

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 25, 1975

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 45 students of Grade 5 standing, of the Riverview School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Polcyn and Mrs. Stevenson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

And we have 28 students of Grades 8 and 9 standing of the Poplar Hill, Red Lake, Ontario School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Paul Miller and Mr. Ken Miller, and they are our guests this afternoon.

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

I see we have a late entrant, Miss Brenda McDonald, the Churchill Aurora Snow Queen. She's from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill. We welcome you as well.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I believe he was in Ottawa yesterday and returned home with a gift, I believe from the Prime Minister, for his new child. I wonder if he can indicate whether, in dealing with the questions of transmission line expansion, northern flood compensation and Saunders Aircraft, he was able to return from Ottawa with additional gifts for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, since it's put in that context, I can advise the Leader of the Opposition that the gift which was received for the newly born was the only gift that I was able to bring back to Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder, then, if he can indicate to the House whether in the discussions of the items of transmission line expansion, northern flood compensation and Saunders Aircraft, there was any indication of additional Federal Government support, and the nature of the support.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, these discussions unfortunately did not prove to be final, conclusive or definitive. However, the discussions did, hopefully, cast some additional light and understanding on the various subjects just referred to, and further exploration and information seeking, exchange of information and attitude, is going on even today by certain officials of the government by long distance communication, and so, hopefully, some of this will be resolved in shorter rather than longer time.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if he can indicate whether he discussed Defence Department overhaul as well, and whether there was any particular information on that matter.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was discussed in terms of the sort of global impact and employment of the air industry in Winnipeg. The Prime Minister expressed the confidence that the course of action they're following will come close to meeting their commitments as expressed last summer with respect to the air industry presence in Winnipeg. I couldn't share the same optimism, but nevertheless we did have an exchange of views in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, as the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. I wonder if, in his conversations with the Prime Minister, there was any discussion of the matter of the tendering for the equipment necessary on the Nelson River, which the First Minister indicated was somewhat less than \$100 million, whether any of the discussions which he had with the Prime Minister related to the awarding of that tender contract.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes indeed, Mr. Speaker. However, I must advise that there doesn't

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) seem to be any indication to date that there can be a course of action followed here which will allow us to depart from bid procedures and at the same time not penalize the Manitoba Hydro.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, then, if a firm decision has not yet been made by Manitoba Hydro whether the meetings called for April 1, I believe, will enable us to discuss the bidding generally, before the final decision has been made.

MR. SCHREYER: There is some possibility of that, Mr. Speaker, but I would not want to attach it as an undertaking, because there is indeed a very definite time constraint that we are having to cope with, and that is the end of this month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and ask him if the film clip currently being shown on television, or at least up until recently being shown on television, purporting to show Manitoba businessmen the amount of assistance available to them by the Provincial Government, was prepared and produced by any one of Manitoba's film-producing companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): I am not aware precisely of the honourable member's viewing habits and I don't know exactly which film he is talking about. Is he talking about "This is Manitoba", a 30-minute documentary, or is he talking about a shorter film that was produced more recently with regard to assistance for small business?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the film clip purporting to show the assistance available to Manitoba businessmen by the Provincial Government.

MR. EVANS: You mean it's a half a minute or a minute sort of an ad. Well I would hope it's produced in the Province of Manitoba. We have recently completed a 20-minute film which was made in the Province of Manitoba on assistance to small business. I would hope that the ads and the clips have been produced in this good province of ours.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity to answer a question raised by the Member from Riel the other day with regard to interruptible supplies of gas in Winnipeg, and we are advised that it's not likely that interruptible supplies of gas will be readily available in Winnipeg again. One of the reasons for this is not only the continuing shortfall in supply out of Alberta, but also the fact that we do not have a large storage capacity in the province that, for example, is in place in Ontario. However, I want to assure the honourable member that we have had many many meetings with the utility, with the people responsible in Alberta, with the National Energy Board and with the Minister of Energy, Mr. Macdonald, to do whatever we can to improve the supply situation for the Greater Winnipeg Utility Company.

Also, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, yesterday a question was asked by the Member from Fort Rouge on another matter, on gas, not natural gas but gasoline, whether we had drawn the question of restrictive trade practices, I believe, to the attention of the authorities in Ottawa, and I wanted to inform him - unfortunately he's not in his seat now but perhaps he can read this in Hansard - that we were approached by the Manitoba Association of Independent Gas Retailers last fall respecting these matters and their concern about unfair trade practices. I have written as Minister of, or Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Council, I have written to the Minister of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa, and have drawn this to his attention. In his reply to me of last September, he indicated that the Director of Investigation and Research of his Combines Investigation Branch was currently inquiring into this matter at the request, dating back to 1973, by the Consumers Association of Canada, and the matter was being given high priority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I obviously picked a very unfortunate time to ask the Minister a very mundane question about where that film was produced and he snowed me under with more exotic answers to other questions. I wonder if he would look into this particular matter and find out if that film was produced by any one of Manitoba's fine film-producing companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) in view of his answer just a minute ago to the Leader of the Official Opposition. I don't know if he indicated that flooding and compensation was discussed with the federal authorities or not - that's one of my questions. And the other one, I know there was a meeting held in Thompson with the Northern Flood Committee. I wonder if that committee has been now recognized by the government as the official agent negotiating for all the communities in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Member for Assiniboia is yes, there certainly were discussions yesterday with respect to the matter of the Churchill River diversion and practical ways and means in dealing with compensation claims and related matters, and I think that answers his question. As to recognition of the so-called Northern Flood Committee, the answer is that we have given an undertaking to work with them as a practical instrument representative of the northern communities that might be involved. It was also expressly made clear that exclusivity was not to be countenanced in that, as a government of a sovereign jurisdiction, we must always feel that we have right of access to any and all citizens.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Have there been any other meetings held since February with this Northern Flood Committee?

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative, Mr. Speaker. The exact dates I do not have at hand, but there have been, I believe, two meetings since.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has there been any alteration in the government's position as to recognizing the Northern Flood Committee since the first meeting in February?

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, certainly not to my knowledge and I would be disturbed if there were. The essence of it is that we would be quite prepared, in fact willing, anxious to work with them as a practical instrument, but it was made clear at the time that exclusivity could not be something that was either relevant or possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and thank him for his reply to my question of the other day regarding the interruptible gas supply. There was a second part to the question at that time as to whether his department had determined the impact of the cut-off of interruptible supply to Manitoba industries and institutions, and I wonder if I could also ask him at the same time; if I heard him correctly, he said that there would be no further supply of interruptible gas to Manitoba and, in that case, will they be undertaking, will his department be undertaking a study of this impact on Manitoba industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I did answer the honourable member's question with regard to the assessment survey, or whatever it may be called, the other day. I said that there has been no assessment as such. It is obviously difficult to precisely measure the economic impact and the other adverse impacts that this sort of situation can bring about. Most of the users of interruptible gas, of course, have the capacity to utilize oil or petroleum products of some type for heating or whatever, and we would hope that these particular customers, these particular interruptible customers, who tend to be commercial and institutional customers, will be able to obtain those supplies. I would say that probably a review and assessment could be made, but I'm not sure how precise the results would be and exactly what could be done about it with the information. We do think that there might be a possibility of aiding or assisting with the supply of gas if we could find an economical storage capacity somewhere in the province, and that matter is being actively looked at at the present time by our department and by the Greater Winnipeg Gas utility.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I gather, then, that the normal source is cut off from here on in for interruptible gas supply, and I wonder if he could confirm that the normal price of interruptible supply sometimes runs to a half of the normal price, and less, that would be paid for guaranteed full-time supply.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well some of these questions, of course, Mr. Speaker, could best be answered by the utility itself, which is responsible for pricing. But it is of course true, whatever form of energy that a utility supplies, if it's on an interruptible supply basis by virtue of it being a potentially cut-off type of supply, an interruptible type of supply, then by the nature

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. EVANS cont'd) of that type of category it is usually much lower in price than the firm price, or the price that's charged to the firm customer. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, regardless, we should in our concern about gas supply be primarily concerned about the firm customers which are primarily domestic customers, and I think the honourable member would agree with me that the priority should be given to domestic users of natural gas, and this is what the utility is doing.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that there have been a significant number of layoffs this winter because companies do not have the capability of switching over because of their particular process to another energy form.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no precise information on that, but I do know that these companies are aware of the situation that they're confronted with and I would hope that they would make arrangements so that they can switch to this other form of fuel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether or not either the government or Manitoba Hydro is now of the opinion that some assistance with respect to legal aid to the Northern Flood Committee should be given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside may know, as I suspect he may well know, we have all along indicated a willingness to provide funding for retaining of counsel relating to the submission of and processing of claims for compensation. For whatever reason, that offer has not really been taken up in any practical way by the people involved, and what has perhaps rendered it somewhat academic is that several months ago the Government of Canada has extended financing or funding to the Northern Flood Committee for purposes which I'm advised relates to the processing of compensation claims, and is specifically not for the purpose of any other kind of litigation other than that relating to claims.

MR. ENNS: One further question for clarification. Is the government aware, has the Northern Flood Committee the advice of legal counsel at this time?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that they have such legal counsel and advice and not only that, it exists in triplicate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 47th Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Liquor Control Commission, and also answer a question that was raised yesterday by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in connection with Frank McIvor Trucking Company of Wabowden. The Receiver did, in fact, forward to the department certain information and requested the department to examine same in order to ascertain whether or not an RCMP investigation was warranted. The conclusion of the department in examining the material was that there was insufficient material to warrant criminal proceedings, and the department in turn suggested to the Receiver that there was a civil remedy available for him to obtain additional information as he required. The Receiver, I understand, has obtained this information through civil proceedings. The Receiver has not forwarded to the department any further request for examination, but he does have this material now before him that he was unable to obtain earlier. So there are no allegations presently before the department of criminality in respect to the Frank McIvor Trucking Company of Wabowden case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I was incomplete in answering a question posed by the Honourable Member for Roblin last week pertaining to communiques between the Minister responsible for parks in Ottawa and myself, being the Minister responsible for provincial parks. I'd like to inform the honourable member that the Minister responsible, Mr. J. Buchanan, did inform me of his intent to raise fees and, more particularly, entrance fees, and there is on record an answer for my part that I made available to the honourable member giving thoughts that we had pertaining to same.

Mr. Speaker, can I have leave of the House to table reports. I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Arts Council for the year ending March 31st, 1974; and reports from the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation ending March 31st, 1974; and the Annual Report

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) of the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission for the year ended December 31st, 1974. And copies will be made available for members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney-General for his information. I wonder if he can indicate the date upon which the Receiver's report was received by his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Receiver's report, it was an interim report rather than the actual Receiver's report. The interim report was dated December 31st, and was received in the department January 2nd, 1975.

