



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 61B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 5 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 5 May, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. We are now considering Item No. 7.(c)(1) Forestry Development and Economics: Salaries. 7.(c)(1)—pass; 7.(c)(2)—pass; 7.(d)(1)—pass; 7.(d)(2)—pass; 7.(e)(1)—pass; 7.(e)(2)—pass; 7.(e)(3) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have an indication here from the Minister as to the seriousness of the Dutch Elm situation. It is one that we all know has been developing in the province ever since about 1975. I recall taking some steps while we were in government by way of bringing in The Dutch Elm Disease Control Act and providing some additional funding. I believe the Minister expanded the program last year. There has been some fear that the programs that are in place, particularly in the City of Winnipeg, simply aren't adequate to contain the problem that Winnipeg may face - the kind of difficulty that Minneapolis faced - in having a burgeoning disease problem there that lost, I think, hundreds of thousands of trees and costs millions and millions of dollars for the city to try and control. So I would appreciate having an update from the Minister as to what's been happening in Manitoba and how serious he views the situation in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Laws has given me a bit of a fact sheet here that does, by way of a brief synopsis, provide some relevant information in respect to Dutch Elm Disease. In 1982-83, the Provincial Government entered into 26 cost-sharing agreements with urban and rural municipalities in Manitoba and I will read the list for the purpose of Dutch Elm Disease Control. Negotiations are presently going on with a number of other communities who will quite likely become involved in the program as well in 1983-84. The ones where negotiations are going on are Gladstone, Altona, the R.M. of Cornwallis, the Town of Rivers and the R.M. of Gimli, among others.

The 26 cost-sharing agreement communities are the R.M. of Glenwood, the Town of Morris, the Town of Neepawa, the Town of Manitou, the Town of Virden, the Town of Ste. Anne, the Town of Stonewall, Minnedosa, Hartney, Pinawa, Morden, Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Pine Falls, Boissevain, Carman, Deloraine, Dauphin, Emerson, Selkirk, Lac du Bonnet, Winkler, Killarney, Winnipeg, Gimli, Souris.

In the City of Winnipeg in addition to cost-sharing to the extent of \$350,000, the provinces also granted the city a special agreement for \$60,000 to facilitate

the removal of diseased and decadent elm trees along the waterways surrounding Winnipeg.

Some particular work activities in conjunction with the Department of Community Services and Corrections and the municipality involved, the department participated in buffering programs or removed diseased and decadent elms surrounding the cities of Brandon, Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg. The contribution by the Forestry Branch to these projects was \$11,000, a further \$11,000 and \$126,100 respectively. These projects created five to six months of employment in excess of 100 people. The City of Selkirk and the R.M. of Brokenhead obtained federal money through Community Development and NEED respectively to carry out river bank and flood plain elm clean-up projects. Both communities were given technical support by our department as required.

Mr. Chairman, we also have I believe a clean-up of dead elms along the Brokenhead River where there was a virtual elimination of the wild elms along that stream. The elms were falling into the river creating a buildup of debris such that flooding would be enhanced along the river. That program has been completed. It cost about \$500,000.00.

In respect to this disease itself there's no question but that it continues to spread. We have, in addition to the programs outlined, been involved in advertising in connection with the need for sanitation on the part of individuals in respect to their elms, being careful to look out for the onset of the disease. One area that we want the assistance of all individuals is in respect to the removal of wood, either the limbs, or the branches, or the trunks of elms, because it's in the bark of the dead wood that the beetle lives and winters.

We have an ongoing program and there's no question that we could even do more than we're doing. The disease will continue probably to run its course. To be quite candid I think the best we can hope for is to, as far as possible, protect the elms in our communities so that the disease will not eliminate all of the elms.

I mentioned our publicity. We have developed pamphlets in connection with it and we have also advertised on billboards.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, why is the amount of money down?

HON. A. MACKLING: We had budgeted for more money in the previous year than actually was taken up. There were communities that didn't take up the program and this year we believe that we have sufficient money to cover those communities that will execute an agreement. I might say also that to date where we have a control program, our success rate has been very good. It's indicated to me that our losses of elms where we have an active program is less than 1 percent.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister tell us how many trees were lost in the City of Winnipeg each year for the last five years?

HON. A. MACKLING: We don't have that information, I'm sure that we could get it. It is the city's responsibility to record because they do have their program and it's share-costed with us.

MR. B. RANSOM: Has the city asked for any further assistance from the province beyond what the province is providing?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, not at the present time - although this whole area is under active review at all times - the initiatives that I talked about were brought about, I think, largely by the provincial impetus to look at ways of containing the spread of the disease primarily in the fringe areas of Winnipeg.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the numbers of trees that have been diseased in the City of Winnipeg have been going up fairly significantly over the past few years. Perhaps it is not a direct responsibility of the Minister of Natural Resources, but is the Minister of Natural Resources not concerned that there may be consequences even beyond the city in areas that the Minister does have greater responsibility? If the city doesn't have an adequate control program in place, has he discussed with the city the possibility, for instance, under the Jobs Fund of providing some extra funds to help limit the spread of the disease in the city?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that our discussions with the city are such that the city has indicated they are quite satisfied with the control program to date. As I've indicated the success rate is very good, less than 1 percent loss. I don't know what further I can add.

In respect to the developments in the fringe area, they were of the nature of job creative work and I think they were highly successful. So far as within the city itself, of course, if the city is prepared to spend more I think that we'd be prepared to look at that. By and large I believe that the towns and the R.M.s, like every other government, have been feeling somewhat restricted in their spending and that's to be understood. There could be a larger take-up in this program if there were more dollars available.

MR. B. RANSOM: This is one of those cases I think, Mr. Chairman, where money should not be cut if it's the desire of a municipal government or the provincial government to control this disease, because if it isn't controlled at the very early stages then it's inevitable that there will be greater expenditures later on which would simply mean then that either it's allowed to go out of control and we'll lose the most beautiful shade tree that we have, or else the necessary money is spent to keep it in check. I think the experience has been elsewhere, in Minneapolis especially, that when the money wasn't spent it ended up costing far far more money later on to try and hold it in check.

I hope that the Minister is doing everything that he can. In this case he's indicated that less money is required this year than was required before but I'd urge him to take a special interest in this area and provide

the funding that's necessary to try and keep an active and effective program going or we're going to lose this shade tree throughout much of the province.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that I am very interested in the problem and have had a number of discussions with both Alan Scarth - his son has written a treatise on this subject - I also had dialogue with the gentleman in Minneapolis who was the lead person in respect to their Dutch Elm Disease Program. I need no reinforcement in respect to my concerns in that respect. We have a very very valuable resource in the elms we have and we certainly don't want to lose them.

