.

The objectives of this particular program, and the agreement, are to assist in the economic development in social re-adjustment of residents of rural areas, particular those of Indian ancestry who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities. The Special ARDA Program in Manitoba is composed of two administrative components; the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Special ARDA Sector and Provincial Department of Northern Affairs and the Special ARDA Sector.

Federal staff in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion respond to request for grant assistance for commercial undertakings. Provincial staff in the Department of Northern Affairs respond to requests from primary producers such as commercial fisherman, trappers, agricultural groups; we also respond to requests for related infrastructure and training development.

The Provincial Special ARDA Program is responsible for the delivery of these three sub-program areas; primary producing activity which provides partial equipment grants to needy groups of fishermen, trappers or persons attempting to improve the production capacity of leased marginal land.

The second sub-structure is related infrastructure which provides limited assistance for the continuation of vital resource access routes or to access Special ARDA projects to sewer, water systems and/or a source of electrification, where necessary or needed.

The third and final sub-component is a program that ensures Special ARDA recipients are provided with the opportunity to develop knowledge and skills and/or the support services that will guarantee the success of their activities.

The program is cost-shared in the following way: assistance to Treaty Indians under the program is 100 percent federal money; assistance to others is 50 percent federal and 50 percent provincial money. The administration of the program is 50 percent federal money and 50 percent provincial money. The commercial section is federally administered and all commercial undertakings are 100 percent federally financed with the exception of training assistants which is financed on a 50-50 basis by the provincial government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of funding under (c)(1) is slightly lower this year than it was last year. Is there any significant change in staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: I'm given good advice by my staff. They tell me that at this point, we should be talking in rather general terms because again this is the agreement which we discussed this afternoon and early in the evening and it is under negotiations. There is some anticipated change, but I would far prefer to discuss those at another time when we have an opportunity to have the agreement in front of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(c)(1)—pass; 4.(c)(2)—pass; That completes the items under 4.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,076,400 for Northern Affairs, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Agreements Management and Co-ordination—pass.

Item 5. Environmental Management; 5.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: I'd indicated earlier that I'd make a brief general statement in respect to this particular item and then we could go into the detail.

Again, as was previously, it was both a pleasure and a privilege to be able to address the Estimates in this way and to provide the detailed comment on the Environmental Management Division in its spending plans for the fiscal year 1982-83. You will note that there is a request for a \$998,600 increase in this year's spending over last year's expenditures. This equals a 16 percent increase. We believe this anticipated increase will allow for specified development of certain new programs and projects. As well, it will mean the continuation of many existing activities of the

division. Finally, the spending plans will permit the enhancement and expanded operation of a number of specified programs. We will be able to address the details of these activities as we proceed through the line by line consideration of the Estimates.

However, there are some general initiatives which I'd like to highlight at this time. Many of the expanded programming which is contained in these Estimates results directly from an expanded awareness of many old and some new environmental concerns. For example, acid rain has been around for a long time. We all know that acid precipitation was generated in the past previous to the industrialization of society by volcanic eruptions. However, with the industrialization of society, we find that the problem has become exasperated and increased. We are now beginning to have a greater awareness of that problem as we look at many of the effects of acid precipitation occurring in other jurisdictions. Manitobans as well as Canadians as a whole are looking to their governments to thoroughly examine and document the presence and the potential or real effects of acid precipitation and possible acidification of waters and lands. Given a transboundary nature or the long-range transportation aspect of this pollution problem, we must approach this problem from a provincial perspective in a number of ways.

First, we must monitor, we must monitor not only that which is happening as a result of pollution emissions in our own jurisdictions but we must monitor that which is resulting from the long-range transport of sulphur dioxide emissions. That's one part of the program.

As well, we must bring forward programs and actions to prevent further sulphur dioxide emissions to the greatest extent possible. Consequently, in these Estimates you will see requests for increased funding to allow us to undertake those particular activities. I believe there is \$55,000 which we'll be requesting for increased acid precipitation monitoring. At the same time, there is money that is built into the budget which will allow us to begin to systematically replace our monitoring equipment which has been in place for some time and in fact — excuse me — is in fact being replaced on a regular basis as necessary over a period of time.

