

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 14 May, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

CLERK'S ASSISTANT, G. Mackintosh: The petition of the First Presbyterian Church Foundation praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the First Presbyterian Church Foundation.

The petition of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg Real Estate Board.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

CLERK'S ASSISTANT: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts presents the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met on Tuesday, May 14, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the Provincial Auditor's Report and the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba and Supplement for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1984.

Your Committee received all information desired by any Member from the Minister, the Provincial Auditor and staff with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all Members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

Your Committee finds that the receipts and expenditures of the monies have been carefully set forth and all monies properly accounted for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 40 students of Grade 8 standing from the Mayville Dash Portland High School under the direction of Mr. Kerlim. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Premier Personnel Corporation - partial funding to

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections. It is my understanding that an organization by the name of Premier Personnel Corporation which is a non-profit community-based organization providing training and placement service to mentally-handicapped individuals has been waiting for almost 10 months for an answer with respect to an application for partial funding. Is her department dealing with that application?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I discussed this with my deputy yesterday and he assured me that my assistant deputy was in communication and would be in direct phone communication with them today.

MR. G. FILMON: Can we infer from that the department is now committing some funding to the organization, Mr. Speaker?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said. When or if there is funding, I think it is appropriately dealt with during Estimates.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this community-based organization raises about 25 percent of its needs on a fee-for-service basis, has been funded substantially by the Federal Government for more than two years, why is the department not prepared to fund it?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did not listen to what I said. I neither said it would nor wouldn't be funded, but it is important when we are responding to volunteer organizations' requests for funding, particularly when it's a case of an organization that has been funded by the Federal Government on a short-term basis and then dropped, Mr. Speaker, with no warning or consultation with us, that we see whether its work fits into our priorities in the planning for the service to that group.

We can't just respond in an ad hoc way to every request, much in all as it would be nice to have that amount of money, but in tight years and when we're concerned with deficit and tight management of the Budget, it's just unrealistic, Mr. Speaker.

Liquor Control Act - judgment re liquor on Indian reserves

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In light of the fact that a provincial court judge has ruled that Indian reserves that are dry will no longer be able to adhere to the wishes that the band may have with regard to that problem, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether he will be recommending to the Federal Minister of Justice to appeal this ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I have asked to obtain a copy of the judgment. In fact, I did obtain a copy of the judgment of Judge Dureault. It's only a two-page judgment which refers to an earlier judgment. I'm reviewing the matter and will give a fuller answer to the House, but I can state in a preliminary way that I believe that the press report rather overstates the effect of the judgment.

It is not the case in any event that those reserves - about half the reserves in Manitoba are dry, and half are wet - that those reserves which are dry can no longer be dry. They're dry to the extent that Steinbach is. That is that there can be and will be no licences issued under The Liquor Control Act or vendors commissioned to sell liquor on the reserves. With a dry reserve, let's say, Norway House, that is presently the case; they have no liquor outlets on the reserve. People who want liquor go down to Wabowden or places like that and purchase liquor.

The question that arose in that case really has to do with the question of individual possession and consumption on a reserve. It is a troublesome decision, and I'll try to report more fully to the House on it.

But certainly to the extent that representations are necessary to the Federal Minister, those will be made, but I'm not yet satisfied or persuaded that representations indeed are necessary. I do not think that there is any need to suggest, as one newspaper headline did or one commentator, that there's going to be chaos. There is not going to be chaos as a result of that decision.

MR. R. BANMAN: For further clarification, is the Minister saying that the effect of his judgment will not have an effect on the provincial statutes? He referred to such areas as Winkler and Steinbach who, by public referendum, have deemed that they do not want to have licensed premises in their community. Is he saying that he does not feel that this judgment will have any effect on those communities?

HON. R. PENNER: I'm satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that it will not. The local option provisions of Part 8 of The

Liquor Control Act and the local option provisions of The Indian Act, Section 98, are not really attacked by this judgment, so that, as I understand it with respect to the reserves, if they follow the procedure outlined in The Indian Act and vote to be dry, they can do so. Certainly, the local option provisions of The Manitoba Liquor Act for off-reserve territory is not in any way attacked by that judgment. So the member can be satisfied that to that extent, there is no real problem posed by the judgment.

Mosquito infestation - Western Equine Encephalitis

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment with respect to the news reports that mosquitoes that spread Western Equine Encephalitis have arrived a record three weeks ahead of schedule.

Can the Minister, Mr. Speaker, assure members of the House that his department's recently published regulations under The Clean Environment Act will not in any way impede the City of Winnipeg from fogging for mosquitoes when the City of Winnipeg and their staff decide that it is the appropriate time to carry on such a program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not make any editorial comments as I did last week and get to the answer immediately. The member's question was roughly answered last week. I have consulted with him, yes. The member already knows that the City of Winnipeg is presently conducting a larvaciding program. The mosquitoes are still largely at the larva stage and that approach seems best indicated and certainly from an environmental and a human health standpoint is certainly the best approach, and the city is following that approach presently.

As far as in what manner the pesticide use permit affects does or doesn't, I answered those questions last week and I did indicate, at the time - the member's got a puzzled look on his face - but immediately following his questions, one of his colleagues asked the questions and I replied to the effect that, first of all, the pesticide-use permit regulation, because of the lateness of the season, could not fully be implemented this year. The city is proceeding on the same basis as in the past year by registering its program with the department and then proceeding. I did indicate that at the end of the season, they will have to comply to the reporting requirements that are a part of that pesticide-use permit.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate if the department has developed or is developing any contingency plans to deal with what is predicted to be a very serious problem with respect to Western Equine Encephalitis if the month of May has a heavy rainfall?

HON. G. LECUYER: We announced the plan last year, Mr. Speaker, and I'll refer to the news release of May 3, 1984, wherein we announced a surveillance function and a mechanism to deal with it consisting of experts from a variety of areas. There is an expert in entomology, a virologist, a veterinary surgeon and a meteorologist. There are a large number of factors that have to be taken into consideration when surveying the effects of the mosquito development and the types of mosquitoes and how these might affect - and we cannot go just by one indicator of a head count of mosquitoes. At the present time, basically, that's the only indicator on which we have any results. At this point in time, this is the only indicator.

But we have to also study the effects as well of those mosquitoes and trying to determine what proportion might be the type that carries the virus. As well, as the member knows, we have studied the effects and the symptoms on horses, humans and sentinel chicken flocks.

The surveillance committee reports directly to a senior official in the Department of Health who interprets the data and then reports to a committee of Deputy Ministers of the Department of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health; Health; Government Services and the Department of Agriculture.

African countries - funding to

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Deputy Premier.

Could the Deputy Premier indicate what assistance the government of the Province of Manitoba has provided to Ethiopia and other African countries suffering from famine?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

St. Pierre School area - request denied by Board

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

An unfortunate situation has developed in the St. Pierre school area where a large group of French-speaking parents had their request of education in 50 percent English rejected by the board.

Would the Minister be prepared to meet with the parents' group to try and resolve this issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I often do agree to meet with groups that are having difficulties resolving issues, and have frequently met with parent groups and school divisions where they've had particularly difficult issues to resolve, and have always made the offer that we are prepared to act in either a liaison or a mediation

role for these groups. However, I think presently the board is dealing with the issue and as I mentioned earlier, they have a split community. It's not a matter of the community coming and all of them wanting the same program.

There is a lot of people on the other side of the issue, and you have a board that is faced with a community that is asking for different programs and trying to resolve that. I think they have decided to set up a committee to look at the issue and to report back within a reasonable period of time. In law, it is in the hands of the school board and they are dealing with it.

RCMP turnover and recruitment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General.

The province and various towns spend together some \$28 million for RCMP services. Can the Minister inform the House what rate of turnover exists amongst the RCMP that provide that service and whether or not recruitment to the RCMP is proportional to that rate of turnover - recruitment from Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Fall rye and winter wheat - estimated losses

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Agriculture. There have been reports of substantial losses of fall rye and winter wheat in Western Canada.

Could the Minister indicate what the acreage and the dollar estimate loss is to the Manitoba farm community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: As well, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Crop Insurance, which is operated by the Department of Agriculture, is now providing insurance for unlicensed semi-dwarf wheat varieties and not for recommended wheat varieties or licensed winter wheat varieties.

Would the Minister put to the Minister of Agriculture and the Crop Insurance Corporation the fact that they should consider providing an insurance for winter wheat grown in Manitoba. Will he, Mr. Speaker, make that proposal to the Crop Insurance?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I will take that question as notice as well.

MTS - salary of Chair of Board

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. In 1981, the government appointed Saul Miller as Chairman of the Board of Manitoba Telephone System at a salary of \$35,000 a year, and on Mr. Miller's recent resignation have appointed a woman, Jean Edmonds, as Chair of the Board of Manitoba Telephone System, at a salary of \$25,000 a year. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House and the women of Manitoba if this is an example of this government's commitment to pay equity.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Labour. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be able to confirm the appointment of Jean Edmonds as Chair of the Manitoba Telephone System Board, a highly competent woman whom I think will do credit to this province in her capacity as chair of that board.

I want to, in connection with her salary arrangements, confirm that the revision downwards was at her request.

A MEMBER: Women aren't greedy.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicated that pay equity was a principle this government was committed to and measures will be introduced during this Session to further develop this principle. Could the Deputy Premier indicate what action the government has taken in order to implement pay equity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in due course, that legislation will be tabled.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Deputy Premier indicate which legislation or which act the government proposes to amend?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to confirm that, as the Throne Speech had indicated, at this Session of the Legislature there will be a measure introduced to provide pay equity in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister responsible for MTS. In the

question of pay equity, is this the way women are going to be able to get their jobs by saying that we'll take \$10,000 less? Is this the only way they're going to be appointed? I'm asking this government if it's not the job that should pay, not the person in it? Is this how we're going to have pay equity with this government? Because I can see, if another woman came along and wanted this job, she's not going to get it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

May I remind the honourable member that Oral Question period is a time for seeking information and not for making arguments.

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.
Does the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park wish to rephrase her question?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, my question to the Minister responsible for MTS, or possibly to the Deputy Premier: are women only going to be appointed to these positions if they will take a lesser salary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, at the time that I discussed with Jean Edmonds the work of the Board, she wanted further information on it. She discussed it with the previous chairperson and she indicated to me that she was satisfied that she would be prepared to do the work. She didn't feel that she would want to contribute as much time as had the previous chair and she, therefore, indicated that she thought the emolument or the honorarium, or whatever you want to call it, the payment, was more than what was necessary. She has indicated that the amount should be reduced and it was at her request that change was made. I want to indicate that the present vice-chair of the board, in the person of my colleague, the Member for Wolseley, has been carrying on the functions of the chair and all of that, at no additional cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, it seems amazing to me that a male that's in this job is quite willing to take \$35,000, and yet a woman coming in is allowed to have a reduction of \$10,000.00.

My question to the Minister is: I feel, is it not the job that's going to pay, not the person in it?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I guess the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park refuses to accept the facts that I've given to her. It was the nature of the job and not the person, that indicated to Jean Edmonds that the salary to be paid should be less than what

had been paid for someone who is spending far more time in the position than she intended to spend at it. Therefore, it was the job that dictated the amount of the money, not the person. If the honourable member does not accept that, she, as a woman, can contact Jean Edmonds and confirm what I say.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Pay Equity Legislation - application of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Labour indicate whether the pay equity legislation will apply to just the Civil Service, or will it include the private sector, or will it include persons or companies contracting with the Provincial Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear most of the honourable member's question, I'm sorry.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Labour indicate whether the pay equity legislation will apply just to the Civil Service, or will it also apply to private employers in the Province of Manitoba, or will it apply to people who contract with the government?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I was able to catch most of the question and the answer, of course, is that the honourable member will be fully advised when the bill is tabled for members to peruse.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Labour indicate whether the pay equity legislation will be the equivalent of implementing the equal pay for work of equal value principle?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have to contain his impatience and await the final drafting of the legislation and that process is necessary before legislation is brought into the House.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1981 in the election document "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party, they indicated that an equal pay for work of equal value law would be passed in Manitoba. Is the Minister of Labour and the government now repudiating implementation of that principle?

Mr. Speaker, in the 1981 election . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. MERCIER: When you get order, Mr. Speaker, then I'll continue with the question.

Jobs Fund - false advertising, billboards

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the acting Minister for the Jobs Fund. Millions of dollars are being spent on the Jobs Fund. Could I get an indication of how many hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent in advertising and promotion in an attempt to promote the New Democratic Party as well?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question. I don't know which Minister is responsible. How many hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent to advertise and promote the Jobs Fund by the Manitoba Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Deputy Premier whether she, as a member of government, will accept the following situation where there are billboards being placed throughout the City of Winnipeg which suggest that it is the Manitoba New Democratic Party which is providing the funding for the Jobs Fund? Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister to examine those billboards with a view to contacting the provincial New Democratic Party and asking them to withdraw their billboards which suggest . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question on a topic which is within the administrative competence of the government?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Deputy Premier is as follows, given that it is the Government of Manitoba, which administers the Jobs Fund, will she examine public statements which are being placed on billboards which say as follows: "Why do Manitoban New Democrats provide jobs for our youth through the Jobs Fund?"

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is a false statement and that it should be withdrawn. I ask the Minister whether she will look at that with a view to telling them to withdraw those billboards?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, signs paid for by the party are just that; they're signs paid for by the party. I can appreciate where the member opposite does have difficulty understanding the subtleties of political organization and government organization and the relationship between the two.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then direct that question to the Attorney-General in regard to his responsibilities in regard to the advertising council and ask him whether any false or misleading statements or untruthful statement can be made by a political party, for example, taking credit for government programs in which they have no financial stake?

Would the Attorney-General look into that question?

Careerstart Program - criteria re applications

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Employment Services.

Members on this side of the House continue to hear from constituents, who have applied to employ students under the Careerstart Program, and they have been informed that the jobs in agriculture are not rated sufficiently high to qualify under that program. This question was raised yesterday by the Member for Pembina, and I would ask the Minister of Employment Services whether or not he has issued any directive to the people administering this program to regard a career in agriculture as being equal to any other career in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I advised the House yesterday in answer to a similar question, what we are attempting to do is to provide job opportunities for young Manitobans that will provide him with the greatest career challenge. There is no discrimination against careers in the field of agriculture per se. We want to look, however, at every industry, whether it be agriculture, manufacturing, the service sectors, or whatever, and look at the various occupational categories within those industries, and provide funding so that young people can have experience in those particular occupations, regardless of industry, that offer the greatest challenge in terms of occupational skills.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the Minister, what career opportunity offers the greatest challenge to a young person in Manitoba?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I guess that's a matter of opinion, but one knows that some occupations require a greater expertise and greater skill, greater training, greater experience; that is obvious. But, if an employer from a manufacturing industry asks for two positions for assistants under this program and one was a job related to working with computers and the other was a job sweeping the floor in the factory, and we were to make a choice between those two, we'd be inclined to provide financial assistance for the young person who would be working on computers, rather than the young person who would be working all summer pushing a broom on a factory floor.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further supplementary to the Minister. The Minister says it is a matter of opinion. Is that opinion formed by the people who administer the program or has that opinion been set down in the form of a government edict from the Minister and the top administrators in the department setting out which occupations are to be given a high priority and which are to be given a low priority?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I'd explained, the department has evolved and has developed guidelines

and has decided on various occupational skills that provide greater challenge. It's not a matter of administering an edict, it's a matter of using some pretty good judgment, common sense, a matter of getting the greatest value for the dollars of the taxpayers' money that we're spending.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister file, in the House, a copy of the guidelines that are being provided to people administering this program, a copy of the guidelines that tell an individual student or an employer, who is applying for a job or providing a job, that that job is not rated satisfactorily by the government; it's not going to be a satisfactory work experience for them?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the entire question that the honourable member posed, but I want to advise him that the staff of the department has evolved certain guidelines for the field managers, and this is the guidance. These guidelines have been utilized.

I haven't seen guidelines per such these details, but I was going to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I understand that there are hundreds of farmers who are receiving assistance under this program this summer.

MR. B. RANSOM: I asked the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he would table the guidelines. Will he table the guidelines?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are various kinds of guidelines relating to occupational categories. There are other guidelines that we have to use with regard to the distribution of funds by population. You know, what I am concerned with — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon?

Mr. Speaker, we should look at various things. We should look at distribution of population. We should look at the incidence of unemployment - where are the biggest pockets of unemployment? If you will look, we have 60 percent of our population in the City of Winnipeg. We have the largest concentration of unemployment in the City of Winnipeg, and I would dare say, therefore, there should be some effort to spend a great deal of that money in the City of Winnipeg.

Having said all that, the greater percentage of the money is being spent in rural areas.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. Do you consider that washing tractors on a farm implement dealer's lot has got a higher priority than working on a farm with a registered seed grower?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member is asking for an opinion. Would he wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I asked for the priorities of the guidelines. Does washing a tractor on a farm implements

dealer's lot have a higher priority than working on the farm of a registered seed grower in this province?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked the identical question. He's asking me for an opinion. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the staff are using pretty common sense in trying to place people in occupations that provide the greatest challenge. It's a difficult job, Mr. Speaker, because the demand for the money that we have far exceeds the supply.