MR. SPIVAK: Has the final report been received by the department?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would not be received by our department, it would be more likely to be referred to the Communities Economic Development Fund, I would imagine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the Communities Economic Development Fund that put this company into receivership without any prompting by my honourable friend, as they put Schmidt Cartage into receivership without prompting by my honourable friend. The receiver in both cases was doing a receiver's job of investigation, without prompting by my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: Has the government received a final report from the Receiver?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware. The Communities Economic Development Corporation will appear before the committee in the regular way. I don't consider this matter one which would interrupt the proceedings of the House in the Question Period. It will be dealt with by the Communities Economic Development Committee before committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Since the department has cancelled the deer hunting season for this year again, is the Minister's department studying the possibility of implementing a draw system next year for the deer season similar to the elk and the moose draws?

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister responsible for Lands, Forests and Wildlife) (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, I can answer that the season will not be opened this year and a decision will have to be made on the basis of an estimation of the population next year, the deer population next year, in order to arrive at a decision on allocation of licensing, and in fact if a season will be available.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the same Minister could inform the House as to whether the upland game bird regulations for that season are also being taken under review by his department.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, there is no anticipated change in the allocation of licensing for upland game birds. It will proceed as it has in normal years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the question asked by my colleague from La Verendrye in connection with the closed deer season, in view of that answer, would the Minister inform the House if he has taken any steps to step up the curtailment of nightlighting of the deer population.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, the nightlighting question is one which is, I believe, coming up for discussion under Private Member's Resolutions, and there is in fact discussion going on between the staff in my department and that of the Federal Government with respect to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister if the colder weather has now allowed the re-opening of some of the winter roads in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I don't have a right up-to-date report; the one I do have is dated March 24th. Except for the road from Hole River to Island Lake area, which was closed during the warm weather, the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) other roads have been kept open because it was cool enough up North to keep them open. It was not expected that we'd be able to open up the Hole River-Island Lake road again even if it turns cold, because some of the creeks had already started to move.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. Can the Minister indicate what percentage of freight has been moved over these roads to date, and how much is still left to go?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the roads have been open long enough that the freighters should have gotten all their goods in that they had had to get into those communities. If the freighters have not gotten all their goods in, then they haven't mobilized themselves fast enough to get them in.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary. Can the Minister indicate what degree of maintenance was carried out in the past winter on these roads to allow the truckers to use them?

MR. McBRYDE: Normal maintenance was carried out as required by contract, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can Manitobans expect to receive information regarding adjustments in the minimum wage during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): There's always that possibility, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister giving any consideration to indexing the minimum wage to continually take into account the cost of living?

MR. PAULLEY: The Minister of Labour gives due consideration to all aspects of the input of minimum wages in the province of Manitoba.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister favour indexing or periodic review by the Minimum Wage Board?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the honourable minister can advise the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if we may have one minute of interruption while the Administrator comes into the House.

ROYAL ASSENT - BILL NO. 7 - INTERIM SUPPLY

THE HONOURABLE THE ADMINISTRATOR of the Government of the Province of Manitoba entered the House and was seated on the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach the Honourable the Administrator with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for the Honourable the Administrator the acceptance of this Bill:

No. 7 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name.

THE HONOURABLE ADMINISTRATOR was then pleased to retire.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Minister would advise the House of the training program which his department has set up to train and help train those athletes who are intending to compete in the Olympic games next year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in that respect the training that's being had now will

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) take place over the period of months before the Olympics of 1976. In different parts of the province, a lot of the facilities that have been made available to different types of facility grants and municipal contributions are being utilized for this purpose. There's other facilities that are contemplated which will be announced in due course, but existing facilities are being utilized, to my knowledge, to the fullest extent, and there's certainly a lot of participation being had by different groups in the province. If we look at the games that just took place in the northern part of the province, it's a good example.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House what kind of a budget these athletes are operating under?

MR. TOUPIN: Oh, here again there's a structure, Mr. Speaker, of grants being made available to different groups, to different sports in the Province of Manitoba, that can be given to the honourable members of the House during the Estimates of the department. I think it would be quite difficult at this time to enumerate the amounts and where the grants are being made and to what sport associations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, for the information of the House, yesterday there were a number of questions asked about the Consumer Price Index, the February index having gone up fairly substantially for the City of Winnipeg, and there were a number of questions with regard to housing. For the information of the House, I'd like to inform members that the component referred to as housing in the newspaper does not simply refer to the cost of purchasing a house or to the cost of construction of housing. It also includes - in fact, more than half of the weight relates to household operations, including the purchases of furnishings, furniture, appliances, cleaning supplies, etc. So because that particular index changes, it does not relate necessarily to the degree to which the cost of construction of housing has changed.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, very briefly: most importantly, the information that we have on a spacial comparison for the entire index is that the City of Winnipeg remains the second cheapest place to live in Canada of all the major cities. This was true in December, it was reported in The Financial Times of Canada in a January story, and I'd like to table this for honourable members. We have made calculations based on the latest data for January - February, and I'm pleased to report to the House all of our calculations indicate that Winnipeg today remains the second cheapest place to live in Canada, second only to Regina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could he advise this House whether Kip Thompson, head of Ilford Northern Construction Limited, or Les Mulholland, or Frank McIvor, bid on any of the winter road network that was let this past winter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, none of these gentlemen or their companies bid on any roads constructed by the Department of Northern Affairs this construction season.

MR. DILLEN: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could he advise as to the condition of the road that extends from Ilford to Oxford House as compared to the road from Cross Lake to Oxford House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The member is asking for an opinion. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and relates to the answer just given with respect to the Consumer Price Index. I wonder if he's had an opportunity to indicate, as a result of a study by his department, indicate to this House as a result of this study, why Winnipeg rose double over Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto in housing component of the Consumer Price Index if in fact Winnipeg is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again the question lends itself to an opinion and to a debate. I am sure it could be done better under Estimates.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if he can indicate whether any study has been undertaken by his department as to why the component part of housing with respect to the Consumer Price Index is double that of Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member relates to the change in the index over time. I want to make it clear, even though there has been this substantial increase over time, housing as a component of the cost of living still is relatively low in Winnipeg compared to the other cities. I can advise the honourable member that the Statistics Canada organization does not give detailed breakdown of housing or some of these other components as between home ownership, rents, household operations, etc., etc. We are now writing to Statistics Canada asking for this very type of breakdown and, when we have it, we will be able to analyze to what degree the various sub-components have a bearing on the major components.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In relation to the Minister's answer, would the Minister tell us if he has any indicators that show exactly what is the rate of increase in the housing component - not the appliances, furnishings, etc., but the actual cost of housing in relation to rent and increase in construction?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I just indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, we are in the process of trying to obtain this information if Stats Canada will give it. But, for his information, the shelter, the housing component, I would say out of 29 points, a weight of 29, shelter has 18, so this means there are 11 points that should be given as weight points to other elements of housing - namely, as I said, household operation. We haven't got the detail but we are trying . . . Apparently it takes special permission and I am writing to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to obtain that permission for Statistics Canada to release it to us.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell us whether, in addition to writing to Statistics Canada, whether the officials of his department or anyone in the government is presently consulting with members of the Apartment Owners' Association or the Builders' Association, or other groups involved in the construction or supply of housing, to gather from them exactly what the cost figures are and what the housing situation is presently in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that we are engaged at this time in any such survey, but I can mention that DBS and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation does conduct various types of surveys from time to time on the cost of housing, cost of construction, and on vacancy rates, etc.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. In view of the Minister's statement that presently there is no consultation going on, and in view of the impending urgency created by the building season that is now upon us, does anyone in his department or in the government intend to meet or consult with members of the building industry to determine what action may be necessary to compensate or react to the problem of the increasing price of housing, which he stated is still 18 out of the 29 points on the scale?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, of course we can consult and so forth, but I don't know whether it's strictly within the purview of this department, of indeed the Provincial Government, as to what degree we can have a control over the cost of construction. There are many many elements in construction costs. One, of course, is the level of wages and these are negotiated, as the honourable member knows, in a free collective bargaining situation. And another very important cost is the cost of materials, many of which are manufactured unfortunately outside of this province, basic steel and the like.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Leader of the Official Opposition asked me a question concerning the rental rates charged by the department at the Gimli Industrial Park. For his information, industrial space in hangars for warehousing and production etc., is 50 cents a square foot plus 20 cents per square foot for heat, when provided by the Park, plus 15 cents per square foot for electrical power where the building is not metered. And for office space, the basic rate is \$1.00 per square foot plus 20 cents for heat, when provided by the Park, plus again 15 cents per square foot for electrical power where the building is not metered.

In terms of agriculture, farm land, there are 300 acres that are cultivated and will be leased on a share crop agreement, and the proceeds of which are shared one-third by the Park and two-thirds by the tenant.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. Orders of the Day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debates on second readings?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 5. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

BILL NO. 5 - THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this bill, as the Minister indicated in his opening remarks, it is essentially a bill to modify some of the provisions of this Act to correspond to changes made in the Child Welfare Act. There is, however, one area which I think, in terms of passage of this bill, requires a degree more of explanation, and that is the portion of the bill dealing with the definition of "death" under the legal statutes.

We can only assume from this . . . that the introduction of that clause into the Vital Statistics Act is done in order to ensure that there are proper safeguards in the whole area of transplants and other forms of medical operations, and to ensure that there is a legal standard against which any transplant of vital organs from those who are dying to those who are living can be made. We feel that because this particular issue, I suppose, has an importance to every one of us, or could have importance to every one of us at some time or the other, again it requires some more explanation as to exactly how the Department of Health and Social Development arrived at both the definition itself, whether it has worked out with the medical profession and the hospitals procedures to determine these criteria for when is someone dead, and we think, Mr. Speaker, and although it's not totally within the strict interpretation of this Act, I think it requires some questioning as to what are the guidelines we presently have in the province for determining the problem of transplants of vital organs from those who are dying to those who may need them in the areas of kidneys, brains, hearts and the rest of it. It seems that that particular clause strikes one with some degree of curiosity that it wasn't accompanied by a log or a definition and explanation as to the context in which it should be examined, and I think in this case, particularly the context of the problem of transplant operations.

So we would simply request from the Minister an explanation before the passage of this Act, to tell us a little bit exactly what has been decided or arrived at in discussion with the medical profession and the hospitals to determine the guidelines, if you like, for transplant operations and how these definitions were arrived at.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 6 - THE WILLS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6 proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill basically that has a great deal of significance for people involved mainly in the drawing up of wills, and I have to admit quite frankly, sir, that my own knowledge in this field is fairly limited, so I had to rely on advice from those in the legal profession and I have since received that advice. Basically, while there is some misgiving under the conflict of law part, the advice that I received was that the benefits that will accrue through the passage of this bill far exceeds some of the apprehensions that have been voiced by some members.

So, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge this bill to move forward to committee, and perhaps at that time we may get one or two opinions expressed by some members of the legal profession.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer honourable members to Page 9 of their Estimate books. Resolution 20(a)--Pass? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, before we let this resolution pass, I think it's fairly evident, to the Attorney-General at least, that there is some concern in the Legislature and in the province as a whole regarding the operation of the Liquor Control Commission. I would sincerely hope that in order to expedite the affairs of this committee and proceed with the estimates of the Attorney-General, that we may get some indication from the Attorney-General if it's at all possible to have the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission brought before another committee of the Legislature, where we can deal firsthand with many of the problems that exist in that field. And I would like the Attorney-General to indicate whether or not he would be willing to have the Liquor Commission brought before a committee such as the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 20(a) - pass? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if the Attorney-General is not willing to do that, then I think we have to proceed and examine his estimates and the operation of the Liquor Control Commission in this Chamber, and so we will have to proceed in that manner.

Mr. Chairman, in 1928 in the Province of Manitoba, we had a major change in the legislation dealing with the sale and the use of liquor throughout this jurisdiction. Again in 1940 we had another revision or review, and then in 1954, some 14 years later, we had what we consider to be a major review of the liquor use in the Province of Manitoba in the adoption of a report which is commonly called the Bracken Commission.

Sir, that Commission was established by an Order-in-Council on the 22nd of May in 1954, and it came about as a resolution that was passed in the Legislature, or was discussed in the Legislature on the 15th of March of that same year. And the broad terms of reference of that Commission, and I quote: "The purposes, objects and duties of the Commission shall be to make full inquiry and to make findings and recommendations consistent with the public interest and the general welfare of the people of Manitoba, with respect to the whole field of relevant facts, matters, issues and legislation relating to the sale, distribution and consumption of spirituous, vinous and malt liquors within the Province of Manitoba, and to report the findings and recommendations of the Commission with reference to the matters comprised within the Inquiry."

Then later on, sir, there was an addition that was made, which gave some additional recommendations to that commission, and that dealt with: "to further inquire into the administration of the Act as well as the Act itself, and secondly, into the manufacture of alcoholic beverages as well as the sale, distribution and consumption thereof."

Mr. Chairman, that was a five-man commission. I suppose in today's society we would refer to it as a five-person commission, because it consisted of Mr. John Bracken, Major-General Riley, Mrs. Jean Whiteford, Dr. Paul L'Heureux and Clifford McCrae. And, sir, while time and the importance of the study no doubt becomes more important in people's mind, I think that it's - I know in my own mind I thought that this was probably a two or three year study that went on, but I find that the first recommendations of that commission came forward on the 1st of September of the following year, and there were further recommendations on November 1st of 1955. So that in the space of one year we had a very significant study of the liquor usage in the Province of Manitoba.

Sir, that last study was commissioned more than two decades ago. More than two decades ago, and since that time, we have had minor amendments introduced in the Legislature, sometimes by government, sometimes by individuals, but they have all been relatively minor in nature and the Commission has been allowed to go its merry way relatively unexamined by members of the Legislature. And, sir, we feel at this time that more than two decades have passed since we have had a major review, and we should in all probability be taking a major look again at the operation of that Commission.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the last two decades other forms of intoxication which have become quite prevalent and quite common within the Province of Manitoba, and indeed throughout the whole country. The Federal Government recognized this and brought forward a report on the use of drugs, and I would think that any further study made in the Province of Manitoba regarding liquor also include the use of drugs as one of the other forms of intoxicants that are used in the province. I would hope that the Minister, in his estimates

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) today, would give us some indication of whether or not he is willing to bring forward another study to update the Bracken Commission, which is more than two decades old.

Sir, in the last 20 years we have seen major changes in society, we've had men go to the moon and back, there's been technical change, there's been radical changes in the methods of communication, there's been radical changes in education, and I would sincerely hope that in this field of liquor use and intoxication that we should update our studies at least. What the recommendations of that committee would be I wouldn't hazard a guess, but I think we should be doing what has been done periodically in the past, and that is reviewing as we did in 1928, as we did 12 years later in 1940, and as we did 14 years later in 1954. And, sir, now this is 21 years later and nothing has been done.

So I would hope that the Minister could give us some indication of his inclinations in this direction, whether or not he would consider a resolution of the House, in fact whether or not he might draft a resolution to bring before the House. I would hope that he would show the leadership that we expect from the Attorney-General as the member responsible for the Liquor Control Commission. I think that leadership should be there and should be evidenced in this Chamber. So I would hope that, in his reply, the Minister may give us some indication of what the government's intention is at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Attorney-General for something that he was able to do for me in my constituency last year regarding the Liquor Control Board, or Liquor Commission, and he will recall that I had requested that in a liquor store that they were going to change to all wine in my constituency, that they, for consideration of the people living in the immediate district, some of the senior citizens in the apartment blocks around, that they keep a small quantity of liquor on hand and beer, and I believe the Attorney-General brought this to the attention of the Liquor Commission and I'd like to tell him that it has been done and the people of the area certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, while I am occasionally in a bar, I find that if I have a drink in front of me and I'm with another person, and we both have a drink in front of us, and he happens to drink faster than me, that he may order another drink for the two of us and the waiter will bring it along, and unless he has finished his drink and unless I am finished mine, the waiter can't put it down, and I really don't think that's a good situation because the person that hasn't finished usually gulps down his drink so that the waiter can put it down in front of him. I think that contributes to drinking faster than one should, and I don't really understand why the Liquor Commission is advertising only one drink in front of you, and some of their advertising really says that that's the law that there can only be one drink in front of you, and I'd like to question the Attorney-General on Section 159 of the Act, which says, "Subject to Section 115, no person holding a licence of any kind mentioned in clause A to G" - A to G is a type of licenses "subsection (1) of Section 73," which doesn't pertain to quantities of liquor in front of you, "shall sell, serve, make available, or permit to be given or supplied at any one time to a person on the licensed premises more than two glasses," - more than two glasses - "of liquor, or one bottle of beer or natural wine. And he shall not sell, serve, make available or permit to be given or supplied to that person any more liquor until that already served, given or supplied to him, has been consumed."

Now the Act says clearly "two glasses" of liquor, and I would agree that the Act is right. I don't think anybody should have more than two in front of them, especially in a bar, but there is occasion when you haven't quite finished your drink, and I think that's the reason for this section. But the Liquor Commission, with their advertising, is insinuating that it is against the law, and in fact the bartender will say to you, "I can't put that down." Now I wish the Attorney-General would look into that particular section. If he feels, or the government feels it should be changed to one, bring in an amendment, but I can't see why the Liquor Commission should be able to set himself up unto a law within himself and make that decision when the Act clearly states "two glasses."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can agree with the comments made by my colleague from Sturgeon Creek. I think some of these regulations have no doubt been brought

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) in with extremely good intent, and there's many of us can see the reasoning behind many of the regulations, but the one such as he has mentioned is a bit ridiculous and it has been the cause of a prosecution or the closing down of establishments on more occasions than one, and it's just a wee bit ridiculous.

Well I won't go into the points - my colleague from Morris covered them the other day, and there's been some mention in the House last night of snooper work and somewhat under-cover methods of gaining information, and I think the Minister can look to the particular department that we're discussing now for ways of gaining information in a manner that might just not be recognized as being in the best interests and in the most ethical manner by some of the people in the inspection staff of the Report.

But, Mr. Chairman, my reason for getting up was to ask the Minister one question, and I wonder if he could tell me the amount of remuneration paid to the Liquor Licensing Board last year, to the members of the Liquor Licensing Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a few comments while on the Minister's Salary. First of all, I want to say that the matter that I have concerning an area in my constituency, I discussed the matter personally with the Minister and I want to thank him for the suggestion he made to me, that the person who was interested in establishing a vendor, that that person write to him. But since that time, I have spoken to my constituent and they inform me that the Commission were telling them that if they wanted to establish a vendor they would have to have a minimum amount of money involved in the stock that they would be entering. This person was told that the minimum would be \$5,000. In other words, the merchandise would be on consignment, which I understand this is so, but they were given to understand that if that was the law, that a minimum of \$5,000 was necessary to stock up the establishment for getting into the vendor business. They could not afford that kind of money, and I'm just wondering, I wonder if the Minister could enlighten me on that whether this is true or; and if it's not, I would appreciate it if he would elaborate the comments as to just how much, if there is a minimum, or if it is decided by an inspector going out and determining what size the business would be. This is the area in which I would like to know, because it's a matter that is of important concern to these people and would determine whether or not they would enter into that field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General may as well catch us all with his replies. I followed with interest last night the remarks of the Member for Roblin with regard to the Liquor Commission, and in his appeal to the Attorney-General that it was perhaps time to have another sort of a study group look at the whole field of liquor distribution and liquor laws, etc. in the province of Manitoba. I think there's one area, and I think that if that were to happen, even if it doesn't happen, it would be well worth looking at - we passed several years ago a new law regarding the age of majority in Manitoba, reducing it from 21 to 18, and at the time of its passing there were fears expressed that this was perhaps too low. In fact, there was a resolution from this side, an amendment to it, that would have placed it at 19 for the reasons that at age 18 you still have a significant number of 18 year-olds in high schools in Manitoba, and that this provides the opportunity for people of high school age to in fact be in a position of having too great an access to the supply of liquor. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be worthwhile if the Attorney-General could indicate whether any studies have been done to find out whether or not this age 18 has posed a problem with regard to the high schools. I think probably all of us get a certain amount of comment and communication from people in our constituencies with regard to problems that are associated with alcohol and young people.

There is presently some sort of popular feeling at least that where there was a considerable worry about drug use by young people in the last several years, that this has subsided somewhat but the consumption of alcohol has to a certain extent increased. I am told, and I am not sure, I haven't verified this, but I have been told and perhaps the Attorney-General could confirm it or otherwise, that for instance the mickey-sized bottles of vodka have been taken off the shelves of the liquor stores. Upon questioning and asking why this was, the one indication I got was that there were instances where these were of too convenient a size and were showing up in the pockets, and so on, of people where they shouldn't, and this of course, included young people in high schools where the mickey-sized bottles were convenient to carry,

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) and that there was even a problem in the schools with these.

Now, again I say Mr. Chairman, I haven't researched this to prove it, and it's very difficult to do. You can simply go by the comments you get, and the more direct a question you ask in this area, the less direct of an answer you get. It's only periodically you get this sort of information that is provided to you, but it comes frequently enough from different areas to raise the concern as to whether or not the lowering of the age of majority from 21 to 18 has not, in fact, created an added problem with regard to the consumption of liquor by young people at the high school level.

So I would ask him for his comments, particularly in relation to whether he has sensed any feedback of a nature that would verify this concern that is expressed periodically, and as to whether or not he does not think that it wouldn't be a worthwhile thing to examine, as to whether or not the age of majority going from 21 to 18, particularly in relation to liquor commission, may not have been a little too low.