I'd also like to comment on a meeting which I had a couple of weeks ago in Saskatoon with the western provincial Ministers of the environment in which we discussed a western approach to acid precipitation and its potential effects. As you know, the Federal Government has been very active in its campaign regarding acid rain and control measures and monitoring measures and a whole series of measures which they have put in place to attempt to deal with the problem from many different perspectives. We met with the western Ministers to insure that we were able to put together that sort of co-ordinated approach for the western provinces. If one looks carefully at the flow patterns of prevailing winds, and at the areas of industrialization, Manitoba is in a unique position. It could either be grouped in with the eastern part of the country in respect to the type of sulphur-dioxide emitters which it has, the primary ones being Inco of course and Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and the control measures which are necessary to deal with

those sorts of point sources of emissions are similar to the control measures which are necessary to deal with similar types of point source emitters of sulphur dioxide in industrialized eastern Canada. But if one looks at the soil structure and the geographical structure of the area and couples that with the prevailing winds, it is apparent that Manitoba should be grouped in with the western provinces in respect to their approach to this problem. So either we're in the best of both possible or in the worst of both possible worlds and I'm not certain which, but we are certainly trying to address the issue from both perspectives. We are concerned about some sensitive areas in Manitoba and the effect of acid precipitation in those areas and we are providing for enhanced monitoring in that respect. We also will be sitting down over the next number of years and discussing emission control programs with our main emission sources. I'm certain we'll be able to discuss that in more detail as the members opposite have an opportunity to address questions to that issue. I hope they have received a copy of the booklet which was in preparation for quite some time, for which I will not take sole credit, but —(Interjection)— The Member for Tuxedo asks if I have my picture in it and I have to suggest no, I didn't, which doesn't surprise me, but he didn't have his picture in it either which does surprise me. Actually that is an unfair comment and I retract it, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. FILMON: If you can find my picture in any booklet in the department, you can have it.

A MEMBER: In fact, he will autograph it.

MR. COWAN: That was an unfair comment. No, there was no picture in it and it was a piece of information which I was impressed with and for which he should feel somewhat comfortable and even pleased that it was brought forward in the way in which it was. I feel pleased that I was in a position to be able to make certain that it got the widest possible distribution, so it's the best of both possible worlds for us. —(Interjection)— I am sorry, I apologize to the member opposite, I will ensure that he sees one. As a matter of fact, we should have enough copies for all members in the very near future. So, we will discuss that in more detail, I'm certain.

I also want to talk about another problem, one which is of growing concern and I'm certain we'll have an opportunity to talk about this in specific detail and address the general issue to specifics throughout the Estimates and that's in respect to hazardous waste and management. You will see that we've asked for increased funding for undertaking the preliminary selection process for a hazardous waste site. We've asked for increased funding for a Federal-Provincial Study on existing waste disposal sites, so we can begin to identify them and categorize them and provide more information on where they exist and what difficulties we may be encountering or may not be encountering with them. We've also asked for funding to allow us to operate the mobile monitoring unit which the Member for Tuxedo and the previous Minister responsible is well familiar with for the upcoming year.

There are a number of other increases, which we are asking for, which I think will become apparent as we go through the Estimates, but I do want to point out one staff person year which we are asking for to assist individuals already reviewing the Manitoba Environmental Assessment Review Act and process, and we want to expand and increase our review of that to try to put in place a comprehensive environmental assessment review process that will either be legislated or regulated or brought in by general practice; I can't say which right now, but will in fact provide us with the mechanism to review projects as they are brought onstream and to provide the type of overview which is necessary to ensure that we are protecting the integrity of the environment.

I believe with those opening remarks I will hand out a flow chart to the members opposite which shows the structure of the environmental management division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to begin with I welcome the Minister to this portion of his portfolio. It's one, I think, that he will enjoy, knowing his previous interests in the field of the environment. The great amount of reading that I think he did in the past as a member of the Opposition and his own particular fascination with those aspects of the environment that saw him, I think, put in many hours above and beyond the normal call of duty to be prepared and ready for the debates on environmental matters in the past will stand him in good stead in his duties as Minister. I also say that he is inheriting a staff which I'm sure by now he's aware of is very experienced and competent group of people. They're highly qualified administrators, technical staff, engineering staff, scientists, who I think have a fine reputation across the country for some of the work they've done, some of the studies they've participated in and a great deal of the information that they have participated in developing on environmental matters across the country. I know that I enjoyed working with the staff, found them always to be very helpful and to be able to provide me with the kind of background that I needed in coming before this House and other committees and groups on a Federal-Provincial basis in the past.