As I indicated the other day, it would have helped a lot if the Federal Government didn't cut back on its funding in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister who is responsible for the Careerstart Program table in this Legislature the guidelines for the Careerstart Program?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to discuss those during my Estimates.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the high priority time for agricultural employment and the need for jobs for our young people is now, Mr. Speaker, not when the Minister's Estimates are before this Assembly, will he table the criteria for the employment under the Careerstart, and will he, Mr. Speaker, put agriculture back on the top priority list as it was when we were in office?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, applications for this program closed on March 29th of this year. All the applications have been reviewed and decisions have been made. Having said that, I am advised that a fair share of this money has gone to the agricultural industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the Starbuck Manor, who have availed themselves of this particular program for the last two years, applied also for an individual under the program to help paint and do work through the summertime. They were turned down also. I'm wondering if the Minister can tell us whether their priorities and the evaluation that has been given to the program is also of lesser priority.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the honourable members that these decisions are made by field staff — (Interjection) — well, if the Honourable Member for Arthur would stop interrupting as he usually does, I can maybe answer the question. I wish the members of his constituency were here to listen to him at times. Then they may have different views of the Member for Arthur.

But, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking again about a specific company. I'm not familiar with what the company is doing. I didn't exactly hear the name of the company, but these can be discussed in my Estimates.

I want to remind the honourable members that this government is committed to providing jobs for the young people of Manitoba. We're providing several millions of dollars more than was spent under the previous government, and we're doing it in a way that is rational, it's fair, that's bringing forth challenging occupations. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of this province are getting good value for their money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Employment Service saying that agriculture is not a challenging career in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: How much authority to individual administrators in the field have to pick and choose between applications made under this program?

HON. L. EVANS: I wonder if the honourable member would repeat the question. I didn't hear it.

MR. B. RANSOM: My question to the Minister was: what authority do individual administrators in the field have to pick and choose amongst various occupations from which there might be applications in this program?

HON. L. EVANS: We're able to select from any occupation that is applied for by the particular employer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee will come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs. We shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister responsible for the department.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure for me, as a new Minister, to introduce the Estimates for Northern Affairs for the coming fiscal year of 1985-86. As you are all aware, this is a first experience for me as a Minister of the Crown bringing Estimates to the committee. I think the Estimates, which have been prepared by my staff and in consultation with myself, will make this exercise a pleasurable one.

Having said that, I would like to start out with a few remarks which I believe will provide an overview for the members opposite to advise them and others of the activities of the department over the past year. I would also like to spend some time addressing some of the anticipated actions which I believe may be of more significance in the upcoming year.

Last year an undertaking of the department was to encourage local autonomy. The way in which we proceeded towards this goal was to have communities enter into block funding agreements with the department.

Last year the community of Cross Lake acted as a pilot project for block funding. I recently had an opportunity to go to Cross Lake, and I was pleased with the progress that community had made in the area of block funding. It supplies us a very good pilot project for other communities; the example has been very positive.

The objective was to progressively transfer authority, funds, resources and responsibilities to the community councils and the committees. Block funding agreements increased the level of decision-making and the responsibilities at the community level.

The following changes take place once a community enters into a block funding agreement: All funding shall be unconditional, and any unused funds in one program may be used in any other program at the council's discretion. Funding shall be made to the community in two equal payments. At the end of the fiscal year, the community may use surplus funds at their discretion, provided they are used for a local service as defined within The Department of Northern Affairs Act.

In order to support a community such as Cross Lake, the department has moved and put into place four local government advisors. This has been done in the areas of administration and finance, and we now have a person who is an advisor to communities under block funding in the area of finance.

We also have a person who will be doing planning and delivery of projects. A specific person has now been assigned to that job. Now all these positions are located in Thompson. We have another individual in the area of planning and policy and development, and a fourth advisor in the area of legal services. These people who are filling these positions are also all located in Thompson.

These local advisors, as we call them, will be individuals who, with their knowledge and skills which they have gained by working with the department in other training projects that have been available, will be valuable to those communities that have entered into block funding in the upcoming year.

This year we are seeing an additional number of communities who are wanting to go into the block

funding. To date, the following communities have signed block funding agreements: South Indian Lake, Seymourville, Waterhen, Duck Bay, Wabowden and Cross Lake.

We were in the community of Cross Lake just last week, and Wabowden, which were two of the communities that last signed the block funding agreements. There is a possibility of perhaps two or three additional communities entering into the block funding agreement and the community of Sheridan is one that is expected to sign a block funding agreement sometime in the early part of June.

These local government advisors I spoke about earlier will be utilized to support these communities that are in block funding and will also act as a backup for communities that are yet to enter into block funding. These communities are under self-administration at this time, or communities that are pretty near ready to go into block funding, so they are watching the experience that the people who have gone into block funding very closely and I am sure with the positive results that we have seen in Cross Lake and with additional experiences now, there will be more communities moving into that area.

Also in the area of block funding, but not directly related to those communities under block funding, the department has worked towards setting up a preventative maintenance program. We have five positions in the department ready for this fiscal year in the area of maintenance.

We have a program manager in Thompson and we have four preventative maintenance trainees, one in each area. Those individuals will train community public works' employees in such areas as road maintenance, building maintenance, sewer and water systems and the operation and maintenance of the equipment that these communities are utilizing. This is a way in which the department is assisting communities in Northern Manitoba to attain more autonomy and self-control of their own administration.

The following list of projects is another way the department is assisting communities in achieving local autonomy. The department has estimated that there will be a total of 53 projects under Capital Works in 1985-86. Of these 53 projects, we are proposing through consultation with staff and committees, that 34 of these projects will be delivered by the communities themselves; 12 of these projects will be delivered by the department; and 7 will be done in a joint delivery system between the community and the department themselves.

Joint delivery involves such projects as water and sewer where the department has an on-site supervisor, as well as council having a local supervisor to assist in ensuring that contractors are utilizing to their fullest capability, local residents for employment and living up to the local employment clause, if and wherever it does exist.

Another area of the department is known as corporate projects. This section of the department is responsible for the development of Crown corporations which provide local employment and development. Corporate projects assist in some of the small logging operations, such as the Channel Area Loggers and the Moose Lake Loggers, their report was tabled in last week's committee.

Within the 1985-86 years, this section will have an additional capability to assist other small logging operations. This started out with an operation in Grand Rapids last year to put together a small logging operation which has been functioning now since last fall. All the reports that we have received to this point have shown that it is quite a successful project and they have completed their quota which they received through a contract with Manfor. They have ended up in a very good financial position and they are awaiting next year's operations.

We believe that there is a need for continued priority on the administration, co-ordination and management of federal-provincial agreements - specifically the Northern Development Agreement. The importance here is to maximize the revenue to other provinces in a time of federal restraint. This priority has to be continued to be accurately pursued by a staff with respect to Special ARDA and Northern Development Agreement. Within this area, there is a need for a lot of co-ordination and we'll be one that has a priority with the department in the upcoming year.

We have also placed a priority on land and resource use planning for northern communities. Within 1985-86, this program will assist communities to plan for the land and resources in the vicinity of the communities and to facilitate the increased consultation and participation of communities in the allocation of these resources. We have identified one staff member to implement this program with the assistance of additional staff in the development and resource branch.

Also at this time of budget restraints, the Department of Northern Affairs has recognized the importance of strategic planning to determine the most effective and efficient use of financial and human resources. We have strengthened the planning capabilities within the department by allocating an analyst and secretary to the director of Research and Planning. This is an area that will require a lot of work coupled with development in Northern Manitoba with special emphasis being placed on the Limestone development.

The move towards more local autonomy, management and co-ordination of federal-provincial agreements, research and planning are the priorities of the department within the 1985-86 fiscal year. We are moving on this priority path.

Mr. Chairman, I hope to be able to give you more specific information on the Estimates and perhaps we can begin on the formal part of the Estimates now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. As is customary, we shall hear from the leading critic of the opposition if he so desires to make his reply.

The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the Minister for his opening statements and I wonder if he would have copies available for us during the Estimates process?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, I could make copies available.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I take this opportunity to congratulate the new Minister in his role as Minister of Northern Affairs. I wish him well in his endeavours

and I know that he has been left with many challenges and with perhaps little time at his disposal to fulfill some of the challenges that he faces.

It's interesting to note too that in each of the last three sets of Estimates, we've had a different Minister of Northern Affairs. I guess the Premier's motto is that it's difficult to hit a moving target. However, after having said that, to those of us on this side of the House, and I would say to probably most Northerners, the lack of honest commitment or importance that the government places in this Department of Northern Affairs and the various communities and Manitobans that it represents by the obviously juggling of the number of Cabinet Ministers who have filled this portfolio in a very short time. I believe that we have had three Ministers in less than something like two years. I think this attitude is showing up every week and maybe more often than that, particularly the number of calls that I'm getting and my colleagues requesting to meet with us, individuals and groups who are seeking ways and offering suggestions to work with us in order to get rid of this incompetent government, these are people who admit they have not supported us in the recent past for the most part. Communities throughout the North and most, if not all, the Northern Affairs communities within my constituency are certainly not pleased with the operation of this department or, in fact, this government.

Swan River is fairly central and well located to provide departmental service to eight Northern Affairs communities in that general area. Now I understand they are being serviced from Dauphin and, in the case of Westgate and National Mills, this is approximately 185 miles or not far off 200 miles from the regional office of Dauphin.

I would say generally Northerners have lost confidence in this government, because it has not fulfilled many election promises. I don't recall the Minister making any reference today in his opening statement regarding the Northern Development Agreement. I may be wrong; I didn't detect it. We all know the fanfare that was created and I'll give this government credit. They were able to get the agreement signed, but since that agreement we've seen very little economic development resulting in the various communities.

Talking to local people throughout the North, they claim most of the money is being spent on bureaucrats and consultants. They are plagued to death with any kind of economic development project that has to be studied and restudied and going before different consultative committees. So there are very little results being shown to date in any case at the community level. So they are wondering what's happened with respect to the Northern Development Agreement and the economic development that is so urgently needed to create the kinds of long-term meaningful jobs that these people are wanting to see happen in their communities.

Also in my opinion, there appears to be a general perception that there are some irregularities in tendering practices for local community construction projects. I've had a number of calls from people in the communities of Cormorant and Barrows and Norway House that I can recall. I believe there were other areas, too, where they felt that there were some irregularities

in the way community construction projects were held, whether it be in the water and sewer programs or light type of community projects.

In my opinion, I believe there should be an all-party legislative committee or a task force, if you will, to visit northern communities to fully examine and hear presentations on a number of issues. I would like to list some of them: Housing and associated problems, including the engineering and design of the houses and the actual costs and financing.

I have had the opportunity to see some of the houses in the North that are extremely expensive. They are in the \$70,000 range and upwards. They are very poorly constructed homes. They are out of the range of most Manitobans, and especially in the communities that I visited, to be able to ever pay for these homes.

Not only that, being expensive is one thing, but they are poorly constructed homes. They are not built with the kind of expertise and engineering that is required in the northern climates and to deal with the kind of lifestyles that the people follow in those communities. So in many cases, the houses after five years, are almost deteriorated to the point where they will require thousands of dollars to bring them up to a desired standard or level. You can go to any number of communities and you run into these problems.

I am sure the Minister has heard from many of the northern constituents about the problems with housing. I don't say it's a problem that just happened in the last few years. The problem has been there for some time, I admit. I don't think that we are making any kind of headway in recent years to try and resolve this problem that has been brought to our attention, particularly, in recent years.

The education system and the quality of education is also another area that's raised every time you go to visit any of the northern communities. Of course, you don't have to go to the northern communities to get this question thrown at you.

Senior citizens' problems and health care are other areas that seem to require some attention, more than they are getting in Northern Manitoba.

Of course, the local employment situation and the creation of long-term, meaningful, self-sustaining jobs is the uppermost issue that faces Manitobans, and particularly Northern Manitobans. They are people that live close to many of our abundant resources and yet they are the people that are facing the highest degree of unemployment.

There seems to be little action, whether it be in the Northern Development Agreement - as we all know when we consulted with Northerners that this is one of the priority issues that was raised - we need jobs in our communities; we would like to see funding directed to creating economic development that will supply and create long-term, meaningful jobs to our citizens.

This is what is making many of the Northerners angry today because there is a lot of money being spent on consulting and looking at projects and nothing is coming out of it. They get into the mill and nothing is coming out. A lot of the money they claim, and I believe they are correct, is being eaten up by consultants and bureaucrats. So I appeal to the Minister that something is long lacking in creating the kinds of jobs that Northerners want to see happen.

What is this northern preference of hiring northern people? What is it all about? I think it sounds good, but why does it include some Northerners and exclude others? I know that I've had calls from Northern Affairs communities in my area that have written to the Limestone office regarding employment, and they are told that they don't qualify because they are not within the northern preference area.

So I'm just wondering whether this northern preference hiring is just a smokescreen that is being used, because certainly Northerners do expect to get a pretty fair shake at getting jobs on this kind of development project, even though the bulk of the jobs will only be for a medium length of time, maybe for four or five years and hopefully longer than that. But there seems to be a lot of confusion today amongst Northerners as to who really qualifies and, if there is a promotion on the Limestone Project, then it is creating some concern to people today that some are being included and others are being excluded.

I would also like to mention at the outset what this Minister's definition of Native self-government means as far as the status Indians and also for the non-status Indians and the Metis. Where does the urban Indian fit into this scenario?

We can all talk about self-government and that it's good for everyone concerned, but really what does it entail? What does this Minister mean when he talks about self-government to Indian people and to Metis people?

What about the proposed formula for settling Indian land claims? Where is at at the present time? What is it? What are the principles that the Minister has indicated there is an agreement on to proceed with the settlement of the land claims? Will Manitobans generally have any input into this important issue, or will this NDP Government endeavour to settle it behind closed doors, like they tried to do with the French language issue? Mr. Minister, these are some of the questions we would like to receive answers for in addition to any proposed policy changes.

In today's Free Press, of course, the headlines with respect to the court ruling, with respect to alcoholic beverages on the reserves and the kinds of implications that this can create, not only for the Indian bands, but for the Minister of Northern Affairs, who has some commitment to work with these people and to work with the elected chiefs and counsellors of these reserves, because the chiefs and Indian counsellors are quoted as saying that this could create chaos or havoc for many of the dry reserves in Manitoba.

I ask the Minister what kind of meetings he has set up or what kind of discussions he has undertaken with his colleagues in other departments to try and be in a position to offer assistance and to reduce any disastrous situation that could result because of the ruling and the implications that this could bring about to many dry reserves - so-called dry reserves as we know them today? Will this Minister want to appeal this decision? What action has been taken by this government and by this Minister with respect to this problem that has the potential of being very serious? I don't want to say that it's going to be a problem, but it certainly has the implications and the possibility of being a very explosive situation.

So, Mr. Minister, I think that those pretty well conclude my opening remarks. The Minister did indicate the block

funding and the number of communities that have been increased over last year. I believe there was only one in 1984 and now we have about five or six that are included in block funding this year.

In an earlier question to the Minister with respect to the situation at Swan River, I believe I asked him a question about the closing of the office in Swan River, and he said something to the effect that, because of the block funding, there wouldn't be the co-ordinators needed in the areas. But I notice that there is only one community, that of Duck Bay, that is included in the block funding. As I mentioned earlier, Swan River is strategically located within a number of Northern Affairs communities and most of those communities consider Swan River as their main shopping area, contact area and yet, now, these communities requiring assistance, and no doubt Duck Bay being new in this block funding will perhaps require more assistance than they did previously, but, as I understand it, the Minister has indicated there are new people hired to look after the details of those communities in the Block Funding Program, but they are all stationed in Thompson, I understand. I believe he said that.

To service Duck Bay from Thompson is not an easy task, because of the transportation difficulties and the actual sheer distance involved, so I don't accept the answer. Maybe down the road a few years, if this works out well, then I can see perhaps not the need for co-ordinators working with the communities, but at the present time, this is something new.

It's a very important program that's being introduced. It involves a lot of tax dollars and I'm sure that the Minister would like to keep close tab on it to make that it's working to his satisfaction and to the satisfaction of Manitobans. However, I look forward to going through the various items in the Northern Affairs Estimates, and so I will cut off remarks at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At this point in time, the Chair invites the members of the departmental staff to kindly take their respective places.

Deferring Item No. 1.(a) relating to the Minister's Salary, the committee shall start its deliberations with its consideration of Item No. 1.(b)(1) Administration and Finance; Executive Support: Salaries and Wages. 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - Mr. Minister.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Possibly before we get started, I should introduce my staff: John Morrisseau is Deputy Minister; Isabel Dube is Acting Assistant Deputy Minister; Brenda Kustra is the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister and Rene Gagnon is the Acting Director of Administration. ALL NAMES OK

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

A MEMBER: There's a lot of actors.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, that's right, there are a lot of actors. After having said that, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the committee whether he plans on making these positions permanent or is he going to continue carrying on in acting status with, I believe, there were three acting positions mentioned?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, we will be looking at making the positions permanent.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are these positions being advertised at the present time?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: They have not been advertised at this point.