One of my concerns and the department is looking at this to obtain the largest or the highest possible involvement of volunteers and individuals that have elms on their property in Winnipeg, to assist us in ensuring that the disease does not spread. It's not merely sanitation in respect to dead limbs and the wood itself, but I've asked staff to look at ways in which, perhaps, we can get the chemical Dursban phonetic which, when sprayed in the lower trunk of the tree in the fall, acts as an excellent way of ensuring that the beetle does not have a happy wintering ground. One of the problems we've had is that Dursban hasn't been licensed for domestic use. I would like to see it licensed in a manner in which we could get it out to individuals in small quantities so that they could make application to their own elms. We have some road blocks in connection with that, but hopefully we will be able to overcome them.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, just a little further on this same question. My colleague asked a little while ago about any estimate of the number of trees that have been lost, perhaps we can arrive at it another way. Is the department furnishing municipalities and the City of Winnipeg with replanting stock? I'm aware that other varieties are being introduced, such as the Japanese Elm, but is that part of our assistance? Where do the municipalities go to to get replacement stock?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised that the city is providing it's own stock, but we do assist them somewhat on that.

MR. H. ENNS: You have no figure, for instance, as to the amount of trees that the department has provided generally in this area, in this program, specifically for replacement for trees that have been lost to the Dutch Elm disease?

HON. A. MACKLING: We don't have the specifics here; I think that information could be obtained.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the program that is in effect in the city is limited in the first instance, to the city property, city boulevards, city lands. I'm aware that there's authority for the city to act on private property to have trees removed, but just how does that relate to diseased trees on private property?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I consulted somewhat longer with Mr. Laws on this because it really

isn't within our department, but we are aware of the fact that the city under their program, they can enter on private property and remove the diseased elm. I think that more can be done in respect to getting more volunteer effort, more appreciation on the part of the citizens of Winnipeg, the citizens of Manitoba, as to the nature of the disease and the way in which sanitation can reduce the incidence of the disease. We are very concerned to get that information to the citizens of Manitoba generally.

I mentioned the billboards, they are up in the City of Winnipeg, but the pamphlet material and the general information is to be used right throughout Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: What is the problem about certification of the particular chemical that the Minister referred to that appears to be useful in the prevention of the disease?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the chemical is authorized for use by government in the program. The problem is getting certification for the use by individuals. It is presumably considered to be a relatively volatile chemical if not properly used and care must be taken in respect to its use by individuals. There is some concern about getting another chemical that could affect health if not properly used. Like all chemicals, there is a reluctance I think on the part of government to get more chemicals out in public use.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty though is - I appreciate that it is a preventive measure not a cure - but if the alternative is a massive and substantial loss of shade trees, then some crash program or effort ought to be considered to find a way of wider and more consistent use of this chemical. I just leave that matter with the Minister and reiterate what the Member for Turtle Mountain said.

It would seem to me a program that lends itself to the kind of things that this government has talked about in terms of their job creation, their Jobs Fund Program. The Minister looks for greater volunteer efforts, which of course is to be encouraged particularly as it relates to trees on private property, but under the direction of the departmental and city staff where that expertise exists, it would seem to be the kind of program that lends itself to a bit of innovation on the part of the department, on the part of the government to see whether we can't redouble our efforts in this regard. Again on the application of this chemical, if it can't be allowed to be in the hands of the general public then a crash course with some student help, currently and anxiously looking for some jobs, in providing them with some grounding and basic training in the proper application, the handling of this chemical. These are some of the suggestions that I would make to the Minister to give serious consideration to try and save or to lessen the impact of the disease on Winnipeg's beautiful shade trees, the elm.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the honourable member. If one looks at many parts of the City of Winnipeg, the elms add so much to the character of the residential neighbourhoods, that without them the city would look very stark indeed. We

have, as I've indicated, successfully employed in excess of 100 people for six months of employment in the past programs. I'm hopeful we'll be able to do more of that again this coming winter, and in respect to the need to get this chemical certified we are pursuing that with the Federal Government. But the Federal Government has many many chemicals that they have to check and you kind of stand in line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(e)(3)—pass; 7.(f)(1)—pass; 7.(f)(2)—pass; 7.(g)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: This funding, under the Northern Development Agreement, I assume that's part of the Northern Development Agreement so proudly signed by the Minister of Northern Affairs November 29, 1982, a five-year \$186.2 million agreement. Was this an ongoing program under the Northlands Agreement prior to this year?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that this is not cost-shared with the Federal Government.

MR. B. RANSOM: Why does it show under the Northern Development Agreement then?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the agreement provides for three methods of payment of projects. One part is 100 percent federal; another portion of the agreement provides for delivery of services that are 100 percent provincial; and another portion of the agreement, another part, is cost-shared. The details of that would be available through Northern Affairs, who have the agreement.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is this amount of money part of the \$186.2 million agreement then which has provision for funding directly from the province, directly from the Federal Government, or cost-shared?

HON. A. MACKLING: This one? I've indicated it was 100 percent provincial.

MR. B. RANSOM: But is it part of the \$186.2 million Northern Development Agreement?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. B. RANSOM: And is it an extension of an ongoing program that was in place previously?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(g)(1)—pass; 7.(g)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 122: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,177,100 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

8.(a)(1) Fisheries, Administration: Salaries - Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you. I welcome to share with me the question box here, Worth Hayden, who I think needs no introduction to most people here. Worth

is in charge of the Fisheries section. By way of introduction, I'd like to indicate that pursuant to arrangements that Worth and his staff effected, I did, along with my colleagues, spend some very happy hours - although some of them I admit were a bit tedious travelling - meeting with some very friendly people, but very concerned people, in fishing communities in Northern Manitoba.

I recall one visit with great vividness when Mr. Carter, I think, Mr. Hayden and others and myself were at Oxford House for a meeting with the Oxford House community. Although it was relatively early in the fall, there was a tremendous snowstorm and we spent the night in Oxford House. We spent a very pleasant time there, but we have had the benefit of meeting first-hand with many people in the communities in the North involved in commercial fishing and getting to appreciate first-hand their assessment of the problems or the needs in the fishing industry.