I'd like to ask a number of questions regarding the Minister's opening statement and perhaps I can proceed by leaving a number of questions on the table for him to pick up and answer.

I'd also like to suggest that in my view the Estimates don't lend themselves very well in their order to sort of an open discussion of many issues which are foremost in the minds of the members on this side. With the permission of the Minister I'd like to suggest that we have a very broad general discussion for the next while, not meaning just tonight, but a continuation after tonight on an issue-oriented basis so that members on this side who wish to have specific answers about particular environmental issues that affect either their constituencies or their special interests could obtain answers as to where a certain order stands or where the Clean Environment Commission review of a particular project stands and so on and so forth.

We would carry on just under Item 5.(a) in general and then on a line-by-line basis, go after it after we have sort of gotten through all the issues that we'd like to have answers for, and then the second part of it, once the issue-oriented discussion is over, would be in my view very short work in getting through the Estimates.

I would think that for at least a considerable amount of time in the early going we'd like to give our members an opportunity to address those issues that concern them and are probably, shall we say, critical in the mind of the Minister and his staff, and he'll have ready answers for, I'm sure. It would be almost a progress report or a status report on as so many were topics that in fact he raised from the other side of the House before, and certainly we have dealt with, but would like to place on the table and get a status report on it. If that's okay, then we'll assume that's the proper way to proceed.

Among the questions that I'd like to ask the Minister are if he could identify any additions to staff on the Environmental Management side of the Estimates and indicate whether there has been — I think he said there was an increase of one staff person year to do the review of The Environmental Assessment and Review Act? But if there are other additions to staff, if he could just in the early going give us an indication of where they are and what the responsibilities are?

The second question that I'd like to lay on the table is if he feels that the 16-percent increase which he's indicated is the overall increase for the Environmental Management side of his Estimates is a fair one, given the fact that it appears to be less than the overall average increase of the Estimates for the government for this coming year, and given the fact that the Environmental Management Division is one of the high-priority and high-profile areas that is, shall we say, in almost a catchup position in terms of initiating a number of new program initiatives not the least of which is the Hazardous Waste Management and Disposal Facility that he referred to and, of course, the Acid Rain Monitoring and Evaluation Program and all of those major areas that our government was working on and that I know that given this Minister's concern for I would think that his government would want to give a high-profile? That's why I would like some comment as to whether or not he feels giving this department a less than average increase in the overall expenditures is fair under those circumstances because I think that it's safe to say that everybody in society today is becoming more of an environmentalist and that term used to have some strange connotations in the past, but I don't think it has as much so any longer.

I think all of us regard ourselves in looking at the future of this country or the world in general as being environmentalists in our concerns for the kind of orderly development and utilization of our resources and limitations of pollution and all of those things that go along with an industrialized society. Those concepts are much more in the forefront of thinking of all of our citizens now and this expanded awareness, this increasing concern, for the future environmental consequences of present day actions and, in fact, actions from the past I think mandate that this government and any other government ought to be

giving a very very high priority to environmental matters, its budgetary process, its public awareness process and everything else that it will be coming forward with.

There is not only the expanded awareness and the concern for these problems, I think, but the need for looking at past actions that may have been taken without full information or taken without proper care to the long-term consequences, and so there is that clean-up aspect that goes along with the awareness, the preparation and the assurance that the things that we do today will not harm our environment in the future but the need to, on a systematic basis, go back in time and clean up existing situations as they become apparent to us as having environmental consequences that are adverse and that are not acceptable in today's standards. Those are a little more difficult to deal with because sometimes you're dealing with existing situations that would have tremendous cost factors in improving. But, nevertheless, I believe that a serious look at that, an evaluative starting point is important to this Ministry, and having arrived at a base line that tells us not only what are the guidelines for future development, but what are the guidelines for improving the past environmental consequences of our actions? I think those things ought to be part of the Minister's picture and his grand design that he has for the future.