MR. D. GOURLAY: When will they be advertised?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: That decision has not been made at this point.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister can indicate to us whether he has a special assistant or an executive assistant, or does he have one of each and where is he located.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I have a special assistant, Jeanette Goertzen, who is located in Winnipeg, and I have an executive assistant, Doreen Hrabowich, who is located in The Pas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I ask the Minister, is he contemplating an annual report for the department?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The Estimates process is the annual report. There is no further report being contemplated outside of the Estimate process.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I wonder, can the Minister give us any reasoning why this department, it's a full department now, that we can't expect to get an annual report other than the Estimates that are before us.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It sounds like a good idea that the Member for Roblin-Russell has made, so maybe we should be looking at it and then submitting an annual report. The department will be looking at it and looking at the wisdom of doing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, while we're on the administrative end of it, Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I'd like to pursue. I also had the privilege of covering some of the northern communities along with my colleague from Swan River and found it very educational. I enjoyed it as much as one can enjoy it, I suppose, when people have all kinds of problems.

The aspect of job creation in the North, I think, has to be one of the most major ones, aside from the Limestone initiative at this stage of the game. Are there any other initiatives taken by this department in terms of job creation for many of our northern communities?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Under our Capital Projects, we have looked at maximizing the opportunities for local people to deliver either wherever they have the capacity to deliver, on a tender process to deliver the projects, and where they do not have the capacities, then we

have tried to maximize the opportunities for local labour to take part in the delivery of these programs.

Also under this department, we've had the Northern Community Assets Projects, which are administered under the Jobs Fund, and it has been very instrumental in job creation projects. When we were first elected to government, there was a need for some urgency in creating jobs and so the northern jobs creation projects the first year were delivering projects of a nature that weren't very long-term, but because of the urgency, we had to move very quickly and there were some jobs created which didn't have any long-lasting effect.

But when we had an opportunity to put a little bit of planning into it, now we're delivering projects that are not only creating jobs, but there also having some long-lasting benefits to the communities. There are community facilities being left behind and the infrastructure to communities also being brought up to standard. I think we can be quite proud of the standards that we have raised in many of the facilities in the northern part of the province.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, the Minister indicated that a few years ago there was an urgency for job creation. Is he indicating that that urgency for job creation is not there now, that that need has been met? My impression certainly would be the other way, but is this what the Minister is saying that they have achieved that plateau that they wanted in terms of job creation up North?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The urgency was that when we came in, we found there was no planning done whatsoever for meeting some of the needs for job creation by the previous government. It was late in the year, so the urgency was that we didn't have an opportunity to plan. But after that, we asked the community to plan some projects and put them on the shelf so we could put them in place when the next year came around.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, could the Minister maybe elaborate then when he says that they have now long-term jobs in progress? Can he maybe elaborate as to the type of jobs that he's referring to?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There are several communities where we're delivering infrastructure to those communities; for example, Norway House, Cormorant, Pelican Rapids - we're putting in waterworks and sewer systems. There's several examples of where we've upgraded the community halls.

In the community of Cormorant, we have established permanent garden plots where the people will be able to look after some of their needs for meeting their food requirements for the year. I think the people are wanting to become self-sufficient and this will give them an opportunity to do so.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Minister of Tourism indicated a federal-provincial agreement had been signed regarding expansion of the tourist industry, and sports angling was one of the things that was referred to there. Is there any attempt through this department to expand the tourist

opportunities for operators in the North. I personally believe that many of our Native people in the North are very capable in terms of supplying guiding services, as well as other services, I think, in operating them and owning them.

I expressed this little bit of concern yesterday in the Department of Tourism as to who would qualify for these Cadillac projects, as I referred to them yesterday, and I still think they are. Has this Minister had any input into that kind of program so that the people in the northern part of the province can take advantage of this kind of an agreement that has been signed?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: As was pointed out in yesterday in the Estimates of Business, Development and Tourism, the potential for tourism in Northern Manitoba is very great. I agree with the member when he says that we shouldn't only be looking at Cadillac projects where we're putting all our eggs in a few baskets, I think there's a need for delivering more small projects where you could take advantage of the natural facilities that exist in a community.

I think there are several examples of the North where we have encouraged people to develop whatever industry is available there. Some of that includes sport fishing and roadside parks. The community of the Waterhen is in a process of developing a park and improving their facilities, so they can take advantage of the tourists that come in to that area. I think the big part of this is making people from outside of the area aware of the natural beauty that exists there and also the good fishing facilities.

I'm hoping there will be co-operation between the Department of Tourism and the Department of Northern Affairs so we can maximize the opportunities that are there for the local people.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I happen to be one of those people that really enjoys the North and I think there's tremendous potential up North in terms of tourism, as well as other aspects of job creation. I feel a little critical that there has not been more action developing by this government in terms of promoting the tourist aspect through this Minister's department, as well as through tourism.

Has this department got any training program, or any promotional programs for Northerners to get involved in the tourist activity end of it? Because I think the potential is unreal if you'd want to look at it in the terms of what can be done with it and it appears at the present time that only the individuals with a fair amount of capital are the ones that are utilizing, or that can set up lodges and things of this nature up North. I think there's much that can be done in that respect. I'm wondering if there is any initiative that is being planned to be undertaken by this department.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I agree with the member that we haven't begun to tap the natural tourist opportunities that exist in all of Manitoba, and especially in the North where they have been totally untapped and there is opportunities for the people of Northern Manitoba to take advantage of some of the opportunities that exist through the Northern Development Agreement. If there is some potential there, we can assist entrepreneurs

or community groups to put together a proposal and come forward with some projects that have some merit. Also, through the Northern Community Assets Projects, we are also going to go in that direction this year as well. We feel that there is potential there and some emphasis should be made to go in that direction.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: While I have the floor, I might as well take advantage of it, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to further just question the Minister on involvement in the commercial fishing aspect of it in some of the northern lakes. There seems to be a certain amount of dissatisfaction, unhappiness and lack of action that really, I suppose, I don't know how to put it really. In talking with some of the people up North, they feel that the commercial fishing potential in some of the areas is not being exploited to the maximum. Of course, you realize the costs of flying out fish from some of these lakes, etc., almost makes it prohibitive, but I think there's ways to generate revenue in some of these lakes. I know to what extent the commercial fishing is taking place in God's Lake right now. Is there commercial fishing going on in God's Lake area right now.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I'm looking to the Chairman for some direction here, because it seems we're having a debate over the entire department of Northern Affairs and I'm not sure where commercial fisheries fits in. I think we could have a discussion on that under Special ARDA, but I would look for direction from the Chairman if we should follow some semblance of order so we can complete the Estimate process.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, if I could help you out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair doesn't need any help at this point in time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Might I make a suggestion then, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rule is clear. Under Rule 64.(2): "Speeches in the Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion."

The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, under Page 128, Northern Affairs, Current Operating Expenditures, Administration and Finance, and then we have Executive Support which basically has always covered all aspects of anything the committee wanted to deal with. That's where the planning and strategy comes from. Are we changing now that we cannot deal with the planning end of it under this aspect of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can deal with wide policy questions as long as it's related to the department.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Correct me then, Mr. Chairman, if I'm wrong on that aspect of it. I think my experience in this committee has been that we've sort of had a free-rolling one for a while, and then got serious and went item by item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The members of the committee are reminded that in this Committee of the Whole, we are dealing with Budget items, although generally as a matter of policy and practice when it comes to the Executive Support item, we deal with broad policy issues. Still it doesn't mean that they can be all free-wheeling and not related at all to the department. It must be within the confines of the departmental parameters.

The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, could you then help me out as to what item was I speaking on that was not related to the Department of Northern Affairs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I heard that you were talking about fishing and tourism.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Probably on a point of order . . . On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member will state his point of order.

MR. A. ADAM: I know that there is a lot of latitude given under the administration and planning of every department, but the questions the Honourable Member for Emerson was raising had to do strictly with the Department of Natural Resources, the fishing industry, commercial fishing and transportation of such. Those programs come under the Department of Natural Resources.

I would say the questions that the honourable member raised, although legitimate, the same questions were raised when the Honourable Mr. Uskiw was here, and we dealt with those very same questions. We dealt with the transportation; we dealt with the fishing and the development up there. I think really my advice would be to stick to the department.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: On that same point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I realize I happen to be the critic of Natural Resources, and I was there. I did not raise those kinds of questions on the commercial fishing for some of these lakes up North.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The President of the Treasury Board.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Chairperson, each department goes through their Estimates in a somewhat different fashion, but generally it seems to work if the questions that are asked pertain directly to the Ministerial responsibility. The general questions are asked in a somewhat unstructured way at the beginning of the process, so that we can deal with them under a co-ordinated fashion. Then as we get into the detail, there are fewer questions.

I would sense, if the opposition were agreeable to that sort of a format here where you have sort of a

general discussion under this particular item and then would limit the number of questions under the specifics, it might be an agreeable way to proceed. I seek some direction and some response from the opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe this is the type of format that we would like to follow where we can cover a broad range of questions that do have direct bearing on the department and the people that it serves. The questions will be asked at some point in time, if we could cover these in a general sense and then be more specific when we wrap this part of it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thinks that is an agreeable compromise, because in this world everything seems to be related to everything else in a general way.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Except for political parties.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what negotiations or discussions are under way at the present time with respect to looking at the renewal of new agreements. I believe the Special ARDA Agreement is expiring fairly soon, and the present Northern Development Agreement is over half-way, and I'm just wondering whether there have been any discussions at this time to look at a new program, to touch base with the Federal Ministers involved and to put in motion the kinds of discussion that is necessary in order to get new agreements completed and then subsequently signed.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: On Special ARDA, there are two years left on the existing agreement. On the Northern Development Agreement, we are just entering our third-year review which was agreed to when the Northern Development Agreement was signed. There are still two years left on the agreement, but we're right now going into the third-year review which will start the negotiations to continue the funding after the fifth year is up. So the review and the negotiations are going on simultaneously. We feel that should be completed by September.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The present Special ARDA Agreement expires when? At the end of March, 1986, is it?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: In March of 1987.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Special ARDA, I believe, under a previous Minister got a two-year extension, if I'm not mistaken. Was there then another additional agreement signed extending that to 1987?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I am told that it was a three-year extension so that would make it expire in March of 1987.

MR. D. GOURLAY: In my opening remarks, I made reference to the fact that there appeared to be, at least there was a perception anyway that there was some

change in the process in dealing with tenders for water and sewer projects, say, for instance. The bids that came in, in some cases, there was no bid bond and that would violate or would be reason to throw those bids out. However, those bids in fact were used and were awarded to those contractors who violated the tender process by not being able or did not provide a bid bond. I wonder if the Minister could verify that situation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I am told that under the Department of Northern Affairs there has been no tenders accepted without a bid bond, but there was one tender last year where there was a misunderstanding of a contract - he was bidding on a contract and he misunderstood the 10 percent need for a bid bonding - and when they consulted with our legal people, once it was explained to him, he was able to come up with his bid bond and it was accepted. There was a bid bond in place.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well to be more specific, in the case of Norway House, I understand that the water and sewer project there was tendered. The department looked at the low tenders, and awarded the tender to a contractor who did not supply a bid bond. Is this correct information or is this not correct?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The contract that the Member for Swan River is referring to was never let. As a matter of fact, it will be tendered this year, or has been tendered at this time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The project in Norway House was advertised and tenders were received on the initial . . .

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, it was advertised and there were tenders received, but because there was no performance bonds with the tenders we did not proceed.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Were all of the tenders that way? None of the tenders had bid bonds provided?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The lowest tender did not have a bid bond with it and the decision was made not to proceed with the project.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I can appreciate then why the people are upset in some of these communities; they have lost another year then. Is this the case in Norway House, where they hope the tendering process is now being retendered, and so the awarding of that contract has not taken place at this point in 1985?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The community council was part of this decision that they decided, along with the Department of Northern Affairs, that they would not proceed. So, yes, they did lose a year because if that tender would have been accepted and if all the tenders had the bid bonds, they would have proceeded last year. But as it stood, the lowest tender did not have a bid bond, so a decision was made with the community council that they would not proceed. So they did lose a year, yes.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The actual administration, or dealing with tenders that are called, and there is no bid bond in place, would it not be such that those tenders should be automatically disregarded? They don't meet the requirements of the tendering process?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, they are discarded, but the only time they are not put out or not acceptable is when the person who was doing the tendering has made an honest mistake. So then we give him an opportunity to make sure he is aware of the procedure and he is given an opportunity to put the bond in place.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, how do you determine when someone makes an honest mistake? You mentioned another previous tendering that there was a mistake as well and then the individual came up with the bid bond later. Now it sounds like there is more than one case in point where this has happened.

Is it a general procedure now to go back to the individual and say, hey, did you forget to put in your bid bond? Because I think this is destroying the whole tendering process. It certainly gives individuals a chance to know what other people are tendering and then it's thrown out and the whole thing is retendered again. I think it somehow destroys the whole purpose of the tendering.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: In the case that you are referring to in Norway House, there was a letter accompanying the tender saying that the bid bond would be in place, but as it came out they were not able to have the bid bond in place. In all these cases we have sought legal advice and we have only moved on the advice of our legal counsel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The President of the Treasury Board.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, perhaps I could just ask a question because I don't want to leave the impression on the basis of one or two instances that the tendering procedures that are in place now are being wholesaledly abandoned; nor do I think we should leave the impression that this is a government that is not willing to be flexible in this area.

I would ask the Minister, if in his experience as a representative of those areas and as a Minister, has he found that the tendering procedures as laid out presently sometimes prohibit communities and community economic development organizations from being able to participate more fully in work that is used to develop their own community infrastructure?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, when we have travelled through the northern part of the province, we have found that both the bid bond and the performance bond has been a real burden to the local communities because in the way the bid bond is set up you have to have a track record in order to establish your word in this, I guess you would say, and they have not had an opportunity to participate in any previous occasion. So they haven't had a track record, so they can't get bid bonds. So that's one of the issues that we are addressing at this time, is how we could set up a system of where bid bonding and performance bonding could

be in place in order for more community councils and more community companies to take advantage of the opportunities that are out there.

HON. J. COWAN: In the one instance that was described in respect to Norway House, did the Minister indicate that it was a community council that was in agreement with the procedure not to accept the awarding of the tender at that time and to reschedule the project?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, the community council was part of the decision-making that said that they preferred to wait an additional year and so they were part of the decision to retender the following year.

HON. J. COWAN: Would it be fair to assume then that by that decision they, at least one community, and in the minds of many others are indicating a desire to see the tendering process reviewed and made more appropriate to circumstances that apply to their own communities?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Without question, in every community we have gone into there are great concerns over the inability of the local entrepreneur to receive bid bonding, so that's one of the areas. Pretty near every community you go into, they are looking for ways of how they can participate and how they can find some new method in order to assist these firms to get bid and performance bonding. So it's an issue that needs a lot of work and, hopefully, we can come up with some system where we can assist them.

HON. J. COWAN: Am I to understand then that the department and perhaps even other government departments are actively working with the communities to develop a system that does not reduce the protections that are afforded by the tendering process that is in place now, but perhaps could be modified to the extent where it would remove the institutional barriers that have prevented them from participating in work in their own communities for decades and even longer?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, the Department of Northern Affairs, through the CDF and several other departments, are looking at ways that we can come up with the protection that is required by contractors and the people who are doing the tendering so we don't lose the protection that is necessary and yet give the local entrepreneur an opportunity to participate to a greater degree than they have been able to in the past.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate the name of the company that was involved in this, was the low tender but didn't have the bid bond? Was it a local contractor?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I do not have the name of it. It was a local contractor from Norway House. Possibly the previous Minister of Northern Affairs would have the name, and we could give it to you right now. We'll get the name for you.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I understand it was listed as a Winnipeg address, but had local people involved in it. Does that sound right?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: That's correct.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Can the Minister also confirm that a former mayor and now President of the NACC who lives in Norway House were involved with this company?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I would have to take that as notice and get back to you on that. I'm not totally sure of that.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, I think the local people in Norway House or wherever, where a situation like this happens, they have lost now a year in perhaps getting water and sewer that they've already waited for. Well, I know when I was Minister of Northern Affairs, it was under way at that time. Here it is some five or six years later, and there's still no water and sewer in. That program could have been completed now.

But I think that, as the Minister of Co-op Development says, the whole process has to be re-examined. I would hope the Minister of Northern Affairs would look at the tendering process. Certainly we on this side agree that if local people can do the work and they can do it efficiently and they have the kinds of equipment that it takes to do a proper job, then by all means I think that every effort should be looked at where encouragement can be given to modify the tendering process, but at least have a system in place that will give a better than even break to a local contractor.

The concerns that were expressed to me in the Norway House area that this was a fairly sophisticated kind of tender. It was a major water and sewer project with certain intricate installations required. It may have taken more expertise than the average kind of water installation. I guess the local people are upset that they now still haven't got water and sewer, and the whole thing is being retendered. Those people who were involved in the tenders, I'm sure, will be somewhat dismayed, because information is available on the kinds of tendering prices that they submitted. Now it's all up for grabs again.

I hope that I'm leaving the message for the Minister that these kinds of things can be avoided in the future, if possible.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I know that the Member for Swan River as a previous Minister can appreciate the fact that we also have to deal with budgets. Sometimes the tenders come in and the tenders are higher than what we have budgeted. So that sometimes enters into the decision as well, that there are not enough funds in the department to complete a project.

