

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 13, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills
 Committee of the Whole House

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, I would ask that this Order be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery, where there are 24 Brownies from the 21st Pack under the leadership of Mrs. Singleton, Mrs. Cook and Mrs. Spillett. This group is from the district represented in the House by the Honourable the Minister of Labour. And we have nine Boissevain Land Rangers under the leadership of Miss Judy Barefoot. This group comes from the constituency represented by the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. There's a story in the newspapers to the effect that two school trustees, and I believe it's in the Springfield School Division, that they had to resign because of some misunderstanding of the Public Schools Act, and I understand from the story, if I read it correctly, that these two men who have been asked to resign because of this infraction of the Schools Act will not be able to run for two years unless they receive permission from the Minister of Education. Will they be getting this permission as the story suggested is required?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, as I understand it, the Minister of Education has no discretion in this matter. I believe the Act is quite clear. This was an investigation under the School Act. The School Inspector is directed to carry out an investigation and to declare the seats vacant under these circumstances, as I understand it, and he has so reported that to the Board concerned and to the individuals concerned.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Do I understand the Minister correctly, then, that the two men in question will not be able to seek re-election for two years? Is this correct?

MR. JOHNSON: As the Act stands, that is correct, except that these gentlemen do have the right of appeal under another section of the Act to the County Court, I believe.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question. The point that I was -- maybe the Minister could clarify it for me. I understand that earlier in the year, or the last year or two, other members did resign and did seek re-election and were re-elected. What is the difference in the previous situation and the situation that exists today?

MR. JOHNSON: My understanding is that both are quite legal.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The two men

MADAM SPEAKER: have subsequent questions. You have used your limit of questions.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I am sorry, Madam Speaker. I don't think the Minister understood my question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 70 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed . . .

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, I would like to make a couple of remarks on it.

A MEMBER: Which one are we on?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Lands, I believe. No. 70, isn't it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Oh, Mr. Chairman, did we not go into third readings in Committee of the Whole House, or have we gone straight into Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have gone straight into Committee of Supply.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, then, with the indulgence of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert, I wish to raise a grievance on the motion to go into Committee. -- (Interjection) -- If I'm too late, well okay.

MR. EVANS: I'm afraid my honourable friend will have to wait until tomorrow. Motions have been passed on this occasion; Madam Speaker has left the Chair.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, I'm sorry.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I was quite willing to oblige my friend but I know that he couldn't raise that question at the moment.

When we were discussing this particular item the last time that we were in estimates, I believe that the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition were asking the Minister whether he wouldn't reconsider the present policy of the government in connection with the sale of Crown lands. I believe that both the honourable gentlemen raised pertinent questions and ones that are of utmost importance to the people who live in and around marginal and sub-marginal lands in the Province of Manitoba. I was in complete agreement with the policies laid down by the government to a degree, but we must reassess our position from time to time, Mr. Chairman, because of the change in the methods of farming, in the markets for the various products that are produced on the farms, and I do believe the time has come for us to reassess the policy now used by the government.

The situation is not as it was even two or three years ago, leave alone five or ten years ago. Most of the farmers in these areas have increased their holdings to where they are near economic units, and in some cases are economic units within the understanding of that term today, and I think it'd only be in the interests of the people as well as of the province if this policy was relaxed to the degree where it would allow an established farmer to buy adjacent lands outright, and I say this, Mr. Chairman, because there is a trend towards emphasis being placed on the raising of cattle, and the only place where this increase can take place in our herds of cattle is in these particular areas. The farmers who are raising and were raising cattle in the better sections of the Province of Manitoba, are going out of cattle because they find that the grain situation has changed, the markets for our grain, and they're going back into full-scale grain farming.

Now, these farmers would not use the land in the way that they would not make the best utilization of it, and that is our prime concern, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the land be utilized for its best purpose. As far as the marginal and sub-marginal lands are concerned, their best purpose in most cases would be the running of cattle either in their present condition and better if these lands were improved and sown to tame grasses and tame hay, and I'm quite sure that there are any number of well-established farmers in these areas who could be depended upon and who understand the matter of utilization now that would make the very best use of these lands, would not even consider growing grain on them in the manner which they have in the past, and the purpose for which the government has set up the policy would be fulfilled and we could get away from the leasing idea and give these people titles to the lands immediately adjacent to their holdings; and I would suggest to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the government consider relaxing its present policies insofar as the sales are concerned, that they consider application from farmers who are established farmers, have economical units or near to economical units, and that their applications be granted providing that the applicant proves himself competent and willing to abide by the best utilization of the land that he wishes to purchase.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise also to take issue with the present government policy regarding the sale of lands. It seems to me that this business of refusing to sell established farmers land that they wish to buy because some expert says they can't, it's of no value to them, it's just ridiculous. I have a case in point of a farmer of long standing in the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) Mulvihill district, and he has requested the government to sell him a quarter section of land which is alongside the highway and adjacent to his present farm. This man has been operating the farm for quite a long time and the land in question had been used by him. He knows the value of this land; he knows what it can be used for; and yet when he applies to have possession of this land they say, "It's no good to you; you can't buy it because we know the land is of no value to you." Well, this doesn't make sense. The man has been using the land; he knows the value of it. It isn't as if you were taking a complete stranger who suddenly wanted to buy the land and had never used it, but in this case the man has been using the land for many years, he knows what he can do with it. And to me it doesn't make sense that he should be refused the right to buy this land, particularly when he knows it.

Another case up in the Gypsumville area, a farmer of long standing has a good-sized farm. He wants to expand his operations. He's been leasing this land in question for quite some time. He knows the value of it; he wants to improve the land; and yet when he applies to buy the land, he's told no, we don't think this land should be sold to you because our experts say that this quality or that quality or whatever the case may be. And this is holding back progress in the farming communities by this policy, and I think it's high time that the government change this policy, particularly when people know the land and have used this land and are not strangers. I can understand the government refusing a man who comes in from another district, who's never seen the land - that is to the extent of using it - doesn't know the qualities of it, and say, "Well, perhaps we shouldn't sell this land to you," but in cases where a man is an established farmer and he has been using the land on a lease basis, he knows, and I suggest that he knows better than anybody, whether that land can be used or not, and for somebody to come and make an inspection on one given day and maybe then go back with a report that the land is no good for this or that doesn't make sense; and I want to ask the Minister to change this policy immediately. I've only cited two cases, but the complaints that I get are prevalent from all parts of the Interlake, and I think it's very unfair to these farmers who wish to expand their operations.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort-Garry): Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have these comments from the Member for Ethelbert and the Member from St. George, and as I mentioned the other night when the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Rupertsland spoke, we are taking a look in depth at this matter at the present time. I think the honourable members opposite, without reiterating the full statement I made the other night, the honourable members opposite will appreciate the concern we have lest some of these lands which are deemed to be land that should be not used for agricultural purposes, are incorporated into a larger unit and then some day again are subdivided and sold off to perhaps a farmer who would put them to uneconomic use.

I agree with the Member for St. George, however, that where an existing economic unit, a viable farming economic unit exists, he wishes to add to this economic unit from Crown land, that we should take an awfully close look at these cases, notwithstanding the fact that we haven't the degree of control that we feel we'd like to have in order to ensure that 10, 15 years or a generation from now that same land doesn't revert back as much as it did in years gone by because it was put to the wrong use. So the best I can do is to assure him that his comments are not falling on deaf ears, and that we will take a look in depth and we are taking that look in depth at the present time of these situations, and I would say to honourable members, not only opposite but on all sides of the House, if there are particular cases where they feel that contiguous Crown land which could be incorporated into a viable farm unit comes to their attention, if they would let the Department, either through the Director of Lands, Mr. Chalmers, or myself know about it, we will certainly look at those cases immediately and see if we can do anything to expedite the desire of the farmer to acquire title, if it's the policies -- because I can see the merit in the argument that they make.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the suggestion that the Minister makes, I have already applied that rule, and the department people, who are quite sympathetic, say their hands are tied because of government policy, and that until such time as the government unties their hands, they are unable to do anything for us when we do raise these points.

MR. LYON: We'll do what we can.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I have a different matter with regard to the lands of the province, and that has to do with the oil prospects and prospecting in south-western Manitoba. I understand that some time recently a survey was made by a firm called J. C. Sproule and Associates Limited, of the reappraisal, if one might call it that,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... of the oil potential of certain areas in the south-west part of the province. I am reading from the New Era of Melita, which copies an article from Oil Week of May 10, 1965, and apparently the report was made before that time. I would like to ask the Minister whether any follow-up work has been done arising from this investigation and report.

This Melita newspaper is quoting from Oil Week, a publication with which I am not familiar but I suppose it's one that pays special attention to this industry, and it seems to give a rather favourable report on J. C. Sproule and Associates' investigations. The first paragraph of this newspaper article reads: "Several important deep formations which have been virtually untested, offer good prospects for oil discovery in south-western Manitoba, according to a detailed report of Manitoba oil and gas prospects by J. C. Sproule and Associates Limited to the Manitoba Department of Mines and Natural Resources." It says that "copies are available from the Department in Winnipeg."

I haven't seen any of those copies, of course, and I wouldn't be in a position to give a very worthwhile opinion on them if I did, but apparently this journal, Oil Week, is also favourably impressed. I do not intend to quote at any length from the article, but a couple of further sentences I think are worth mentioning. This again is arising, I take it, from the report. "Most effective single incentive, the report said, would be the five-year exemption from Crown royalty on all newly developed Crown lands. This should induce companies to develop Crown lands on a priority basis." And later they say, and this appears to be a direct quote from the report because it's in quotation marks: "Considering that experience in various parts of the world has shown that many oil and gas pools overlie other pools in deeper beds, this lack of deep tests in an established shallower productive area is very surprising," and there are several other points made here that appear to have aroused a good bit of interest in that area. Would the Minister mention what has been done following this report, if anything has been done, or what view the Department takes of it?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the report which the Honourable Member for Lakeside mentions is indeed an interesting report and we have -- it was commissioned before my time in the Department and the report was received later on. I forget the exact date. There's an Order for Return coming down on it at the present time. I supplied copies of the report just recently to the Leader of the Opposition and would be happy to give my honourable friend from Lakeside a copy of that report as well, because it does point out some interesting facts, some of which I think were largely unknown by the oil industry in Manitoba with respect to potential prospects in parts of our province which have not been thoroughly investigated from an oil standpoint, and also, as the honourable member has mentioned, with respect to drilling in deeper horizons.