I'd point out an interesting further observation that when we were down in North Dakota looking at the Garrison Diversion, we had an opportunity to meet with the Governor of North Dakota, and so on, and in the course of our conversation he mentioned that they had to examine, by popular pressure, the reducing of the age of majority from 21 to 18, and Governor Link's comment was that they had kept it at 21. And one of the reasons they had kept it at 21 is that they had looked at other jurisdictions where it has been reduced from 21 to 18, and two of them that he mentioned in particular were Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and he said that the assessment that they had done informally of the reduction in the age of majority in relation to these two jurisdictions had satisfied them that it wouldn't be a good move to do it, particularly in this area of liquor consumption.

Now, I pass that on for what it's worth but at least the Attorney-General knows this particular gentleman, he's a very considerate and thorough man in executing his public responsibilities, and that his assessment of the impact in Manitoba and Saskatchewan was that the age of majority reduction from 21 to 18 was not a good move insofar as the encouragement of the consumption of alcohol is concerned.

So I would, with those comments, ask for the Attorney-General's remarks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General. Oh, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. ADAM (Ste. Rose): Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was not my intention to rise to speak at this point but the remarks of the Honourable Member for Riel prompted me to do so. He indicates that he is critical of our younger people between the ages of 18, that the young under 21 have been allowed to consume alcohol. Is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A matter of privilege here. I didn't express criticism of the young people. I'm asking the question, which could be critical, with regard to setting the age of majority at 18.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, I apologize if I didn't understand his remarks correctly, but I'm just wondering how he can equate that to the fact that young people of 18 years of age are quite acceptable to be inducted into the army, to defend our country. I am not promoting drinking of any kind, I'm just saying how on one hand can you allow young people to go and defend our country, so those that are staying at home can drink all they want, and you would deny them that privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): The remarks that I had felt needed to be said were pretty well said by the Member for Riel, although I do think that there's a problem with the 15, 16 and 17 year olds having liquor more easily accessible to them now since the age of majority was lowered. I find in the liquor store that I go to occasionally on Portage Avenue in St. James, if you go there on a Friday or Saturday night, around 7:30 or 8:00 o'clock, you'll find liquor being exchanged, hand to hand, right in the Liquor Commission parking lot. And I think that this is something that should be . . . well you can't police it in the parking lots, if they don't exchange the bottle there they're going to do it elsewhere. But I think that something has to be done to protect the youth of that three years below age 18, that it seems that it dropped that three years with the age of majority. Where we had a problem with the 17 and 18 year olds getting it before from the older people, I think that the 15's and 16's are getting it now, and it's creating a real problem in some areas.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment very briefly on this document that we just got in our hands today, and it's too bad that the Chief Inspector didn't have an opportunity to give us access to this document while we were dealing with the Minister's Estimates, and Page 6 and 7 back up my argument that I raised in the House last night, and I am sorry that the Honourable Minister hadn't responded and given us some indication of the needs that there are for some real serious discussions, and the need of a committee to review where we're going, because this report is quite a . . . I'd like to know first of all how many convictions the Honourable Attorney-General's Department can give us regarding juvenile delinquencies under the Liquor Act. I think that's more than backed up my argument, and the Chief Inspector raises it in this report.

During the year, it's mentioned here the number of complaints that have been raised in various organizations, including welfare workers and the clergy, etc., and I wonder how many of these kind of reports, and what they say, what kind of information that the Minister has got. It also goes down and spells out there the . . . Mr. Paquette the Chief Assistant Commissioner has submitted a report to the Minister indicating the seriousness of the situation and I, certainly we in the Opposition are entitled to a copy of what that report says, too, and I think it likely will back up some of our concerns in this matter.

Over on Page 8 at the top of the page there, convictions under the Act involving juveniles show a definite increase throughout the province. And my gosh, Mr. Chairman, I again appeal to the Attorney-General, let's get a group together, an independent group, and take another look at where we're going with this legislation and see if we can't improve upon it, or find out where the serious problems are and hopefully alleviate them. That's what we're here for as legislators, and I hope the Attorney-General will recognize my concern and the members in our group, that the need is now for a review of this whole Act, and let's get the Chief Inspector to come and sit down with us and the Chairman of the Board, and discuss this whole matter and see if we can't make some semblance of order out of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the subject that was brought up by the Member for Roblin, and I'm glad that he brought it up because if he hadn't, I intended to bring it up. I want to quote from the report, the 44th Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control. And I'll go to Page 9 - this is in December, 1971. "I also wish to make the observation that liquor offences since the Age of Majority Act was implemented in 1970 have shown an increase in offences involving juveniles who are able to obtain liquor from 18 year old youths." That was December 31st, 1971. Showing an increase in the juvenile.

Now we'll go to December 31st, 1972. And on Page 8: "I wish to advise an increase in convictions under the Liquor Control Act with an increase in the number of detentions under the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act. Convictions under the Act involving juveniles also show an increase and the only reason which can be attributed to this increase is the availability of liquor to juveniles."

1973 - Page 8, 1973: "Convictions under the Act involving juveniles shows an increase. This would be attributed to juveniles associating with friends who are over the age of 18 and therefore resulting in liquor being more easily obtained."

Inspector's report, 1974, again as quoted by the Member for Roblin: "That the use of liquor and the abuse of the Liquor Act by juveniles again showing an increase."

Now I've just quoted from the last four years' reports, Mr. Chairman. Every one of them have pointed out an increase, and while the present Attorney-General has not been the Attorney-General in those last four years, he has been a Member of the Cabinet. Obviously, the Cabinet must have wrestled with this problem, or perhaps they swept it under the rug hoping that it would go away.

Mr. Chairman, the four consecutive yearly reports of the Inspector have shown the same thing occurring every year, and nothing has been done. We have asked for a committee or a commission to look into this. We've asked the Chairman of the Commission and his major or Chief Inspector to be able to appear before the Legislature. The Minister as yet has not indicated what the position of the Government is. But I would sincerely hope that he will tell members of this Legislature and the people of Manitoba what he is prepared to do about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20(a). The Honourable Attorney-General.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if members, and I believe we had an understanding two or three days ago that we would proceed item by item, then possibly return to general ministerial salary. There are a number of specific questions that were asked of me here and I want to be able to answer them correctly. Now either I attempt to answer what I can here now and find some other opportunity some way or other to answer specific questions, or we proceed with item and then return later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to usurp the authority of the Government House Leader but it seems to me that the arrangement that was made, if I understood it correctly, he perhaps wants to confirm that, was that since we have proceeded so far along on the Estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General on the first item, I'm sure he wouldn't want to invite us, after going through the whole thing, to go back again and go through the whole routine again. I think that the understanding that was reached was that starting with the next set of estimates that will be coming forward, which would be the Department of Agriculture, we would follow that practice; but insofar as the Department, the Estimates of the Attorney-General was concerned, we would complete the first item and then go down, and when we have completed all the estimates then we would be finished, rather than returning to the first item again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: You see the problem that I have, Mr. Chairman, is there is no item Liquor Control Commission, and I do want to respond to specific questions, and I cannot rightly at this point respond to specific questions unless some way or other I am provided with some other opportunity to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that particular problem before I spoke yesterday afternoon, but that would be the only way that we could cover the Estimates of, or the Department of the Liquor Control Commission was on the first item. And I regretted, I think I said at that time, that we did not have a separate item in which we could carry on a question and answer session, since now that has to be done on the first item. But my point is simply that I don't think it would be fair to the Minister if after having gone this far with the first item that we ask him to come back to that item again after all the other . . . after the details of his estimates have been considered. I think it would be asking a little bit too much to give us that permission to recap the whole thing again. We may start another debate on the first item that would be as lengthy if not even longer than the first one, and I hesitate to suggest that we should proceed in that fashion. So may I suggest in the absence of the House Leader that if there are any questions that he chooses, that he wishes to answer on the Liquor Control Commission that he answer them at this time, and then we'll complete the first item and go on to the remaining items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: . Well then possibly at some other opportunity I can respond to some specific questions that I don't have the information for members now in regard to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think that we did make a proposal to the Attorney-General which may get him out of this dilemma he's in at the present time. If we could take the Liquor Commission before another Committee of the Legislature, then we can get off all these Liquor Commission problems and get on with the Minister's other estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say in connection with Section 159 of the Liquor Control Act, the section which the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was speaking to, and was indicating his concern about the present implementation in regard to that section. I would like to simply indicate to the Assembly that we are presently examining that section carefully, and as honourable members may expect there will be amendments forthcoming later in the session. There will be an opportunity I think later in the session in which we can deal with that particular section of the Act, Section 159, as to the position which we may wish to take in that connection. I think the spirit and intent of Section 159 is admirable; I do think we ought to examine it carefully to ensure that it's not imposed in such a way, as far as the enforcement is concerned, that it appears a little on the silly side. We will have an

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) opportunity later this session to return to a consideration of section 159, I expect, when further amendments are presented to the Act.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked as to the licensing of members of the Liquor Licensing Board and, subject to being corrected, I believe that the amount of remuneration is \$1,000 per year for each member of the Licensing Board. I'll have to confirm those figures but from my recollection that is the amount of pay.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake, I can't answer his question now but I'll certainly obtain that information for him later as to the minimum stock required in order to obtain a vendor's license.

Most of the discussion related to the issue of the lowering of the drinking age to 18. I believe that Manitoba, insofar as Canada is concerned, is certainly not all alone in this respect. I believe that most provinces have proceeded to reduce the drinking age from 21 to 18. There's no question, as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell indicated, that we find increasing problems in respect to liquor abuse in respect to drinking by juveniles as in other, and also insofar as other groups are concerned within our community. And I fear that this is a part and parcel of the increasing demands and changes within our society.

I do not think that the reduction of the drinking age from 21 to 18 in itself has created this problem. I suspect that if the drinking age had not been reduced, and I suspect if we had before us the reports for the period prior to the reduction of the drinking age in 1971, we'd find references to increased liquor problems, increased numbers of infractions insofar as juveniles are concerned under the Liquor Control Act.

So I fear that this is a continuing problem and it really relates to the concerns that were expressed back in '71 whether or not those 18 to 21 consume liquor according to the law, and expected to drink according to the law and the provisions of the Liquor Control Act, or whether they do it in a surreptitious and a hidden manner. This would seem I think to be basically the choice that confronts us.

But I think that one should not dismiss lightly the problem that, as with drugs, with liquor we have a serious problem insofar as the number of infractions are concerned, not just with juveniles but throughout our entire community. And I would say to honourable members I appreciate their comments in respect to licensees, that this again I think reinforces the need for studious care and scrutiny of licensees to ensure that they do in fact live up to the responsibilities expected of them.