It occurs to me that the Minister has indicated a \$55,000 increase in his Estimates for the Acid Precipitation Monitoring and I'd like to know if this involves the establishment of any new monitoring sites within Manitoba under provincial jurisdiction. I did get some information from the Minister earlier this year on that and I'd like him to give us an indication of the federal sites, the CANSAP and the federal sites, the provincial sites and what his plans are in terms of further monitoring. I'd also like him to indicate what the budget had been prior to the addition of the \$55,000 for that particular item.

He has given some introductory remarks on Acid Precipitation and indicated his awareness for and concern for that, and I'd like him to give us some indication of any plans he might have to reduce the amount of sulphur dioxide and the oxides of nitrogen that are in the atmosphere in Manitoba on a long-term basis because after all these are the precursors of acid precipitation. That is really the long-term solution to the problem, is getting at the source of the acid precipitation and even although that folder, that booklet that the Minister has apparently released does have information that indicates at the present time we are not suffering any adverse consequences that are measurable in Manitoba from acid precipitation, we do have a sensitive area in around the Precambrian Shield which occupies a great deal of the land mass of Manitoba that could be sensitive to acid precipitation and must be monitored and, in fact, protected from any adverse consequences of acid precipitation. So, assuming that he is interested as we were interested in ultimately addressing the sources of the acid precipitation, those precursors being as I indicated the oxides of nitrogen and, of course, sulphur dioxide. I'd like to know what his plans are in that direction.

Finally, of course, his concern for the ultimate disposal of hazardous waste that is generated within

Manitoba will be a topic that we will want to discuss in some detail. I would be interested in knowing on a status report basis where the other western provinces' plans stand; what decisions they have already made and how they might affect Manitoba in terms of any shared-cost arrangements or shared-facility arrangements that might be arrived at. As well, Northwestern Ontario is included in the study that was done by Reid Crowther for the western provinces and territories, and I'd like to know just exactly how the course of action following the Reid Crowther report is proceeding.

I'll just sit down for now and let the Minister respond to the many things that I brought forward on that.

MR. COWAN: I thank the Member for Tuxedo for his opening remarks, and kind remarks at that, and I can assure him that I, too, look forward to that broad general discussion as we've had throughout where we can discuss the issues and then, if need be, as we drop line-by-line, we can discuss specifics and move around a bit, back and forward. I found whether I want to or not I'm going to, so I might as well want to; it makes things so much easier.

The number of issues which he brought forward — I'll try to address at this time and will attempt to provide him with some more information tomorrow in detailed response to a number of them. Firstly, of course, the 16 percent increase which we are calling for is not all that I would like it to be. I hope it is enough to accomplish those things which we have set out to accomplish over the next year.

However, as the member has indicated, we are forced to deal with environmental concerns from three distinct and different perspectives. The first is to clean up much of the damage which has been done in the past. We've addressed that somewhat in some of the programs which we are bringing forward as additional programs such as the federal-provincial study on hazardous waste sites. We are attempting to find and identify those hazardous waste sites which may have gone — or excuse me, waste disposal sites; I shouldn't refer specifically to hazardous waste sites when we are talking about waste disposal sites in general, but to identify and study a number of waste disposal sites which we know are in the province, but we do not have detailed information on. This is a federal-provincial study; we're talking about \$40,000 on the part of the province this year. I believe, over a 3-year period, it's a \$120,000 study on the part of the province and, well, I think it would be more on the part of the Federal Government because there's a number of provinces which are involved in this particular study. So I can provide all that detailed information to the member opposite tomorrow, but I just want to let him know that we're addressing the past part of the problem with those types of programs. As well, the member knows that there are ongoing types of programs that are already in the system and which we are continuing or expanding at an inflationary increase which deal with that problem as well.

We also have asked for \$42,000 for the lead soil removal program in the Weston area. That's dealing again with past problems and ones which we have to clean up. This is a very frightening aspect of the whole problem because as they are finding out in other

jurisdictions when you locate one of these sites, you sometimes have a very momentous task to clean it up. The cost factors are staggering and the member opposite knows that. So when one goes looking, one almost hopes that they find there are none, but one must be prepared if they do find that sort of a problem to put in effect the type of activity which will minimize the problem or eliminate the problem, if possible. So that's a program which may appear to be not a sizable amount at this time but the potential implications of it can, in fact, be staggering as the member opposite knows.