It will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that two years ago we did bring in incentives, new incentives for oil drilling and exploration, based in some measure upon this report and some measure upon consultations that we have had with the Independent Petroleum Association and other representatives of the oil industry in Canada. We have since distributed that report quite widely to the oil industry of our country in order to make them aware, as much as possible, of this over-all view of the oil industry in our province, and while we are not -- the government -- of course actively engaged in oil exploration, because this is not a field that government enters into, we have certainly, through the incentive program and through the dispersion of this report, tried to encourage the oil industry to look at these new areas and to, as well, encourage them to drill to deeper horizons through this new incentive program, in order that there can be some realization of the potential that is spoken of in the Sproule report. I'll be happy to let my honourable friend have a copy of that report so that he may see what is involved in it. Reference was made some time ago in debate to the Interlake area, an area which has some potential for oil and natural gas, and of course a large lease in that area was put out by the government, not too many weeks ago, to an exploration company in Manitoba, and this is not only in oil and natural gas, but in helium as well. And so we are quite hopeful that as a result of this report there will be added interest in oil exploration in the province; that coupled, of course, with the incentive program which is already announced and which I think is pretty well known in the oil industry in Manitoba. The present new regulations, of course, that I've mentioned, the incentive ones, give a royalty-free period on a discovery well, and the wells surrounding the discovery on the section containing the discovery well, for a period up to 1970. So this recommendation has been already incorporated in the regulations.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister able to say offhand as to approximately the depth that this horizon that they think is rather favourable lies? I believe this report calls it

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... the Mississippian. I thank the Honourable Minister for saying that he will furnish me with the report. I wasn't aware that an Order of the House had dealt with this matter. I'm afraid I wouldn't be a qualified judge on it anyway, but I do recognize that the one advantage that the Province of Manitoba has, so far as oil potential is concerned, is that up to date the wells where we have had a recovery have been considerably shallower than those in the other prairie provinces, and a well in Manitoba was economical because of that fact would not have been economical in either Saskatchewan or Alberta. My point is that if this formation that's spoken of here lies at even the same depth as, generally speaking, the wells of Saskatchewan are, or even the wells in Alberta, providing the potential is there it should put us at least on a par with them.

Then, of course, isn't it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the other favourable factor that we have here is that we are, in the case of Alberta, several hundred miles closer to the big market than they are. As I remember the situation - I've not kept in touch with it recently at all - as I remember it is that those two factors together were really the ones that made our oil potential as good as it was in the Province of Manitoba. But what I gather from the press report here is that this expert seems to feel that an area that has already shown some potential in the shallower field, is more likely to have potential in the deeper field than one where it's completely new exploration. So I would think that the logical place, if that is a fact, would be to continue this exploration work at the deeper horizons in the area that already has shown some potential at the shallower horizons. Have some discovery wells been drilled, some experimental wells, in keeping with the recommendations of this report?

MR. LYON: I can't accurately answer my honourable friend right at the moment. I will try to get that information for him, however.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 70 was read section by section and passed.) Resolution No. 71, (a) --passed; (b) passed; --

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, in this connection I feel something like our late friend Walter Miller did when he said "There wasn't a dime for Rhineland." Well I feel there hasn't been a dime for the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve according to our last report. However, there has been considerable sums of money spent, and I understand from the report the intention is to spend approximately \$5 million over a four-year period for parks in the Province of Manitoba, and part of this is to be spent in the expansion of park facilities in existing sites, and looking over the report, as I said, I don't see the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve mentioned in the report at all. I don't know what went on the immediately preceding year, but I feel that the government is overlooking a recreational area that is second to none in the Province of Manitoba, and it has not received the same consideration that other areas in the Province of Manitoba have, and I really do not understand why it has not. I don't want to go into a talk on what the area contains; I've often spoken about it in this House and I guess the members of the Committee are well acquainted with it, but I do feel that as time goes on this area is going to become more and important to all the people of the Province of Manitoba.

We have campers, both with tents and trailers, from all over Manitoba and other parts of Canada as well as from across the line, and unless the facilities are there we will have the reputation of not having the facilities and not only those who have visited once won't come back but they won't encourage anybody else to come in there. And I do think that the Honourable Minister should do a great deal more. Of course that isn't saying very much because there was nothing done, so "a great deal more" wouldn't be very much. But let us say "a great deal" for that particular area, because it is, it is going to be the future recreational area of the Province of Manitoba.

Now there's one other thing I'd like to mention at this time, and that is one of the lakes in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve, and as I've often said there are any number of them - I guess you could say hundreds - of fresh water lakes. The government has spent considerable money in stocking these lakes with a variety of fish, a variety that can't be found anywhere else in the Province of Manitoba, because you can catch any species of fish that exists in the province in one of the lakes in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve; and one of the lakes, which is a very beautiful lake and one of the larger lakes, is the Charles Lake area. I'm sorry to say that there was not all the foresight that we should have had in building up the facilities around this lake. I believe there were better facilities in other parts of the shoreline than have been utilized for campers, swimming, beaches, and for that matter the lodge that has been built there, and we are proud of this particular lodge in that area because it compares with any in the province of Manitoba, and the party who undertook the construction of this lodge has gone

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) . . . to a great deal of expense in building it and is hampered because of the lack of facilities. This particular lake is visited by hundreds during the week-end, and the facilities for them - for the visitors and the campers - is one little open kitchen, where they could get out of the rain in case they are caught in the rain, to do their cooking and preparing their lunches. The toilet facilities are chemical toilets, and you can imagine what they're like at the end of a day when the park has been visited by several hundred people. There's no facilities worth talking of as far as landing boats is concerned, and I think all of these things should be looked at pretty carefully, and I would ask the Honourable Minister to give some preference to the area and in particular to Charles Lake and the facilities required by the lodge that has been built there.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that a year ago I believe it was, I mentioned the fact that the Development Fund had foreclosed on a similar lodge in northern Manitoba whereby the party who had invested his life savings in this particular lodge lost over \$30,000 - lost everything he had. And I want to remind the Honourable Minister that none of these lodges can reach the stage of operating at a profit, or even meeting their expenses, for quite a number of years. It takes time for them to become known and it's just impossible, no matter how well they're operated, to get out of the red until they become well-known, and we much remember that this business is seasonal. There's only two or three months of the year in which they are able to operate, and they should be given every concession and every reasonable help to become established and not pressed, as the one up north was where it was foreclosed and resold for less than half of what was invested in it. And I would ask that in this particular case -- there's one other thing. I believe that this person is paying 3 percent of the gross turn-over as rental. That is the same amount that has been paid in the Falcon Lake area, if I'm not mistaken. But in the Falcon Lake area you have all the conveniences; you have all the services. You have hydro; you have telephone; you've got black-top roads; to draw the public, you've got the golf course and all the other things that draw in hundreds and thousands of people. And in the Falcon area it's an operation, in the business concessions I believe, almost the year round because you're so close to the main highways. This is in an area where in time the public will be there, but it'll always be more or less a seasonal matter, and this 3 percent runs into a lot of money especially when it's applied as tax on tax. The 3 percent is paid on the cigarette tax and the gasoline tax and the liquor tax, being doubly taxed, and I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that in all fairness to this operator or any other operator who is willing to invest in the lodge which adds to the attraction of the recreation area and adds to its services, that the matter of rental should be reconsidered. The 3 percent in this area is far too high for the services that the operator obtains from the government, and I might add also that the same operator provides certain conveniences to the visitors and the travelling public as well as to the campers and everybody else, and that should be taken into consideration. I would suggest that the matter of rental be looked into and whatever changes are reasonable -- and I believe that it would be reasonable to reduce this rental to an insignificant amount until the operator was established or until a reasonable opportunity was given to the operator to become established, and thereafter you could apply the same rates as you apply in other areas, but for the time being the rate is not just and I certainly would make a plea on behalf of the operator that it be looked into and that the rate be changed.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief on this item but noting that the report is almost, or is a year old, I wonder if the Minister could not bring us up-to-date on what has been done in the Grand Beach Provincial Park during this last summer, and probably he could also touch on a few of the other parks. After all, we're going to spend a lot of money on this park just outside of the city of Winnipeg, the Birds Hill area, and I would like to be briefed as to what has taken place during this past year and what are the intentions for the coming year.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, dealing first with the last speaker. When we come to the capital items at the end, I can give more detail as to what the program is involved with this year in connection with the different provincial parks around the province. I can say that it is a continuing and a large program and I can hasten to add to my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains, who I know has such a genuine interest in the Duck Mountain area which is certainly one of the loveliest natural areas that we have in our province, I can hasten to assure him that there's a little bit more than nickel in the estimates this year for the Duck Mountain area. I think there's something in the area of \$28,000 going into Charles Lake, Wellman Lake, and a number of the lakes that he has mentioned in the course of his remarks. Now it won't all be done at once, and

(MR. LYON cont'd)... of course it's a question of spreading the money that's available to us among all of these areas as much as we can, and at the same time trying to complete Centennial Park for the Centennial Year, but I do want to assure my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains that the Duck Mountain area is not being overlooked because it is one of the great natural beauty spots of Manitoba as he knows perhaps better than any other member in the House with the sole exception maybe of the member for Swan River, and I can assure him that in addition to being prodded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains I'm constantly prodded by the Member for Swan River. They're both on the same track; they both want the same things done; and I dare say that their persuasive powers will ensure that many improvements will be made over the years to this very attractive area in our province.

I don't have immediately in front of me the program last year for Grand Beach, but when we come to capital I can tell, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Rhineland about what is proposed for next year, and perhaps by that time I will have more detail on what was done during our past year at Grand Beach. I can tell him, however, that the work is proceeding apace at Grand Beach and if he ever has the opportunity on a Saturday or a Sunday afternoon to go to the Grand Beach Provincial Park, he will find, as we know from our statistics and from our views of the situation there, that next only to the Whiteshell Provincial Park in Manitoba, Grand Beach is the most sought after and the most used provincial park that we have. It's a tremendously used area for the general public of Manitoba and is being utilized to a heavy extent by people not only from the metropolitan area but by people all over southern Manitoba. So I'll be pleased to give him that information when we hit capital and I'll have, I hope, a resume of the work that we did in this past fiscal year at that time.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I only have one question that I overlooked asking the Honourable Minister. Is it the intention of the government to treat the roads in the Duck Mountain Forest area to make them dust-free this coming year?

MR. LYON: I don't have anything on that and it doesn't appear in my capital item that anything will be done. However, we'll note that suggestion from the honourable member that roads should be treated and try to incorporate that in one of our future programs.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, when the Cabinet met at Neepawa for the first time in their history outside of the capital city, my honourable friend will recall, if he was at that meeting, that the rural municipality of Rosedale made a specific request to them that they consider developing a park at Kerr's Lake some 20 miles north-west of Neepawa. Apparently the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made an inspection of the area, and on November 13, 1961, advised them that it was not possible at this date, but that a survey was being made of all the roadside parks and Trans-Canada highways and so on and so forth, and that it would be considered along with other projects when the survey had been completed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if after six years this survey has been completed and if it is necessary for the rural municipality of Rosedale to now reapply in light of the new survey and policy and program, if in fact there is one.

A further letter of September 24, 1963, from the Honourable C.H. Witney who was still the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in respect to the same area states: "The Kerr's Lake area was assessed for a recreational development and I visited the area over a year ago. The decision at that time was against any recreational development by this department. The survey made this past year of recreational needs in the province, in particular the relationship between activity and potential in cities, towns and municipalities with that of the broad picture, has been made through a questionnaire delivered to all affected and completed by our field personnel. The report has not been issued by the consultants who have studied these reports and made their own observations, thus the progress to date has been the collection and compilation of data only."

Now was there a report made, and if so, should all of those areas, municipal corporations and towns and villages now reapply for development of certain areas? I think they would very much like to know. And back about the same time - to be specific, on Friday, March 10, 1961 - the Honourable C. H. Witney, who was Minister at that time as well, tabled a reply to questions put by myself on Tuesday, March 7, and I simply asked three questions: what was the provincial financial contribution on the resort area at Rivers, the PFRA Dam at Rivers, and would the same contribution be made to other areas of the province? And the answer as given then was that the province did contribute \$26,000. No, pardon me, there was a total federal-provincial contribution to the park or recreational area at Rivers of \$26,180, of which \$21,000 was provincial and \$4,800-odd, federal. And my question number 3 was, is this policy applicable to other similar

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... areas such as Neepawa, and the answer is yes, "provided the use of the reservoir for recreational purposes can be reconciled with other purposes which have a priority" and so on.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my honourable friend inform the House whether or not he would at this time welcome new applications from all over the province from the people concerned, municipal men, as to development of certain recreational areas in their communities. Now I think last year or the year before, Mr. Chairman, we were supplied with a map showing roadside parks, picnic areas, wayside areas, heritage areas, and so on, and I wonder if he would again oblige us with this information.