So some other times and some other areas, the same thing has happened. There's been a project that is tendered and it's come in higher than the department has estimated. The funds just aren't there to proceed with it that year, so that might have had something to do with the decision as well.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, that brings up another question. It has also been brought to my attention that the low bid was actually the same amount as was estimated in the Department of Northern Affairs for the project. So the contractor did not - and you may correct me, I'm just passing on information that

I received that there was no thorough examination of the project as to the actual costs involved. Yet the tender was put in at the same rate as was that amount budgeted by the Department of Northern Affairs to undertake that project.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The project did come in much higher than was estimated by the department engineers.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Can the Minister advise, at one point, \$1 million was the amount budgeted for the project?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It was \$1 million. I'm not giving away any secrets here, because it's a new process that's in place now, but there was \$1 million budgeted for that project.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The original estimate was \$1 million?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: That's right.

MR. D. GOURLAY: And the low bid came in at 1.1?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The bid that came in from the local person was at \$1 million for which there was no bid bonding, but the next tender was at \$1.4 million.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, the statement I made then and what information was supplied to me is accurate, that the low bidder bid the same amount as the amount of money that was in the kitty to do the job without looking, but the fact is there was no bid bond attached. It was a numbered company with a Winnipeg address, and yet it involved local people. Is this right?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There were local people involved and we said previously there was a Winnipeg address, and it did come in at \$1 million. So I guess maybe it was a coincidence; I'm not sure what was the problem, but the local council also decided not to go with it. So I guess we can heap the blame wherever we want, but the local council was aware that this was going to delay them receiving their waterworks by a year, but they made the decision that they would not accept that because of the bid bond and they didn't proceed with it.

MR. D. GOURLAY: So the present tenders then are going to be called when for this project?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: They have been tendered at this time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: When is the closing date for tenders?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It has been closed and awarded. It has been closed and it's on its way to Treasury Board, for Treasury Board to approve it.

MR. D. GOURLAY: How many tenders were received?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There were two tenders received for the installation of the water lines, and there were four for the water treatment plant.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Were the tenders called for exactly the same as previously, or were they split up in different packages?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The tenders were called exactly the same way they were previously, in two separate tenders.

MR. D. GOURLAY: What did the Department of Northern Affairs estimate the cost to be or budget for this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear the question. Having been the Minister of Government Services and also the member who is the critic also was a member of Government Services, were you?

MR. D. BLAKE: No, you're wrong again, Pete.

MR. A. ADAM: Well, anyway, I know that there are certain ethics in regard to tenders, and I am just cautioning that until the award has been given and accepted, there is a certain amount of confidentiality involved; once the award has been given, then it's public information. I just caution that you are kind of skating on thin ice.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask the amount of the tenders that were submitted; I asked what the amount budgeted by the department was. The tenders are already closed. I didn't ask the question as to who was the low bid now. I just want to know what the updated estimate for this job is, seeing that the tenders are already closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The inquiry is the amount budgeted, not the amount that is tendered.

The Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: If the tenders have been awarded, then I would sense that it would be entirely appropriate to provide that information. It's probably not a problem to provide it as long as the bids have been open, except in the event that for some reason one were not to go ahead with those particular bids, if there was a problem and it had to be retendered at that stage, then you wouldn't want to have available the amount which the government had budgeted. I think those are the same procedures that were followed when the member who was addressing the question was the Minister responsible. I know they have been long-standing.

So there may be a difficulty in the event of some unforeseen circumstance preventing the awarding of the bids at this time and having the information as to the budgeted amount out there. But it would be simply a matter of awaiting the Treasury Board decision, and that's the final approval once it's approved at Cabinet by way of the minutes, and then providing that information.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I am not sure if it would help the Member for Swan River in his line of questioning, but I can slip you a piece of paper and show you what it's

on, but maybe that's not what you require it for. But I can tell you, I don't think we should do it for the reasons that were outlined by the Minister responsible for the Treasury Board.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I don't want to see a slip of paper. If it can't be made public, then I don't want to see your slip of paper. I think, though, that I am concerned about the people of Norway House who have been waiting so many years for this, and it seems to me there is a lot of fumbling around in this department getting this contract awarded. I think the department has been on some shaky ground with respect to the tendering process and the implications that have been indicated here today.

I just want to know where this thing is at, when it's going to be awarded and whether this project can be completed this year, or are we going to have to wait another year?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It will be going to Treasury Board, and if Treasury Board makes a decision very quickly then they will be proceeding with it very shortly.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The matters before Treasury Board, I wonder - seeing the chairman of the Treasury Board is here - when it is likely this item might be dealt with.

HON. J. COWAN: I would have to ask as to when the submission went in. The normal procedure is 10 days, later it's dealt with; so if it was not dealt with at today's meeting which just finished this morning, so it would be next week if the submission was in the previous Friday.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I have been told by staff that it will be ready to put on the agenda for next week's Treasury Board meeting.

MR. D. GOURLAY: There was another situation where the Minister indicated that the tenderer forgot to submit his bid bond, but later it came in and a contract was awarded. Was this for the Barrow's community?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, it was.

MR. D. GOURLAY: How many tenders were received for that project?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There were five tenders submitted for that project to Barrows.

MR. D. GOURLAY: And the lowest tender was the one that . . .

HON. H. HARAPIAK: That's right, the Zander Construction from Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: And how much lower was that to the next tender?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Approximately \$29,000.00.

MR. D. GOURLAY: What was the range in tenders, of the five, from the lowest to the highest?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: From \$84,900 to \$172,225.00.

MR. D. GOURLAY: To get into another area here, during question period some time ago the Minister indicated that general principles on the land entitlement settlements for Indian bands had been tentatively agreed upon and if further information was desired, that he would be able to supply this. I forget who was questioning at the time, but there was no follow-up question on that, and I am just wondering whether that information can be made available, or is that something that the Minister does not want to table at this time.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: We have an agreement with the Federal Minister, the Treaty Land Entitlement people and the province that we would be making a joint statement once the negotiations are completed. We are coming very close to having completed the agreement in principle and we are in the process of setting up a meeting with the Federal Minister at this time. So once we have that meeting, we will be making a joint statement if there is agreement reached.

MR. D. GOURLAY: So then there would be no provision for Manitobans to participate in further discussions with respect to the principles to be followed in dealing with the Manitobans?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There was an opportunity for Manitobans to participate when Judge Mitchell had his hearings. Before we come to a final signing of the agreement, there will be a round of consultations with all the people who made presentations, and the Treaty Land Entitlement people will also have to go back to their reserves to have their people ratify the agreement as well. So Manitobans will have an opportunity to have some input.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I recall the Mitchell Report and it being tabled. I don't recall the number. Can you tell me whether there was quite a number of submissions made by various people to that commission?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There were approximately 30 submissions made to the Mitchell Commission.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Now just to recap what is going to take place now, I wonder if the Minister could go over that again.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: The technical people from the Department of Northern Affairs and the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and the Treaty Land Entitlement people have met, and the technical people have met, and there are a few issues that have not been resolved so we're in a process of having a meeting set up with the Federal Minister to see if we can resolve the final issue that's outstanding.

MR. D. GOURLAY: So that when the joint announcement is made, then the formula would be announced as to how the Treaty Land Entitlement settlements will be achieved?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, the formula will be announced at that time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: But that's what's being negotiated right now, to try and finalize the principles that deal with the formula.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: There's no disagreement on the formula at this time. There are some technical areas that have not been worked out yet; and that's the areas where there are some technical points that have to be clarified before there is agreement.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The formula as such has been agreed upon by all parties concerned.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, the formula has been agreed upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Following the finalization of the agreement in principle, will a copy of the different aspects of the agreement be available for opposition members, the general public, and particularly, those individuals who made representations in the first instance so that they can provide comment on them?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, that opportunity will be there for anyone who has made a presentation in the first place and I guess it will be open to the public if they want to make a presentation as well, to have an opportunity.

HON. J. COWAN: So the general public will be made aware that an agreement in principle has been reached and that they are entitled to make representations on the basis of any concerns they might have, previous to any finalization of the full package.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: That is correct. We intend to have a full round of consultations so everybody is fully aware of what agreement has been reached by the three parties concerned.

MR. D. GOURLAY: When do you expect a formal announcement will be made by all parties concerned? Is it something that's going to happen in the next month, or two months, or is it going to be several months away yet?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: We have written to the Minister responsible for Indian Affairs, the Federal Government, Mr. Crombie, and we are awaiting his reply as to when we could meet. We are ready to meet at this time and the Treaty Land Entitlement people are ready to meet, and it would depend on what the results of that meeting were. If the results were positive, then I can see it happening within a couple of months.

MR. D. GOURLAY: To move on to another area, I wonder if the Minister could comment briefly on the situation with respect to the judge's ruling in the case of the Indian reservations, up to this point in time, have been so-called "dry reservations" and now with the implications that this court ruling places on those reserves, what discussions has this Minister had with

his colleagues or with other members, of the chiefs or the various bands, with respect to the role that this department may be faced with, or the role that may be, because of the implications of this ruling.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: In all my travels through all the communities in Northern Manitoba and meeting with the bands, we have never had this issue raised with us. So it's something that we have had no consultation over and I'm sure there will be an opportunity now that this issue has been raised, there will be an opportunity to meet with them and we will plan a strategy of how we should be pursuing it. But up to this point, it wasn't an issue out there. It was never raised with me on one occasion.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it's an issue of one of many that perhaps because of the Charter of Rights legislation that is in place, that we could be faced with similar kinds of situations. But this is something that has just happened recently. I'm sure that when you travelled through the reservations, this situation probably wasn't anticipated of happening, but I'm wondering if the Minister has received any calls from any of the chiefs. Has the Minister himself shown any kind of concern that he would like to discuss this with the Attorney-General to try and resolve a potentially dangerous situation before it happens, or have a mechanism in place that can quickly deal with a very explosive, potentially dangerous kind of situation that the chiefs are quoted as saying in the paper, and I'm sure they have legitimate concerns.

We all know that when this kind of thing gets publicity, there will be people out there who will take advantage of the situation that's at hand and it's something that well - we deal with emergency measures situations as quickly as we can and even then we have some serious problems arise from time to time - I put this situation in a class of emergency measures type of situation. It's something we haven't had to face in the past. What mechanism is this government putting into place to try and alleviate the anxieties that I am sure are out there?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It is impossible to anticipate all the potential problems that are going to arise and I think we would have to have a very big department if we were to anticipate all the problems that were going to be arising.

This situation here has just happened and we will be setting up a round of consultations with the bands. It's ironic that you raised this, but we were just in several communities last week and we talked to some chiefs and this was not raised. So I guess they didn't anticipate it either. But we will be setting up a round of consultations to be sure that the Attorney-General and the Department of Northern Affairs and the Department of Health are also involved in it, to be sure that if there was any way that we, as a government, can be helping him, that we'll give him all the help that we possibly can to see that this is dealt with.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister would like to express his own view of this situation and what kind of situations he anticipates could result. For sure, the chiefs that you spoke to a few days ago, I am sure,

would have no reason to know that this kind of ruling was coming down. No one would appreciate this kind of ruling, so there's no way they could know in advance that this was going to happen. I'm sure with any Charter of Rights that's in place today, this is an ongoing kind of surprise situation that we can expect. And I think it was one that was anticipated when the issue was debated some time ago.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: It's an issue that I am sure was of great concern to everyone involved. I know I have worked on the railroad through communities that were, at that time, "dry reserves", and it was always a consideration if we were overstepping our bounds by not allowing people to ship liquor into those communities but I guess with the ruling that's come down today, I guess we were not within our rights to stop them, in that judge's opinion.

We were not within our rights to stop them from shipping liquor to those communities, but I know it's going to make the responsibility of the chief and band much more difficult to control, now that in the judge's opinion they can have liquor on that reserve. It's a difficult question that I would not want to make any judgments of how I would go before I had some consultation with the people involved, the Attorney-General, who was looking into it and had some expertise in this area and also the police have a lot of experience in this area. I wish this would have happened a few days earlier because I was just at a policeman's ball in Souris, Manitoba, where there were many police officers there, and I would have loved to have consulted with him on what their opinions are on this new ruling. But, unfortunately, it didn't happen that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. What concerns me about it is that it is effective apparently immediately. These court decisions are. The Minister, the government and us, in the opposition, aren't prepared for this type of a decision. I'm wondering, would you expect the Indian Affairs to pursue the matter or would it be the Attorney-General's Department on behalf of the bands in our province? I suppose that's a question maybe that you couldn't answer at this time.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I would not pretend to have any expertise in this area and I would yield to people with much greater knowledge than myself to make those decisions.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: We don't have any of the legal fraternity at the table.

MR. A. ADAM: I'm just wondering whether or not this might be appealed to a higher court and I'm just wondering if we want to. I'm not sure whether it has been appealed yet or not, but there is a possibility whether or not it will be. Then again, we might be on thin ice because it could be appealed.

I think the question was raised in the House in the question period and I think the Attorney-General responded that it doesn't really affect the reserves being dry or any other community, the decision of that

particular judge. Very likely it'll be appealed again. There'll be an appeal on this. That's my view. So I just say that we may just be going around the mulberry bush here.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Again, I don't pretend to have any expertise in this area and I'll certainly be looking to the Attorney-General and any of our legal advisors or legal counsel to advise us on what path we should be pursuing in this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m., the committee shall interrupt these proceedings for Private Members' Hour.

The members of the committee shall return and resume proceedings at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The committee will come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Environment And Workplace Safety and Health, item 2(a)(1) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you.

Last night, as we finished off, I had mentioned about seven or eight items that I was going to bring to the Minister's attention. Is the Minister going to be bringing in his staff?

I think the one point was on the Carman spill and I think that was just one of the items and I think that's as good a place as any to start, Mr. Minister. Can the Minister bring us up to date on the Carman spill, whether, in fact - I would believe that the spill has been cleaned up, but there has been a cost factor involved. Can the Minister advise if and when that cost factor will be transferred over to the people who were responsible for the damage that was done at Carman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is an investigation that was conducted with regard to this particular spill. Although I haven't personally read the report, which came to me two days ago or on Friday I believe it was, I understand that the investigation has not produced any great results, in that so far the guilty party, if we may refer to whoever is responsible for that in that manner, has not been discovered as part of that investigation. So, presently, at this point in time, there is no one to charge that to, except to the department presently, so the investigation hasn't shown who the guilty party is.

MR. A. KOVNATS: What was the cost of the clean-up spill to the department, which will be a cost to the people of the Province of Manitoba if the guilty party is not found?

HON. G. LECUYER: The report is, as I indicated, inconclusive in that regard. The investigation has not discovered who the guilty party was and the costs that

we, as a department, have incurred will be absorbed. If we are not able to find out who the guilty party is, our costs will be absorbed by the department. I don't know if the member heard. I said, Mr. Chairman, that the costs incurred by the department have to be absorbed by the department unless we can, as part of an ongoing inquiry, determine with any assuredness who the guilty party would be. The cost is approximately \$8,000.00.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That was the figure I was asking, Mr. Minister. I thought I was going deaf. I've been accused of not listening, but I was listening and I hadn't heard that cost figure.

Anyway, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask the Minister at this point, has there been an environmental study concerning the oil exploration in Hudson Bay as to the possible environmental damage to the area around where the exploration of oil is taking place and the drilling of oil and, in effect, not just to the land area, but any environmental study as to the implications with polar bears and other animals in that area?

HON. G. LECUYER: The studies that the member refers to were conducted under the auspices of COGLA, which stands for the Canadian Oil and Gas Lands Administration. In preparation for exploratory wells, these also took into account aquatic and wild life in the region as part of those studies. Now, if these core drillings were to show promise before oil production were to take place, then there would be further environmental assessments done.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm glad that the Honourable Minister has advised that there have been some tests. Can the Honourable Minister advise when those tests took place? Was it lately; was it four or five years ago? Could the tests have changed because of the amount of time back that they had taken place?

HON. G. LECUYER: The tests took place between 1982 and 1984. I don't know whether there is another part of the question or if that's the full answer.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, that's good.

Do the reports of the tests imply that there will be any environmental damage? You say that the tests have taken place, but do they imply any environmental damage if no further precautions are taken to protect the wild life in that area?

HON. G. LECUYER: The reports indicate to our satisfaction that the location and extent of the program would not pose any adverse environmental impacts, and I repeat again, that is strictly in regard to the core drilling or exploratory wells to determine the extent of the deposits before any further drilling could take place to actually extract oil, there would have to be a more in-depth environmental assessment carried out.

I don't know if it's clear to the member. As I understand it, there is, I believe, only two core drillings that are going to be carried out to determine the extent of the oil deposits that might be there. That's all that is going to take place as part of that operation presently.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'd like to switch just to a different part of the environment at this point and I'd started

on it yesterday, Mr. Minister concerning the dump out on Highway 201 in the Mensino-Piney area where right underneath the large sign saying, "No Dumping of Dead Animals," and there was a dead animal just in the process there. I know it's a very very small dump and I'm leading up to the handling of all deads in the area, it's just the beginning of the questions. But there has got to be some control where people from rendering plants are advised and maybe even government subsidized to pick up these deads rather than leave them lying around, or by the time you go into the control aspect of it where it would be very very expensive to control, if there was some initiative for these people who have these dead animals to contact some rendering plant so that they're just not left lying around. Can the Honourable Minister advise whether there has been any association with rendering plants to encourage the pickup of dead animals in the rural area?

HON. G. LECUYER: The disposing of dead animals can be done in a variety of ways. The one approach and the one that the member refers to is the one that I consider best personally, and that is through the rendering plants. The regulation also permits or allows individuals who have dead animals on their property to dispose of them by burying them under at least a meter of soil. They can be disposed in these landfill sites in the same manner.