In regard to suspension of licenses one will ascertain by examination of the suspensions that many of them related to service of alcohol to intoxicated persons in cocktail lounges, disturbances, loitering, intoxicated loitering, the service of underage and other areas that - here's one here, allowing a juvenile to remain in a beverage room. So that the Commission does have an enormous responsibility on its part to ensure that the areas that were expressed here in this Assembly as being areas of great concern by members, are in fact properly enforced, and that the licensees who receive a trust, an important trust, from the community at large do in fact undertake every reasonable effort to enforce those responsibilities.

I can't deal with the question of whether or not the mickey size bottles of vodka were removed from the shelves of the Liquor Control Commission because of problems that they created. It would sound probably reasonable that that may in fact have been the reason for their removal from the shelves of Liquor Control Commission. I will check that out further, the reference by the Honourable Member for Riel.

I am certainly concerned about the references by the Honourable Member for Charleswood that there's an exchange of liquor taking place with juveniles in parking lots of Liquor Control Commission Stores, and certainly those comments will be passed on to the Chairman of the Commission.

A number of questions were raised in respect for a Committee to review the Liquor Control Act, and I think the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and others, must realize that certainly one cannot respond in a definitive way to that request here today.

We are going to be dealing with amendments later on in the session to the Liquor Control Act. Some of them will be of some significance and some importance, and I think we should consider ways and means by which we can develop techniques to ensure that there is a hearing given in regard to liquor amendments and needs for reform in the meantime. Mr. Syms will certainly be present during those amendments to the Liquor Control Act, and I think because

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) of the wide array of the amendments that there'll be quite a large degree of opportunity for questioning at that point. But in the meantime, certainly from my vantage point, I intend to pursue that because I would not be hesitant to see a more thorough examination of our laws in Manitoba pertaining to liquor. I think there have been pretty significant changes in the last four or five years; there's been considerable writing done as to the laws in Manitoba, favourable writing, that our laws in Manitoba do in fact compare very favourably with the liquor laws in other provinces in Canada. So I'm not certain at the moment whether the need is there or the demand is there for a full scale commission of inquiry into our present liquor laws. But I certainly do not want to remain static and in the position of not continuing to obtain submissions and re-examination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to prolong this too much longer, Mr. Chairman, but it would have been helpful had we had all these reports and been able to study them for awhile before we got maybe into these estimates.

But there's one particular section that I would like the Minister to comment on and it's the data in respect to prosecutions under the Liquor Control Act. And it's rather startling to me because I've had it brought to my attention by some rural people that they feel they are being unduly - I don't like to use the word harassed but I guess for lack of a better one I'll use it - but by owners of licensed premises with the presence of cruiser cars in the immediate vicinity of the premises and the people become a little reluctant to get into their car and go home, whether they be intoxicated or not. And we know that half of the population of Manitoba lives in the City of Winnipeg and under the prosecutions the amount realized of \$276,000, that the Winnipeg Police Force collected only \$38,000 in liquor convictions and the RCMP collected \$187,800. My God if the rural people are paying this kind of fines in relation to the people in the City of Winnipeg, with half the people here, and I know a lot of them they're just as good drinkers as us country boys are, every bit - and just as bad drivers. I just find that just staggering and hard to believe, and I'd like the Minister to comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, the Minister in his statement indicated that Mr. Syms would be appearing before a committee when changes in the Liquor Act are brought forth. I'd like to ask the Minister a question. Has Mr. Syms been re-appointed Chairman of the Liquor Commission this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before the Minister gets up to answer the previous questions put to him, I'd like to bring one matter to his attention and it has to do with the ID cards, I believe, that are given to the young people 18 years of age. I do believe that there is some, let's say a little bit of bootlegging going around as far as the cards are concerned, not in the literal sense, but I believe the cards sometimes are loaned out to other younger people which allows them to go in on a false passport in - it's either a hotel or a beverage room. And this may not happen in a locality where the underage person is living in a small town, but in the event that they are travelling a distance, or into a neighbouring town where people do not know them, it has come to my attention that there is some of this going on.

Now I believe that those who do give their cards, their ID cards, to someone who is underage do not realize exactly the importance of what they're doing, and I think it's a matter of education. I can just surmise if that younger person has someone else's card showing that that person is of age and some accident would happen, just what the outcome would be to that person who loaned out the card, who gave the card out. I would say, sir, that there should be some publicity. This should be brought to the attention of all those people, the younger people, who do have ID cards, the danger of lending that card out and what are the consequences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20 (a). The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission's re-appointment takes place in - I'm not sure the exact month - I believe it's April or May.

A MEMBER: January.

MR. PAWLEY: The first of January. Then if it's the first of January, then certainly it has been processed and re-appointed for this year.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . the Minister indicate when it was gazetted?

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. PAWLEY: I couldn't. It could be checked out. I'm not even sure. I don't think it would require gazetting.

MR. GRAHAM: It's always been gazetted before.

MR. PAWLEY: The Member for Minnedosa certainly aroused my curiosity in his comparison between the fines imposed in our rural areas and within the City of Winnipeg. I suspect that part of the reason of course is basic to the amount of mileage outside of the City of Winnipeg as compared to the City of Winnipeg, and certainly that in itself would be prone to increase the number of instances in which convictions would be registered in many respects. But I do think there is a message there and certainly as Attorney-General I will look into that carefully, because it's true as the Member for Minnedosa pointed out that we have 57 percent of Manitoba's population in the City of Winnipeg probably paying 10 percent, less than 10 percent of the fines, and knowing our rural people and their inclination to good old Victorian values, I find that there just must be something a little remiss there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I rise again because some comments have been made here that have been interesting to me. And first I want to deal with the problem that my colleague from Riel brought up in regards to the age of majority when it was changed from 21 to 18, and the effects that it's had on the drinking habits, particularly of one who had reached the age of 18.

The Member for Ste. Rose was commenting, well when you reached the age of 18 and if you're accepted into the services to provide protection for your country in a time of war, then you should be able to do these other things. I don't think that his comments were as valid as I would have liked to have felt, but you know, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring a problem that has been presented to me in regards to some of our students who are still in high school at the age of 18. This is an area, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister that is a problem in, I think, many parts of the country. They're not in school sometimes in the afternoon attending classes. They'll be going to - and find out that they're sitting in the local pubs enjoying themselves until maybe from 1:30 in the afternoon until almost 3:30 when it's time to catch the bus to go home. Trustees have brought this to my attention in various areas.

So I want to suggest to the Minister that this is one of the problems that has been created by the Age of Majority Act being reduced from 21 to 18. I don't think, as the Member from Ste. Rose tried to create a smokescreen here when he said, you know, when a man reaches 18 if he can carry a gun then he should be able to do anything else. I think that there are other problems related that are far more important than that. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the Minister is aware of this kind of problem, but I think that he should be talking to his Minister of Education and finding out if the Minister of Education is getting any complaints about this kind of thing. I think this is one area that's very important.

And the other is, and while we're talking about that very subject, the age of majority being reduced to 18 again, we've had a problem with our friends to the south, because it's not the same as it is in Manitoba and the laws differ and so they take advantage of it. You can go down along the border and talk to any of the customs officers and they will tell you that many a time they've been very disturbed with the problems that have been created because of this legislation. And we can go on and on, Mr. Chairman, on this very thing.

My colleague from Minnedosa mentioned a very important matter here as it relates to the report that we just received, and I, too, want to say that it would have been much better if we'd have had it earlier to be able to peruse it and look into the details of what it does report to us. And when you talk, Mr. Chairman, about the fines as it relates to those in the City of Winnipeg, and compare it with the rural areas of the province - and when I say this, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it abundantly clear that it's advertised "if you drive, don't drink" and I agree with this, but it's been a problem in all our times. On the other hand, and let that be as may, Mr. Chairman, but on the other hand, I think - and I can't help but wonder, I have no proof of it - but I'm wondering if instructions have gone out to the RCMP throughout this province, that, instead of watching for maybe violations to the Highway Traffic Act, someone who's speeding too much, they're told - and this is the complaints I'm getting - to sit some place in a place where they're inconspicuous, when someone goes into a local pub, enjoys one or two drinks maybe, or three drinks, for an hour or two hours, he comes out, he jumps in his car, and he's going to maybe go home or go somewhere else, right away the police are

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) on his tail. In a number of cases, for no reason, the man was not breaking the law in any way, shape or form, but just merely the fact that he'd spent so much time in a hotel or in a bar, the RCMP were after him. And I'm wondering - I don't know, Mr. Chairman, but I'm wondering if that could be one of the answers that is as a result of why the difference in the fines are so much greater in the country as they are in the City of Winnipeg.

I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, that this is a complaint that has come to me. And when I say that, I don't want it misunderstood. You know, there have been many accidents, and fatal accidents, caused by those who have been under the influence of liquor, and I want to see that the law is enforced to deal with those people who probably are in that position, or hopefully before they get into that position, but as long as one has consumed one or two drinks or three drinks, if he is driving his car very properly, not violating the laws insofar as speed or anything else is concerned, and I've been told that despite all this, the police are after them and probably they are sometimes charged unduly. So I just wonder if the Minister would have any comments to make on those matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20 (a). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The other night, Mr. Chairman, the Minister introduced into this debate for the first time, to my knowledge anyway, a formula that is used in the Commission's decisions on whether or not to delist a fortified wine, and I find it rather peculiar, Mr. Chairman, that when we are dealing with a product that is sold only by the government, and on which the government collects a percentage, a definite percentage according to the price that it is sold at, that they would take the steps to delist a product that was relatively cheap, and say that if that price was increased it could again be relisted. Because, basically, while the Attorney-General didn't say that, basically that's what he meant, that the percentage of alcohol per dollar of value was the determining factor. So if there was more alcohol in a cheap wine, all you had to do was raise the price of it and you could again have it listed on the market. And I find that very strange.

If we were in a competitive field where there is competition, I'm sure that the government would not embark on a program of that nature, but we are not in a competitive field, and so the government is now taking the stand that because it is relatively cheap and there's a fair degree of alcohol in it, you must raise the price of it before you can sell it. And in turn, naturally, the province will get more revenue. Yet at the same time we had the Minister stating on an evening previous to that, that he was really not interested in making money, in fact he would hope that the Liquor Commission did not make as much revenue for the province as it does.

So I would ask the Minister to reconsider, and in fact either affirm what I have said as being true or categorically deny it, but I got the impression that if they raised the price of the fortified wine to make it relatively consistent with the formula they had adopted, that that wine could again be listed for sale. I would like to know if that is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20 (a)--pass?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Does the honourable member wish to speak again?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes. If the Minister is maybe going to give us an answer to that after the supper hour, I would now like to bring forward to him another problem which I think is borne out by the report which we just received on our table here today, and that is dealing with the inspectors in the Province of Manitoba. Sir, I have noticed that you compare the report of this year to the report of last year, all the inspectors seem to have been reassigned to different districts, and I want to know if it is a practice of the Commission to constantly move inspectors from one district to another. I would like to know if the inspectors have been consulted in this, because I have a suspicion, sir, that if you take an employee, a civil servant, or you put whatever label you want on them, and you constantly move them from one place to another, I think it has a demoralizing effect on that individual. It is, I think, a natural tendency on the part of any individual to establish grass roots in a particular community in which he lives, and I would think that he would like to raise his family in that community where his children are allowed to make their friends and grow up attending the same school for several years, rather than having to move two or three times a year or maybe annually. Maybe the Minister feels that constant moving like this is good for the Commission, maybe

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) it's good for getting greater convictions, but I just wonder whether he has taken into consideration the livelihood of those people that are apparently just being shifted from one place to another - I don't know whether it's indiscriminately, but without due consideration being given to the disruption that it makes in the lives of those individuals.