MR. LYON: I believe I spoke last year on Kerr's Lake, and I don't have in front of me any up-to-date information on that situation. I will endeavour to get it for my honourable friend, if not before we are through these estimates, some time before we are through the Committee of Supply. I don't want to say anything to encourage more applications by municipalities for roadsides or developments of other recreational areas, because I can assure my honourable friend that they need no encouragement. They send us many applications, or many suggestions, for local and regional park areas, more than we have either the funds to develop or the staff to develop, regrettably, because many of the ones that are sent to us by municipalities are indeed quite picturesque areas which, but for the want of funds and sufficient staff to develop them, could be incorporated as part of either an expanded municipal park program or perhaps an expanded wayside program. But I do say that there are many cases which appear to be exceptional ones, which would have more than a local attraction, because this is the test that we must apply in terms of provincial waysides and so on. There must be more than a local attraction, because if it is only a local attraction then I suggest that the municipalities should undertake these programs on a municipal basis for the benefit of the people in the municipality. If, on the other hand, they have a regional or a provincial or a national attraction, then certainly we want to hear about them to see whether or not at some future time they can possibly be incorporated into the provincial recreational program.

I'm told that Rivers is a provincial recreational area. The Neepawa Reservoir, about which he speaks and with which I am familiar, is of course, or at least so I am advised, largely on private land, and there is this distinction on land holding between the two, but as soon as I get further information on Kerr's Lake, I will let my honourable friend know about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) --passed, (b) --passed..

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister prefer that all of the discussion and questions with regard to parks be left until a later item, because like my honourable friend from Rhineland, I was going to ask for a report on some of the park progress. Seeing that the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities is also in the House, I was going to raise the question of an extension of hydro facilities to the Moose Lake area. I understand that has been under consideration for some time, and if either one of the Ministers would bring us up to date on where that request stands, I would appreciate it.

I am very interested, as the Honourable the Minister knows, in the progress of the Birds Hill Park, and I would like to hear a review of the present year's -- or rather the year that has just finished; what has happened. As the Honourable Member for Rhineland pointed out, we have a report that is now a year old, but we have no report on what has happened since that time, and I would be interested in knowing what the progress has been.

I notice in the report of a year ago that it is stated that the provincial Department of Public Works completed the design of the nine mile perimeter park road. This is with reference to Birds Hill Park. Does that mean what the word "perimeter" implies, that it is on the outside of the park, or is it the road system within the park?

And then I am interested, in the Birds Hill, in the progress of settlements with regard to the individuals who are appealing to the Courts to have their claims settled. Have any of those yet gone to the Courts, and have we judgments given in the matter as yet?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, starting at the conclusion of my honourable friend's questions with respect to Birds Hill and the acquisition of land in the Birds Hill Provincial Park, the latest figures I have are as at April 6th, which is just approximately a week ago. The settlements completed to date - 81. Sixty-day notices have been served on 89 people. The number of requests for arbitration received to date are 73. There are two that are still outstanding, and two of the municipal lands are still under negotiation for a total of 158. Settlements have been completed to date and payments made out including five percent interest from the date of taking, for a total of 871,625.51. Of those who have not settled, 75 percent advance payments pursuant

(MR. LYON cont'd)... to the Statute of the amount that has been offered has been paid in the amount of \$245,995.68, for a total paid out thus far of \$1,117,621.19, and again those figures, I am told, are as of April 6 of this year.

Insofar as arbitrations are concerned, I am advised by the solicitor who is conducting these matters on behalf of the department, that he has made -- I can't give the exact figure, but a number of appointments for trial have been taken out in the County Court of Winnipeg with respect to cases. In some cases where earlier appointments were taken out -- I think some were taken out for the latter part of March or April -- requests were then received by the landowners to defer these dates, and these dates were then deferred by agreement between counsel, but at the request of the landowner. To the best of my knowledge today, none of these has come on to trial yet, but they should be coming on to trial some time, I believe, later this month, and I am hopeful that we will start getting judgments out on these matters as expeditiously as the Court can deal with them. I am also hopeful, as I am sure the Honourable Member from Lakeside is, that it won't be necessary for all of these people who have indicated they wish to go to arbitration, to follow through to the actual court procedure, because I think this has been the pattern in the past, not only in this jurisdiction but in other jurisdictions in Canada, that once the pattern of judgments is determined, say, from one, two or three cases, then it becomes an indication to the landowners as to whether or not they are approximately right in their request for compensation, or whether or not the Crown is approximately right in the offers that they are making, and as a result, it hasn't been the experience, to the best of my knowledge or information, that all of these would necessarily have to go to Court. Certainly I hope that they don't have to go to Court, but the first batch of them are under way, and appointments have been taken out, and I hope that these cases will be heard and disposed of expeditiously.

My honourable friend will appreciate that from the earlier debates that we have had on this matter in the House that there can be, from time to time, quite a discrepancy between the offer that is made by the Crown, and in this case after triple appraisals were made, and the amount that is being requested by the particular landowners, and some of the figures in this regard are rather interesting. If I can just put my hands on them I will give him some indication of some of the reasons why you have to go to Court in some of these cases, because there just doesn't seem to be any median point for negotiation.

The amount offered by the Crown may be -- take for example \$15,000, to use a hypothetical case. The landowner may well request \$85,000. Well there is just -- the negotiators have negotiated and talked to a point where there is no consensus between the parties at all, and it leaves the expropriated person in the position where if he holds to his view that he should receive \$85,000, and if the Crown on the other hand is adamant after its triple appraisal that they should only pay \$15,000, there is only one proper place for the settlement to be made, and that's in the Court. The figures with respect to this are quite interesting. We have -- and these are total figures. I'm not singling out any individuals because I don't think that that is required, but in the Municipality of Springfield, as an example, 19 owners; the total offer that was made to these 19 owners, when you add together the offer made on each piece of property, was \$364,627. The owners are claiming in their 60-day notices, and now presumably going on to arbitration, \$1,420,242, so there's a great discrepancy between the \$364,000 which we're offering in total, and the claim which is a \$1.4 million. In St. Clements where we have -- and this is just another batch to give some indication -- 40 owners who have been offered \$63,848, again just to give gross figures. These owners, who have been offered this \$63,848, are actually requesting \$664,775 -- ten times as much. Well again, it's impossible apparently for the negotiators to reach any consensus with the owners and arbitration seems to be indicated.

There are individual cases, no names attached to them; owners who have been offered -- and these are just rounded out to the nearest \$10,000. One owner was offered, say, \$40,000 -- his request was for \$270,000. Another owner is offered \$14,000 -- his request was \$182,000. Another one was offered \$1,700 and his request -- and here I presume there must be gravel values involved -- his request was \$275,000. Well, there's only one place to settle an argument like that and that's in the court and that's where they're going at the present time. But that gives my honourable friend a brief general indicator of the progress as I indicated to him before, the figures where settlements have been made and where arbitration has already been indicated.

With respect to Birds Hill, I don't have in front of me the press release that we put out, oh, some months ago, late last fall I believe it was, indicating the work that has gone on in the previous work season. The big job last summer was the construction of the perimeter road, and as the honourable member realizes, this perimeter road is within the park but it's sort of

(MR. LYON cont'd)... a great circle road that gives the traffic or the people using the park access to the different usage areas of the park. That was the number one item that was under construction. Number two, we had the contract last summer for the excavation of the artificial lake which has now largely been completed. Sanding operations have taken place over the winter so that the lake can be filled this following summer, and I would certainly invite all honourable members of the House who have the opportunity - whether informally or if they wish to be taken on a tour by myself or members of the staff, we will be only too delighted to arrange it - to go to Birds Hill preferably after the snow has left the ground and when spring is really with us, to get a view of what is going on in this remarkable area.

When one views this artificial lake from the south shore of that lake and looks across to the rise of land where the park pavilion building is going to be, you can begin to get some idea of the expanse of this park and of the multiple uses to which it can be put by those who are seeking recreation in an area only 14 miles from downtown Winnipeg. The different terrain in the areas is also a matter, I know, of surprise to people who visit it and examine it closely for the first time, because it does present a spectrum of terrain which one would find most unusual for an area so close to Greater Winnipeg. All in all, we're delighted with the progress that has been made thus far on the major projects - that is the roads and the lake project itself.

There are islands in the lake as well, which will be connected to the mainland by foot-bridges, and when you get onto these islands which will be grassed and which will have trees on them this summer because they're trying a new planting process that is lifting out with heavy equipment semi-mature trees and planting them right on the islands from other parts of the park, you'll see such interesting configurations on the islands as bowls in the centre of each island, and when I was asking the Director of Parks when I first saw these - you know, "Why are you hollowing out these little mountains?" - he indicated to me that this was just an added little thought that they had when they were putting the islands together. These will be little campfire or meeting bowls where groups of Boy Scouts or Girl Guides or whatever can get together at night and have a campfire in the centre of this island in the middle of this artificial lake, and have sing-songs or whatever type of entertainment they carry on as a group, and this is just a small thought and, may I say, indicative of the kind of careful thought that is being put into this park under the very capable direction of Mr. Walter Danyluk, our Director of Parks.

So I certainly do encourage honourable members from all sides of the House to see this park. If they can arrange it themselves, fine; if they would like to have a tour arranged some time after the Session - after the House rises - I would be more than happy to do it, in order to give them a view of it. For the forthcoming year, when we get to capital items, I can give further indication as to the program that's been planned.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm never astonished to find that the claim that is presented by the owner of land under these circumstances is much higher than what the public body that is purchasing is inclined to pay, because it's been my experience that the public body is inclined to look at it as just land. I think the one mistake that has been made in this area is that my honourable friend's officials have considered this as being agricultural land, and it is anything but that, whereas the owner looks at it, recently in that area, from the point of view that he has intended to establish a home there in some cases, or in other cases that he has intended to hold the land as an investment, knowing what the trend has been of people moving out that way recently, and he sees that it's going to be very valuable property in the future. I would hope that when these cases come to arbitration that that point of view will be considered.

Now, I recognize that we're not going to be discussing here the bill that the Honourable the Attorney-General has already introduced dealing with expropriation, but I also recognize that that bill, even if it were passed now, does not apply to these in the Birds Hill area. So I'd just like to check with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that these cases go to the County Court Judge - I think that is correct - and he mentioned that appointments have been made even if the dates are not firm in all cases. I suppose it will not be one County Court Judge that will be hearing all of these. Will they be distributed among the County Court Judges? Is that the system? And is there not considerable danger when they're distributed among several County Court Judges of getting a variety of approaches to this subject? I realize that it would be quite an assignment for any one judge, or perhaps any two, to take 73 cases if they all proceed to final arbitration, but I would think there would be some advantage in having as few as possible so as to get as uniform an approach as possible. This is going to be a mighty important job to these people who are appealing to arbitration. Just how is it decided as to what judge or which one of the judges available will take these cases?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the appointments are taken out with the County Court of Winnipeg, and I'm going now only from memory and recollection, but I believe the solicitor has told me that three judges thus far have indicated they have room on their calendars for appointments. Each will be taking, of course, more than one case. Enquiries were made to determine whether or not one judge could take a series of cases and I think one of the judges - I regrettably don't have the figures before me - one of the judges is taking two, three cases, something of that nature, and the other work is being spread out among the others. But I'm hopeful that there can be judgments handed down quickly by the Court so that there can be a pattern established or determined in order that both the landowners, who are vitally concerned, and the government will know what this pattern is to determine whether or not any adjustments are going to be required.