Obviously, the member can appreciate that there is no way of knowing on an individual cattle operation or individual farm when this occurs. So there is no way, like I say, of putting staff in communication or to liaise between the individual farmers and rendering plants. We encourage this, and the Public Health Inspectors have been asked on numerous occasions as to whether to investigate complaints that have been reported. Generally, the reports that I've been getting indicate that dead animals are disposed in accordance with the regulations.

Now the other thing is, by the time an animal is brought to a landfill site for disposal, oftentime it wouldn't be in a condition perhaps to be of value to a rendering plant. So it is difficult to make absolutely certain that all of these animals would eventually go to a rendering plant. A lot of that is dependent upon the individual farmers. Most farmers, I would hope, know that this is available to them.

I can recall that, as a young boy on the farm, this is what would happen. All you've got to do is look a little bit and see how much I've got left and how grey they're getting to be, and that's a long time ago. Already, we were at the time referring to the rendering plants to dispose of dead animals. I would assume that, generally speaking, that is the practice in the agricultural sector.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I guess I've got to accept that. It really doesn't give me an answer as to what we are doing to encourage the farmer to pick up the phone and say, come and get a dead animal within a day or two after it's died. I think the animal lays around for a while and, as it starts to rot, the farmer gets his tractor and drags it out to the bush somewhere in the back. The bears and all the wild animals eat it, and diseases spread around.

I think it would be a matter of keeping the environment clean with the Minister of the Environment encouraging the rendering plants to provide a service, not at a loss, because obviously they're not in business to operate at a loss. But I know we have a rendering plant close to the locale, and this rendering plant is becoming a better corporate citizen, Mr. Minister. We've had complaints about the odours in that area but I think, if the Honourable Minister will just pay a little bit of attention here, he will find out something that I have been made aware of, particularly with the rendering plant in our area.

They have spent \$1.5 million in upgrading that plant to eliminate the odour and it wasn't through any action of the Provincial Government. It was action that these people are good corporate citizens. I think there's got to be some co-operation with them to encourage them to carry on their business, particularly when they're putting that kind of money into seeing that odours are eliminated and they are providing a service. I wouldn't want to see that type of a company go out of business inasmuch as they do provide a service and should be encouraged.

HON. G. LECUYER: First of all, there are a number of things that the member refers to. The example given of someone, for instance, who would drag his dead animal in the bush and dispose of it there, that is certainly contrary to the provisions of the regulations and certainly leaves the individual open to charges if that is reported and it comes to the attention of the Public Health Inspector.

The Public Health Inspectors that are scattered across the Province of Manitoba do indeed advise of that service on numerous occasions. The information I get, there is no major problem in this regard.

The comment made by the member in regard to intervening toward the rendering plant operators perhaps to encourage them to put out a bulletin letting the farming communities in the area know that they are there and, of course, provide that kind of service, we'll make that approach and see if it might not help the problem that the member underlines.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I had mentioned to the Minister that the rendering plant, particularly in St. Boniface - and I've forgotten the name of it, it doesn't matter - but they are good corporate citizens and they have, to my knowledge, invested \$1.5 million in new equipment to eliminate odours and we didn't seem to have any control over obnoxious odours. We just drove through it, got sick and complained about it.

But I think there has to be some control of obnoxious odours, because I see in the report that the Minister has distributed - just a second - on air standards and studies on computer services, there doesn't seem to be a good enough control on the element of society that is contaminating the air control in society.

I have an article here concerning a pig farm where it says: "Hogs force family out of the house. The Wheatland resident says pungent pigs drove him out of his house."

What protection do we have? I know that we can always come up with the answer, well we were here first. There's got to be some control of the air quality,

no matter where it is. If it's next to a pig farm or next to a rendering plant or next to a killing plant or an abattoir, there's got to be some control.

I think that we have given that responsibility to the City of Winnipeg. As a province, we've given that responsibility and said here, you look after it, but it's our responsibility throughout the province. I would think that the Honourable Minister, in his wisdom, would try to co-ordinate the whole thing and see that there are standards that would govern in the whole province. Can the Minister advise if he's got any plans in that regard?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member is probably referring to Page 12 on the annual report which indicates that in 1982, in terms of older surveys conducted, there were 230; and in 1983-84, there were 213 such surveys conducted.

For the member's information as well the major packing plants, for instance, the one he's referring to in St. Boniface are under Clean Environment orders. That does not mean that there are not incidents when the odour can get pretty bad. For instance, in terms of plant breakdown or time for plant shutdown for repairs, or in circumstances when there is climatic inversions - I don't know if that's what it is properly called, but it's close to that - on those particular occasions, the odour gets worse.

But the member lives in an area close to where I live and, depending on the wind direction, we sometimes get a whiff of that, and as well the member probably has noticed that in recent times that has been far less frequent than it used to be. That is because of the Clean Environment Orders and because of equipment. He has made reference to the rendering plant, for instance, having put in place as part of an expansion technology that reduces the amount of odour. That is all to the well and good, but as the report indicates, we are involved in trying to control odours.

I have just today authorized for release and distribution a report which conducted a survey of major residential areas in Manitoba - Brandon, The Pas, Flin Flon, Thompson and Winnipeg - of surveys done of the atmospheric quality in terms of measuring a great variety of particular substances in the air such as lead, nitrates, sulphates, sulphur dioxide. I believe there are about some 15 various categories of substances for which these surveys were conducted. It does indicate that the ambient air in Winnipeg and the other centres, I referred to, is generally good. That doesn't mean that it's good in respect to all of these. I believe there are around 15 of the substances that were analyzed, but generally it is good.

Now that particular survey itself did not measure odour quality of the air. As I indicated, in places near packing industries there are times when it is worse than at others, and that can be explained due to the fact that the scrubbers that are in place sometimes fail. There are breakdowns and sometimes weather conditions worsen the air quality, but, generally speaking, there has been an overall improvement.

The member, I am sure, will be able to attest to the fact that he hasn't noticed these odours as frequently as we used to. So I think that indicates some measure of better control than there used to be in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question for the Minister is at what stage is the planning for a proposed hazardous waste disposal facility in Manitoba?

HON. G. LECUYER: It's nearing the end of the first phase. Just to briefly, and by memory only, go back over a number of the incidents that have occurred as part of that first phase, it was initiated in late '82, I believe, under the previous Minister of the Environment. The environmental council was involved along with staff of the department in setting up the symposium in the early spring, late part of winter of 1983, at which time a number of experts came and gave talks on the subject and this was followed by a report.

We also had Clean Environment Hearings in the fall of '84, I believe. A report of the hearings was made available, roughly, I guess two months ago, or maybe a little bit less than that, and widely distributed.

The department is currently completing an extensive report, which will contain, for instance, a survey of some 700 industries in Manitoba who do produce a variety of hazardous waste substances. We wanted to have a better knowledge of what these substances were, the quantities of these waste substances, in order to better be able to evaluate whether, as part of a hazardous waste management program, obviously there is not only one process that will solve that, but a variety of processes.

I think we can assume immediately that there will still, once we have such a system in place, be a need for some waste disposal, for solid waste disposal and landfill sites. There will still be a greater need for recycling of a variety of these substances that are maybe the waste of one industry, but maybe what another industry needs as part of its operation. So we will be providing that report very shortly.

As well as containing an inventory of the wastes of the major industries in Manitoba, we will also have an indication in there how these wastes are currently disposed of in Manitoba, and start working, as well, in that report, establishing criteria for selecting a waste management site. That is going to be available, as I said, sometime during the course of next month. It will be widely distributed.

During the course of summer, staff from the department also will be consulting with some of these industries to get further knowledge and insights and recommendations. This meeting with the various organizations, as well, who are interested in that field, this will lead to some awareness campaign in probably September, which will be followed by the last round of clean environment hearings, which will close Phase One.

As part of those hearings, we expect and hope to get the population of Manitoba making its views known on the whole question of "Hazard Waste Management for Manitoba." That will open the second phase, which will consist of selection of sites for Manitoba, and the types and means of disposing of hazardous wastes in Manitoba. That would then be followed by the final phase, which would be the implementation of the recommendations after extensive consultation on the basis of the reports that would be coming out of the

Clean Environment Commission as part of the final round of hearings in Phase One.

So there will be an ongoing process of consultations throughout each one of these phases because the hazardous waste system that is implemented in Manitoba has to satisfy and meet Manitoba's needs. We have to have the public fully aware of what is going on as part of that process.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Before proceeding, I would like to direct the attention of members to the gallery where we have standing a group of 17 students from Grades 8 and 9 from the Crane River School. These visitors are under the direction of Mr. Peter Slobodzian, and they come from the constituency of the Member for Ste. Rose.

On behalf of all members, I would like to welcome you here today.

SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH CONT'D

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, just as I thought, the Minister has given me the answer that I expected; that is, that there is no commitment to do anything of substance by this government. His whole 10-minute dissertation was filled with great words like consultation and awareness and study and review and process and hearings and all of those things, but no commitment to action.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1981 there was a report done by Reid Crowther and Associates, Consulting Engineers, in which all sorts of things were established, including the sources of the various different types of hazardous wastes in Manitoba, including an inventory of the amounts of hazardous wastes being produced, including such things as the state of the art and even primary sites, potential sites in which to locate these; all sorts of things.

Since then, this government and this Minister have continued the process of avoiding doing anything and taking any action, but rather creating the impression that they're doing something by consultation, and having meetings, and having seminars, and having conferences in which people talk about hazardous wastes, and we're no closer to having a commitment to establish a hazardous waste treatment facility in this province than we were in 1981, we're no closer whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

I want to know from this Minister what he can tell us about when a hazardous waste disposal and treatment facility will be established in this province? What is their target for establishing it? What type of facility is it likely to be? Will it be a facility that allows the destruction of PCBs, for instance? Will it be an incineration facility? What is the preferred facility that is likely to come here and what is their target for establishment of this facility? What are the potential sites that are being examined? These are matters, Mr. Chairman, that have been on the drawing board since

1981. I sense from this Minister's talk about consultation and process and discussion and review and conference and all of those things, that we're no closer today than we were in 1981.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, for someone to get up and say that I'm talking in vagueness. I've heard the member stand up and expound with his beautiful voice and say and repeat three times the same things and having said absolutely nothing, and having proven to me that he doesn't know what else is going on in the rest of Canada nor in Manitoba in regard to hazardous wastes. In fact, if the member had stopped writing when I was talking, he would have heard some of the concrete things I've said.

I will repeat some of those. Now, the report the member refers to is based absolutely on no survey done, is based on guesstimate, and during guesstimates it was not based on and it did not reflect in any degree, shape or form an accurate picture of Manitoba's hazardous waste situation. Now, the member seems to indicate you have to take the lead, go ahead there, decide what you're going to do and implement a system for the disposal of hazardous wastes. — (Interjection) — In a vacuum, you know, independently, of what the population believes.

For the member's information, I want him to know that some of his colleagues in Alberta and in Ontario did some of that and they found themselves further behind after they had undertaken these actions than they are now. They're further behind than we are for having done these things.

In one instance, for instance, they went ahead and purchased the lands where the site disposal of the Hazardous Waste Management Program, then they find out that there's nobody that understands what they want to do and everybody is opposed to it, so they're now having to start from scratch.

I've said to the Minister we've taken some concrete steps. These are intended to develop in the population of Manitoba an understanding — (Interjection) — an understanding is part of the awareness, yes, of what we are doing. It's all very well for the member to say go ahead and do it and you tell him afterwards, and then afterwards you tell him nobody understands and nobody wants it. — (Interjection) — The Member for Tuxedo, I am sure, will find that if he actually goes back to Hansard and gets the facts, the previous Minister had indicated that it would take 5-7 years to have such a program in place. That's in 1982. In 1982 he was saying 5-7 years. — (Interjection) — Well, the member then if he wants to look up and find where that is stated, I will accept that, but before he does that I will.

Now I have indicated concrete steps, I have indicated we have made that survey of various industries in Manitoba to ascertain what are the waste products that we have in Manitoba. We're not going to build a system to handle Ontario's waste products. We have to have a system in place that will satisfy and meet our needs. — (Interjection) — That is going to be part of that process. We don't decide where we're going to build it before we know what we have to deal with. — (Interjection) — That is also going to be part of this final round of hearings that is coming up in the fall.

The Member for Lakeside is making comments, but I will wait for him to stand up and ask those questions.

Now, having said that, these are not vague these. These are very concrete things.

We have increased the staff in the department. We have nine staff that are working in the area of hazardous wastes because the member has to also understand that it is part of a bigger process which includes the handling and the transportation of hazardous goods in Manitoba. We are in the process of implementing that along with the Federal Government and other provinces.

What we are trying to establish is not just a process to deal with hazardous wastes not knowing what we have to deal with, but we have to know how we're going to transport them, how we're handle them in the workplace. We want to have a manifest system for these goods that are transported and considered hazardous. We want to have a waybill system in the workplace for the handling of these products. We have said we want to implement a system that will deal with hazardous goods in Manitoba from cradle to grave; from the time they are created or manufactured or from the time they are brought into the province to the time they are finally disposed of.

The member wasn't here last night, but we said as well that as part of that we have to take into account reuse, recycling of these substances. I indicated at that time that we were involved with the Canadian Waste Exchange Institute in Mississauga.

We had also, and for the member's information I will repeat, last December we initiated in a co-operative fashion with the Federal Government a Manitoba Waste Exchange Program administered by Biomass Institute of Manitoba and interconnected with the Canadian Waste Exchange Program.

I also indicated for the member who was not here last night that where we agreed in December to cost-share that program, the Federal Government has indicated they don't want to continue this. So we are carrying on with that aspect as part of that overall program, but the member should know that for what has been said about a few months back as part of a policy of regionalizing the Waste Exchange Program to make the hazardous wastes available and known to industries who might be able to recycle them, and after four months, I gave exact figures in terms of what was exchanged and put on the market and the value of the products. In my mind, it certainly warranted that we should carry on that program but, unfortunately, we'll have to do so on our own.

MR. G. FILMON: I assume, Mr. Chairman, that you're now operating under different rules. The member three times referred to the fact that the member was not here last night. I remind him that there are two committees sitting with respect to Estimates and aside from the fact that it is unparliamentary to make those — (Interjection) — remarks . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for Inkster doesn't want to follow the rules. He may say that but he doesn't know the rules, I'm sure of that. — (interjection) — He may choose to advocate that we don't follow the rules, but that's his business.

My position is simply to place on the record that the Chairman was not enforcing the rules and that if he chooses not to, then we will abide by those changed circumstances when dealing ourselves in this committee in future.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get back to the Minister and to ask is he confirming for me - and perhaps he can just nod so we don't have go through a lengthy exchange - that Manitoba has decided upon appropriate consultation with other provinces and reviews and studies and discussions that have taken place, if Manitoba will not be a partner with other provinces with respect to the disposal of hazardous wastes that in fact we will be going it alone and creating our own facility for disposal of our own hazardous wastes? Is that a confirmation?

HON. G. LECUYER: Before I make that confirmation, Mr. Chairman, and before I make even reference to that - for the point that the member raised a moment ago, I still want to apologize for making that reference. I wasn't doing so with any malice. I was just indicating that I had made reference to that last night. I should have used different words.

Now in reference to the point that he raises now, I want to make sure that the member understands when he's referring to hazardous wastes. If his understanding is the same as mine, then I will be able to confirm that Manitoba has decided that it wants to implement its Hazardous Waste Management Program, yes. In fact, we have decided that we want this as soon as possible. We have, in fact, decided to make that a first priority on the environmental side of my department for this current fiscal year.

So not only have we already covered a certain path in order to arrive at that goal, but we have decided as well that it is a path we want to follow with acceleration during the course of this fiscal year.

MR. G. FILMON: Now the Minister has me confused, Mr. Chairman, I have to admit to that. He is saying that Manitoba is going on its own Hazardous Waste Management Program which I assume includes recycling and reuse of some of the hazardous waste that's utilized here or produced here in Manitoba.

But what I am trying to find out is whether or not it is the intention of this Minister and his administration to establish a hazardous waste disposal facility that will be able to dispose of all of the various types of hazardous wastes that we produce in Manitoba.

HON. G. LECUYER: We want the facility that will indeed dispose of the hazardous wastes we produce in Manitoba, but that is not to say that includes the list of every particular hazardous waste that is produced in Manitoba. If the member includes as part of that, for instance, PCBs . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Yes.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . and if the member includes as part of that, for instance, nuclear waste - or does he?

MR. G. FILMON: You tell me. Are you going to deal with it?

HON. G. LECUYER: You see, I'll answer your question if you know what question you want to ask.

MR. G. FILMON: I first asked PCBs. I put that on the record earlier.

HON. G. LECUYER: Okay, you want to put PCBs. No, you didn't make the reference to PCBs.

MR. G. FILMON: I didn't say that in the question before.

HON. G. LECUYER: Okay, we'll take that as part of this question again. Now we're talking about the hazardous wastes of Manitoba. The hazardous wastes that I described a moment ago were part of that list that I referred to.

Now we haven't made any decision at this point in time whether that should include PCBs. We are, in fact, on that particular hazardous substance having a meeting shortly, in fact probably before the end of the month, with all of the other provinces and the Federal Government to address that issue as a separate issue.