We also have to deal with the present effects of environmental pollution. How do we stop it? How do we find it? When we find it, what do we do about it? This is where the Clean Environment Commission comes in, and we've asked for an \$18,700 increase in the Clean Environment Commission funding. I believe that's salary increases — yes, salary increases.

We will be relying more and more upon the Clean Environment Commission as time goes on to undertake a lot of activities which will assist us in this regard, not only to define specific guidelines, but also to look at major problems in a more general way and to provide us with their expertise and their experience through their recommendations and suggestions. So we are continuing to hold Clean Environment Commission hearings on specific operations; we will continue to do so. One which is coming up which deals with a sulphur dioxide emitter, of course, is the one in the Shell refinery in the St. Boniface area, and that will be March 22nd, I believe. I may be out by one or two days. But in the latter part of March, the Clean Environment Commission hearings will begin on those. Inco is coming up for hearings; I don't know if a specific date has been set yet but I can certainly find out and, again, we will be discussing Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and we are reviewing what is happening there at the present time.

When dealing with nitrous oxides, or nitrogen oxides, the problem becomes much more complex because you're not dealing with large, single source emitters. You're dealing with cars; you're dealing with a whole series of small pollution sources by themselves, but in combination, large pollution sources. So you have to address that from a somewhat different perspective and, quite frankly, I'm looking forward to the suggestions that the member opposite and the members opposite may be able to provide in that regard because it's a difficult problem, but one which we will be addressing over the shorter and the longer term as the member opposite suggests is necessary.

We are asking for three new testing sites for the Acid Precipitation Program. We now have in place provincial sites; there are a number of federal sites, so we're increasing it by three. I will attempt to provide to the member tomorrow a map showing the CANSAP sites and provincial sites and where we intend to put the new sites as well.

Finally, the member opposite said we must begin to plan for the future and that's exactly what we must do. If we want to avoid the mistakes of the past, if we want to avoid having to go through this lesson time and time and time again, we really have to start addressing what's going to happen a number of years down the road because when dealing with pollution and deal-

ing with environmental degradation, one is talking about future effects as much as one is talking about immediate effects. We will attempt to do that through an enhanced environmental assessment review process and through a number of studies which will hopefully provide us with the data base information which we need to ensure that we are operating on the basis of the best possible information.

Let me give you an example. When I met with the Provincial Ministers responsible for Environment from Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia a couple of weeks ago, we talked about how staff could sit down and begin to develop monitoring mechanisms for acid precipitation in each of the different jurisdictions that would complement each other, so that we would be able to develop that base line data and know that base line data which was being developed was comparable and compatible. That's very important and we have to address, especially the long-range transportation of pollution problems, from that co-operative perspective; sometimes more difficultly accomplished than not, but it is something to which we are setting our minds at this time. Hopefully, we'll be able to come forward with that sort of co-operative approach at both a provincial, an inter-provincial and a Canada-wide basis.

The member opposite asked for a list of staff additions. We are asking for 8.26 more staff for this Environmental Management Division. However, we are deleting one existing staff, so it's a total increase of 7.6 (inaudible) staff. We are asking for one support person in the clerical field, clerical support in administration. We are asking for an additional position for the MIRA section. We are asking for an additional position for the hazardous waste site selection process. We are asking for an additional Public Health Inspector position. We are asking for two additional positions for acid precipitation monitoring, one additional position for pesticide analysis and 1.26 positions for the lead soil removal in the western area.

We are deleting one Urea-Formaldehyde Program position in response to the Federal Government taking on responsibility for the testing program. I might clarify that for a moment so that I can allay any fears which people may have upon hearing that news. The Federal Government, of course, is only going to acknowledge their testing program when it comes to their particular program. So, for us to go in and do testing at this time or to continue our testing program in an expanded way would mean that we were actually performing a redundant function and one which was not of any value to anyone other than for their own individual information because the Federal Government wouldn't accept our test results anyway. They will only use their own test results. So, we are deleting that position but there still will be people in the department who will be doing testing for urea-formaldehyde insulation emissions on a sporadic ad hoc irregular basis as the demand presents itself, so that we have some test of the federal testing; so that we have some way to ensure that the federal testing is coming up with results which we would come up with if we were doing our testing program on a more expanded basis.