There is always the danger, of course, of -- not a danger so much as it is a comment on human nature, that each judge looks at a case in his own way, but there is the common denominator, there is a levelle, and that of course is the Court of Appeal, and if discrepancies appear as between different judges on similar land and similar areas, then certainly it is the case where very often the Crown will take the initiative if the legal situation permits, to take the matter to the Court of Appeal to get a final establishment from them as to what the land value is, and in some cases, of course, these matters have gone on to the Supreme Court which has handed down judgments in expropriation matters both in this province and other provinces in recent years. So under the present system that is the arrangement, that the cases will be heard before - as far as I know at the present time - more than one judge.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite aware of the fact that there is this leveller in the form of the appeal from the judgment of the judge of the County Court to the Appeal Court, and furthermore that the individual can go to the Supreme Court if he so wishes, but this is the difficulty of the private individual fighting with the government at all times and I'm very glad there is that appeal. I'm glad that first of all there's the arbitration before the County Court Judge, because from what I've seen through the years, and I'm not referring only to the time that this government has been in office - I've seen it before this time as well - the departments can be, and boards and commissions can be, municipalities and school boards can be pretty arbitrary in dealing with the ordinary citizen. I'm glad there is the appeal, first of all to arbitration before the judge, and then that there's appeal to the higher court and to the Supreme Court. But the difficulty with all of these things, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, belonging to the legal fraternity yourself, that even though this is a safeguard yet, it's a safeguard that's very unfair, because the taxpayer has to be fighting against the government, some of his own money is being used against him to fight him, and the average citizen just can't afford to go to the appeal. The average citizen may have the best case in the world but he still finds when he gets to court - and all my legal friends I think will agree with this - he still finds that it's pretty necessary to have a lawyer. Lawyers are expensive these days, aren't they Mr. Chairman? Very expensive. And he has to have the lawyer, and there's all this matter of taking the evidence and if you go to appeal, it's very costly, and this is why -- and I'll debate this at greater length. I don't intend to develop this theme now, but I intend to develop it more fully when we get to the bill that the Honourable the Attorney-General has before us. Because while there is a leveller, one of the things that it levels very effectively is the taxpayer's pocketbook. The average taxpayer can't afford to be in court very often. It's just too costly. This is why, in my opinion, governments and departments should make a special effort to deal with them on the fairest basis so that they can avoid going there.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I have a problem that I'd like to bring up at this time too. I'd just walked into the House when the Honourable Minister was discussing land at Birds Hill and I didn't hear him at the time that he mentioned that all the land was finally finalized or it has not at this time, and he I believe did mention that some of it is before the courts. Well the problem that I want to bring up, I don't think it's before the courts at the present time, but listening to the Honourable Member for Portage, I believe he has a real good point. There are many people who do not wish to get involved in courts at all and are somewhat reluctant to go to court, and I would like to know how is the market value of their land determined for the ones that do not go to court, because the individual that has come to see me and I have gone out to look at his property -- if I describe the property I believe the Honourable Minister will know but I'm sure that all of us appreciate that a lot of the land at Birds Hill has great potential values because of its adaptability to many uses for it, be it housing projects or recreation and so on, and it may be pretty difficult to establish a market value for that type of land.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)...

Now the man that came to see me, he said he was expropriated under the Birds Hill Provincial Park Expropriation, and the land I believe consists somewhat of 19 to 20 acres; it's about 50 feet off No. 59 Highway and I believe it was purchased for a resort area. This man did spend some money in trying to develop it for this purpose, and I believe he's expended somewhat in the neighbourhood of \$4,500 for this purpose and he's spent something in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 for machinery. Now he tells me that he had received an offer from the government of \$3,097, and at the same time this man also tells me that he had sworn affidavits that he has received as much as \$800.00 an acre for this land from private people, and he has received from one \$25,000 for the whole parcel of 20 acres of land. Now, I just can't see at this time why should this man accept the offer of \$3,000 or \$3,097 for 20 acres of land when he did receive these other offers, and if these other offers were real good offers. I think this should be checked into. I've seen the land, I've looked at it; it's a really nice piece of property. It's got beautiful trees; it's got a good hill where he did start to build some slides which he was going to have toboggan slides, and swimming pools in the summer, but I think there should be some real measure taken to see that these people are given a good price for their land if they don't go to court and they're not prepared to go to court. I can't see why they should suffer and have their land expropriated for almost next to nothing while the people that go to court may finally receive the price that the land deserves.

MR. FROESE: In connection with the expropriation of properties for these different parks, Birds Hill and such as the Grand Beach area, how many decisions that are made by the courts have been appealed; how many of these are finalized; and how many are still in progress?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for the invitation to visit the Birds Hill area because some 15 to 20 years ago, when my children were quite small, we spent many happy hours in that area and I began to think that there were very few people who really knew the value of that area at that time. One could go there weekend after weekend and never go over the same trail again, and with everything there in the ravines from cranberries to -- the happy hours we spent even using the 22 at target practice, so large was this area.

When I heard that the government had decided to make this large area into a park, my first concern was that I hoped that the City of Winnipeg would never need the gravel that lies buried under this park, but I imagine that there are many more pits in the area. I think that this did show foresight, and when we think of the area as being I believe some - 9,000 acres, is it? -- 8,000 acres, and I heard the Minister once say that if you wanted to accommodate 1,000 boy scouts for the weekend at a jamboree you certainly needed space. So I would look forward with pleasure to the visit suggested by the Honourable Minister for the area that holds so many memories for me.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the question from the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I believe I answered that question earlier. He may have been out of the House. None of the cases with respect to Birds Hill has as yet been settled in court although appointments have been taken for the first group to go through. In that connection, I could mention to him and to the member for Lakeside that on the Floodway expropriation, which was considerably larger and dealt with many more landowners, in the end result - and here I am subject to correction as to the exact figure - but in the end result I believe there were something like four cases that finally did go to court and were arbitrated upon by the court. Now I merely mention that figure to indicate that this was part of a pattern that I had spoken about earlier, that not all of them will necessarily go to court. That was the particular pattern in the Red River Floodway expropriations and all of the others settled either before or after those judgments were handed down.

With respect to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I can't of course talk about the particular case that he has in mind and I don't think he would want to mention any particular name here, but I'll be quite happy to take, if he wishes to speak to me outside of the House, I'll be quite happy to take a look at the particular file that he has in mind. But I hasten to assure him, Mr. Chairman, and without reiterating all of the debate that went on last year, that all of the properties in Birds Hill did receive a triple appraisal. First of all by private and departmental appraisers; secondly, by the Board of Review which was established under the chairmanship of Mr. Price Rattray, with Mr. Dick Driver with whom my honourable friend will be familiar, the Mortgage Manager of Montreal Trust, and Mr. Harvey Odell, former Past President of the Union of Municipalities. They did a review of all of these properties and then a further appraisal was done prior to this review.

(MR. LYON cont'd)...

In addition to that, the Board of Review invited all landowners to come in singly if they had any questions to raise with them or any matters such as my honourable friend has mentioned about market value that they wanted to discuss, and as a result of these discussions with a large number of the landowners out there, certain adjustments were made before final offers were sent out. I can assure him as well as the Honourable Member for Lakeside, however, that the land out there was certainly not valued particularly on an agricultural basis, because as indicated by some of the figures that I've been reading off in the House, just sample cases, a subdivision potential was built into each of these. An amount was given of course as is usual and customary for compulsory taking of small holdings. A potential was built into all of the appraisals where that - to all of the appraisals to the best of my knowledge, and certainly market value - going market value at the time of the taking of the land is one of the strong indicators that the appraisers used when trying to arrive at a price that is fair, first of all to the landowners; secondly, fair to the public Treasury.

So I think all of these matters have been taken into account, but if there are matters on a particular case that my honourable friend feels on behalf of the landowner our Lands Branch should take a look at, I would be quite happy to receive any submissions from him and pass them along to the Lands Branch in order that they can draw this particular file and take a look at it and see if these factors have been taken into account, because I can assure the House, Mr. Chairman, that it is the desire of the government on not only this but on all expropriations to be as fair as possible - as fair as humanly possible to the landowner and at the same time be fair to the taxpayer who is paying the total cost of this land acquisition.

I'm happy to be able to report of course that we are receiving splendid assistance in the acquisition costs of this land from the Federal Government. I believe the figure, subject to correction, is in the area of \$400,000 that is being received from the Federal Government toward the acquisition program in Birds Hill.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, we've had a considerable discussion dealing with the financial aspects of expropriation of properties and the buildings of parks, and I think this is all well and all to the good. I think we should have it. But there's another aspect of the situation in Birds Hill that I think is worthy of some note. My colleague from Seven Oaks just drew to the attention of the committee that for many years he took his family out to the general area of Birds Hill and roamed the countryside. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I've had the same opportunity with my children too. Living in Transcona, it was quite easy to go out to Birds Hill.

One of the features of going to Birds Hill, Mr. Chairman, was to gather the first blossom of the spring, the prairie anemone commonly called the prairie crocus, which is the floral emblem of the Province of Manitoba. As I say, Mr. Chairman, a few years ago we used to be able to go out into the area of Birds Hill, and at the properties one could pretty well see field after field with a purplish hue of our floral emblem. Now, Mr. Chairman, when one goes into the same area, however, it's getting more and more difficult even to find the odd flower blooming in the spring, and it can conceivably be, Mr. Chairman, that future generations, and not too distant future generations of our province, will not have the opportunity of knowing, of being able to see what the floral emblem of Manitoba is as it grows.

I would like to recommend to the Minister that in conjunction with the building of the Birds Hill Park there be an area set aside, if it is not too late, where there will be preserved for future generations an opportunity - as the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks referred to and also myself - where our children and our children's children may see the floral emblem of Manitoba. Where we used to go, most of the operations that have disturbed or destroyed the crocus, the gravel has been used for purposes of building dikes or building monuments in the Greater Winnipeg area through the use of gravel.