It was a very useful experience and I hope this coming summer to learn more about the other half of our commercial fishing and that is our sports fishery. I look forward to that and I might say that almost the most recurrent request from commercial fishermen was a concern, in light of the diminished prices and in light of their escalating costs, to receive a greater quota. It is not easy to deal with those earnest requests because one appreciates the fact that fisherman, like farmers, are faced with this squeeze, a reduction in price of the commodity they sell, while the commodities they need for their industry keep going up.

We have made some changes to quotas in some areas and I'll deal with the specifics of that as members request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, some general questions on this Administration item and prior to coming to the specific areas of concern in this division, Commercial Fishing and Sport Fishing.

Mr. Chairman, the department had some difficulties, I was given to understand, in the last year or the last few years with the disease in the hatcheries. Can that be confirmed and the question of course, the concern of course, is did that have any serious impact on our stocking program, generally speaking, level the stocking program that we have traditionally carried on in the province?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the honourable member is correct. There was some problem in hatcheries at Grand Rapids and the Whiteshell in respect to a disease affecting trout for sports fishery stocking primarily. It did not affect our commercial white fish and pickerel stocking but did impact on the exchange of trout, which takes place with other jurisdictions normally, and did involve loss in respect to the trout being diseased and had to be destroyed. The problem has not been fully eradicated. The department is still working on it.

MR. H. ENNS: Can the Minister - it's always of interest to members of the committee to appreciate just what the department is doing in this area - give us some

idea of what kind of stocking was done and we'll break it down in the commercial area, and as well in the sports area what is the level of stocking of the important species of fish?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the commercially stocked waters in 1982, Lake Winnipeg, 6.5 million whitefish; Lake Manitoba, 48 million walleye, 2 million whitefish; Lake St. Martin, 6 million whitefish; Lake Dauphin, 14 million whitefish. I've just rounded these figures.

In respect to further 1982 commercial stocking, Pelican Lake, 20 million whitefish fry; Archie's Lake - most everyone knows where Archie's Lake is but the Minister - 1,500,000 whitefish fry; and Moose Lake East Arm, 2 million whitefish fry; an experimental stocking in Landry Lake near The Pas, 2 million whitefish fry.

MR. H. ENNS: This is the normal stocking ratios that have been applied to our rates, or are the up, are the down, or are there reasons if they're down, money restraints?

HON. A. MACKLING: The stocking program does vary from year to year somewhat, primarily depending on the success of obtaining the spawn and the emphasis the department feels is necessary in respect to different species. Presently there is more emphasis on walleye than on whitefish, that is for the current year.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the relationship with the department, the government and fishermen is always a matter of concern and sometimes somewhat tenuous. On the Lake Winnipeg Fisheries an advisory board was operating and my question to the Minister, I assume that the board is still in effect, operating and acting as an advice-giving counsel to the department, to the Director of Fisheries on matters pertaining to the fisheries on Lake Winnipeg?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, they're functioning very well, I believe, and as a matter of fact there was a meeting just today which staff attended.

MR. H. ENNS: Just covering off another small size and that has to do with some of the difficulties that have cropped up particularly on the Lake Manitoba Fisheries, the problem of net sizing and the enforcement of fishermen using the appropriate net size in their fisheries. We had quite a discussion about this several years now running when we got to this point in the Estimates. There is a problem of control of the quality of the manufacture of the nets, I understand, that has created problems in the past both for the fishermen and for the department, the net result being that nets have been declared illegal, that fishermen in their judgment felt they were purchased in good faith with the appropriate mesh size.

The department I know has looked at more convenient or simpler ways of providing the measuring tool that would tell the fishermen quickly as to its eligibility for use in a given fishery. The system now in place, I believe it's called the Allen measurement, has its problems associated with it. It seemed to me at the time although I must confess that we resolved

the issue when it was my responsibility, that there ought to have been some simpler way of coming to grips with this matter and quite frankly also a less expensive way as I'm given to understand. So, Mr. Chairman, I invite the Minister to tell me how he has resolved the problems that I failed to resolve when it was my job.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I shouldn't record such humour about the problems but I appreciate the humour of the fact that these issues are not readily solved. They don't lend themselves to easy solution. However, in respect to the net sizing problem, I concur with the honourable member that the gauges or the devices for measuring to me seem to be a bit too intricate. I believe that a much simpler device could be developed. As a matter of fact, I've suggested to my staff that a simple wooden cone with graduations marked on it could be developed so that the net sizes could be determined fairly quickly and very inexpensively. I'm sure my department's going to be looking at that thought.

In respect to the net problem, I know that some of my colleagues - I specifically recall the Honourable John Bucklaschuk talking to me about the idea of having nets manufactured in Manitoba - we use a great many nets in this province and most of them come from places like Japan and Korea. I think I certainly want to see a review of all of the potential for initiative here in respect to the fishing industry. I agree with the honourable member that there have been complaints by fishermen that the sizing was inadequate by the manufacturer and that's led to some problems.

As to misunderstandings about the area for using different sizes, I think that the system has over the years finally established where appropriate sizes are to be used.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Minister, that of course is one that fishermen will take issue with the department from time to time, and one has to yield to the best biological advice that the department can bring to bear on the subject matter and one won't always find an agreement among the fishermen.

But the specific concern was that at the wholesale or retail level, nets were being sold, purported to be meeting the regulations and fishermen then purchased them on that basis. The Member for Interlake is aware of what I am speaking of and under those circumstances I think the fishermen really were wanting some consumer protection, if you like in a sense that they were purchased in the belief that they would meet the regulations set forth by the department. Then upon inspection on-site in the lake, either because of the quality of the manufacture or other reasons they were found to be in some instances microscopically out of line with the requirements of the department. That's pretty tough on the fisherman when he has 40 or 50 nets yanked out from under him.

There was some effort made, I believe to contact the suppliers of the nets in question. We are after all, Mr. Minister, not speaking about a commodity that is being sold at every corner grocery store. There are relatively few outlets, there are relatively few dealers. I suspect one can number them on your hand that are importing these nets, where these nets are being sold

or made available to fishermen, very often through their co-operatives and it seems to me it should not be that difficult to either have those nets pass muster before they ever get into the fishermen's hands. In other words to have departmental people from time to time meet with the sellers of the nets, the distributors of the nets and either declare nets, a certain quality of nets, certain types of nets unfit for fisheries' use in Manitoba, then at least the fishermen know that in advance prior to the purchase of them and prior to their being put in place in service in the lakes.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I know that the honourable member would welcome a suggestion that I go over to Japan and check with the manufacturers . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: Have Cherniack do it while he's over there.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . but I really have declined to do that thus far. Seriously we have put pressure on the distributors of the nets because the manufacturers are not here in Manitoba, I think the major distributors being Lecky's in freshwater fish and asked them in turn to demand quality and precision from the manufacturers. But as the honourable member has pointed out, the net result is that it is a difficult problem for the fishermen.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes an intriguing suggestion. I am going to take it up with him, not entirely tongue-in-cheek, I will make a deal with him. He goes to Japan and talks to the Japanese about straightening up their manufacturing process on nets, and I'll go to Washington and talk to the Americans about Garrison. We'll see how well we make out.