It was previously stated that there was a feeling that the morale within the Liquor Commission was fairly low. I would think that maybe this is one of the reasons. And I would hope that in the interests of a good relationship without civil servants, that consideration be given to those civil servants, that they be consulted with when it comes to the position or the place where they're talking about transfers, because quite frankly, sir, I know I wouldn't want to live and work under the conditions of where I may be transferred two, maybe three times a year, maybe go to The Pas for two or three months and then come to Winnipeg for two or three months, and then be sent to Brandon for two or three months. I think it would be very difficult for me to take my children out of school. I think it would be most disruptive to their educational process. and I think that we must give a great deal of consideration to the lives of those people that work so well in our interest. And I would hope that the Minister would, if he has not already considered this matter, consider it very carefully, because just looking at this list and comparing it with last year's report, it seems that almost without exception or maybe with one or two exceptions, every inspector has been moved in the past year. Now how many times they have been moved I have no way of knowing, but comparing the report of 1974 with that of 1973, we do notice the change in the area in which these inspectors work, and I'm sure that it must have some detrimental effect to the family life of those that are working for us and working to endeavour to make this Liquor Act work in the best interests of all the people.

So when we come back after supper, I would hope that the Minister at that time has had the opportunity to review this situation with the Chairman of the Liquor Commission, and perhaps at that time, he could give us a report on the policy of the government in this particular field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with Rule 19 of our House rules, I'm interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour, to return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m. (Mr. Speaker returns)

. continued on next page

IN SESSION - PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please. Private members' hour. We're on Resolution 8. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry is absent; it is put down. Resolution 9. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

RESOLUTION NO. 9 - WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that

WHEREAS changing environmental and wildlife conservation considerations have altered the circumstances under the terms of the Natural Resources Transfer Act (1930);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of reviewing the provisions of that and other Acts of a related nature and recommending changes to ensure that they are not in conflict with current environmental and wildlife conservation policies.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm just a little bit flustered at the moment. We've had three curling games back to back, and I can assure the honourable members opposite that they'll be short a Whip for a few days.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is quite short and quite concise in what it is trying to do. We're trying to basically update an antiquated act and, as we're all quite aware, the conditions have changed considerably since 1930 and the environment today is such that we feel that all the people in the province should be treated as equals. I don't think that there's any existing conditions now that should entitle one group to have special considerations over others. There are ample job opportunities, schools, hostels, and the environmental conditions are such that I feel that we should update this Act, and I don't think that it will affect a great many people in doing so. The province has been faced by quite a loss of revenue due to the fact that there are no licences basically on the deer population - licences are still being sold on elk and moose in restricted areas - and we are also having a considerable loss of revenue due to the fact that our hotels, restaurants, etc., are not picking up the trade of the hunters coming in from various locales, and our existing laws are practically impossible to enforce.

The basic law, I suppose, that you would talk about enforcing would be trespass, and this it's utterly impossible to enforce, because you have to actually catch someone in the process of trespass, you have to have your signs limited to 80 rods apart, and there's just no way that you are going to go driving out and try to apprehend someone that's out trespassing. The Mounted Police are not going to waste their time trying to do it for you.

Were again faced with the fact that there will be no deer season this year; and I would doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if the time will ever come again in the Province of Manitoba, except possibly in areas that are unaccessible, that you ever will see another deer season existing in Manitoba under the existing laws. Not only this but we are running into a situation whereby there is a great deal of animosity being created, and this brought to the forefront this fall when an individual was pushed so badly and aroused so badly that he started shooting. And this basically is not right. This individual basically was angry because I expect that people had been trespassing on his land, and he was angry with the unfairness of the law and of the Act, and consequently, possibly a very innocent individual was aroused to the point that he is now facing a very serious charge. And I feel that this is only the tip of the iceberg. There have been several times when it could have got out of hand before but it was just very fortunate it didn't, and in this case it is very unfortunate that an individual did lose his licence, but it is also very foolish that we don't upgrade our Act and upgrade our laws to the point where this situation will not exist.

This has been brought up in this House for the last several years, Mr. Speaker. As I recall the former Attorney-General, the Member for St. James, said it was a terrible thing, and the present Attorney-General last year said again that it was - I don't know whether he said it was awful or terrible, or something along this line. But I doubt very much if either one of these Attorney-Generals have approached Ottawa and asked if there was any possible chance that the Act would be updated. I don't know whether there's a lack of knowledge on the part of our Attorney-Generals or just a basic do-nothing attitude.

Provinces to the west of us are contemplating changing their Acts, or approaching Ottawa. Yes, this will have to be a federal change, and consequently I think if the three western

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) . . . provinces got together and agreed on a united approach to Ottawa, that possibly something would be done.

Our present government makes a great show of the environmental conditions. They're establishing wildlife refuges, and one thing and another, and basically I don't know what they establish them for, Mr. Speaker, because anywhere that there is an accessible road, you're going to have nothing there but chickadees and sparrows, because there's going to be no wild-life of any other type left. And consequently I can see no point in having wildlife refuges, and I don't think in a lot of cases that our Game Wardens are required any more in many parts of the rural areas, unless they're in an area where there are ducks and geese, largely wildfowl.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but the Game Wardens are throwing up their hands, the Mounted Police are throwing up their hands; they are getting no support and no back-up from the Attorney-General's office in enforcing any of the acts. There are conditions, according to the federal fellows, Mr. Chretien, that possibly you can charge, but there's just no way that the fellows are going to waste their time taking it into court because the cases are just being thrown out. And the people that are involved in this practice, Mr. Speaker, are reaching the point whereby they just quietly pull over in the field, or over to the side of the road, and tell the police where to go, and consequently it's not going to be tolerated for too much longer. You're going to see more - I won't say more bloodshed - but you're going to see more problems, and the animosity increasing between two groups of people, and I think it's very unnecessary.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will see fit to approach Ottawa; that they will try to upgrade this Act and get it in line with present-day conditions, and get out of the 1930 thought. I mean any act certainly can be amended and can be brought up-to-date, and I think that this is one that should be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Services.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the speech that has been made by the honourable member that he is referring to certain hunting rights of the Treaty Indian people of Manitoba, and how those would reflect on the conservation of wildlife and the possibility of extinction of certain types of wildlife in our provinces. And also the longer term concern of management of that wildlife. I believe that is sort of the major concern expressed by the honourable member.

The comment that he makes when he says that nothing has been done, or that no approach has been made, or no discussion has taken place on this subject, is not correct. I would say that the former Minister responsible for wildlife, the Honourable Sidney Green, has made presentations, has made representations to Ottawa, has discussed this matter with the former President of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, Dave Courchene. There have been three-way discussions going on over this question. And since I have taken over the responsibility of wild-life in this province, Mr. Speaker, I have also attempted to continue those discussions, and in fact, the ball is in the court of the federal minister at this time. The federal minister has offered to take up the discussions, to establish meetings between ourselves from the Province of Manitoba and the Indian Association that represents the Indian people of Manitoba. And I would emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it is not something which the Provincial Government alone can solve, and it's not something that the Provincial Government has the power to solve by itself. There are three-way discussions necessary on this problem because there have been three-party agreements to the rights to which the Indian people now enjoy in the province. The treaties that were signed, that were signed between the Treaty Indian people of Manitoba and the Federal Government, awarded certain rights to the Indian people of Manitoba, and those are established in those treaties.

The information that I have on the treaties, Mr. Speaker: there were ten treaties that are affected here, ten treaties that affect the area of Manitoba. Most of them refer to the rights that the Indian people are guaranteed, and if I may just refer to one of those Mr. Speaker, which would be an example for the others, that it states, "that Her Majesty further agrees with Her said Indians, that the said Indians shall have the right to pursue their avocations of hunting and fishing throughout the tracts surrendered as herein before described. Subject to such regulations as may from time to time to be made by Her Government of Her Dominion of Canada, and saving and excepting such tracts as may from time to time be required or taken up for settlement, mining, lumbering, or other purposes by Her said Government of the

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) . . . Dominion of Canada, or by any of the subjects thereof duly authorized therefore by the said Government." So it clearly, it clearly outlines in the treaty Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. According to the treaty though this doesn't include private land, does it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister . . .

MR. BOSTROM: I think I pointed that out. I was going to go on to say, you know, as a layman, I would interpret this certain part here to say, "that except for those lands that are taken up for settlement, mining, lumbering or other purposes," so that in fact it says in the treaty that those private areas, private lands that are taken out of the general Crown land area of Manitoba, would be excepted from the agreement on hunting and fishing and trapping rights. So that that would apply to the settled areas and to the private lands in the province, yes.

I just refer to this, Mr. Speaker, to point out and to emphasize that this treaty which is between the Indian people of Manitoba and the Federal Government can only be changed with the consent of those two parties, That it is not something which the Provincial Government can influence the changing of, other than to make representations to those two groups, that there is a problem, and that something should be done. As I said earlier, those representations have been made from time to time.

The other law or regulation, the law or act, which is in question here also outlines the responsibilities of two groups with respect to the hunting rights. And that is the Natural Resources Transfer Act, which outlines and secures certain rights to the Indian people of Manitoba. In fact, in certain cases it may be argued that this goes even further than some of the treaties, where it says, "In order to secure to the Indians of the province, the continuance of the supply of game and fish for their support and subsistence, Canada agrees that the laws respecting game in force from time to time shall apply to the Indians within the boundaries thereof provided, however, that the said Indians shall have the right which the province hereby assures to them, of hunting, trapping and fishing, game and fish for food at all seasons of the year on all unoccupied Crown lands, and on any other lands to which the said Indians may have right of access." So that, even on those private lands, Mr. Speaker, even on those private lands to which the Indian people have right of access, they would have these rights. So that where they do not have right of access of course, the law of the land would apply.

There are cases before the courts today which are testing some of the interpretations of these various acts and treaties, and the interpretations of these are important for the kind of decisions that have to be made. In fact, there have been cases in Saskatchewan, which has a similar kind of Natural Resources Transfer agreement with the Federal Government, with the Dominion of Canada at the time; the two different cases that are referred to, that I've had a look at, give two different interpretations of the term "what is unoccupied Crown lands." In one case the court ruled that a forest reserve could not be considered occupied Crown lands, that Indian people would have the right to hunt even on a reserve, a reserved area which was set aside by the Province of Saskatchewan. In another case which was challenged in the courts, the term unoccupied Crown land was interpreted to mean something else.