As the member might well understand, as time goes by will be less and less PCBs in use. None of these are currently being put in use, primarily in the electrical apparatus that is used by either Manitoba Hydro or Winnipeg Hydro. Therefore, all the new products that are coming on-line don't contain PCBs.

Now we have to determine, in order to dispose of what is currently stored and what's still in some of the transformers that are still in use that were put in use some years back, or capacitors or other various electrical equipment that uses such oils with PCB contents, whether it is necessary to implement a system to dispose of these, because we are talking here of very specialized - for instance, we were talking about incineration - incineration system that will dispose of the bulk or most of the other substances that we have in Manitoba cannot dispose of PCBs.

So are we going to implement a system specifically to dispose of PCBs? That decision has not been made, and that decision will not be made independent of consultation with other provinces.

Now if we weren't to follow that logic, then we would require each province to have a system in place. I don't think it would be fair to ask, for instance, Prince Edward Island to implement its own system to dispose of PCBs when they have so little. We have a great deal less than Ontario or Quebec or B.C. or Alberta, in Manitoba. Do we need to put in place an incinerator? I think we have to consult with the other provinces and with the Federal Government.

It may be, in fact, that when we consider costs and disposing especially of substances that have high degree of PCBs in them, it may be that the only way to go would be through a national facility. I don't know that. I am not saying that's the route we're going to go. I am saying we're not going to make that decision before we have had these consultations.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm very familiar with the concepts and the processes and, in fact, the various considerations that are involved in this because, in 1981, I convened a meeting here of Environment Ministers from Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta and myself

as Manitoba Environment Minister in which the report from Reid Crowther was at that time made public, in which the central concept of the report was that a high temperature incineration facility be located in the Province of Alberta to take care of the incineration and destruction of PCBs for the three Prairie Provinces and Northwestern Ontario.

I'm very familiar that this involves all of these provinces. If the Minister is now telling me that for three years, three-and-a-half years that that has all sat on the back burner while he and his predecessor, the Member for Churchill, monkeyed around with all of their consultations and meetings and conferences and all of the window dressing, and did not continue to work towards that particular decision.

That decision involves other provinces, obviously. If you're going to have somebody else in another province to locate a high temperature incineration facility to destroy your PCBs from Manitoba, you have to be working with them to see whether or not they're willing to. You have to be working with Saskatchewan to ensure that they will continue to allow PCBs to be transported through their province to Alberta for that purpose and all of those things.

The Minister isn't telling me anything I don't know. I want to know what's been done. He is telling me that he doesn't know whether he's going to put a high temperature incineration facility here, because he's got to talk to those people. I say, what's he been doing for the last three-and-a-half years and what's his predecessor been doing if they haven't arrived at an agreement as to whether or not the facility will be located somewhere else or here?

I know that they're not producing capacitors and transformers with PCBs in them, and they haven't been for quite some time. All of that information is a matter of record. I am asking him what decision has he arrived at. It's evident, since you haven't arrived at a decision, that obviously we're not very close to even establishing a hazardous waste disposal facility because we don't know what kind of facility that's going to be. We are three-and-a-half years down the road, and we've gone nowhere with the decision. That's the point that has to be made - absolutely nowhere! -

HON. G. LECUYER: If the Member for Tuxedo insists on putting it in that light, that's his opinion and he can hold on to it as hard and fast as he wants. But I can just as well say that, if we haven't got it in place yet, we have covered much of the grounds to get there.

On the other hand, I can say while he was in government, while he was Minister of Environment, they didn't even start to deal with the question . . .

MR. G. FILMON: That's nonsense.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, you didn't start it. You didn't ever commit your government to put in place a hazardous waste management program.

MR. G. FILMON: We were already into the phase of committing site selection hearings.

HON. G. LECUYER: Oh, yes?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes.

HON. G. LECUYER: Okay, you were committed to doing that?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes.

HON. G. LECUYER: All to your private little self?

A MEMBER: A number of years ago.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, this as I say, this Minister has given us no indication that he has a goal in mind, that he has a target in mind, for the establishment of a facility here in Manitoba. He can't say whether it is the intention of this administration and this Minister to have a hazardous waste disposal and treatment facility in place in Manitoba by 1986, 1987, 1988, 1990, it doesn't matter. And so all of the things that came up during the recent heavy-duty publicity with respect to the PCB spill near Kenora highlight the fact that this administration and this Minister, although they talk a great deal about dealing with the process of establishment of a hazardous waste facility, are no closer to it than we were in 1981; have no firm target in mind to establish one here because they don't even know what type of facility it will be.

They haven't even arrived at that stage of deciding whether or not there should be a high-temperature incineration facility here so that PCBs can be destructed, or what it will include. Nothing, they're just at the stage where they're continuing to talk; they're continuing to dialogue and discuss; give people the impression that they're doing something. But they can't tell us what their target is. They don't have a target and they don't know where we're going and, of course, if you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there. That's exactly the state that this Minister is in.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the member hasn't asked any questions, he keeps giving his own information. And talk about vagueness, that is for sure, vagueness.

We have, as indicated — (Interjection) — let me finish and you'll hear. I have already indicated to the member that we're nearing the end of the first phase. There were three phases. The third of these phases consists of actually implementing the actual hazardous waste program. There's left essentially the phase in between, which is site selection. I am sure that I can easily make a commitment to the member across, if he listens, that that will be in place before the end of the next term of our government. — (Interjection) — So within certainly the next five years, it will be in place here in Manitoba. — (Interjection) — In the meantime, which government passed the enabling legislation to have such a system in place? We have passed the legislation. We had passed it at the last session. — (Interjection) — Did you want us to have the system in place before we had the legislation? Well, I certainly assumed that it took a period of time for the Member for Tuxedo to grow from the time he was a baby drinking from the bottle, to the time that he was ready to go to school. But I'm not so sure that he's grown up since.

We have also proceeded to accurately determine the amounts of types of waste in Manitoba. We have been able to establish how these wastes are currently being disposed of. We have conducted an evaluation of some 750 waste disposal sites in Manitoba; some that are active and some that are not active over a period of three years or three phases. We are dealing currently and still continue to monitor and assist those problem sites. This is all part of this system which will lead to implementation of hazardous waste management program in Manitoba. You just don't approach this very important complex solution by just saying, well we need a hazardous waste management program in Manitoba, we'll build a facility, just like that. We don't do it that way.

If the member thought it was so easy, surely in his four years of government, he could have done that in the first year.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the — (Interjection) — the quote is, "What do you know about the environment, Steve."

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of the Environment has an appalling lack of knowledge of the history. I was not — (Interjection) — he asks why I didn't do anything about the establishment of the facility when we were in government for four years and I will remind him, Mr. Chairman, that I was only in government for two of those years of the term. But he wasn't around, I realize he was too busy trying to figure out what he should be doing in school to be interested what was going on in the Provincial Government. But now, that he's been the Minister for year, he's an acknowledged expert world-wide in all of these things and of course, he wants to tell us all about it. So I'm giving him lots of time to tell us about it.

I'm not interested in his talk about the rhetoric; in fact, I think that we need a resolution to make this Minister a rhetoric-free Minister, rather than anything else in this Assembly right at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to know from this Minister is, how many sites are being investigated for the establishment of this particular hazardous waste disposal facility? How many sites are under consideration at the present time? What is the timetable for establishment of the facility; not for a completion of Phase 2, which is the awareness phase or the discussion phase, or the review phase, when does he say that we are committed in Manitoba to the establishment of a facility and will he ensure the people of Manitoba that we can know with some security, that we are going to be able to dispose of all of the various types of hazardous wastes that we produce in this province?

And for the time being, to make it a little easier, I'll separate nuclear waste from that, so that he doesn't have to talk about nuclear waste. We'll talk only about the other forms of hazardous waste, up to and including PCBs. When can he assure the people of Manitoba that they will have a facility available to dispose of these types of hazardous wastes and how many sites are currently being investigated and can he put some time frame on it instead of talking about the discussion phase, and the review phase and the study phase and all of those things.

HON. G. LECUYER: The member doesn't want to me to give him a long reply. So even though he took a long time to ask his question, I will be very brief.

We expect to have a system in place sometime within the course of the next three to five years. Now in terms of the site selection, that is part of the process that begins as of October, thereabouts, this fall.

MR. G. FILMON: How many sites are currently under investigation or apt to be proposed in the site selection process?

HON. G. LECUYER: I haven't indicated that we had investigated sites for the disposal of hazardous waste management program. I said that was the process that begins as of October, this fall, you don't understand?

MR. G. FILMON: They have no sites in mind. They have no indication as to preferred locations or areas to begin with and they are going to now send people roaming around the province trying to decide where this facility is. I understand.

HON. G. LECUYER: I repeat for the member across who thinks that we should begin by selecting sites, by choosing one final site, build a system and then we try to find out, we pass the legislation, then we conduct surveys to determine what hazardous wastes we're going to deal with. Then we determine what substances we're going to have the system for. We're going to do all of these things after. We're going to inform the population after. We said, and I repeat, we very consciously decided as part of that process how we would proceed and we certainly made no decision that we would choose a site before we had given plenty of input to the population as part of those hearings. And also, we wanted to have legislation placed; we wanted to have a clear understanding of what, or how these substances were currently being disposed of in Manitoba and what hazardous substances we would have to deal with when we have such a system.

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Minister saying that there are no criteria that would narrow down the process, that it could be anywhere in this whole great province of ours, that in fact it's a shotgun approach and that you just simply go out and hold hearings and ask the people where they want it to be? Surely, he understands that you have to have access to the site. You have to have it in a position where it makes sense in terms of the collection and transportation of the hazardous wastes, where they're being produced, where ultimately you want to take them for treatment, access, roadways, all of those things, soil structure, the geological underpinnings of the site, all of those things have to be taken in and surely he can't tell me in his naive little way that we have absolutely no idea, that we're just going to wait to find out what happens from the hearings.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know whether it's because the member is doing it on purpose and is just trying to do some posturing here or whether he doesn't understand, or whether his whole view of the whole thing is so simplistic that a hazardous waste

management program, I believe in the Member for Tuxedo's mind, consists purely of a landfill site. That's what he thinks it is. How profusely he's talking about geological underpinnings and whatnot. We have information on it and that is why I said we went throughout Manitoba to study the landfill sites that we have, to really apprise ourselves of the problems that we currently have in regard to these landfill sites, some that are still in use, some that aren't. But, obviously, the facility to handle hazardous wastes in Manitoba is going to be a lot more complex than the member would seem to imply, and therefore, we have to look, not only in terms of establishing a site to dispose of substances, but the various processes that will be part of that system of disclosing.

Getting back to the PCBs, the member wants to bring that one back and I indicated to him where we were at in specifics. To that, I also want to add for the member's information that we have in Manitoba in the past disposed of some of these PCBs by shipping some of those out. We have also in Manitoba last summer disposed of some of these low level PCB oils by neutralizing them here in Manitoba through a private firm from the United States that came in here with a mobile system and that actually disposed of some 20,000 - 22,000 litres of low level PCBs - a chemical process which consists of removing the chlorine molecule and thereby neutralizing these oils and making them available for re-use, or as neutral oils.

Now, I have indicated to the member a specific commitment of this government. I've indicated a time frame. I've indicated the process we are involved in, and I've indicated as well that is a well thought-out process, certainly the one that we want to follow. If the member would have liked to follow a different type of process, that is his choice. They could have followed that process when they were in government. All I'm saying is, we are in government now. I have explained where we're at in that process and how we are intending to proceed in the time frame of the next three to five years.

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Minister saying that a secure landfill is not part of the disposal facility?

HON. G. LECUYER: Now you're going the other route. I want to . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Look, I talked earlier about the fact that you needed a high temperature incineration facility if you were going to dispose of PCBs. I asked the Minister whether or not an incineration facility was part of the plan and he declined to answer that. So, I know that a secure landfill is likely to be at least part of the type of facility that has to be established. I was trying to draw some information out of the Minister; it's very difficult and I'm not sure if it's because he doesn't know the information or he's covering up, or he just simply doesn't want to discuss it any further. So we go from one side to the other on the issue, but I'm trying to draw out some information from the Minister. Is he saying that a secure landfill isn't part of the disposal facility that would have to be established?

HON. G. LECUYER: Certainly not. I've indicated that the Member for Tuxedo was simplifying the issue to

the extent of saying that was the only part of the system. — (Interjection) — That's what I said, because that's the only reference he made to in his intervention before. He only talked about gathering information in terms of the types of soils, the geological and underpinning; that's all he talked about in the previous question. — (Interjection) — we have that type of information as part of the initial report from the Clean Environment hearings that were part of the, again, the first phase. We have that type of information now, and we went on to get further information by conducting that survey of the landfill sites in Manitoba.

We know that, for instance, in certain areas with certain types of - referring specifically to the point that he was making - soils and geological underpinnings, that we would have certain problems in certain areas where we might not in others.

Now, I certainly have not indicated to the member that a landfill site would not be part of such a system. I've indicated that it's away more complex than simply looking at it from that standpoint. Obviously there would be other features of such a system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to a topic that the Member for Niakwa was referring to earlier when he was talking about pungent odours in the atmosphere.

I sympathize with him immensely in terms of his concern for people who live in the neighbourhood of pig farms. Having grown up on a farm and every weekend, my father backing the manure spreader into the barn for my sister and I to fill up during the week, and he politely referred to the substance as pig sugar, and it certainly did have a very pungent odour.

I'd like to ask the Minister in terms of particular pungent odours in the atmosphere, this afternoon during question period, I noticed a very pungent odour coming from the opposition front benches, particularly in reference to some comments that were made around the position of the Member for Lakeside, and I wondered whether they might have perhaps come from that particular species of the pig family known as the male chauvinist pig. I wondered if the Minister could give us any suggestions on how we can control that particular pungent odour in the atmosphere of the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal briefly on another item of the same area, involving Environmental Management. The Minister, and certainly his staff, will be aware that in the years, particularly '80 and '81, there was substantial work done by this department in preparation for an aluminum smelter on a site that had been chosen by the then government in the Balmoral area in the Interlake. I believe a report was provided to the department shortly after the change in government. Without going back to that particular history of the department's work, my question to the Minister was that, shortly thereafter, for whatever reasons, and I won't abuse the privileges of this committee by getting into a debate as to why that proposed major industrial development did not proceed.

The government of the day, this government, indicated that they were in one of their now all too many mega letters of understanding and agreements of understanding, commitments were in discussion with another major aluminum producer, namely, Alcoa.

My question to the department, to the Minister is, at the time of the announcement, and as one would expect that similar environmental impact studies, one would assume would have been undertaken or commenced with respect to the Alcoa proposal that was then highly touted by his colleague, the Minister of Energy and indeed the Premier, as being a major industrial operation that was hopefully to commence in the not too distant future.

My specific question is, what actual studies were undertaken? What work was undertaken by his department, by the Department of the Environment? And I appreciate that perhaps it was his predecessor, now the Member for Churchill, who was perhaps more directly responsible at that time, but perhaps his staff can indicate to him what particular studies were undertaken with respect to the Alcoa proposal.

HON. G. LECUYER: As the member implied, it certainly was before I was Minister responsible for the department that this occurred. But there are two things I want to say.

First of all, the study that the member refers to that Alcan was conducting in reference to its proposed operation was a study which Alcan kept, I presume, because it certainly was not released. A study was also begun under the proposed development plan, Alcoa, but here again when the company decided not to pursue, it discontinued all aspects of its proposed operation and study, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Study which also the company did not release to us at whatever level it was at that point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will, of course, accept the Minister's statement. I am the first one to acknowledge that my responsibilities were not in this area of environment at that time, but it was my understanding and I certainly was a more than interested observer inasmuch as that the proposed Alcan site was within my constituency, it continues to be of considerable interest to many of my constituents.

It was my understanding though, and certainly I say this with the knowledge that the company undertook very substantial feasibility studies which, as I agree with the Minister, one would assume would continue to remain company property. It would be up to the company if they wish to release any of it.

But it was also my understanding, and certainly I can tell the Minister my full intention, that no major industrial enterprise, particularly a smelting enterprise which has with it a great deal of concerns about environmental problems, environmental damage, would conceivably have been able to be proceeded without an independent government sponsored environmental impact study. It's my firm belief, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the Minister once more that, in fact, was carried out by various disciplines within government. I'm sure it involved disciplines and professionals from other departments, water resource people, biologists from the Department of Natural Resources.

In fact, there was an independent government-sponsored environmental impact study made with respect to the Alcan proposal on the Balmoral site. That proposal and that study rests somewhere within the archives of government. I would be interested in knowing if that isn't the case, Mr. Chairman.

HON. G. LECUYER: There are similarities and differences in these two projects the member refers to. If we're talking about the Alcan project on which a site had been selected, the similarity is that it was still at the feasibility stage. But an environmental impact study could be carried out at least to the extent that the site had been selected. It could be based at least on a lot of relevant factors to that site.

But I wish to say to the member again that this report - the member may have seen that report and some of his colleagues may have seen that report - but that report was never released. It remains the property of the company, and certainly was not made available to the members of the opposition at the time or members of the government of today. It is not certainly accessible to us.