HON. A. MACKLING: I think we'll go together Harry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)(1)—pass - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, one more item on this general item. It's not a new one, but I raise it because it is a perennial problem and one that the fishing industry in Manitoba should continually try to resolve. That is the issue of better utilization of upwards to - I don't want to use figures that I am not totally familiar with now anymore, but anyway they are in the millions and millions of pounds of rough fish that are available, in some instances, in fact are a problem to the fisheries industry and that some continuing effort be expended by the department to resolve the issue or try to find some beneficial way of turning that now dormant resource into a useful resource both by the fisherman and for the province.

In this connection I do want to acknowledge the work that one Dennis Herendy (phonetic) was doing and bringing at least some interest to bear on the part of, in this case the west coast, Japanese people that were at one point in time getting pretty interested and coming up with some pretty attractive-looking proposals that could utilize this resource. It required, and it would require some accommodation on the part of the

Freshwater Fish Marketing Board to set the proper climate for somebody to seriously take a look at the situation. Certainly prior to anybody getting seriously interested to actual capital investment in terms of plant and processing facilities, there would have to be a clear understanding with the marketing agencies that they would not be unduly hindered or impeded from doing the same. By that, I really mean that they would require an exemption because it simply doesn't work. I know the Marketing Board has in itself on its own right, made numerous efforts and I am sure they are continuing. I know they have had some measures of success in marketing some of the rough fish but really we're just scratching the surface and haven't really broken that barrier.

I am aware of course that we have a project going on, I believe at Eddystone that's involved in the processing of some rough fish. Perhaps the Minister could just give us an updating of what's happening in this area. It's an opportunity that has been there and simply not found a resolution to date. I encourage the Minister to continue to impress upon his staff that it's really perhaps one of the most - the one area, the fish, which is after all a finite resource. We have x-number of bodies of water that for many different reasons, the commercial fisheries can be viable in. Other factors enter into it, freight, transportation. While I talk about that, we'll talk about the Freight Assistance Program, how that is working, if it's still working at the same level that it was last year, or whether that is being increased. Perhaps the staff can supply the Minister with some information on that program, but specifically what, if anything is happening in our search to find some resolution to the problem of rough fish.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm what the honourable member has said, and maybe this isn't a fair analogy, but the so-called course fish, the mullet and to a lesser extent the carp, are to fishing what the aspen or the poplar is to forestry. There is a tremendous potential there. Lake Winnipegosis alone, there are thousands and thousands of pounds of mullet. It is an excellent food. It's a first-class protein food. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion there is not a fish that comes out of our waters that is not a good edible fish. Even the lowly maria is an excellent eating fish, although most people don't appreciate that. I consider the mullet to be excellent, and the carp.

The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has been doing a good deal to promote the sale of mullet and carp; they get orders for mullet and carp for specialty lines, specialty markets. I met with the Manitoba representative on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board just recently. His name is Mr. Ray England, very knowledgeable about fishing and the industry. He indicated to me that the corporation has developed some market, particularly in the Third World countries, in some countries in Africa, for whole mullet. There has been a fair number delivered to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for marketing overseas, but it is still a very very small portion of the available resource.

I share the concerns of the honourable member that further pursuit of the Japanese market would be valuable. I'm almost half serious about talking about the need to go there directly and maybe promote the

processing of the mullet and other fish here in Manitoba, maybe joint ventured or something like that. Certainly, I still believe that further initiatives are possible there, not that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation hasn't tried. I'm given to understand, and I have a note here from Mr. Hayden - maybe it was from Dale here, Mr. Stewart - that there have been about 12 studies over the past years in respect to utilization of this excellent resource. But because I suppose the appearance of the fish, maybe the quality of the fish, the fact that it has a great many little bones, there are factors that put people off in respect to its consumption, but it is an excellent protein fish.

In respect the Eddystone operation, they're still there. They continue to look for further development through appropriations of money by both the Federal and the Provincial Governments. The problem with the lake fresh fish operation, I think, is marketing; I think that's the key. We certainly sympathize, they have a good product, but a very very considerable problem in marketing.

In respect to the Freight Assistance Program - I have a note here - I don't think I want to deal with all of these things, a bit too much detail. The payments were \$300,000 paid in '81-82, and a little bit more than that in '82-83. The program is to be reviewed to better direct these payments to be more cost effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)(2) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, my colleague for Lakeside mentioned Garrison. There was a report today in the Winnipeg Free Press about a study, I believe, done at the University of North Dakota concerning fish species in the Missouri system. Does the Minister have a copy of that report?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, not yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Will he be seeking a copy of that report or is he familiar with my reference?

HON. A. MACKLING: Indeed, I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)(2)—pass; 8.(b)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: How many regional biologists are there?

HON. A. MACKLING: Six.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is that any increase in the number, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: Not in the last year. About two-and-a-half years ago there was an increase of one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(b)(1)—pass; 8.(b)(2)—pass; 8.(c)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: How have the experiments with the rearing ponds been progressing? Also, there had been a project that was under discussion with respect to

Lake Dauphin, I believe it was, as a possible initiative; it might have been cost-shared with the Federal Government. Perhaps the Minister could give us an update on those?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I was orienting my Estimate Book here. If the honourable member wouldn't mind repeating the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Turtle Mountain be kind enough to repeat the question, please?

MR. B. RANSOM: I just would like the Minister to give me an update on the pickerel rearing pond projects that have been under way, and also I recounted that two or three years ago there was a proposal being put forward with respect to Lake Dauphin stocking pickerel in Lake Dauphin as a possible federal-provincial initiative. What was the status of that proposal?

HON. A. MACKLING: In reverse order, in respect to Lake Dauphin, the federal Fisheries Department is carrying out an experimental program. We are co-ordinating information with them, but we are not involved in the funding of that. We have our own project there.

In respect to the pickerel rearing ponds, we are continuing to use them. We've expanded our horizons somewhat in looking at an association of the efforts of Ducks Unlimited in some areas where we can enhance not only the wetland for waterfowl, but for raising fingerlings.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister makes reference to the province having its own program at Lake Dauphin. What is the program then that the province has and how does it differ from what the Federal Government is doing?