While it may sound a little mundane or a little farfetched after listening to the consideration of monetary values of property for me to make a plea for a little furry crocus, I do so, Mr. Chairman, because after all it is our floral emblem. It was chosen because it was abundant and peculiar to this province, and I ask that the Minister get hold of the horticultural aspects of the department concerned in government and set aside in that area of Birds Hill, even if it's only a small section of your 8,300 acres or whatever it is, where there will be preserved the provincial floral emblem.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend an invitation, not only to the Honourable Leader of the NDP but to every member of the House, to visit the Arden Ridge area

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . in two or three weeks hence. We have an abundance, or generally do, of the wild prairie crocus, starting from about Edrans to Birnie, through the entire what is referred to as the Birnie Ridge, and drop in and see me when you come to the country. You may get an extra crocus and other fringe benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister has told us of the number of parcels of land that was not only required for the Floodway but required for the Bird's Hill area, and we have discussed the value of the properties. I wonder if a compilation of values related to assessments was made as a result of the various purchases, because I have always maintained that there is a relationship between the assessed value of real property and the actual cash value, and while it does change slightly over the years, I as a real estate man - and I'm sure this applies to other real estate men - would like to know what the relationship is, because it makes it fairly easy for we people to arrive at the actual cash value if we can relate it to the assessed value, and if there is no relation, well then I would like to know what method the assessors now use in arriving at their assessed value. So I would appreciate very much, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend could supply us with even an over-all figure of the price paid for these various parcels of land related to the assessed value of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has suggested that some of the land - or the value of same has been settled in court or will be settled in court, and I wonder, in light of the experience that Mr. Lamb had on the Grand Rapids property, whether or not some of the people will now be encouraged to go to the Supreme Court. I understand that Mr. Lamb, on several parcels of land, or one in particular - I am not certain how many - after he had negotiated for some time went through the courts in Manitoba, and still not being satisfied with the price arrived at by the courts here, went on to the Supreme Court in Ottawa and got what - four or five times as much. Now what happens - what happens when the government, we'll say, have been successful in purchasing 95 percent of the land they require, whether it be for a right-of-way or a park or a floodway or any other project, what happens when the remaining five percent who have refused to settle gets two or three times more, or ten percent more than those with whom they had been settled, because it strikes me that they would immediately be dissatisfied with what they got, and I don't suppose that they can re-open negotiations again.

I know that a branch has been set up to acquire lands for all purposes and I suppose it's too early in their history to know what success they have met with, but I have seen it happen with both governments, federal and provincial governments in the Gladstone constituency, where one man has held out and got a big price and then everyone else in the area are completely dissatisfied. It seems to me that if there was some definite relationship of the assessment to the price paid, that it would alleviate perhaps some of these problems. So I would hope that my honourable friend might be able to supply the House with this information, that is the relationship of the assessment to the price paid for the various parcels of land.

..... continued on next page

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware myself of any compilation that has been made between assessed value and market value and compensable value that is paid pursuant to The Expropriation Act that has been made by the appraisers. This of course is part of their science of appraisal and while probably such a compilation exists with respect to individual properties, I don't know that it exists in a compiled form at all. If so, I haven't seen it. The indicator that he uses sometimes is accurate, sometimes is inaccurate, and I would suggest that the closer you get to a metropolitan or an urban centre perhaps the more inaccurate it becomes, because the land values on the outskirts of a city tend to be less stable and less fixed than the land values say in a purely agricultural area where by and large the values remain very much the same over the years with the exception of say the last five years in farm land there has been a gradual increase in the value, price received for farmland. But it's not a skyrocketing type of increase, it's more gradual than is the case with urban land where there is a subdivision potential and so on.

The question that he raises with respect to what happens to the man who holds out and occasionally maybe gets a higher settlement; the settlements that are negotiated of course are final settlements, and if a new principle of law is established by a Court with respect to settlement where arbitration has been resorted to, then that principle applies from that date forward to all future cases, and of course the appraisers in the carrying out of their professional function, adopt that principle, if in fact there be a new one, adopt that as part of their appraisal handbook for future appraisals. But of course, because there must be finality to these matters the fact remains that once a settlement is made it's made, and it's final. It's like saying that for--in a Court action ten years ago you could get roughly one award of damages from a Court in Manitoba for example, a broken arm. The award that you would get today for a broken arm might be 50 percent higher, but that doesn't mean that all of the cases on broken arms that were tried before the Courts five or ten years ago are then opened up and the new prevailing award is given. That isn't done because the system of course doesn't work that way.

The Honourable Member for Radisson is not in his seat but I hasten to assure him that we have taken account of this excellent thought that he has had. This has already been built into the planning of the park for the protection of our natural flora, and we have acreage set aside in the park as a natural heritage area and will be designated as such, where native flowers and grasses and so on will be cultivated. We are working in this connection with the Natural History Society of Manitoba as well as the Horticultural Society of Manitoba, both on flora and fauna, in order to ensure that within this show place park - and it will be that - we do have good areas to display to the public showing the natural flora of the area. So far as the fauna are concerned I am told that there is a small herd of white-tailed deer in the area, and this year, the past year, the park has been under protection of the Game area and the deer are being preserved and we hope that they will continue to thrive and to multiply in that area and will continue to be a natural attraction within the area. As well of course, within such a short distance of downtown you can find many other examples of wildlife, particularly birds in the area.

It's one of the great bird havens on the annual migration through, particularly of songbirds, and plans are already afoot in that regard, I believe with some advice from the Audubon Society of America, to ensure that we do as much as we can to preserve and to exhibit in their natural state the different varieties of songbirds and other wildlife that we have within the park area itself. It's a tremendously interesting area and provides, as I have mentioned on so many occasions before, a wonderful example of native land for people to visit and to see birds and animals living in a natural state.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 71 was read and passed. Resolution No. 72, (a) --

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one of the pages to take these brochures and pass them out to members of the House and the Press Gallery. We have a new brochure that the department has turned out with respect to Manitoba Waterfowl, and I would like honourable members to have copies of this brochure because from early reports that we have from people who are interested in the waterfowl resorts of our province, and there are many thousands, both inside and outside Manitoba, they find this an extremely interesting brochure, and it shows off in a colourfully pictorial way the many examples of waterfowl that we propagate and hunt in this province.

By reference to the brochure members will see that there is a description given of the different flyways. There is a general introduction to the brochure itself. There is an article within the brochure on identification, and under the different species of birds you will find a few descriptive paragraphs on each, in order that people who may not be totally familiar with

(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . these birds will have some more knowledge of their habits and of their numbers and where they can be found and seen in Manitoba. I hope that this brochure meets with the approval of the House. As I have said, we have had early indications from people interested in the waterfowl resorts that this is a most helpful brochure for not only sportsman but all people who are interested in the waterfowl resource. I hope that we will have it turned out in sufficient quantities to supply to school children and as well to natural history societies and to other groups who may well be interested in having this very handy document, and very well-illustrated document depicting the wild waterfowl of Manitoba.

I would like to mention while I am on my feet that this is one of the projects that's turned out by our Conservation-Education section under the direction of Mr. Al Murray, and without intending to puff at all I think that this is indicative of the kind of very good work that Mr. Murray and his staff are doing in order to get across to the people of our province the great story that we have to tell about our resources in Manitoba.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Minister and his staff on the production of this brochure because it certainly gives you information that is pretty hard to get elsewhere. It's well illustrated and I hope this is only the first of many that the Department will put out insofar as our wildlife is concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there seems to be still some misconception and misunderstanding as to the part played by hunters in the conservation and preservation of our wildlife, especially our game birds and our big game and because the hunters do contribute towards preservation and conservation and because of the misunderstanding I thought I should spend some time on this particular subject and I don't know of a better way to do it than to refer the Committee to the Wildlife Crusader, the November-December issue of 1965. And while I mention this Wildlife Crusader I would like to pay my compliments to the Game and Fish Association of Manitoba for their contribution towards the conservation and preservation of our wildlife. I think there's no other body or organization that has contributed so much to that end and in particular to Paul Murphy, the Editor of this magazine. In the early stages it was nip and tuck whether the magazine would be able to continue its lifetime or whether it would die in its early stages and it was only through the efforts and diligence and dedication of the editor himself, through hard times as well as good times, that the magazine has now reached the status where it's considered an authority on conservation and preservation of our wildlife. It's widely read by the members of the Association and by others. I, myself enjoy every copy of it from page to page and I would suggest to the members of the Committee, to those who do not receive it, that they subscribe to it and they'll find it not only interesting but useful and containing a great deal of very important information.

Now, instead of using my own language in describing what I think is the role played by the hunter in the conservation and preservation of big game, I want to read an article here headed: "Go Ahead and Hunt" and it's written by a Professor of Wildlife Management at Purdue University. I'm going to read quite extensively from this article, Mr. Chairman, because I think I should and I endorse the opinions expressed in it. And now I quote, Mr. Chairman: "He would know that hunting seasons and regulations of every conceivable variety have been picked apart for analysis, top, bottom and both sides". Now he's talking about the person who doesn't agree with our hunting seasons and the harvesting of our wildlife. "Actually even the most technical biological studies have the application of the hunter's problems. As for killing off the does, no one ever suggested it. How do we reach the guy who wears blinders and hangs on for dear life to his handed-down convictions? I guess we don't, one administrator told me. We just keep on getting facts and using them where we can. We tell our story to the people who will listen and hope there are enough of them to make a respectable program stick. He was right because that's the way it has been and there is progress to see. In certain quarters the deer hassle continues but in others big issues are settled and herds are paying off by ranges and crews.

"Twenty years ago Northern Commission closed the grouse season each time the cycle decline set in, which happens about every ten years. Today they just forecast poor hunting and leave the season open. It's now common knowledge that when you have a year of good pheasant production that's the time to make the most of it. The abundance doesn't store well for another year. So in 1963 Nebraska set a generous season, mustered in the out-of-staters and everyone had a ball. On the one hand we see more restrictions on certain waterfowl and on the other a loosening up on deer, antelope, sage grouse and turkeys. The changes are made when conditions change because someone got the facts. Where legislators respond to pressure

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd) . . . and meddle with game regulations anything can happen! But I'll hang my hat on this: when technical specialists recommend any particular hunting program they are convinced it won't reduce the year to year animal population.

Every game biologist I know believes in adequate protection for all wildlife, game, song-birds and rodents and predators; in the right places and proper numbers we need them all. For creatures like prairie chickens and whooping cranes protection must be total, while we go all out to establish ranges where such endangered species or races can survive. Of course the biggest challenge is to serve the growing public demand for hunting and our best chance of doing this lies in managing mass production species. These are the same birds and mammals which thrive because there still is a lot of country suitable to support them. In using this recreational resource it seems proper to make available to the sportsman whatever annual surplus exists. Surplus, certainly; it's the expendable part of a yearly production which would not survive anyway and which is above and beyond the breeding stock needed for replacement. Game, says a biologist is a renewable resource and hunting is non-destructive. How is he so sure? Behind this conviction is the knowledge of the changes that go on in animal population through the year. Spring and summer are the breeding and rearing period when new recruits build a population. A peak number of grown up animals - that is adults and sub-adults - is reached in fall before the hunting season. From the time of that annual maximum numbers dwindle until another spring brings a new crop of young. In these seasonal changes certainly relationships and trends appear repeatedly, so consistently in fact that they are recognized as population principles. These principles have limitations and we'll keep them up for review, but it's likely they are here to stay and they are worth knowing about.

One such relationship is called simply "diminishing returns" and it's everywhere you look. Among wild creatures nearly any cause or mortality is density dependent; that is, losses are highest in a dense population and the death rate goes down as numbers are thinned out. Every gunner has seen this work - his shooting is likely to be best on opening day. But to go a step further with it - suppose we have a pheasant season of three weeks. It might well happen that 75 percent of the total season kill is taken the first week and as little as 10 percent the last week. It turns out this way because on each successive day of hunting: 1) there are fewer birds to be shot at; and 2) the survivors get more wary. Pheasant shooting is subject to a rapidly diminishing return. The fox or any other predator has the same kind of luck. His rate of kill declines steadily in a thinning prey population. So, it means the hunter can take game animals away from the fox or from autos or disease or any other loss factor by getting there first in the fall.