In fact in Manitoba today, we have a case before our courts with respect to our wildlife management areas. It's not known at this time, of course, what the outcome of that will be. But up till this time it's been accepted that wildlife management areas could be defined as unoccupied, or rather occupied Crown lands, which would take it out of the jurisdiction of the Indian people for hunting purposes. But if the court is to determine, or to make a decision that in fact the wildlife management areas are defined as unoccupied Crown lands, which they may decide, then it poses a greater question again on that problem.

Further to the discussions that have been going on, Mr. Speaker, the Indian Associations of Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba, have made representations to the Federal Government on this issue. They've presented an interim statement on hunting, fishing and trapping rights, which expresses their concern about the original meaning and current interpretation of the Treaty provisions and the Natural Resources Transfer Act. And in that representation which the Federal Minister has communicated to us, they have expressed a concern about the wildlife management concept. In fact, it looks as though there is a good basis for discussion at the present time. In fact, the last communication we had from the Minister of

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) . . . Indian Affairs in Ottawa was to my honourable colleague the Attorney-General, and it was with respect to the negotiations that are being proposed, and the Honourable Minister of Indian Affairs is at least hopeful that there can be three-way discussions on this, and that we can come to a decision on this very complex problem.

I would just say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that because this is such a complex matter it will undoubtedly take some time to resolve. It is not something that can be decided easily, because it requires the agreement of three parties. Three parties have in the past made agreements which are binding today on the province, on the Federal Government, and on the Indian people. And until the three parties can sit down and come to a compromise or a new agreement on this, there can be no action by the Province of Manitoba with respect to this matter. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this resolution. I want to thank my colleague from Gladstone for bringing in this resolution, because I think, Mr. Speaker, it's a subject that is of much more importance and of a serious, and what could be of a serious consequence than what many members opposite realize. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a reservation in my constituency. The population on that reservation is just almost 500 people, and I discuss with them the problems just the same as I discuss with any other members of my constituency.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, just to relate an incident last Fall where one of my constituents phoned me in the morning, about 9:00 o'clock, to let me know that there had been activities around his farm house between 3:00 and 4:00 o'clock in the morning. He said somebody was out shooting deer. He said a rifle shot went off right by his bedroom window, at least it appeared that way, at about half past three in the morning. He woke his son up to tell him that this had happened and his son didn't want to believe him, but he did go out and they found and met three fellows who had been out night-lighting. And of course he brought it to my attention and I in turn brought it to the attention of the RCMP in Crystal City, because the people in that area of my constituency became very very concerned. And this is a matter that I have brought up before this government, I would say, for the past three years, and I want to say that I thank the Honourable Minister from Rupertsland - I'm just trying to think of his title, I'm not sure of it - well, the Minister of wildlife and probably wildlife preservation, I think it's something like that - I'm sorry I don't have the proper identification, sir, but however, I want to thank him for the information he gave us. It does shed a little more light than the kind of information I can recall getting from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, who indicated to us whenever we brought the matter up, he would never indicate that it was any responsibility on his part but rather I should take that on myself and pursue any negotiations that I wanted to go through the Indian Brotherhood in this province and then in turn go to the Minister of Indian Affairs in Ottawa. That's about the satisfaction received from this government in past years.

I was interested to hear, Mr. Speaker, the Minister comment that the Indian people in both Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba have managed to get together and in turn discuss this problem with Ottawa, because, you know, when my colleague from Gladstone mentioned the seriousness of this problem, where there was an accident last fall in the southern part of the province, it is a serious matter, sir, and I'm aware, and I think the Minister must be aware when he talks about cases that have been taken to the courts and in one particular case it was taken to the Supreme Court, and it was a member of his department that did this very thing but lost the case because, Mr. Speaker - and my Indian friends in my constituency, say you know: "The white man made the law. If it's not right, he'd better change it," and I think that's a fair comment to make and I think that our Indian people are as reasonable to sit down and talk to and reason with as anybody, any other citizens of this country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Honourable Minister is aware of the seriousness of this matter that we're discussing right now, because, you know, these people are not only night-lighting but they're going on private land, and I think he was trying to decipher the laws pertaining to Crown lands, whether they are occupied or unoccupied; and, as I understand the law, that comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Now he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that private lands are the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government within a given province. And this is where the problem arises and where the crux of the problem is, is that whether it's a white man or Indian people, no matter

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) . . . who it is that goes out night-lighting, he's not allowed to night-light on private land without permission. Of course, if the law is as he stated, our Indian people can hunt for the purpose of providing food for themselves, etc. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, that law was made a hundred years ago or thereabouts. Conditions have changed a lot. Well, we were talking about the resources . . . back to 1930, . . . treaty, yes.

But, you know, I'm still further back at the time of Confederation when this country became a nation, and I think it has some significance as well as the treaty that he's talking about of 1930. And I feel, sir, and I hope that some progress will be made in the very near future, whereby we can get all our citizens to realize and understand that no one should be allowed to hunt wildlife at night. You know, I fail to understand the thinking of those who feel that this is their right. Even though it may be, why should he have to do this at night? Are there not enough hours in daylight for him to do this, because it becomes a very serious situation when people are doing this at night.

I give him one example, and my constituent was so desperate when he phoned me; "What should I do about it?" I indicated to him how I pursued this thing with this government and the satisfaction I got from them. So I said, "You know, there's only one other thing I can think of." I said, "Why don't you phone Peter Warren, get on his by-line and bring the thing to his attention?" You know, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what he did. --(Interjection)-- No, when you don't get anywhere, when you bring a matter before the members in this House, and you get the kind of satisfaction from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources such as I did, as I've indicated, then --(Interjection)-- Well, of course, they're saying now. . . I mentioned Peter Warren, I don't have all that faith in Peter Warren, I don't have the faith in him that he feels he does himself, I can tell you that, sir, but I think that nevertheless, if we're going to solve this problem, something has to be done.

Another matter that concerns our citizens of this country, and particularly the farmers, and you're talking about the preservation of wildlife, I think, sir, the Department of Mines and Resources, as I'm given to understand, have been sending their staff out to the various municipalities to discuss with them, asking them how they feel about the government getting in and buying quarter sections of land for the preservation of wildlife. And, as I understand it, that's what this government is doing right now. But on the other hand, you know, that's like putting the cart before the horse, because they're doing this and they're protecting the rights of certain citizens at the expense of many farmers who are growing crops and already providing the preservation of the wildlife that we have in this province. And I say that the provincial governments don't have to go out and buy land in order that they preserve fodder, pasture and so on, for our wild animals. That's already been done, been taken care of by the private citizens, the farmers of this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that - and I hope - that from the meetings that our Indian reservations are having, as the Minister indicates to us, with Ottawa, that the results of that will be able to create a situation whereby the Minister and this government can get together with their Indian people in this province and try to solve that problem. Mind you, it will have to be a change in the Act so that it becomes legally binding to them as well as to our white people, and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, that come this time next year or the next session round, that the Minister will be able to report something that's going to be of benefit and something that is going to prevent the kind of accidents that happen that we've had here, I think it was last December.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Would the honourable member permit a question with regard to his remarks, a point of clarification. He mentioned that . . . I wish to speak on this but I wanted to ask a question first for clarification. You mentioned something about the farmer in his area. First of all he mentioned that there was an Indian reservation in that area and there was somebody night-lighting and apparently dangerous to those inhabitants there - the farmer. Is he saying, or does he know that those people who were night-lighting were in fact Indians? Is that what he was trying to tell us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose asks me a pointed question. I have no way of knowing myself whether they were white people or whether they were Indians, but I only can go by the reply or the information I received from the person

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. EINARSON cont'd). . . who made the call, and he did indicate that there were three Indians who were night-lighting in his area, on his farm, that night. And I want to say too, sir, that they were not Indians from the reservation from my constituency, but that doesn't mean to say, you know, that the Indians in my area have not maybe violated the laws insofar as the white man's concerned, and this is the point. It's not that they've violated the law. The fact is that there's a problem here and he's asking if they were Indians. All I can say is, the information I received from this person was that they were three Indians from some part of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I thank the honourable member for his reply. I just wanted to get that clarification because he was speaking of an Indian reserve and then he tied it in with some night-lighting right close by, and I wanted to get that point clear, whether he felt to his satisfaction that it was indeed the people living on the reserves there or another reserve.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that this type of resolution has come up in the House either on the Minister of Mines' Estimates. I think it's a very important problem that we have to address ourselves to. Certainly as an ardent conservationist myself, I feel that we have to do all we can to protect our wildlife. However, I want to say that certainly it was a bad deal in the beginning to perhaps make such treaties, but having done so, since the government of the day felt that in order to have an agreement with the Indians, the Indian population of that time, that they did extend to them certain privileges, I cannot argue too much with that.

However, Mr. Speaker, having signed those treaties, the government of the day should have known that the resource would not be able to withstand the pressure of the all-year-round hunting of the Indian population plus the hunting season of the white, of the non-Indians. There is just no way that the resource can withstand that pressure. Something has to give. I believe that while on one hand we did give the Indian population the right to hunt in all seasons - and I understand and I want to thank the Minister for enlightening us on some of the treaties that have been signed - I understand that some of the treaties are different one from the other; in fact we understand that the treaties to the south there are no hunting privileges that have ever been signed. But having given that right, then the non-native population does not come under the treaty rights, therefore the province can close the season, and that is what is happening. The province has realized that, of course, they have said that the winter of 1973 was a serious winter for the deer population and we had a severe winter kill, and I would like to - I could probably do that outside of the House - but I would sure like to have an approximate figure of what the department, the Game Branch figure, or how many deer, what estimation of the winter kill. I would like to have the figures on that. I think this is important.

Another thing that I would like to - and I brought this up last year or the year before - and that is on the count, the wildlife count. I'm not sure whether that has been changed from past practices or not, and I don't distrust the people, the wildlife people, the Game Branch, on how they make an actual count of wildlife, but I don't know, I never could accept those figures as being accurate, and I would like to know just how it's done, how accurate it is, whether the population is higher than what they indicate or whether it's lower than they indicate. Of course, I expect they will say that it's right on, I don't know, but I have never been too satisfied with that. I would prefer to have somebody up there with them counting, not that I distrust their estimates but just for my own satisfaction. I would like to be up there counting myself, in other words.