HON. A. MACKLING: In respect to Lake Dauphin, the federal program is more in line with basic research. The province is primarily looking at spawning stream rehabilitation and selected stocking.

A further comment in respect to the pickerel rearing ponds, in addition to the province and the interest I've indicated, Ducks Unlimited, the Commercial Fishermen's Association have been very interested in that and have been, I guess, very instrumental in making sure that our activity level is high.

MR. B. RANSOM: There is a project on the government's wish list having to do with control of water levels at Lake Dauphin. Does that have any relationship to possible development of fisheries in the future, are there any benefits attributed to fisheries that would be attached to that project?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have seen documentation about Lake Dauphin and, although he's not here, the Member for Dauphin, the Honourable John Plohman has impressed upon me the history of that lake and the fact that years back it was an excellent commercial fishery for walleye and, as we all know, it's way down now. The water commission is doing a review,

or they had that lake as a reference, I think it's common knowledge, however, that the level of the lake has diminished. If the lake was deeper, if there was more water, I think the majority of the opinion is that it would be a better commercial fishing lake. It has probably been silting up for many, many years but that silting up has, no doubt, been accentuated by agricultural development on the fans of the mountain areas from which streams carry the silt and shale down into the lake and we have, therefore, lost a good deal of the depth of Lake Dauphin over the course of our lifetimes.

MR. B. RANSOM: A general description of the problems is not that hard to come by, Mr. Chairman. What is the probability of anything being done to offset those impacts? What's the probability of the project that's on the "wish list" going ahead?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't like to speculate on that. I haven't been very enthusiastic about what the Federal Government has indicated by way of its Capital commitment, or the amount of dollars to its Capital funding. I don't think that Manitoba is going to have that many dollars but we don't know what the federal interest will be and I don't know what the Water Commission's Report is going to recommend, but I do know that the department - now it's not under this branch but under Water Resources - has spent a fair bit of time looking at the streams, small rivers flowing from the mountains, trying to come up with ways to arrest the tremendous amount of erosion and silt that's carried down these fast-moving streams into Lake Dauphin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(c)(1)—pass; 8.(c)(2)—pass, 8.(d)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: What does this section do, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, perhaps if I just quickly read the activities of the section; this is the Biological Services section. A review of the chronology and type of land use activities in the Valley River Watershed; to determine cause and effect relationship affecting fish and development of land use guidelines; to assist in minimizing these impacts on fish stocks; assess the current or potential impact on fish stocks and fish habitat by resource development and use and provide guidelines for impact mitigation; develop techniques and provide training to branch staff who analyze and interpret data collected by commercial catch and experimental fishing; and tagging studies for the determination and modification of catch quotas and mesh sizes; analyze and report on status of whitefish and walleye stocks in Cedar Lake and whitefish, walleye and sauger stock in Lake Winnipeg; fish aging; fauna enumeration and identification and statistical analysis; review and analysis of biological and socioeconomic aspects of the bait fishery on the Red River, Lake Winnipeg; evaluation of the Saskram marsh fish resources and the effects of the Ducks Unlimited Control Regimes on fish production in the marsh, and the contribution of the marsh to the Saskatchewan River.

I might say that, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the effect of structures on fish propagation, when we were

dealing with water resources we did discuss the removal of the Clandeboye Dam. It's also been brought to my attention by people, particularly in the Whitemud Conservation District, that a number of structures exist on the Whitemud River that were put there years ago. We are concerned, as a department, to look at this type of intervention that has occurred in streams, waterways, that can reduce spawning run and has disturbed the natural propagation of fish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(d)(1)—pass; 8.(d)(2)—pass; 8.(e)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Ministersaid the Lake Winnipeg Advisory Board was alive and well, is it reporting to the director or is it reporting to the Minister?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it reports and I think fairly frequently to the director and, of course, the director and I meet fairly frequently.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister doesn't meet with the Lake Winnipeg Advisory Board then, they don't bring their recommendations to him, they bring them to the Director of Fisheries.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have met with the Advisory Board but their regular line of communication is with the director.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I placed an Order for Return some time ago which the Minister promptly responded to, and I'd like to ask him some questions about that.

First of all, I had asked some information concerning increases in commercial fishing limits and quotas. On Lake Winnipeg there were quota increases on Mossy Bay, and in the Grand Rapids area, Poplar River, Big Black River and Sturgeon Bay, what was the basis for increasing the quotas under those circumstances in those areas?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the basis was the best optimistic assessment that the department could make in respect to utilization of the Lake Winnipeg fishery. The north end of Lake Winnipeg has held up very well to the quotas that had been in place. The long-term average of fish take is about where we're at right now, as I recall, looking at the volumes that we're taking, as against the historic level. Mind you the department has recommended, and in some instances we have granted enlarged quotas knowing that we believe we're pushing the upper limits of the fishery, but we think that, for example, particularly the whitefish stocks have been greater than I think have been utilized. So we felt it was possible to increase quotas.

Mind you as I say, for example in Grand Rapids that is a commitment for a period of time; we've cautioned that we want to leave the quotas the way they are; it's hard to resist the continual request for increased quota, but we want to hold the quotas that we now have for a period of time so that we can see whether or not the lake will sustain those levels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Are these increases, in every case, supported by sound biological information?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we do follow a biological base. We continue to monitor that biological data by samplings during the course of the commercial seasons and there is no question, but we have to monitor the fish stocks very closely.

MR. B. RANSOM: In these cases, Mr. Chairman, did the staff identify that there was an opportunity to harvest more fish and, therefore, approached the fishermen and said, we've got an extra resource and let's take advantage of it, or was it the other way around that the fishermen came to the Minister, to the Department, and put pressure on to increase the quotas and then that was subsequently done?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it works I guess from both directions. The department had identified that whitefish were in larger supply and it appeared that quota increases were logical; and in addition to that commercial fishing communities, of course, pressed from the other way for increases in quota, and to that extent we have increased the quota in response to the continual request for larger quota. We have admittedly pressed the quota to the point where we think it's as far as we can take it safely. It's one of those things where we are not enthusiastic about going too high but, nevertheless, we feel we can't honestly deny the quota increases we made because we have no biological base for saying that they shouldn't fish to that extent.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I know what kind of pressures that the Minister faces, but I guess when one gets into the position of doing things in the absence of information to indicate otherwise, that one begins to run some risk in doing that, and it would have to certainly be carefully monitored.