"Take a second principle. This one is known as compensation. To get the hang of it, let's not hunt at all and see what happens to our game. The answer is easy - we don't save anything. With no reduction by hunters the loss of animals from all other causes is correspondingly higher. Factors like highway killing, predation, disease, food depletion, competition for living sites and accidents keep whittling away at the population. By spring they will have taken the crop the hunter passed up. In other words, when one thing doesn't get them, something else does. The various loss factors including hunting tend to substitute or compensate for one another. Here's a good place to recognize a natural statute of limitations that works for every species in every environment. At any given time there is a strict limit to the number of animals a habitat can support. This is carrying capacity idea. It affirms that wild animals like domestic stock or cultivated crops don't grow in thin air. They depend on local resources of cover, food and water; thus there are good habitats and poor ones; high populations and low ones. Regardless of over-all quality the carrying capacity of most habitats tends to decline from summer through winter. This is why loss factors are effective in picking away at the exposed vulnerable surplus parts of the population. It's true too that all animals are not created equal. Some are less capable, less healthy or less lucky than others. In terms of competition and averages the handicapped and the underprivileged must compose the bulk of that expanded annual surplus. It's hard on individuals but it's good business for the race. When animal numbers have been trimmed down to a level where the survivors are well protected and supported by the range, then losses may practically cease. Paul Errington, long time leader of the co-operative wildlife research unit called this level of number the threshold of security, and that's what it is. He found that reduced populations of quail or musk-ox were often nearly immune from loss even in the presence of ordinary numbers of horned owls and foxes."

I'm going to skip part of this article, Mr. Chairman, although all of it is interesting.

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd) But I'm going to skip it because there's just a possibility that there are some members of the Committee that are not interested in the wildlife or its conservation. So I'll just touch on the highlights of the balance of this article.

"If we waste a harvest of small game no harm is done, but failing to take an excess of big game can mean a damaged winter range and the effects are lasting. That is why heavy hunting must be part of deer management. But the gun does have a biological shortcoming. It doesn't cull out the weak, the halt and the lame. Therefore, any wild species should have some attention from its natural enemies. An orderly knowledge of natural processes must survive every kind of checking against a wide variety of conditions. Our game research is doing this right along. Probably our most meaningful revelation is the amazing productivity of nearly all wild creatures when poor conditions are met. Meeting conditions is habitat management, but taking the crop in full measure with safety depends heavily on some of the most abstract and technical kinds of inside knowledge. On both counts we seem to have good reason for keeping our game program on a scientific basis now and in the future". The end of the quote.

Now I said I agree with that and I believe that the Honourable Minister and his staff either agree with it or agree to something very much like it. I want to draw attention to the trophy hunt of bull elk in the Duck Mountains in the fall of 1965. Now I believe that the department became aware of the fact that the area was becoming over-populated, that it needed to be reduced in order to maintain proper browsing conditions and also to see that some disease or a hard winter didn't kill off many of the animals. In this area I've seen elk, moose and deer depleted by a hard winter to about 25 percent of the total numbers. You would hardly believe that a hard winter could kill off that many game animals, but it has happened on at least two occasions in my lifetime.

So I think what happened here, and reading from the information section that is issued regularly by the department of Provincial Secretary dated July 30, 1965, and I quote: "Mr. Lyon said the elk herd in the Duck Mountain has not been hunted since 1960 and it has increased in numbers to somewhere's between 500 and 1,000 animals. There are signs that the herd is approaching the carrying capacity of its range. Biologists estimate that about 35 percent of the animals are bulls more than one year old. Now, Mr. Chairman, you can read the first part of the statement two ways: that the overall increase was between 500 and 1,000 animals; or that the increase since 1960 was from 500 to 1,000. But let us take the latter which would make the population considerably smaller. This would mean that from 1960 to 1965 the number of animals had doubled, that is in a period of five years. Well I know from my own personal experience, that I have a herd of elk on my place which is adjacent to the park, that started off with about nine animals back in about, oh I'd say 1954, '55, and now numbers between 30 and 40. Now in order to harvest the excess we had a season. The Honourable Minister and his staff thought that they should reduce the bull population and in doing so issued a limited number of licenses.

As I read this particular piece of literature, they wanted to reduce the increase by about a third or half the bull elk population, which meant 175 animals, because I do believe that if you consider that there were a total of a thousand animals in the park - and I believe there were considerably more than this, but that's the interpretation I take of this - then with a bull population of 350, the ratio there between male and female would have adverse effects on the reproduction of this particular species. So 175 animals were to be taken and 175 licenses issued. We ended up with a kill of 24 which was far below what the department set out to harvest. The total number of applications that were put in were 500 and even had the licenses been issued to all of the 500 the kill still would have been less than what was desired. In order to reach the kill of 175, I believe you'll find that you could have issued more than 1,000 licenses and that you still would not have taken more than what you had intended to.

Now the point I'm getting at is this, Mr. Chairman, that in the first place the elk is a very elusive, very cautious, very careful animal with an exceptionally keen sense of smell, hearing and eyesight, and he always makes it a practice to be in areas where he can disappear in the wink of an eye, and during the fall season it's extremely hard to hunt them. The advantage of course of the runting season - I'm passing that out, but I mean outside of that - because you cannot track them, the noise you make in walking through the bush makes it exceedingly difficult to get within gunshot of them. Last fall there was one advantage to the hunter that snow fell before the season was over so there was an amount of tracking done.

I want to tell the Committee about a little experience that I had this winter on my own

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd) place. I had a herd of elk come right into the yard within 50 yards of where my stock was corralled, but in the yard that was fenced off, feeding on a stack of oat sheaves that I had in the place. There were 14 of them by count that came into the yard that was fenced off and they even slept in that yard for a matter of two weeks. Now we don't mind the elk feeding on our feed, but what actually happens is that they waste more than they eat. They'll climb right up on top of the stack and of course they'll fowl it and they'll chop it all up and eventually you've got to scare them off because they could waste tons of feed in no time flat. We did eventually get the conservation officer come down, use the bangers and scare them off. But they were there for two weeks. There were 14 in the yard and I think twice as many outside of it that we didn't see, because they all wouldn't come into the yard, that is for sure. But the reason I raise this point is there must have been some reason for them getting out of the park and coming down and feeding the way they did. Well there are several reasons why they would. If there were timber wolves in the park any number of them, they'd be forced out; they could be forced out by extreme cold or they could be forced out because the browse wasn't there, the feed wasn't there. And if it is the third reason, then I say to the Minister that it's high time that we harvested quite a large number of the elk herd in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve, because otherwise we'll see them die off either from lack of food one of these winters, or from disease, and I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that in the coming year we either have a wide open trophy season or any animal season during the winter months, together with the moose season. I believe in that way you will reduce the numbers to the limits which you want to reach and you will preserve the elk in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve.

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member for his comments about the elk season. I don't know if he was one of those who applied or got a license. I thought of him as soon as I signed the order for the new hunting season however, because I know what an avid hunter he is and I dare say there is no man in this House who knows that country and knows the animal life in that country as well as the Honourable Member for Ethelbert. So I merely want to assure him that we'll pay close attention to his suggestions about big game, particularly the elk season for the future.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend was going to give us - or outline the whole program of pothole payfor farmers when we reached this section and I for one would like to know what it is.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to give my honourable friend a brief resume of what is happening with respect to wet land and pothole preservation or what we anticipate will be happening in that field.

First of all, I should inform the Committee, if they do not already know, that the Federal Government, starting effective this duck season, this fall, will be requiring all hunters in Canada to buy a federal hunting license. Purchase price will be \$2.00 and as I understand it from the release made by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, these will be obtainable through post offices throughout Canada.

The main purpose we are told by the federal minister for this new licensing provision is to garner statistical information for the records of the Canadian Wildlife Service with respect to hunters, their take of waterfowl and other pertinent statistical information that they wish to have. With the funds that they will obtain from the sale of this license and with additional funds which the Minister has advised us will be voted presumably this year by the federal department, by the federal House, that department is going to begin hopefully on a close co-operative basis with each of the provinces a program of wet land and pothole acquisition and/or leasing. We have had under consideration in our department in recent months the initiation of a program on a provincial scale. However when last May, I believe it was, in Victoria at the annual meeting of the Council of Resource Ministers of Canada, the Honourable Arthur Lang announced this new program and sought comment from the various provinces on it, we gave at that time approval in principle of the idea of the federal government engaging in this wet land and acquisition program and at the same time we took steps as much as we could without further information from the federal government to ensure that there be the closest co-operation between the operating Department of Mines and Natural Resources and this province and the National Department of Resources at Ottawa.

Only recently senior officials of the Canadian Wildlife Service met with the Director of Wildlife and other members of our staff to give us more detail than we have had previously on the purpose and intent of this program, and while no definite areas of agreement have been put

(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . down on paper and signed between the two levels of government, I am most hopeful that before too long - and by that I mean within the matter of the next few months - there will be specific co-operative projects in which the province can engage with the federal government and with these federal funds which are now being made available, on a fairly generous scale as I understand it, although the money has not yet been voted, in order to ensure that we start first of all on a pilot program in Manitoba of pothole leasing or pothole acquisition and then on a broader scale of marsh acquisition where marsh which is particularly well suited for the propagation of waterfowl and which is in private hands can be taken over and can be managed on a productive basis for waterfowl in our province. So I say that while the provincial plans were budding the federal department decided to move in in what I think will be a most worthwhile venture for the future of the waterfowl resource right across Canada.

Now we have some reservation about the manner in which this program may be implemented. We have made it quite clear to the federal minister that we don't necessarily agree with all aspects of this program. There are administrative problems to be worked out, such as enforcement provisions with respect to the new federal hunting license and so on that have not been satisfactorily resolved at the present time, but by and large looking at the overall scheme, I have to say to the Committee that it is a scheme that we feel will be of great benefit to the waterfowl resource in our province. I am hopeful that substantial amounts of this federal vote can be channelled into Manitoba where we are gifted with one of the great resource areas of our country in terms of nesting for waterfowl.

Most of us tend to think of course of ducks as being waterfowl which fly north, considerably north of here and hatch in barren northland and then come south. In actual fact, the bulk of the most sought after species of waterfowl in the duck field are hatched and propagated right in our settled agricultural country, in the pothole country of central Canada, the western part of Saskatchewan, the northern states of North Dakota and Minnesota, Nebraska and so on. This is where the vast majority of your ducks, particularly your mallard ducks, which are No. 1 in terms of desire of the hunters, where they are propagated and where they are raised, and this is why it is so important that there be a pothole preservation program undertaken on a broad regional basis in this area in order to ensure that before all of these potholes are plowed under and put into agriculture use, that some regard is given to the other uses that are being made of this heretofore thought to be useless land in order that we can keep large populations of waterfowl present not only for our hunters but for those people who wish merely to keep the duck or to keep waterfowl generally as part of our enjoyable landscape in Manitoba. So that in very general terms is the program that is now being put under way by the federal department.