I'll provide a list of the increases in the program delivery area for the member opposite now and he can

perhaps address specific questions to them tomorrow if he wishes. We are asking for \$156,200 for the new salary positions which I outlined. Other salary adjustments, merit increments, come to a total of \$279,900.00. The inflationary increase for many of the programs involved in the Environmental Management Division comes to a total of \$313,000.00. As the member knows when one starts talking about lavatory supplies, one starts to talk about items which are escalating faster in cost than does the general inflationary increase. So, that's why we have a significant increase in that area.

We are asking for a \$1,200 increase to the Western Canada Water and Sewer Conference. I believe we're hosting that conference, are we? —(Interjection)— We're hosting that conference and so that's why we're asking for that increased amount. The Resource and Environmental Minister's Council Grant increases \$7,900.00. The hazardous waste site selection increases \$21,000.00. We are doing a Federal-Provincial study on dust suppression and the environmental impact of that for \$10,000.00. Again, the Federal-Provincial study on waste disposal sites will amount to a \$40,000 increase this year for the province. The operating and maintenance costs of the mobile monitoring unit are \$28,000.00. The acid precipitation monitoring increases are \$55,000; again, \$42,000 for the lead soil removal in the western areas. We're asking for a \$10,000 increase in computer service costs, an \$18,700 increase for the Clean Environment Commissioners and \$15,900 for hazardous waste site selection activity.

Now, the member full well knows that the Estimates that were put before him before the change in government called for a much larger increase in many of those areas. There are some areas where an increase was called for which aren't even included in this particular list which I have read off. We have asked for the 16 percent increase on the basis that we wanted an opportunity to put some of these programs in at a level where we could test them and watch them and then hopefully in the next year expand them to undertake the type of activities which we know are necessary. I'm going to be hopefully in a position to provide that analysis during the course of our next Estimates as to whether or not these programs did in fact provide the type of information which we had anticipated in providing and are worthy of expansion. I would expect in this particular area that we will see some significant expansions over the next number of years or perhaps exceeding 16 percent by a greater or smaller amount as the case may be. But the member is absolutely correct when he says we have some catch-up to do in this area. If I'd had a bit more time to deal with some of the new programs and if those programs had been in effect and we were able to have had some analysis of them then perhaps we would have been coming back with a far greater amount requested for the '82-'83 year. I don't offer that as an apology or excuse, I offer that as a statement of fact and the member full well knows that we have to undertake that sort of review. We have to analyze those programs because they are new programs doing new things — very urgent and necessary things nonetheless — but doing them in a new way and for that reason we need to analyze and follow them very carefully in their developmental stages to make certain that we are

getting the most efficient use of our money. I know the members opposite want me to use our money as efficiently as possible.

Sometimes, by not using money you can use it inefficiently as well and one has to walk that delicate balance between spending great sums of money in order to accomplish goals or spending lesser amounts of money and not spending it as wisely and as effectively as is possible. I may have laid myself open to that criticism. All I know is if I had spent a lot of money, I would have laid myself open to the other criticism. I accept both criticisms in the way in which they are provided to me as suggestions and comments and critiques in the way in which we do things. So, I can only suggest to you that the 16 percent was a value judgment on my part, which took into consideration many new programs which were necessary; the stage, development and implementation of those programs in such a way as to ensure cost effectiveness and efficiency to the greatest possible extent. I know full well that perhaps that by spending less than I should have in some instances, if that is proven to be the case, it may not be the most efficient use of our money but I'm prepared to take that chance at this time. Next year when I have a bit of a better understanding and when we all have a bit of a better understanding of these entirely new programs and how they will develop and how they will be implemented, I'm certain we can address the percentage figure by way of increase in more specific detail. I'm prepared to do it this year but I'm certain we'll have to wait until next year in order to have the information available to us which will enable us to make the type of considered decisions which we all have to make from time to time.

Just one last comment in respect to the member's opening remarks and he suggested that I did do a bit of reading on these subjects in the past and indeed I did and it was one of my more enjoyable activities, I can assure the Member for Tuxedo. I read, perhaps not vociferously, but certainly enthusiastically to gain a broader knowledge of this entire subject and my only regret is now I don't have as much time for that reading as the member opposite knows happens when one gets in the position that I'm in so I'm counting on him now to do that type of reading and from time to time to suggest to me some new approaches and some new options and ways of doing things as he will have far more time to acquaint himself in more detail with many of these subject areas. So I am certainly expecting and encouraging him to come forward with that sort of information from time to time.