The annual report of the department refers to the existing 5-year Cedar Lake Fisheries Management Agreement. Now that, as I recall, was negotiated while I was Minister of Resources. It was done on the basis of having the people that fished Cedar Lake involved in a committee with the department, and they set a criteria ahead of time, as to objectives and measurements, to see whether or not increased quotas could be sustained over a period of time. How is that agreement working out and how was the lake holding up?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking so long before I respond, but there is a fair bit of detail on this. The honourable member is quite correct about the 5-year agreement, it is still in effect, modified somewhat. People in the community, of course, participants in the fishery have changed somewhat. The 5-year agreement provided for a lake quota of 800,000 lbs.; we have increased that to 1 million lbs. Also the 800,000 lbs. was a lake quota as we are endeavouring to do elsewhere in the fishery, emphasizing the individual quota, and we have established individual quotas now, but not everyone has the same quota; it was a compromise arrangement worked with the fishermen based on past fishing experience.

MR. B. RANSOM: How is it working as a mechanism for co-operation between the department and the fishermen? It was considered at the time to be a method of operating which would give the fishermen a considerable degree of input, but not remove the ultimate responsibility from the department. At the time, four or five years ago, feelings were running pretty high in the community at Easterville and, in fact, people in the department were temporarily detained in the village. So I am interested in knowing just how it is working, from a human relations point of view as much as a fisheries management point of view.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the agreement has been of assistance. I have been in Easterville, I'd say two or three times, and there was no suggestion, they never detained me, I think they'd like me to stay longer, but . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: I don't understand that, Al.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . I think they made it clear that I was most welcome and I found the people very cordial, but like other fishing communities they were very very sincerely concerned to have the ultimate that they could by way of quota. It continues to be a concern in every fishing community to get the maximum quota. The Cedar Lake Fishery seems to be holding up very well. However, we have indicated to the community, the fishermen at Easterville that again we're hoping that we can hold the quotas for a long enough period that we can be more certain that we are right to the extent the quota has been set.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister contemplating, in any case, simply transferring the authority, the responsibility for managing the resource, to a community?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I have to say yes, only I'd like to qualify it. During the course of the visits that we had, my colleague, Harry Harapiak was with me, my colleague Jay Cowan, colleague John Bucklaschuk, a number of my colleagues in whose constituencies we have commercial fishermen, attended with me and with Mr. Hayden, Mr. Carter, I made it clear that from my perspective, that the commercial fishing industry will prosper and the people in the industry will be happier if fishermen in their communities have more to say about the administration of the fishery. That is to say, not necessarily setting quotas and seasons, but advising and having greater measure of control as to the allocation of licence quotas, determining who is most qualified to fish and that sort of thing. I really think that we need that kind of a dedicated input in respect to the commercial fishery, because there's no way in which we can have sufficient monitoring by staff if fishermen themselves are not involved in having a good deal of say and a dedicated interest in the fishery themselves.

MR. B. RANSOM: The fisheries resource belongs to all the people of Manitoba and if the Minister turns it over to a particular group of people or a community and gives them the responsibility for managing it, that seems to create a condition whereby the province is

really abrogating its responsibility to all Manitobans to retain the ultimate authority. The Management Agreement, the 5-year Management Agreement seemed to provide the opportunity to have a much greater input at the community level but still retain the ultimate authority and responsibility in the hands of the Minister. After all, when we get together in this committee to talk about the management of the resources, we can still ask the Minister about the responsibility or what's happening to a resource because the Minister still has that responsibility. If he's going to give that up, then I would be concerned about that. The Minister is shaking his head; maybe we'll hear an explanation of that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I didn't make myself very clear. I indicated that where I felt the community could be very effective and really produce an atmosphere of co-operation and dedication to the industry, is where the local community would be very much more involved in the decision as to who fishes. I have had a succession of people tell me that there are fishermen who really, while they hold a licence, they don't fish; they have someone fish on their behalf and some people in the community resent the fact that people hold licences but really other people use them.

I've had fishermen tell me of instances where some fishermen did not fish properly. They had left nets - now, maybe there was an unusual circumstance happen that the net could not be removed - but some fishermen are very concerned about the way in which fishermen generally operate and I think that much more can be done to effectively monitor the industry if fishermen themselves have much more to say about who fishes. That's not to say that I, as a Minister, am wanting to turn over to people who are not elected or unaccountable to the people generally, control of the fishery. I've indicated that so far as seasons, quota, pretty well everything, I can see no delegation of that, but I can see a greater measure of - maybe not complete delegation - assignment of greater input in respect to the community in deciding who fishes.

MR. B. RANSOM: There was a system of allocating fishing licences that was largely handled through the advisory boards, worked I believed on some sort of a point system, one had to qualify, get on the list, move up the list, etc. In the Order for Return which was filed in response to my question, there were quite a number of licences that were issued at Ministerial discretion. Now I've never heard of issuing licences at Ministerial discretion before. They always were done with the advice of an advisory group which seemed to allow the basis for the input that the fishermen were looking for and provided a known set of guidelines. People knew what they had to do in order to be able to qualify for a licence and if they did, then they got to the top of the list and when they became available they got a licence, and that would seem to be fairly consistent with the position that the Minister's just given us.

Now we have a list here of quite a number of licences that were issued by Ministerial discretion. Perhaps the Minister would give us an explanation of just on what basis then he was able to exercise discretion and on what basis he actually exercised it.

HON. A. MACKLING: First of all, the point system is still in being, the advisory committee still assists in

respect to advising as to eligibility and provides for an appeal mechanism from the decision to licence or not licence. In respect to the discretionary licences, let me indicate that there was a fall fishery introduced for Big Black River and Grand Rapids. By and large, those licences went to existing fishermen, this is the people that had fished the summer season. I don't know whether they were listed as licences issued - they probably were - at Ministerial discretion.

In addition to that, we issued 40 new licences on Sturgeon Bay. Sturgeon Bay is northeasterly from Lake St. Martin. At the same time we did that we placed a quota on Lake St. Martin. There had never been a quota on that lake. We believe that a fair number of fish were coming from Sturgeon Bay by way of the commercial fishery on Lake St. Martin. The 40 licences were allocated 10 each to four communities in that area. The licences issued on Mossy Bay were to one fisherman in Norway House, or two? Two in Norway House. No, wait a minute. Warren's Landing it was one or two.

MR. B. RANSOM: Warren's Landing was four.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, pardon me. Mr. Chairman, I don't recall the numbers with precision. We don't have that here, but we opened to the Playgreen Lake fishermen an opportunity to fish Mossy Bay.