I know that this has come up before and the Member for Gladstone and I have locked horns on an occasion or two, because I've always objected to people making a blanket condemnation that all the night-lighting is done by natives. This is the point that I take exception to, because I have made some research, I have been in contact with the Game Branch in Saskatchewan, with the Game Branch in Ontario, with the Game Branch in Alberta and British Columbia, to find out what their problems were insofar as night-lighting was concerned, and the figures in Saskatchewan were quite enlightening and perhaps startling, if you will, because the information I got there - and I could stand to be corrected within a few percentage points - but the indication that the Game Branch in Saskatchewan gave me was that in those people who were stopped for night-lighting, that it was about a 60-40 percentage. In other words, they felt that 60 percent of those people who were stopped or apprehended for night-

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . lighting were natives and 40 percent were non-natives, and that is quite a high figure for the non-natives. They also mentioned that in close proximity to --(Interjection)-- Did you have a question, sir? Did you want to ask a question, sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you. The figures that you quoted were interesting, that 60 percent of those apprehended were native and 40 percent were non-native. Were they non-treaty or was there any way that they could distinguish between the two?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I thank the Honourable Member for Minnedosa for his question. The information that I received was that 60 percent of the people that were stopped for night-lighting, or apprehended, were natives. I'll put it in another context, they were supposed to be status Indians and the 40 percent were non-status, or they could be just anybody. This is the information that I got. But the point they made was that in close proximity to an Indian Reserve there was a higher percentage of natives hunting, but the further they got away from the reserve the opposite was true. The further they got away from a reserve it was non-natives that were jacklighting. So the big objection that I've had all this time was that anybody gets up and says well, you know, anybody that's night-lighting has got to be an Indian, nobody else. And I take exception to that.

MR. FERGUSON: Who said that?

MR. ADAM: Well this is the impression you get all the time, even from farmers and everybody else. --(Interjection)-- I'm sure that that's what's happening. The Honourable Member for Gladstone, we locked horns here a couple of years ago on that, and he denied that he'd ever done that but he didn't deny that he wrote to Mr. Lalonde, or Mr. Chretien, whoever it was that was in charge of that department. So why would you write to Mr. Chretien if you were talking about a deer problem? Why didn't you write to the Minister of Mines and Resources?

But I say that the majority of the people take that position, that if there's anybody night-lighting that it has to be a native, status Indian. And I say that is true, there are a lot of natives hunting, because they have a right to hunt, our courts have found that they have a right to do it. --(Interjection)-- They have to night-light. No they don't have a right to hunt on private land. --(Interjection)-- They don't have to hunt; they're not allowed to hunt on private land. The same laws apply to them there as a non-native --(Interjection)-- Well that's not the way it's coming out. Maybe that's what you're talking about, but I mean that's not the way it's coming out. You know I'm sure that there are some people in the Honourable Member for Gladstone's constituency from time to time, people who are apprehended for night-lighting and they're not Indians. Must be the odd one surely because they're not all in my constituency.

A MEMBER: The odd Scotchman.

MR. ADAM: You know I've had - there were four or five charges laid in my constituency to people, non-status Indians, who were night-lighting and they were not even Metis, they were whites if we have to use color. They were farmers, they were ranchers. And you know what the arguments were? The argument was that one was hunting timberwolves; timberwolves were killing all the livestock, and he was hunting timberwolves about 11:00 o'clock, 12:00 o'clock at night, he wanted to shoot timberwolves. But he got caught night-lighting. And the next two fellows that were apprehended for night-lighting they were looking for rustlers at 11:00, 12:00 o'clock at night. But they were not Indians. They were charged, they were charged, they had rifles. They had, you know, if you're checking cattle you don't have a rifle. What do you carry a rifle for? You have a rope - like the Honourable Member for Thompson says he should have a lynching rope.

I agree that we've got a problem and we have to try and solve it, and I would certainly hope that those conversations that are now taking place, communication between the Minister and the federal people, and also the native population, the organizations, may come up with a solution. You know, I feel that if you take a right away from a group you may have to exchange that for another right. If you are going to take a right away from someone, you have to replace it with something else, I expect. --(Interjection)-- I don't know. Well I don't know, there's three fellows talking at the same time from their seats, and I don't know what the - there's some interruption.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I think I will yield the floor to the Member for Pembina or . . .

RESOLUTION 9

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make several comments with regard to this resolution in support of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina state his matter of privilege.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether you're aware of it, or others, but there is a case before the courts on this right now, and I don't know really whether we should be discussing it or not. I think possibly it's something that you should consider. I should have brought it to your attention earlier because probably you didn't know, but there's a case before the courts right now on this. It happens to be in my particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the resolution before us has got nothing to do with any court case, and the only caution I would say is for the members who are aware of a court case to stay away from it and discuss the resolution. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye,

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As mentioned before I want to say several words in support of the resolution. In southeastern Manitoba we've had certain problems, and I'm sure the Member from Emerson has had certain complaints with regards to night-lighting and game shot out of season. I sympathize with the officials of the Minister of Co-operatives Department, the Game Branch people, the fellows that are supposed to administrate the law, and there must be quite a frustration within that department.

One of the problems facing them of course is the problem of controlling night-lighting, and as mentioned we do have, and we do have people in our area get caught, and white people get caught for night-lighting. But the problem is compounded by the present situation in that it's very very hard, they'll be tracking somebody, they'll see somebody shooting a deer, and very often they'll come up and it could be a native person. As a result what has happened is that it makes their job very very hard. Instead of catching, getting a conviction when they do spend those late hours out in our wilds to try and patrol and protect our wildlife, they're very very often hampered in their efforts.

The other thing of course is the proper management and proper control of wildlife within our province. I note particularly in the - I don't know if it's in the Honourable Member from Swan River's riding - but in the Porcupine Mountains we've tried to introduce elk over there, and I think they're doing fairly well. We haven't allowed a season in that area, I understand, and there have been certain problems with regard to elk being shot in that area.

I would also like to say that the preservation of game is very important to the people in my constituency, not only to those who enjoy the sport itself and the outdoors, but also people that want to see that we preserve a certain amount of wildlife for future generations to enjoy. And I think the indications that we have seen in the last little while with regard to the closing of the deer season, I think there's many people that would have laughed at anybody that would have suggested it a number of years ago; five years ago we had a lot of deer running around in Manitoba, now suddenly there's very very few. I think that move alone shows the necessity for a certain amount of conservation and preservation of our wildlife resources in Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm very glad that the present Minister from Rupertsland has taken this position seriously because I think the former Minister didn't. It's been talked about --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . and I'm very happy, too, to think it's the Member from Rupertsland and not the Member from Ste. Rose because he just seems to be able to carry on with a lot of nonsense as if he's trying to waste some time.

We're talking about a treaty that was established 45 years ago, which was very proper at that time. Things have changed a lot in that time, and many people of all nationalities have been wanting things changed. Just because we had treaties years ago when the country was being settled and we had different problems, doesn't mean that they can't be changed. And I think the Minister in his explanation said that they could be changed but they had to be worked out together. And I think he's taking the right steps when he's working with the provincial and federal people and the Indian people to get this done, because in my particular area it's been no joke. We have a nice valley in there and there's been just any amount of Indians, I'm sorry,

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . any amount of deer, that have been killed in there in this last while. --(Interjection)-- All right, since you say it, and I won't beat around the bush about it one bit there's been Indians that have been caught with them, and they've found trucks with as many as 17 deer in them, and they were from a reserve from outside. Now we know what's going on; actually what's going on is that they're peddling them, and probably to white people. Now anybody knows that this isn't right so let's get the thing changed and straighten the thing out.

So I don't think that we should just belabour it like we have for years and talk about different things that's happened. But times have changed and it's time that we do this before there's more violence, because how would you like it to be in a constituency where the people that belong to the Game and Fish Association have come in to see the Minister and have got the season taken off for shooting deer - they didn't want any shot that season - and then to find out later on that there were people that were night-lighting and taking large numbers out of the area where the local people were denied the privilege of even shooting on their own place. And even though there's supposed to be no shooting on private property, the signs have to be so close, the lettering has to be so large, that all a person would have to do if they really wanted to shoot on there is to break off one of those signs and they could go in there and they could be shooting, and then it wouldn't stand up in court anyway. So I think it's really a sensible resolution. I think it's one that really should be changed to fit today's times, and I hope something will be done about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Very briefly in support of the remarks just made by my colleague the Honourable Member from Pembina who, I think, brought you know a greater degree of seriousness to the resolution, to the substance of the resolution before us, and that really is all that I want to do because I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is completely prepared to accept the responsibility of the consequences that we see developing in this matter, and namely, the escalation of the problem by the closure of the deer season, with which I agree with. But this is going to highlight the concern being expressed by the resolution, and sir, without being sub judice in any instance, but I noticed some unknowing frowns on the part of the members of the fourth estate when certain instances were referred to. But let me put it more bluntly. The fact of the matter is that, you know, a person of native origin has been killed as a result of this. We are walking into a situation where, you know, if we close our eyes to it we can expect more of this, and that's a tragic thing that is happening, I'm sure the Minister is well aware of and is concerned with.

I'm just saying that, you know, we have two separate actions that are taking place here that are accelerating a very bad situation. It was bad before but the community that accepted the laws of the land with respect to hunting rights at least had that safety valve, if you want to call it that, and could hunt during the regular seasons as provided for under the regulations of the department from time to time. Now that that is, for sound management, conservation reasons, being withdrawn the continued hunting, illegal or otherwise, but as is viewed very often by the people in the community as being, who aren't constantly aware and, in fact, don't particularly want to maintain that kind of divisiveness, which unfortunately treaties tend to further, no matter how right they are or how wrong they are, that's not always understood out in the field, and I have that feeling that the Government could be doing considerably more.

You know, the Government is right now actively pursuing a policy of taking away the rights of an entire group of Indian and native people with respect to Nelson House. They're going to be putting 30 feet of water on them in very short notice. They're not concerned with providing them with legal counsel, and paying for that legal counsel, as another previous administration did under similar circumstances. Pardon me, not under circumstances, because those particular lands referred to were not treaty land covered by longstanding treaties, and I refer specifically to South Indian Lake.

However, I'm just saying, Mr. Speaker, that the question you know that today this resolution is one that is going to unfortunately accelerate - there have been the kind of most regrettable instances to the extent that human life has been lost as a result of the situation that is developing, and I see no easing up of that situation with the continuance of the restrictions to deer hunting that we have in the province, unless fairly high level and fairly high priority is given to this question.

I think the Minister's laudable acknowledgement of the complexity of the problem that it

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . involves longstanding rights granted to native people within this province, and indeed throughout Canada that involves the federal jurisdiction, that involves the native organizations, as well as the provincial organization; that there seems to be a little bit of complacency here on the part of the government in not recognizing that the kind of incidences that have been alluded to during the course of this debate can in fact be expected to increase.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour of recess having arrived I'm now leaving the Chair and the House will resolve itself into committee at 8:00 o'clock. Does the Honourable House Leader wish to say something?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be more simple for you if we resolve ourselves into a committee right now.

MR. SPEAKER: It's already done. We are still in committee.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.