As well, he knows that the staff indeed have much expertise and experience in many of these areas and I'd like to say to him that if he does have specific questions which he has in between Estimates or when the House isn't sitting, that he should call upon staff and ask them to provide him with information which is of a public nature and I'm offering him their service as well, as well as to any other member of the Legislature and the public because I know it is so necessary that we get the type of information which they have in their possession out in a general way so that we all understand better the problems which we encounter.

The story of the lily pond is one such example and I'm certainly going to, at this point, fend off any desire on my part to tell that story. However, if I had encour-

agement from the other side, if I had a bit of clapping, perhaps a little desk thumping, I could be convinced, I could be encouraged to tell that story. Now, you see, there a number of new members in the House who probably haven't had an opportunity to hear the story in the Chambers, although I'm certain I've told it to them in other ways at other times. So I will not — (Interjection) — the Member for Fort Garry — I'm so used to calling him the Minister responsible for Health — the Member for Fort Garry suggests that we should get together for coffee tomorrow morning and we can just go over the story. Was that all of us or just those who haven't heard the story? Well, in that case, 9:30 in my office, anyone who wants to hear the story? — (Interjection) — 8:30, the Member for Seven Oaks says and I will take him up on that because I know he won't be here at 8:30 so I feel perfectly safe in accepting that challenge.

I wonder if this might not be a good time, seeing as how the other committee has risen, to ask committee rise or — I'm at your . . . committee rise or do you want to make some comments?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Actually, we were going to have committee rise about half-way through the time that the Minister has taken to respond to those very few opening questions that I've laid before him. However, his response as normally happens has brought many more questions and provoked many more ideas from this side and so both the Member for Turtle Mountain and I, just prior to committee rising would like to respond and carry on with a few of the areas that he has touched upon and of course, depending on his response, we may end up going later and bringing open new areas. So I must say that I'm rather surprised at the Minister's approach to the problem of environmental pollution control in the province and the initiatives that need to be taken in the near future to arrive at some long-term solutions to the problems that exist and that will continue to exist and perhaps more will appear as we dig into the matters as he has indicated very fairly.

I'm particularly surprised at his very, I won't say *laissez-faire* because that was a term that he used in referring to the former Minister of the Environment when he was in Opposition, I wouldn't say *laissez-faire* because I'm sure that would be unfair to this Minister, but perhaps his rather easy-going approach towards the carrying out of these programs, given the urgency that he exhibited when he was on this side of the House for those problems of major concern in the environment that he spoke about in the past. I guess I'm surprised at his pragmatic approach to the Estimates and how he might consider that he could be criticized for spending too much and then again he might be criticized for spending too little. Given the attitude that he portrayed that these matters ought to have been looked after yesterday, let alone today, and certainly not tomorrow. However, they say that confession is good for the soul and he has bared his soul with us as to his inability perhaps to do all the things that even he believes ought to be done in the forthcoming year's expenditures in Manitoba so I'll accept that as an honest assessment and contribution to the

Debate and suggest that it certainly is one that I can understand, although the conversion has been a rather remarkable one as he took on the mantle of responsibility of a member of the Treasury Bench.

If the Minister permits, perhaps the Member for Turtle Mountain can just interject at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think on the offhand chance that the Minister might lie awake tonight worrying about it, and be in a weakened and debilitated state tomorrow, I'll wait and ask my questions then.

MR. SHERMAN: That won't necessarily preclude his being in a weak and debilitated state.