As I've mentioned we've already had one meeting with the officials and I am hopeful that others will follow. There is a jurisdictional problem of course because the federal government have responsibility under the Migratory Birds Convention Act for waterfowl only, that is for those that migrate from Canada to the United States and back again; but in terms of marsh management - and I use as an example the Netley Marsh, the Delta Marsh, other large marsh areas in Manitoba, at the mouth of the Saskatchewan River in the constituency of my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare - the province has a much greater involvement in terms of not only ducks but it has the rat population to be concerned about, the big game population to be concerned about, the fish population as well, and all of the other wildlife activities that are indigenus to this kind of territory. So with the Federal Government moving in with a concern for waterfowl alone, we have made it quite clear to the federal authorities that we feel that there has to be the very closest of co-operation in order that these marsh tracts can be managed on a multiple use basis, taking into account all of the other needs and all of the other demands that are made on these areas, demands such as the one that I have mentioned in the wildlife field, plus recreation demands, plus haying demands, and all of the other uses to which these good waterfowl breeding areas can be put.

We don't know what success we will have with the Federal Government in terms of titles and other problems that will arise where large tracts of land are being acquired. In the meantime, we are proceeding, not on a large scale, but we are proceeding to acquire in different parts of the province from time to time as they become available or as the necessity for their acquisition becomes apparent, other tracts of land which are set aside and used for waterfowl or wildlife purposes generally. Many of these acquisitions are supported by ARDA money from Ottawa, in fact the bulk of them thus far have been supported by ARDA money from Ottawa, and so that provincially-oriented program continues although it's on a much smaller scale, I hope, than will be the program that we anticipate coming to the fore through the instrumentality of the

(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . new federal policy.

I have made speeches in different parts of Manitoba about the pothole situation. We have taken a look in some depth at the question of tax exemptions for potholes, and other incentive measures that might be utilized in order to encourage the farmers who today, in our pothole country in Manitoba, are not only farmers, people who are farming in grain, they're also farming ducks. They're raising ducks for us. I think it has been said in the House on other occasions that some attention must be paid to the fact that the farmer is, out of the land that he owns, supplying this wildlife resource, or helping to in its propagation through the maintenance of these potholes. Now if through the leasing program, which I think is envisaged by the Federal Government, or by any other incentive program we can encourage as many of these potholes as possible to be maintained, then we will have done a great thing, not only for today but for the future generations who will want to enjoy this waterfowl resource as we enjoy it today.

We do find however in checking our own statistics that, by and large, pothole land in Manitoba is assessed on a very low basis at the present time, and any incentive program that you could work out on the basis of present assessment would be very small in terms of hard cash into the farmer's hand. So that is why I think pilot programs will have to be developed under the federal scheme in order to ensure that a real incentive is given to farmers to maintain desirable potholes and breeding areas on land which they otherwise might consider draining and putting under cultivation. That, very generally, Mr. Chairman, is the latest report we have on this pothole and wet-land preservation program.

While I am on my feet, however, I should like to reiterate and to underscore the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains about the Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish and the tribute that he paid to the Executive Director, Mr. Paul Murphy, and the President, Mr. Don Muir, for the great work that that Federation and their affiliated associations do in the whole field of conservation in Manitoba. I know each of us pays tribute each year to these people. They now number more than 10,000 in their ranks. They undertake projects in many of the associations of lasting value to our community and to our wildlife resource, and they deserve this annual commendation which I am very pleased to pay to them now.

Last year, as a special new venture, they offered a scholarship to students studying wildlife biology. The students selected received a scholarship from the Federation of Game and Fish Association and spent several weeks on this scholarship at the Delta Waterfowl Station in Manitoba, and made a report subsequently to the Federation on the work that he had engaged in that summer.

Also in this general field, I am also happy to be able to tell the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that the University of Manitoba is now beginning on a small scale, and what I hope will grow into a larger scale, a program at the Delta Marsh with respect to research that will be carried on in close conjunction with the Delta Waterfowl Station. A grant has been voted this year -- has been made this year to the University of Manitoba - I believe the sum is \$15,000 initially - and they will be utilizing some of the Crown properties at Delta, Manitoba, for the first time this summer for this new project. They have been in discussion with the North American Wildlife Foundation about it and I am hopeful that this will lead to a much closer tying-in of our own Manitoba University with the wildlife resource in Manitoba, hopefully to the point where, before too long, there can be developed at our university a department which will be able to train people in wildlife biology in Manitoba.

We have a growing number of youngsters in our province who are interested in getting into this very important field at the present time, and how delightful it would be and how important it would be - and how important it is to Manitoba that before too long we are able to offer this kind of training at our own university here in Manitoba. So this first initial step by the university is a welcome one indeed, and one which I hope I can report upon in more detail next year after their first summer of activity in the marsh this year.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat what I said on at least two other occasions at this Session in respect to wildlife and that is this, that I don't think that we will ever achieve any real success in maintaining an adequate supply of wildlife for all concerned until we are prepared to pay the farmer some compensation for the damage done by wildlife of all kinds. Why the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains just told the House of a haystack that had been eaten up by 14 deer. Now in the --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Feed stack - by elk. Well they're deer as far as I'm concerned. Elk and deer and moose are all game animals that I

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . class under deer.

But anyway the point is this, that in the Langruth area we're presently talking about pothole pay for farmers, and I notice that in a Wildlife News, that's apparently published by the Federal Government, it outlines very briefly on this proposed program of Mr. Lang's that the Minister here has referred to. This article claims that there will be more than four million small potholes in the prairie provinces under this pilot project - four million potholes. Well, I must confess that I don't think it will have any success or will not meet with the farmers' approval unless some assurance can be given to the farmer that he is going to be paid for the damage done to his crops, and if he is, well then it may be very encouraging and may be a worthwhile project. But why in the world should a farmer who has a two or three acre pothole on his farm be allowed to leave it in its natural state, let the water remain in there and let the weeds grow up around it, have two or three thousand ducks settle there and then they eat all the crop that is surrounding it for several acres.

So I hope that my honourable friend will certainly consider this aspect of it when he is discussing future plans with the Federal Government. I suggested, Mr. Chairman, that it was a fairly simple - a fairly simple thing to do to assess the damage that is done to a crop by wildlife. It's not a big problem and I don't think that it's a costly one. I don't think it would be a costly one at all, but perhaps the \$2.00 permit, according to this report here, will help to raise \$50 million. That's the figure they're talking about in Mr. Lang's program. -- (Interjection) -- \$600,000? Well I saw a \$50 million figure here somewhere. However, that may be over a 20 year period or something of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, I would like too to know if my honourable friend or his department has made any study on the effect of pesticides on wildlife generally, and that includes fish and bird life, animal life, and all of this. Now I know that I have read parts of Carson's book, "Silent Spring," and I know that there are a lot of people who claim that it was a gross exaggeration, her statements in regard to the damage caused to wildlife by pesticides of all kinds, but I think that now that the author is deceased that people are taking a new look at it, and I believe that now that it is generally believed there was a lot more truth than poetry in many of her comments in this respect. So I would like to know if a study has been made in Manitoba in regard to this aspect of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the States, and by the States I mean the States immediately adjacent to Manitoba - North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota - in order to encourage the wildlife, the government has bought quite large tracts of land and in many cases rented it back to the farmers in the immediate area. I understand that in North Dakota for instance, just over the border, that they - whether it is the Federal Government there or the North Dakota Government or both - they have bought a stretch of land there that is 50 miles long to encourage wildlife to harbour around there.

Now in the Neepawa area, the Game and Fish Association and certain interested persons are presently purchasing a small lake in the Arden area. It's known as Rose Lake. I think that they, that is the interested parties, had made representation to the government to see if they would share in the purchase or the management of this area, and I wonder if the government will assist other interested parties, whether they be Game and Fish - local Game and Fish organizations, if they will assist them in any areas in the province where it would appear to be in the interests of the province generally.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to be brief but I would like to ask the Minister this. I ask it every year. As you know, there is an area a few miles west of Lower Fort Garry called St. Andrew's Bog, and particularly an area called Oak Hammock. I tried to find out historically where the name came from. The archives were not able to help me. The name Oak Hammock seems to stick, but somehow I believe there was a Scotchman who called it Oak Hammock at one time, because there is a hill there with oak.

However, Fish and Game Associations have been interested in this area for some time because I believe that the staging grounds for the Canada goose are drying up and they have to go farther north. This area called Oak Hammock or St. Andrew's Bog was looked upon by the Fish and Game Associations as being an ideal spot to be developed by the government. When we hear so much today about pothole pay for farmers, it seems like this area, which is somewhat larger, should be preserved by the government.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture last year told me that because of the agricultural value of the land - I think he was thinking of the future when enough drainage would make it that way - that he was not going to consider this area for this purpose. It seems to me that in view

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . of the changing thinking that is taking place in regard to conservation, that perhaps we should look at this area which is so close to the historical spot of Lower Fort Garry and which could be in the spring probably a wonderful attraction for children. I throw this out to the Minister to see whether any new thinking has been done on it because many people asked me. I don't know whether if economically it will be considered to be agricultural land in the future or whether there's anything in mind by the department.

MR. LYON: I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that I met not too many weeks ago with members of the West Kildonan Game and Fish Association on this particular area, and as a matter of fact we have marked that area as one area to speak to the Federal Government about in connection with the joint program for preservation of the area. The Game and Fish Association have done a lot of studying on it and it does seem to present some very interesting possibilities. I'm hopeful that some action can be taken on it before too many years go by.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not consider myself as one of the experts in the House in the question of wildlife management in general; I do pose as a bit of an expert, although I'm afraid I'm only self-acknowledged rather than in any other capacity, on governmental duplication, and I must say that I view with more alarm than the Honourable Minister has expressed today, the inference of the Federal Government into this field in the provinces. Apparently, on account of jurisdiction the Federal Government has control of the migratory birds and it's a matter of convention between the two countries, and that's something we can't do very much about, but I would certainly think that it's a very doubtful proposition for them to be moving into the field of game management and licensing and other things in the various provinces. I don't like duplication between different governments. I think it leads to overlapping, extravagance, contradictory policies and a lot of other things, and I must say that I hadn't heard until today that it's proposed on this scale and it certainly at first blush doesn't commend itself to me.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, surely if the hunters - and I don't speak for them because I'm not one of the hunters myself - I've always admitted that I remained a conservationist even when I went out shooting, and had so little success at it that I never developed as a sportsman at all, at least in that field, and I do not pose as being either knowledgeable or having great opinions on this subject, but surely if they're going to come in here and license the hunters as well, the waterfowl hunters, the migratory birds, surely some arrangement could be made that the licenses could be collected by one authority rather than having two different ones doing that job. Surely they could, if they find it necessary to come in at all, they could trust the Provincial Government to collect that license for them and remit to them. I also leave to the ones who are experts in that field that discussion as to whether the projects that they're going to initiate in this province and others are worthwhile or not.

What I do feel I'm an expert on is this question that my honourable friend the member for Gladstone mentioned a little while ago, and this is duck and other bird depredations. I agree completely with him that they simply will never get and don't need to expect and don't deserve the co-operation that we want from the farmer if we're not prepared to take some action to compensate them for the damages that occur, and if the program is going to be expanded now of marshland development and pothole preservation and programs of this kind, then it will simply add to the pressure that we've already experienced and do experience year in and year out.

I would like to ask the Minister, as I notice under the Chapter on Wildlife Branch in the annual report the references made to research projects - I would like to ask him is there any further research being made into the question of duck damage and a way of handling it and a way of paying for it. The logical way, it seems to me, for paying for it is by adding something to the cost of the license. I note that in the same periodical that my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains referred to, that we have a note in the questions and answers page of the March issue about the number of big game hunters, both resident and non-resident, and I'd like to get from the Minister the number of licenses for the small game - or what do we have - small game hunting licenses, because it wouldn't take in my opinion - it wouldn't take a large amount added to those licenses to look after the damage that occurs, and if it were done there would be a completely different approach so far as the farmers are concerned.