MR. B. RANSOM: Was that something that was recommended by staff?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, in our tour of the fishing communities, the fishermen in Playgreen Lake made a strong case for an allocation of the fishery on Lake Winnipeg. They pointed out that Playgreen Lake had become subject to debris, pollution from the two channels that were cut. The fishery had suffered as a result. We felt that they had some reason for concern. They had fished in Mossy Bay prior to the closure of Lake Winnipeg; they had for a long period of time.

When the lake was closed to the commercial fishery because of the mercury contamination, they were allowed to fish Playgreen only. When Lake Winnipeg was opened up they were not allowed to return to Lake Winnipeg. We felt that on the merits there was a basis for some greater flexibility in that fishery on their behalf.

MR. B. RANSOM: Does Ministerial discretion mean then that the Minister made the judgment, that it was not something that was recommended by staff, as such?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I have involved staff in every decision that is made in the department. I don't think that staff were bludgeoned into submission on any change in the fishery.

MR. B. RANSOM: What is meant by Ministerial discretion? That is one thing that the Minister hasn't answered yet.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the provisions of the Act, the buck stops with the Minister, and I have the final decision as to the licensing.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister saying that he ultimately can determine who would get the licence then, irrespective of any point system or recommendation from an advisory committee?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is probably the case, but that isn't how the system works so far as I am concerned. As to who is licensed is determined by the Advisory Committee and application of the point system to the greatest extent possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(e)(1)—pass; 8.(e)(2)—pass; 8.(f)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister wants to indicate to us what's in store for the sports fisherman in the coming year. We note a number of changes to the regulations, regrettably, not always all is clear as perhaps they could be, of course, in most instances, reductions in allowable limits. I would invite the Minister to make some comment with respect to the 1983 sports fishing season that is now upon us.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope our regulations are not unclear. It is true that the allowable catch in some instances has changed, but we did that last year. We reduced the three-day licence limit to half the number. We felt that these were tourists who were here for the fishing experience primarily, the joy of fishing, rather than acquiring a great deal of fish to take home. We still feel that it's reasonable. We have reduced the number of trophy fish that can be taken in Division One, that's the southern part of Manitoba, to one trophy only because of the relative numbers of trophy fish available in southern Manitoba.

One other change in the regulations is that we have effected a regulation that the limit for fishing in High Lake, which is a lake which borders Ontario-Manitoba, is to the Ontario limit, so that anyone fishing there under reciprocity with Ontario, an Ontario resident can fish on our side of the imaginary boundary, and a Manitoban can fish on the imaginary boundary in fishing really in Ontario water, but the lower limit applies. The lower limit happens to be an Ontario limit in that lake.

The only other one that I can recall is the Molson Lake one where we provided that a non-resident, and by a non-resident we mean a non-Canadian resident, is required to employ a guide, a licensed guide, when fishing on Molson Lake. That was introduced; it had been brought forward because of a concern that because of Northern road development, non-Canadian resident fishermen were being unable to get onto that lake which had been a remote lake for decades. We had there a lodge that made a considerable investment and was employing a large number of Native people from the Norway House area. The continuation of employment was considered to be somewhat imperilled by the fact that because of a road system that made access to the lake now possible that we wanted to reduce the number of non-residents of Canada going onto that lake, not necessarily staying in the lodge, but without having a guide.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just dealing with some of these specific changes, I'm just looking at the

Manitoba Sports Fishing Guide 1983. On Page 3 of that little booklet, I assume that is what the Minister just described, having arrived at an agreement with Ontario that the border lakes, the More Lake and High Lake, both situated on the Manitoba-Ontario border, have their walleye and northern pike limits reduced from eight to six. That is to conform with the lower Ontario limit.

I am told that in the past one had to have two licenses. Would it not have been advisable to also indicate that, if you're already making a notation there to indicate, how does the Manitoba fisherman know that he doesn't require an Ontario licence now? Is that posting on the lake or why would it not have been put into the guide? The law minds us of all Manitoba fishermen who, particularly fishermen who have fished these lakes, if they have in the past been required to purchase both the Ontario and the Manitoba fisheries, I see nothing in the guide that tells him that only the Manitoba licence will now suffice.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member makes a good observation. We will post a lake to indicate that.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to acknowledge somebody who is obviously no stranger to the department, I don't think he'll mind me reading him name into the public record, one Mr. G. L. Thompson, 343 Albany Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba, who has had ongoing correspondence with the department, some with the Directors of Fisheries, I suppose some with Mr. Nelson. . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: I just wrote a letter to him today.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and some with the Minister directly, and he has been kind enough to assist me in bringing some of these matters to your attention, Mr. Chairman; such as, another one being the fact that we, of course, are going metric and so the new regulations here all spell out the prescribed sizes and limits of fish in the centimetre form, but then I notice - and you do provide on Page 20 of your Guide a metric conversion chart, to make it a little easier for the fishermen to, particularly our Yankee friends, to convert inches to centimetres, or centimetres to inches. The only trouble is that the allowable size of the fish can, in the one instance, be 60 centimetres or 23.5 inches, but your conversion size only goes to 13 inches. So somewhere you stopped a little short where . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand - and this is new to me - that we provide a paper measuring strip, a glue-back thing that the angler can stick on his boat to measure his trophy.

MR. H. ENNS: Where is this available, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: At our licence outlets. Most of the lodges have them.

MR. H. ENNS: Most of the lodges have them. Mr. Minister, the regulations are getting more complicated and I think it's extremely important that inasmuch as

people can be charged with an offence if they don't fall within the regulations, that whatever information we provide them in this handy Guide be as straightforward and all-inclusive as possible.

Mr. Chairman, one of the areas of concern is restricting the angler to the one trophy fish, and I'm always concerned about just how a regulation of that kind actually works out to the benefit of the conservation of the resource. Knowing frailty of human beings the temptation surely will be to go along and have that size fish on your stringer, the biggest one that you last caught but, should you catch a bigger one before the sun sets, why then that becomes your trophy fish. However, to make sure that you are not in difficulty with the law, when you dock your boat at the dock or run into conservation officers, you release what's left of the other fish.