MR. COWAN: Well, I would certainly welcome the opportunity to develop my responses to those questions over the evening if the Member for Turtle Mountain would allow me that opportunity. However, if he believes it would be more appropriate to provide his questions to me in the afternoon tomorrow, I'm prepared to take them at that time and to respond in the open and not casual, but certainly relaxed way in which I have been responding to the debates in general. I'm trying to, through my own aura, impart upon the Chamber that sort of relaxed discussion. There shall be time, I am certain, for more fervent discussions and those sparks of zeal that every so often come forward in this debate. I look forward to those too, because it gets the adrenalin flowing and allows one an opportunity to discuss in eloquent but persuasive terms their philosophy and their approach. But the Member for Tuxedo should not be surprised at the approach to the Environmental Estimates because they are in fact with my general approach. I've just found now that in the position to which I have been appointed. I can accomplish much more and yet at the same time speak much less, and I know that comes as a great surprise to the Member for Tuxedo but it should not and I know it comes as very pleasant and welcome news to the members of the Chamber who, from time to time, have heard me try to, through long and vibrant persuasion, convince certain Ministers and other individuals of the necessity for action. I don't mean to appear overly relaxed or immodest as the case may be but I do want to point out that there are some new initiatives in this year's Estimates that were not in the Estimates before. Things are getting done, things are happening, Manitoba is on the right track again; we have more acid precipitation stations; we have two more personnel involved in that process; we are undergoing hazardous waste management studies; we are looking for waste disposal sites; we are cleaning up the lead at Weston. How long did it take them to clean the lead up at Weston, now I give them credit because they started, but it took a long time. It didn't take us that long to proceed with that project.

So, things are happening and I find to my surprise that I don't have to speak nearly as loud nor as long to make those types of things happen, so I do appreciate the opportunity to discuss in detail either tomorrow or beyond tomorrow as the case may be, many of those things which are happening. I also want to discuss

many of those things that aren't happening because I need the Member for Tuxedo's assistance and help, I need the Member for Pembina's assistance and help; I need the Member for Turtle Mountain's assistance and help; I need all of their assistance and help as well as the assistance of my own colleagues when it comes time to make those very costly decisions which ensure that we have in place the best Environmental Management Division in this country and I think we can do that, and I'm going to rely upon you for the support when I come back here for increased expenditures may be necessary to deal with some specific problems which we encounter and I know that you will provide that support to me because you too want to see that happen.

MR. SHERMAN: You're sounding like the Jay Cowan again?

MR. COWAN: I see the Member for Tuxedo rising to his feet, I've done it, I'm sorry, I apologize, I didn't mean to provoke you or incite you into a response; I said such nice things about you. I do hope that tomorrow we can in some detail discuss some of those major new initiatives, some of which he began and we are continuing, some of which we are starting on our own and all of which are extremely important to the people of this province.

MR. FILMON: I indicated earlier that the Minister's remarks continue to provoke additional comments on my part and I can't let him refer to the situations as the Weston Lead and Soil Removal Program as being in any way the responsibility of his government other than in bringing the final paper forward which was left on his desk upon his ascension to his new office and for him to suggest that anything other than perhaps the time that it took to arrive at the decision could be criticized and even there he is already telling us how these initiatives that he is looking after will take time and will have to be approached slowly and carefully to assess the effectiveness of them. And certainly all of the testing and examination that led to the eventual decision in the Weston area program had to be done carefully so that the right decision was made. And in fact we were dealing with a program that was unlike anything else that had ever occurred in the province before and the decision involved two levels of government and a private operation and many homeowners and other things. And, therefore, the program that was put in place obviously was done to the credit of the staff and to the credit of the government in office at the time that the program was in, so that he could arrive at his desk and sign the papers that allowed it to go forward and . . .

MR. SHERMAN: We are now getting a cursory follow-through, that's all.

MR. FILMON: . . . as well the hazardous waste management and disposal problem, the site selection process, the public information process. All of those things that he is carrying through and I'm glad he is because, indeed, he would have had considerably more difficulty in dealing with his Estimates if he had not chosen to carry forward with those excellent pro-

grams. So I'm delighted that he's carrying through with them.

But to suggest that they're major initiatives of a new administration, I think leaves me a little weak in the knees in response. The acid precipitation monitoring stations, indeed he has added to them and I compliment him for that because the Provincial Government that he follows added acid precipitation monitoring stations as a part of its program along the way and the initiatives, and so on. And, indeed, it's worthwhile to carry that forward.

I leave with him, if he's having difficulty in convincing his colleagues as to the importance of the environment to the future of all of us that he suggest to them that, and I quote this, although its source is forgotten to me, but I thought it was one of the best things I had read as Minister of the Environment that "we ought to start treating the environment not as though we've inherited it from our fathers but as though we are borrowing it from our children," and if he can impress that upon his colleagues perhaps he will then get some serious consideration of the kind of programs and expansion that he needs to carry forward the works that we are going to need for this province in the future from an environmental perspective.

Committee Rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.