Now the difference is with the Alcoa plant, no site had been selected, so the feasibility study which is a responsibility of the company could not certainly proceed to the same extent in that the part of that feasibility study was meant to ascertain what would be a suitable site and before that ever was completed, the project was not proceeded with. The similarity again is that the report, I have never seen nor did the staff from my department ever get to see it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I accept the Minister's statement with respect to the difference between the two projects that I have referred to. I appreciate that in the case of the latter proposal from Alcoa that there had not been a definitive site selected. Under those circumstances, I suggest - I don't know - but I would suspect that there could have only been some very premature, or general recommendations made to the department, that the department should prepare itself for an impact study when, in fact, a final site selection was made. So I have no differences of opinion with the Minister with respect to Alcoa.

But I am troubled with the answers that I am getting from the Minister with respect to the Alcan site. I hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking these questions merely to go back into history. I want to assure the Minister and the department that he will appreciate that a project of that size and magnitude was of considerable interest to many of my constituents and continues to be a controversial subject, particularly by those who have environmental concerns and that should include all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be eminently fair to the Minister. If the Minister is not aware of it, then I would ask him to perhaps take the question as notice. But I have difficulty in accepting the fact that it is not on record and I agree that the report has never been made public. It's also my understanding that the report wasn't finalized until such time as the last administration left office, and probably not presented to the new Minister of Environment, the new government till sometime in February after the 1981 November election.

But I simply want to ask the Minister to carefully consider his response to this question. I am interested in that study; my constituents are interested in that study. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether or not the study was reasonably positive, whether the concerns that have been voiced by some of my constituents about that project were the kind that could be allayed by the kind of study that I understand the department entered into in late '80-'81 and, as I understood, was completed in February of '82.

It may not have been the all-inclusive study; it may have had to do with more work with respect to the actual commencement of further plans by Alcan at that time. But the fact of the matter is that, as the Minister himself has indicated, a site had been selected.

It's my understanding, and I can recall just from memory, that there were, I believe, public hearings held in communities in Balmoral and Stonewall called by the Clean Environment people. I don't know whether it was the Commission or whether it was a multi-disciplined task force group that went out.

Surely, there is some research, some study, in my recollection, was undertaken by the department and should be in the hands of the department now. For some reason, the department, or the Minister, doesn't wish to acknowledge that or does not wish to make that public. Well, we will fight that battle another time, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps in the Fall Session of the Legislature.

But I ask the Minister to consider the request that I am making, and I want him to clearly understand the nature of the request. I am not trying to confuse the Alcoa with the Alcan situation. I accept his answer with respect to Alcoa, but it's my firm recollection that a fairly substantial amount of work was done with respect to the Alcan site.

HON. G. LECUYER: First of all, I am not too sure why the Member for Lakeside - and I will accept the fact that he is interested in the results of that study - but the member should have obviously raised that at any time with the Minister who was then responsible for the environment.

Staff assure me that no senior staff in the department have ever seen such a study as the member refers to. There were two status reports that were released and I believe that these were made available in terms of the schedule, where they were at in their schedules, the issue they were addressing at the time, and those I certainly have no difficulty in making available to the member if he hasn't yet seen those. I presume that he would have had an opportunity to look at those two status reports.

But there was none I've seen - and I will check to ascertain whether this is indeed correct - but I am assured by staff that they have never seen such a report and I certainly haven't. The member will have to take my word for that because I certainly have no qualms about stating what I know to be a fact. I mean I haven't ever seen such a report in terms of a report that would have environmental impact bearings, and I haven't seen it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(a)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the newspapers that I receive from around my constituency,

this weekend there was an article or a notice put out by the Manitoba Environment and Workplace Safety and Health Department on sensitive areas designation. It listed several lakes in Northern Manitoba and several in western Manitoba that have been designated as sensitive areas.

I was wondering if the Minister could tell us what criteria was used in designating those particular lakes, and just give us a little insight into that designation place.

HON. G. LECUYER: The member refers to the lakes in Northern Manitoba and a number of lakes in southern Manitoba which were designated as sensitive lakes because of the type of soil, primarily because of the very porous nature of the soil. In so designating them as sensitive lakes, it restricts the method by which people can dispose of wastes, primarily sewage wastes. It prevents them from putting in place a septic field; instead they have to resort to holding tanks. There are, under special circumstances, exemptions can be granted, but these have to be obtained from the Minister.

The designation of these lakes has been something that a large number of people in Northern Manitoba, especially, have been pressuring for the department to declare as sensitive areas because of the high demand and pressure that is being made on those lakes and the fact that they can so very readily and quickly become polluted. It's a problem that would take years to correct.

So in order to prevent the problem from occurring, the people who have cottages in that area, or who project building cottages in these areas, of course, would like to have some degree of assurance that these lakes are going to be protected. The whole intent and purpose is to do, as a result of that, just that.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is there then a set of regulations that is readily available to the public so that they will know just what kind of facilities to put in place there should they happen to be building, for instance?

HON. G. LECUYER: We have prepared a leaflet. I don't know; perhaps the member has seen that leaflet. The Parks Branch has undertaken to distribute for our department the leaflet with the annual lease billing to all the cottages in the parks areas affected by this legislation or regulation.

As well, the Parks Branch has an annual brochure that is sent to the cottage owners in the parks and reference will be made in those brochures of the lakes that are so designated.

I suppose, on an ongoing basis or periodically it will be necessary to bring the public's attention to this designation of the lakes in order that future residents of those areas might not contravene the regulation. But the very fact that many of the existing residents would be required to comply would in itself provide some degree of protection from others coming into there and not complying with the regulation - that's not a regulation - with the designation of the sensitive lakes, so that the newcomers would not be allowed to do what the others who are already there are not allowed to do.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister says newcomers, which leads me to my next question.

This designation in the regulations pertaining to it, will that in any way inhibit future cottage lots being allowed on any of those lakes? Is there, for instance, a regulation involving the spacing between cottages which would cut down on the number that could be built? Would the Minister care to elaborate on that, please?

HON. G. LECUYER: The designation is not intended to do that at all, and the concern that the member raises then would come under the Parks Branch in terms of what parks are available for cottage development and to what extent. That does not come under the jurisdiction of my department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Having placed that designation on those lakes and being prepared because of the designation to impose additional costs on users of those lakes, is the government itself prepared to do anything by way of expenditures to preserve the quality of those lakes?

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know whether the comment made by the member is correct. I don't know that that imposes additional costs. It's simply a different way of handling the wastes, and I'm not sure that having to put in a holding tank is costlier than putting in a septic field. I would imagine it's generally cheaper.

Now, the other point that I can make is that we have not at this point in time decided to implement other procedures or programs to preserve the quality of these lakes. We feel that that measure itself will go some long way in doing just that, but I also have to advise the member that one of the reasons for the designation is because of the pressure which was made on myself to designate these lakes as sensitive areas by the people who are presently there. So, their concern was that one of the things they saw coming was that as increasing numbers of people who located themselves on the edges of these lakes, the quality would quickly deteriorate and their feelings and the understanding was that by so designating these as sensitive areas and forcing the cottage owners to comply by a specific method of waste disposal, we would prevent effluents from leaching into the lakes. I do believe, indeed, that it will go a long way into doing just that, preserving the quality of the water in these lakes.

MR. B. RANSOM: Pelican Lake is one of those lakes so designated. Does the waste water from the Pelican Lake Training Centre still find its way into Pelican Lake?

HON. G. LECUYER: I can't really answer that question. As far as I know, Pelican Lake is not one of those lakes that was so designated, and as far as the specifics that the member asks for, I would have to obtain additional information. I can give the member the list of these Lakes. The lakes are: Clearwater Lake, Rocky Lake, Paint Lake, Setting Lake, Athapapuskow Lake, Snow Lake area, Wekusko Lake area, Snow Creek area, Rock Lake - yes, Pelican Lake, I'm sorry is one of those - George Lake, Bower Lake, Sharpe Lake, Dromore Lake and Metigoshe Lake. Having said that I still do not have

the specific information that the member has requested. I certainly could check that and provide that information to the member at some other time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To get back to PCBs, I was going to wait until we got to Minister's Salary, but I think now would be a good time, at least before we get into Private Members' Hour.

I was sitting here pretty smug and not really too worried until I heard some of the answers that the Honourable Minister was giving to the Leader of the Opposition today and it's starting to frighten me inasmuch as we do not have any control in the province - or very little control. We keep saying that it's somebody else's responsibility. Wait until we have the meeting with the other provinces. Wait until we have the meeting with the Federal Government. Wait until we have the Americans come up with their trucks to handle some of these things. The Honourable Minister made some remarks about it, but are we putting the responsibility in the wrong place?

Where are these PCBs located now? Whose responsibility is it? I hear the Honourable Minister keep saying, "We are going to do this. We are going to have hearings. We are going to do this and we are going to do that." It seems to me that it's Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro who have these PCB materials stored. Why not encourage them to recycle these PCBs? It's their responsibility. I think to make it as simple as possible, it's their responsibility. Let them, as good corporate citizens look after their responsibility. Let's give them the opportunity to recycle and to plan to get rid of these PCB materials before the next short time. Let's not wait two or three years. I see where it says "Disposal Site Hearings Slated." The Provincial Government, under this Minister isn't going to do anything for two or three years. It says, "Hazardous wastes are now either buried or shipped to an out-of-province disposal site."

I think the Minister with a little bit of foot work has confused the writer of this article also because the other thing that PCBs are, is stored - and we have lots of them. Can the Honourable Minister advise whether he or his department have done anything to encourage Manitoba Hydro, Winnipeg Hydro, to recycle these materials?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Niakwa raises PCBs and has raised a lot of questions on PCBs in the House over a long, fairly lengthy period of time. I have provided a great deal of information to the member in regard to quantities, where they're stored, who has them in hand, how they're transported, how we're advised, etc., etc.

It's unfortunate, but it'll help in the end that the member is concerned about the issue and a lot of other people in Manitoba are concerned about that issue and it will enable us, as a province, and it will enable many of the other provinces to proceed to address that issue, because obviously it cannot be done without incurring costs, for one thing; and it will take a certain amount of time.

it's not because there was a spill this spring that the problem is all of a sudden here now and wasn't here before. It's been there for a tremendous amount of time. In fact, it was there as a problem — (Interjection) — The Member for La Verendrye keeps shouting at me, half in jest that, you know, we used to wash with this stuff, referring to the fact that it's been there for a long time and for a long period of time people didn't know that it was a hazardous substance and were not dealing with it with due and proper care. But, yes, we know that it is a problem for only a short period of time. We did not have a system in place to dispose of it, nor did the other provinces. In the meantime, a lot of these substances were shipped to other jurisdictions, primarily to Oregon at the beginning where they were accepting these substances and disposing of them or storing them over there until they discontinued this practice.

But the fact is, we're not saying we're simply going to refuse to shoulder our responsibility in this regard and go and seek advice from the other provinces. I told the member that it is the Federal Minister that has requested a meeting specifically to address that issue. As far as I know, all of the Environmental Ministers have agreed to meet and discuss how as a nation and as provinces we should address the issue, not because it's all of a sudden a problem, but because it has come to the forefront of the minds of people.

There are many other hazardous substances. I have to tell the member, we don't dispose of PCBs in the soil. I don't know what the member was reading, perhaps an article, and perhaps he was not referring to PCBs when he was saying that, but I just heard him say that disposing of them in landfill sites or whatnot. We don't dispose of them in that manner, and that is why we have so much of it stored presently in all of the provinces.

I have to also advise the member when he says that we should encourage the industry to take its responsibility to deal with it. Essentially, that's what has been happening. The industry has taken some responsibility in dealing with it, and that's why they were shipping them out wherever they could get rid of them, or wherever there was another jurisdiction that would take them.

As I indicated before, we were very closely involved in every aspect of that particular operation whereby Manitoba Hydro last year, using the firm called Sun Ohio, did process and neutralize some 20,000 to 22,000 litres of low-level PCBs. So there have been some beginnings, but as the member knows, the problem hasn't come to the forefront until very recently. Now we are, all of us, endeavouring to resolve that problem as quickly as we can, knowing that it's not a simple matter that it cannot be simply put in the same category as all the other hazardous substances.

I also have to remind the member that there are many other hazardous substances that are just as bad and perhaps, in many cases, worse than PCBs. So we can't focus the attention all on PCBs and forget all about the others. We are in the process of putting in place a program to address a great variety of hazardous substances. Unfortunately, the methods of disposing of PCBs is, in many instances, some of the other hazardous substances that can be worse than PCBs can be disposed of, neutralized easier than PCBs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Member's Hour. I am leaving the Chair, and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION
PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

The first item on the agenda for Tuesday's Private Members' Hour is the adjourned debate on second readings of public bills.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND
READINGS -
PUBLIC BILLS**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 20, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. ENNS: Stand.

**BILL NO. 30 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE
REGISTERED RESPIRATORY
TECHNOLOGISTS ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 30 - the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we've had an opportunity peruse the contents of this bill and are prepared to pass it on to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

RES. NO. 4 - ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 4, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has two minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had more or less concluded my remarks with respect to the resolution before us, Aboriginal Rights, introduced by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. I recall, Mr. Speaker, I essentially was asking the mover of the resolution to more clearly define what precisely is meant by the term "Aboriginal Rights", and I look forward to his comments and other members' comments when he concludes debate on this item.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to place a few comments on the record in regards to this resolution. First of all, I'd like to begin by commending the Member for Rupertsland for identifying, I think, a number of key issues to Native people in Canada at the present time in that resolution. The most obvious being that of self-government, but

also for his putting the issue of self-government in its proper context, Mr. Speaker, in terms of its constitutional and legal ramifications, the process which would be involved in achieving it and also the impact of those negotiations on the existing arrangements that exist between the Federal Government and Native people in Canada at the present time, both in terms of departmental obligations and also Treaty obligations.

As I see it, there are essentially three key things that have to be recognized in looking at this issue. One is the legal and constitutional rights that Native people clearly do have in terms of Aboriginal rights. The background of Aboriginal rights in Canada legally is a rather lengthy one. Until the 1970s, Aboriginal rights were not legally recognized. In fact, there were several court cases in which Native groups did attempt to have those Aboriginal rights looked at by the legal system and recognized.

What did happen, though, in a number of key decisions in the 1970s was that a number of judges in a couple of those decisions did support the concept of Aboriginal rights and there was a parallel growth of interest and concern about this issue amongst the public generally, and certainly a growing awareness amongst Native people of those Aboriginal rights.

That led, of course, to the enshrining of Aboriginal rights in the Constitution, which I personally felt was a very significant event, not strictly for Native people, Mr. Speaker, but for our country as a whole, because I think it went a long way towards recognizing what I feel should have been recognized far earlier in the courts and politically in Canada. From that recognition of Aboriginal rights, I think, Native people are attempting to go one step further and that is to have recognition of the concept of self-government.

Now some people, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to self-government. In a lot of cases, they haven't really examined what it means, at least in my opinion. Some are suspicious of it. I would take another approach, I think the approach taken by the Member for Rupertsland, and that is essentially that self-government is not something that we should fear. It's something we should look forward to. It's, I think, a way in which we can look at tackling some of the significant problems that Native people have faced in Canadian society over the past century or more. I think it's an approach that offers a great deal of prospect, Mr. Speaker.

It's not an approach which is actually that unique to Canada. There are certainly many other Aboriginal peoples in the world who are seeking similar sorts of recognition of their rights as Aboriginal peoples, Mr. Speaker. It's even not that unique in that sense either in the sense that in many other countries, the general concept of self-determination or as it relates in industries to industrial democracy, Mr. Speaker, those concepts are accepted by many people in all sectors of society. In fact, if you look within Europe, for example, there have been a number of countries where major advances have been made towards this very same concept. I'm not suggesting that the concept of self-determination, in its more limited form, is necessarily a model for self-government, because obviously it's on a different scale, Mr. Speaker, but I think the concept is the same and that is people are seeking greater control over their own affairs, whether it be in the workplace or the communities they live in, Mr. Speaker, or on a more regional or national basis.

So I don't think the concept is really something that we have to fear. I think we only have to look at the example of countries where they have taken that approach, where they have taken this move, Mr. Speaker, towards greater self control and where they have succeeded in bringing a different sense to their societies.

But the way not to do it in Canada, is to adopt the approach that we're hearing from some in Ottawa at the present time in regards to the handling of Indian Affairs in Canada. I'm referring, of course, to the documents that have been released, Mr. Speaker, which show that the Federal Government is presently looking at some massive cutbacks in their role vis-a-vis Native people in Canada. Massive cutbacks, Mr. Speaker, to the extent of \$311 million in reduction in funding.

I think that is totally the wrong approach to adopt for a number of reasons. First of all, it would hit the sector of our society which can perhaps least afford to be hit, in terms of funding cutbacks. To even suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government not fund housing programs, Mr. Speaker, in Native communities, to attempt to encourage Native people to leave their communities, to leave their reserves and move to other areas of Canada, I find offensive, as I find some of the other recommendations in that report.

I find them offensive, not in the least because of the fact that they are a clear repudiation of what has been the traditional role of the Federal Government in regards to Native people in this country. They have a traditional role that relates to the treaties they have signed with treaty Indians across this country and in terms of jurisdiction, they're clearly recognized as having a very important role to play in terms of the affairs of Indian people in Canada. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it's in keeping with the spirit of the resolution, in fact in the very words of the resolution of the Member for Rupertsland where he stated, and I quote Mr. Speaker, that the self government that he is talking about, the negotiations towards self government would be conducted on a multi-lateral basis, would be conducted without derogating from the trust and treaty obligations of the Federal Government with respect to the Aboriginal peoples.