Now this next species that I am going to mention is not considered one of the game birds, but it's been mentioned for a long time and I can tell you that the damage that's done by blackbirds is very large. I can't blame anybody for that I guess - don't know where we're going to make investigations to try and establish a program with regard to blackbird damage - but this

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . is something where I think research should be done too. The only person I can remember having gone hunting for blackbirds was - somebody in "Sing a Song of Sixpence" must have done so because they had four and twenty blackbirds, I believe, that they got some place.

Well blackbirds do a tremendous amount of damage and they too - they too, so the experts tell me, are hatched in these marshes, and I suppose if there's an expansion and a perpetuation of these and a program to add to the numbers of wildfowl of one kind and another, that the same habitat that is conducive to increase in duck populations will also be conducive to the increase in blackbird populations, and I would suggest that there should be some research done by somebody. The Wildlife Branch would be a good one to do it because I think if they would do some research in this category they would help in the public relations field with the farmers with regard to the duck damage as well, but so far as the duck damage is concerned, I agree completely with what my honourable friend from Gladstone has said, and I'm sure that it would not be difficult to estimate the damage.

For some reason or other the department abandoned the program that was instituted a few years ago, that I thought had been quite successful, of feeding the ducks to keep them away from the farmers' land, and I would hope they had some alternative that was available in place of that program. Now I know that people say that you can use these "bangers." I know that they are effective, more effective incidentally with ducks than they are with blackbirds, but the job has to be done at a particularly busy time of the year and it takes quite a bit of time for the farmer to do that, and after all, is it the farmer's job to protect against these other things? Isn't it the job of the owner of that wildlife - in this case either the province or the Federal Government - isn't it their job to do something about either controlling them, which nobody suggests, or else paying for the damages that they inflict. I think this is a fundamental point that has to be developed if we're going to have the co-operation that we need from the farmers of the province.

I have this other question that I'd like to ask my honourable friend the Minister in connection with the big game, and here I recognize my honourable friend and colleague from Ethelbert Plains as an authority. I don't pretend to be, but I was intrigued in the March issue of this Wildlife Crusader by a question that was asked and answered by the Director of the Department. These are questions and answers. Manitoba's Big Game Chairman poses some interesting questions for the Wildlife Department, and I take it that the Wildlife Director, Gerry Malaher, was the one who answered the questions. The question was asked about any possibility of deer trapping being instituted in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Game Preserve. The thought behind this is that the habitat is very rapidly disappearing in this area. Due to residential expansion, they can no longer exist there in near normal conditions, and they feel that they could and should be live trapped and moved to more suitable locations. Game and Fish locals would be glad to assist in such a project.

I was interested to note that the answer was that unless real hardship developed in the area, they had no wish to enter into the picture with live trapping. I would agree with that. I would think that answer is correct. From my own observation of the area, and I'm very familiar with it because people will recognize from my reputation, one of my favorite sports is walking - it's recommended by economy and -- there's a bit of a consideration about wear and tear on shoe leather of course -- I do a good bit of walking out in that area and there are a lot of deer there, but the Minister may be aware that recently the item appeared in the daily papers, and quite frankly I doubt the information, but certainly it appears that 15 deer have been either killed or wounded by dogs. Well, I don't suppose the Minister's responsibilities include dog catching. I don't suppose he's the official dog catcher of the province, but if this is a fact, somebody should be responsible for the dogs under these circumstances. There is a nice little park area out there. There certainly are deer. I don't agree with the suggestion made in here that they should be trapped and taken away. Subject to what experts on the subject would say, I would think that when they get very plentiful that they'll move on to other areas themselves. They have so much sense about so many things that I would expect that they have that much common sense, that they move along to some place else. I think if it comes to an overflow time that that's what would happen.

I do know that out in that area where I was brought up - the justly famous Flea Island area - I do know that we have many many more deer in that area now than we had when I was a boy, which is a long time ago. Many more deer - they're not decreasing there, they've been increasing in the last two years. I suppose that this group out here when they get too numerous

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . that they'll move to some other area; I wouldn't think there's any need of trapping them and taking them away. But I certainly do think there's need to protect them from dogs. And who's going to do it? If it's a game preserve erected against people, it should be a game preserve erected against dogs too - don't make dogs have any more right than people have. There's no sense to letting a nice herd of deer be prejudiced by a bunch of dogs that are a very very doubtful value I would think in many cases.

So, I say to my honourable friend that even though I recognize that this is not his primary responsibility, I think he should exercise some moral suasion in the matter and see to it that this little herd that exists very close to the city here - you can go and drive around that area almost, almost, any evening at sundown or thereabouts - or for those of you who like to get up in the morning, it's something around sunrise or thereabouts - and if you take your time you'll likely see a few deer in that area. As a matter of fact, when they were pushing through Grant Avenue there the chaps who were working on the Grant Avenue extension out toward Hedley Avenue in the Charleswood area told me that they frequently saw six and seven deer there quite regularly during the day.

Now this is a resource right close to the metropolitan area and it should be protected and it should be encouraged and it certainly shouldn't be allowed to be prejudiced by dogs, no matter who is responsible for the dogs.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to answer . . .

..... continued on next page

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of brief remarks to make under this item. I was very interested in what some of the last speakers had to say in connection with the particular problem of blackbirds. No doubt this in our area has something to do with the size of the crop that we grow of sunflowers. Sunflower production hasn't been any too large this last couple of years and naturally the blackbird problem is less because there's not as many sunflower seeds. However, in some years it presents itself as a real problem and especially to those farmers who have probably creeks or sloughs running next to their properties in which they grow these crops and these birds can do a terrific amount of damage to a crop in a very short time, and I'm just wondering whether farmers have been given any assistance in the past in connection with this. They've gone to a great length of trouble in trying to scare these birds out of their fields in various ways and I think we should certainly be helpful if we can and probably providing them with some of the necessary supplies used to scare these birds away. I think this is about the only thing we can do unless the government has done some research work on it and that they control it in any other way.

This is definitely worthy of mention and looking into in my estimation because certainly we do not want to stop growing this particular crop. I think we will have a larger acreage this year as newer and better varieties are found and as there is a stronger market for this product again since a year ago or so. There's a very much stronger demand for this type of seed and this product.

I was rather surprised also to hear this matter of dual jurisdiction in connection with wildlife or game birds as between the province and the federal government. Certainly I would like to hear more of this. Has any negotiations taken place on this matter as to - draw distinction as to which is the province's jurisdiction and which the federal. Certainly I think there should be only one authority dealing with licenses. Certainly something can be arranged in this regard.

I would also like to speak in support of paying our farmers where they have particular crop loss because of wild birds and game birds because I find in late seasons that these birds migrate to the south and they invariably will settle down and in the southern part of the province for the time being and destroy crops our there as well, especially those farmers again that are located close to creeks or sloughs and where you have water. And here too, these birds do a lot of damage in a very short time and I've seen farmers - smaller farmers further west of us who had their crops almost a complete ruin because of this and yet there was no way for compensation. Certainly if on the other hand we as the government try to conserve then we should take on this responsibility of compensation these people who have to suffer losses because of our program; or also because we want to supply the people that are active in shooting and so on, and hunting, that they want a supply of wildlife that we should be prepared to foot the bill.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'll attempt to be brief because I know we are approaching 5:30 and there may be a disposition on the part of honourable members to pass some items. Mr. Chairman, the brief answer to my honourable friend from Lakeside in connection with the federal licensing is that we learned of this through the Canadian Wildlife Bulletin that he's reading out. There was no consultation with us concerning the licensing provisions at all. In fact, there have been some suggestion by the provinces when the federal minister first broached the subject that there should be a common licensing provision, but there was not consultation with us and we were more than a little angry that there was not consultation on this matter. We learned of it only through this Bulletin and we're not too pleased with it. That's why I said in a moderate tone that we have reservations about the manner in which this program was being implemented by the federal government - without that degree of consultation that we feel is necessary, particularly when they're moving into a resource field over which the province has primary responsibility.

We are endeavouring through this new federal program, and it's our understanding that the federal department in consideration of the Pothole Preservation Program and the Wet lands Acquisition Program is giving definite consideration to possible acquisition of land or use of land acquired adjacent to marsh areas for the purpose of growing newer crops in the direct feeding of waterfowl. Now that's our understanding at the present time and we hope - we will certainly pursue this matter with them with a view to obtaining more acceptance of responsibility by the federal service in the matter of solving the duck depredation problem here in Manitoba. Certainly it's a serious one and we want to take whatever steps we can to ensure that the depredation is kept down as much as possible.

My honourable friend from Rhineland asked a question about - if I can just insert this

(MR. LYON cont'd)... here - Grand Beach Provincial Park. He wanted to know what was done last year. The basic work was camping area development including access roads, hardstands, sanitary and water facilities and fireplaces. There will be 450 camping units ready this spring at Grand Beach. There was extended irrigation in the landscaped area, parking lot construction and ground improvements at Beach No. 2. There was asphalt paving of interior roads, parking lots, motel sites, service entrance to the pavilion and lagoon channel improvements - were basic work that was done last year.

Now I'll sit down at this point in the hope that we can perhaps pass some of these items.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I would like to know why the government discontinued their duck feeding program that was so effective and beneficial in the 50's. Apparently it has been replaced by this banger - zone bangers and the farmers in the area do not seem to be very happy with it at all; because let's face it, you can do all the shooting - when a duck or a goose is hungry, they've got to go some place to eat and you can't fill them up with a bunch of zone bangers - zone bangers just scared them from one crop over onto another and over and over and over. So the farmers I know would appreciate very much the government, when needed, when needed, implementing once again the duck feeding program that seemed to be so successful in the '55-'56 - '57 - '58 years.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would like my honourable friend to comment on is whether or not the regulations 81-55 in respect to compensating the farmers for domestic animals shot by hunters in hunting season, is it still in effect? Is it possible now for a farmer to collect for domestic animals shot in hunting season? It is. The note that I have here says that it cost the Saskatchewan government \$43,000 last year for this. Because it seems to me that it's not very well advertised. I would be interested to know how many farmers made application - what was the loss in domestic animals of all kinds last year? My honourable friend says very slim - well, in Saskatchewan there must be worse hunters or something - there was 206 cattle shot last year in Saskatchewan: 39 horses, 3 pigs, 21 tame ducks and 10 sheep in Saskatchewan last year. And so Mr. Chairman - now I got into an argument you will recall over the \$50 million with my honourable friend. Probably we were both right, and that seems odd, but I have a newspaper story here that refers to it as \$50 million. It says \$5.1 million per year for 10 years to make \$50 million --(Interjection)-- I see, okay. Well then for once I suppose we are both right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I still have predator control, different kind of predators and I still have fur game management to deal with but I'm quite prepared to go on if you want to extend the time.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if there's any disposition to stop the clock so we can pass some items, if there's consent, I'm prepared.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I have about 15 minutes - I'd like to have about 15 minutes on Predator Control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 72 (a) passed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: No, no, Mr. Chairman, There's a motion that the committee rise Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the speaker.

Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we adjourn, I would like to remind the honourable members that Mr. Eric Butler from Australia will be in Room 254 at 5:30 to discuss the Rhodesian question. Any honourable members wishing to hear his views are cordially invited to attend.

It is now 5:30; the House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.