I would suggest to you, Sir, that if the proposals in the so-called Neilsen Report were to be adopted that would clearly indicate a complete breaking of the trust of the Federal Government with Native people in Canada; and I would feel that would set back the situation facing Native people many decades and would also set back the process of attempting to attain self-government for those people. So I think that's very important that we stress at this time, at a time when the Federal Government apparently is taking an ambiguous stand on that report, at first refusing to even acknowledge its existence, but now not committing themselves to rejecting its Draconian measures, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that we speak up in this debate on this very important matter and say that is totally unacceptable as far as we're concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are various elements in the resolution that the Member for Rupertsland has pointed out and I think they are all elements that we, as members of the Legislature, can accept.

I'd like to make one final comment and that is perhaps to echo some of the statements by the Member for

Rupertsland when he says that there have been many problems in Canada for Native people over the past century or more. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland is correct when he points to those problems.

I would suggest to you that the concept of self-government offers some hope for Native people in this regard. The present system has obviously not solved those problems. I'm not saying that there aren't elements in the present system which aren't helping. Certainly when we look at the kind of cutbacks that are being proposed in Ottawa, we can see that the situation would be worse if there were no system in place whatsoever. But as we look ahead, Mr. Speaker, to the '80s and the '90s and the next century, it seems to me that there is a new approach that we can come to which does offer some hope for Native people in Canada.

One of the key elements of that approach has to be self control, self government by Native people. That's not separatism, as the Member for Rupertsland points out; it's not a unique concept. In one sense, as I pointed out, but I think in the context of the situation facing Native people today it is an absolutely needed concept. We have to give Native people a much greater opportunity to deal with the many problems that they see for Native people across this country.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for Rupertsland for introducing this resolution. I support the principles outlined in the resolution and would urge all members of this House to support them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The operative section of the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland reads as follows:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House support ongoing, multilateral discussions between the Government of Canada, the various provinces, including Manitoba, and the various Aboriginal peoples of Manitoba, to consider the nature, jurisdiction and powers to be recognized and affirmed for the said institutions of Aboriginal self-government, without derogating from the trust and treaty obligations of the Federal Government with respect to Aboriginal peoples.

Mr. Speaker, other members on this side of the House speaking before me have indicated our support for this resolution and I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland introduced this resolution and that he made some comment on it and went some distance toward explaining to the public and to members of the House what is meant by self-government.

I think one of the significant things that he said, that I agree with in supporting this resolution, is that he said, can we do any worse? Now that may seem like a rather negative way to approach the question, but in fact I believe that it's true, that what we see at this point in time after 118 years of Confederation is, we see 118 years of paternalism towards the Indian people by the Federal Government mostly. To some extent, Provincial Governments have been involved, but basically, the Federal Government, and that is an

example of what you can get through total domination by government, where even the most basic decisions have not been able to be made by the people who are most directly affected.

So I agree wholeheartedly with the Member for Rupertsland that the present system that is in place does not work well and that something else must replace it. It's a question of what that something else is and I had hoped to hear from the Member for Thompson, some of his ideas about what self-government is. He continues to say that it's a concept that we should all support, but he seemed to spend most of his time equating it to industrial democracy and self-government in the workplace. — (Interjection) — He says he didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I listened rather carefully to what he said and those were the only analogies that he drew. Now I'm not sure that the Member for Rupertsland would see it in that light. I have my doubts, but he will obviously be able to speak for himself.

The Member for Rupertsland has made some effort to outline it and I commend him for that and I hope that we would hear more of that. He said at one point, "I hope that members opposite will understand what we mean by self-government." I have to tell the Member for Rupertsland that I do not understand what he means by self-government. I would like to understand what he means by self-government, but I do not understand it. I am perhaps getting some better appreciation of what the Native people think it means.

There was some understanding of that communicated at the last meeting in Ottawa, at the First Ministers' Meeting, when the representatives of the Aboriginal people sat around the table and some of the leaders talked about what they meant. I found it very useful when they spoke that way to explain to other people what they mean. Some of the Native leaders, unfortunately, in my judgment, took the view that it wasn't necessary to talk about that, that anyone who didn't understand what self-government was didn't really deserve to have it explained to them, that almost you were uninformed if you didn't understand the concept and some of the Premiers who questioned it were criticized for questioning it.

I think what those Native leaders didn't realize was that of all of the people watching that convention on television, I would venture to say that perhaps 95 percent of them would say, right on, I agree with the Premier of Alberta, the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Premier of British Columbia, when they ask what does it mean. The vast majority of their electors don't understand what it means and they want to know before anyone is committed to it. And I want to know.

That's why I really want to commend the member for introducing this resolution which, to me, says that we need to go on talking about it until we have some understanding of what it means. I think the Attorney-General when he addressed the issue, used the phraseology "Do we enshrine and then define, or do we define and then enshrine?" To me, it is simply inviting trouble and disagreement to try and enshrine terminology that we don't understand, that will then eventually be defined by a third party. It's likely to be defined by the courts rather than by the people who are involved who have the responsibility.

So it seems to me that there was progress made at Ottawa at the last meeting, even though there may not

be language that is going to be entrenched in the Constitution as a consequence of it. I believe that there was progress made there and I felt that having attended the meeting that was held two years ago, that there was quite a different attitude this time, that there seemed to be a lot more understanding on the parts of both sides as to what was being talked about and some of the basic rights that the Aboriginal people had.

I happen to think that the Aboriginal people and their representatives made somewhat of a mistake at that last conference by not taking advantage of the opportunity to tell all of those people watching on television what their views were of self-government, because they had an excellent opportunity to convince literally millions of people in this country of what they were talking about and to allay their fears. When any group in our country talks about having self-government, then for a lot of people that does conjure up the idea that perhaps they're talking about separatism. Very few people would agree that they would want that. Some of the Native leaders in Ottawa set that aside and the Member for Rupertsland has set that aside.

The Member for Rupertsland has given us some indication of what he means by self-government. He said that we have to start taking over some of their institutions like the schools, economic self-sufficiency that exists. We have to talk about the structure and powers that we would like to have and the institutions that we like to develop. He makes a point that we have the ability and also had a prior inherent right to govern ourselves. Then he says it is not merely taking over programs and delivering services.

I find that in those comments that it's not merely taking over programs and delivering services but, on the other hand, that it is to start taking over some of the institutions like the schools, then I see a certain contradiction there - perhaps not a contradiction, but a lack of a complete and fuller definition - that maybe the second thing that the member is talking about, taking over some of the institutions, he means that as not being exclusively what they're talking about. I would like to hear some of the other things that the Member for Rupertsland sees as being part of self-government.

I think it's extremely important that we try and resolve this kind of an issue because I see that there is a great deal of effort being expended on the process of trying to determine, define and enshrine self-government, just as there is a great deal of effort going into trying to settle other Aboriginal claims and treaty land entitlement claims. Although these issues are very important to the Native people and to the rest of us, they really are not going to change the actual conditions under which Native people live in the short term. If you today enshrine self-government in the Constitution and today made a settlement of the land entitlement claims in Manitoba, it would not make any difference tomorrow to how the average Native person lives.

Now, these may be some of the means to improving that, but as long as the debate centres around the concepts and what the actual terms of the settlements are going to be, then I don't see the Native people being able to move ahead to solve some of the very real problems that they have. In fact, there are so few of the Native people who are able to be employed in the sense that other people are employed, and once

they have settled it - suppose that one of the more remote reserves in Manitoba was to get self-government and to get whatever kind of land settlement that they sought. They would only then begin to face the kinds of problems that thousands of communities in Canada face and that is, what are they going to do to sustain economic development, because we have countless examples of towns in rural Manitoba where there have not been jobs created for the young people that were coming on, that were growing up in those districts and they've had to leave. They could not sustain the economic activity in their communities and it's going to be infinitely more difficult for Indian communities located in remote areas to try and generate economic activity to support their people.

They also, of course, are going to face great difficulties in trying to adjust once they leave those communities and come in to the City of Winnipeg, for example, and that is going to arise partly because of culture, but partly because of isolation, of having lived in a different kind of environment; and we can see other examples amongst the Hutterite people for instance in Manitoba, where the young people are brought up on the colonies and they don't have much contact outside of the colonies. Some of them attempt to leave and to go and integrate economically into the rest of society and they're unable to do it and that they find themselves, by circumstances, being forced to go back and live on the colonies.

I see that there is some parallel there with the Native people, that it's not just because they're Native people that they're not able to make huge adjustments from living on the reserves in remote areas to integrating economically into the society in Winnipeg, for example. It's a huge cultural shock to go from one circumstance such as the reserve presents to come and try and integrate economically and to some extent, socially, into the environment that we find in the city as well. So to me, those are the kinds of immense problems that the Native people are going to have to deal with and the quicker that they can get on to dealing with those issues the better; so I believe that the sooner we can arrive at a definition of what we're talking about with self-government, the better, and the sooner that we can begin to give that level of self-government.

But I don't think that we will move faster towards solving the problems that Native people have by rushing to enshrine something in the Constitution that we don't understand because then we're going to go through a very difficult process afterwards, of trying to define that, perhaps through the court system. Better that we should try and work it out in advance because - and I make one final point in closing, Mr. Speaker, that despite what is put in the Constitution for self-government, the Native people will not truly have any form of real self-government until they also have economic self-sufficiency. He who pays the piper calls the tune and the Native people can talk about any form they wish, of government, but until they're able to pay their own bills, they will not really have independence and that's the question, one of the issues that was raised by Doug Fisher in his column in the Toronto Sun. He raises that question of who will sustain all these self-governing First Nations throughout perpetuity.

"Most of the nations are distant from what economists see as the underpinning of our economy,

industry, production, exchange, jobs and commerce. At this point in time, only a very minor fraction of Native people are gainfully employed. That's why the annual federal bill alone for Native people is over \$2.5 billion." That's the end of that quote, Mr. Speaker.

So that's the issue that ultimately has to be addressed as well. So I would hope that all of the members of the House would support this resolution, as I think they will, and that the governments involved and that the Native people involved will work diligently to arrive at a definition and I would urge the Honourable Member for Rupertsland to use his influence with the Native people, the Native leaders, to talk more openly and repeatedly about what it is that they seek, because the more they talk about it and the more they define it, then I think the closer they come to getting acceptance from the public and from their representatives who form their governments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland will be closing debate.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a great privilege for me to introduce this resolution. I think members opposite, by the statements of the previous speaker, will support this resolution. I have spoken about self-government many times, whether it be in the House, I have mentioned it numerous times in my speeches and also in the public meetings that I've attended.

First of all, let me say that self-government is a way to start dealing with our own problems and start applying our own solutions. I may say that we need a lot of assistance from the governments, both provincial and federal, and also from individuals. I think in the past we have always fought against governments. We tended to deal with the Federal Government and also the Provincial Government. I recognized the problem. We haven't gone much beyond that to explain some of our positions to different individuals, to different organizations, and I'm beginning to find that many of the different organizations are requesting information and also seeking more information so that they may understand what we talk about when we say self-government, because they see the reports in the news media, whether it be on TV or in the papers, about the poor conditions that exist among many of the reserves in the small, remote communities and they begin to question what the Federal Government is doing in respect to providing the services to the Indian people, the Aboriginal people.

When you consider the social conditions that exist, the child welfare situations where many of the Native children are placed in foster homes, away from their communities, when the education level is very low and the high school drop out rate is extremely high and the poor housing conditions that exist in many of the communities - it is very - I wouldn't even say liveable, in some of the houses.

The income that is earned in reserves and the job opportunities that exist are practically minimal. The unemployment rate is very high; and also you would

find that many of our institutions, especially the prisons, are filled with Native people; and the death rate amongst Native people is very high. Causes of death are violence, suicides, related to alcohol; the violent deaths that take place in suicides, the infant mortality rate is high. The life expectancy of an Indian is away less than the average Canadian people. The hospital admissions are away high above the Canadian average. Those are things that we are trying to address and hope that when you rise to support this resolution, that hopefully these drastic statistics can be curtailed.

I have said before that we are not asking for hand-outs or sympathies. We want to have some say into what our future is. When we go to Ottawa and start talking about our Treaty on Aboriginal Rights, what I see happening is that each province begins to posture their position and begins to carve out a position as to what we are talking about. An example could be what I put before you, the Indian self-government. And they put on restrictions. We talk about within the Canadian Constitution or within the Canadian Federation.

So actually we're not talking about Indian self-government. What we're talking about is beginning to put restrictions, beginning to define, and conditions under what we negotiate. I am beginning to find that we are not there for what we can gain, but rather what we can salvage and protect because the system we have inherited, or the Canadian system is evolved by a parliamentary system, democracy, which Indian people were denied for long periods of time.

The Canadian system says that everything must be done through Parliament and every expenditure that is made towards the Indian people, somebody must be accountable; and that accountability is something that we want to be able to do ourselves. Presently the Minister of Indian Affairs is the one who is accountable for all the expenditures that are made to Indian people. We don't have that accountability or responsibility directly to our Indian people because when somebody questions in the House, it is the Minister of Indian Affairs who stands up and takes on the responsibility of where these expenses are made. I think it's about time the Aboriginal people started being accountable and also taking some responsibility.

There have been some criticisms of Aboriginal people, whether they have the ability to manage their own affairs. I can tell this House that we have many people who have gone through many of the institutions, gone through law school, gone through technical training and various skills, that we are capable of looking after our own and start being part of this mainstream society. I don't believe that someone should be looking after our interests. We should be the ones determining our interests and our future for our kids.

When I was small, I mentioned before that I was raised by my grandparents and when I was in trap lines and fish camps, I thought to myself, when I'm a man where am I going to be, what am I going to be doing? I vowed even then my world only extended to the community on trap lines, not much beyond that. But it was with guidance and the philosophy of my elders that I am able to speak with confidence, speak with the Members of the Legislature, and take the challenge.

The challenge that I'm speaking of is to carry on fighting for my people and also carry out their wishes, which is to look after ourselves instead of being bound by the Federal Government.

Although many Aboriginal organizations exist there is no such one common position because when you look across Canada there are different Aboriginal organizations even within the Assembly of First Nations, which are a Treaty and Status organization. Also we have the Metis National Council and the Inuit group.

I think what needs to be done is that the Aboriginal people start talking about the structure in which they want to be part of this country. It is not merely just giving programs to the Indian people because we would be still subject to the purse strings of Ottawa. How else can Ottawa transfer money to the Indian Bands because the accountability still rests in the House of Commons?

Somehow parliamentarians have to devise a means of transferring the accountability and responsibility to the Native people, so they themselves will be judged by their own people; and also it would encourage the communities and the bands to start making their own decisions wisely, and also start planning more seriously rather than blaming Ottawa and the bureaucrats; and that's the challenge that I speak of because the challenge comes on to us, because we are the ones who are going to be taking the rope and also leading the way for our Aboriginal people.

I said that various provinces and also Canada started talking with the various Aboriginal groups in each of their provinces. I find that in some of those constitutional conferences there hasn't been any discussions at all, in B.C., or in Alberta, and yet they question, what do you mean by Indian self-government or self-government? We want to find out what you mean.

I think under Section 35 of the Constitution which says that, "Treaty and Aboriginals are hereby recognized". I believe that one of those Treaty and Aboriginal rights is self-government and yet there is still some difference in respect to that.

We also have been subject to the Canadian system, the judicial system in Canada, which is not sensitive to the issues of Native people, not being, I guess, aware of the values of Indian people.

For instance, we may talk about the issue of let's say, what today appeared in the newspaper about the judge making a decision in respect to alcohol on a reserve. That treaty right exists because it is mentioned in the treaties where the Queen said to the Indian people that there would be no alcohol on reserves. The question to implement that is done through a parliamentary process and devised by The Indian Act. Yet, when we talk about treaty rights whether this treaty right specifically mentioned in the treaties is not subject to the Charter of Rights. It is a collective right because treaty rights are collective rights.

As a matter of fact, I can refer to Section 25 of the Canadian Constitution. It says here, "the guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedom shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any Aboriginal Treaty or other rights or rights that pertain to the Aboriginal people of Canada." And it says "including" and that's including any rights that have been recognized by Royal Proclamations or any rights that been acquired by the treaty land settlement or claim settlement.

Our beliefs are quite different from the dominant society, even the question of the issue of women. What I do find is that we are beginning to acquire non-

Aboriginal values. We are beginning to protect ourselves from infringement of the dominant society. We began to conserve cultural things, we began to protect ourselves in terms of economic situations. Our answers lie in economic solutions.

The Member for Turtle Mountain mentioned about self-government, that without economic base that you are not really able to making your own decisions. I agree with that statement because in order to survive and also make decisions, we have to make an economic base for ourselves. That may come along in a long time. Things are not going to be done overnight.

This resolution calls for support of continuing discussions and eventually come to a resolution of defining the Aboriginal self-government so that we may have the ability to make our own decisions; so that we may curtail some of the problems and the statistics that I mentioned earlier; so that we may join you and walk proud beside you and walk proud beside your children and our children and say that we are a proud country.

So, with that I'm pleased to have been privileged to submit this to this House and to the members opposite for their consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 2 - the Honourable Member for Inkster has 15 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be an inclination to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed).

The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in Committee this evening at 8:00 p.m.