Now, can the Minister really assure me, or can the department assure me, at least acknowledge the possibility of abuse in this particular case, and have they really thought through their position on this?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I share a common appreciation for human frailty, but I say that fishermen are fun-loving sports people. I think that the majority of our piscatorial friends are receptive to the view that, if you restrain yourself, there will be something for your children to catch another year. I know that, particularly with our lodge operators, and I've talked to the lodge and outfitters on more than one occasion, and they tell me that the Catch and Release Program goes over very well; that the tourists, particularly, appreciate the concern that it's one trophy only, because they want their friends to be able to come back and catch one of these marvellous trophy fish. As a matter of fact, we are promoting, pretty vigorously promoting, the "Go barbless" at some of our lodges, and it's working. When they catch a large fish without a barb it's much easier to release and George Nelson has been enthusiastically promoting that and I think it's going very well.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, the Minister raises a point that data would seem to bear out, that the loss is high in the release program. Without some proper education, and again perhaps without full information in the Guide that the loss ratio can be as high as 90 percent, the fish that are being re-released, you're not really doing the resource that much of a favour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there's a growing understanding in the fishing public about the thrust of the programs. As Mr. Hayden has reminded me, in addition to the program that we have, the lodges and outfitters do promote that program and we have guide training programs where we promote this philosophy of conservation. So that, particularly for our non-resident fishermen, they have surrounding them people who are practising and indicating conservation and the reception for the program has been good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(f)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Director of Sports Fishing, Mr. George Nelson, whom I have a great deal

of respect for, indicated at a recent Manitoba Wildlife Federation meeting that these regulations were being essentially brought into force, or being altered and changed with the downward reduction in terms of the limits, principally for reasons of overfishing; that stocks were being depleted unduly and the fact that the changing in the various sizes or limits or catch really is, in my judgment, questionable in terms of the impact that that has on the overfishing problem. I say that, particularly, and I encourage the Minister to discuss for a moment the problem of enforcement. Enforcement probably has more bearing on the over-fishing problem, particularly in view of continued stories about the very substantial amount of bootlegged fish that is being marketed from our lakes in really very large numbers. I think the department has - and I was trying to look for that press release here earlier on, the statement that the news media picked up - somewhat in excess of 1,130,000 kilograms.

Other less authoritative sources indicate that could be considerably higher; could indeed be as high as 5 to 6 million pounds of fish that are being bootlegged out of our lakes bypassing the recognized marketing sources. I appreciate that a substantial amount of this would fall in the commercial fishing class, but is the Minister really satisfied that kind of activity, and the obviously not sufficient enforcement that's being carried on, impacts to a greater extent on the overall fishing problems? Are we really attacking the problem by reducing limits, changing sizes, all in all, putting more regulations to bear on the legitimate sports angler, and then still not accomplishing what the regulations are to some extent trying to accomplish, that is, to try to resolve the problem of over fishing?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that enforcement is very important. Of course, the department is heavily engaged in that, not only in the commercial, but in the sports fishery. We do get from time to time people who want to take an inordinate amount of fish; they do want to exceed their limits.

In respect to the sports fishery, the trophy size pike, particularly, and trout are considered by the lodgers and outfitters to be essential for them to attract the tourists. They want to have the big lunkers available. So they are very anxious that we not encourage people taking too many large fish out, because the appeal that the lodgers and the outfitters - and I was down in Minneapolis with my colleague, the Honourable Muriel Smith at the Minneapolis Boat Show recently and toured the promotion we had there - it was reinforced heavily with me that the appeal is catch the big one, so they're very concerned about preserving the big fish in the lakes that they have.

I'm advised of the interceptions that our conservation officers make in checking licensed fishermen; 96 percent of sport anglers are within the regulations. There were 20,000 sports anglers checked in 1982. There was only 1 percent that were over their limit, so there is a high degree of respect for the regulations, and that is really commendable on the part of our residents and our tourists. I think most people want the pleasure of the catch and are not concerned to harvest for a great quantity for the table. Part of the concept and part of the utility of the regulation in the one trophy size is

educative in itself, that people then get a clear message that there are only so many trophy fish. The lake is not full of all trophies. There are a lot of smaller ones, too. The emphasis is on in trying to preserve a fair number of the real lunkers for everyone to have a go at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8(f)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling me then and is satisfied that the — (Interjection) —

HON. A. MACKLING: Excuse me. I'm sorry there was one other area.

The Member for Lakeside indicated some concern about illegal fishing and I should have commented on that, Mr. Chairman.

I can only say that there are one or more cases before the courts presently. The honourable member is quite right, they involve a very substantial amount of what we contend to be unauthorized fishing activities or transporting of illegal fish. I can't comment further about that because the matters are before the court.

MR. H. ENNS: A couple of further comments, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is satisfied then that, by and large, particularly the regulations re the trophy fish and the restrictions surrounding them are ones that have been requested and are going to be well received by the outfitters and lodge owners in our Manitoba fisheries?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to raise a number of brief concerns in regard to sport fishing in my area.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just conclude with one or two more questions.

MR. S. ASHTON: Sorry, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think though, nonetheless, having said that, there's always the concern that not undue influence is being exercised by any one particular segment of the sport, of the industry, in this case, the lodge owners. I continue to put on the record the fact that while that may well be the desire, I would hope the department would monitor that program reasonably well in terms of its checking with the lodge owners; the checking of the anglers' catch from time to time with a particular view in mind that how successful this particular regulation is being accepted.

I must commend, and I agree with the Honourable Minister, that the kind of compliance with the rules and regulations by Manitoba sports anglers, sports fishermen, is an enviable one and one that seems to bear out the fact that, as the Minister says, most fishermen do abide by the rules. I think therefore it's all the more incumbent upon us, who from time to

time are charged with responsibility of making the rules, to make them as understandable and as acceptable to the general public as they can be.

You see, Mr. Chairman, just let me throw in a little aside while I'm at it, that's why I can't support the seat belt legislation that this Minister is going to bring in. — (Interjection) — Not so much because I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . have any particular position on the matter, but because I know that I will make 50 percent of my constituents lawbreakers the morning after the law becomes proclaimed. I don't like doing that. Legislators, regulators should do their best not to pass laws and regulations if they know they are going to be broken in any substantial way. In fact, some sociologists say that if there's failure to comply with upwards to 5 or 6 percent of the general public in any given matter you are asking for serious problems in what you're attempting to do.

I would ask the Minister to take that into regard and to continue to listen to the constructive advice that's offered to the department from time to time by people who are obviously knowledgeable in the sport; who are actively engaged in the sport; and to try to keep these regulations to a minimum and to ones that are easily and properly understood and any information that is being supplied by the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(f)(1) - the Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I've been waiting patiently, Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting patiently. I just wanted to raise at the end of the discussion on this item, as I am sure we are reaching the end of that discussion, the concern in my area of the decline in sport fishing in the prime recreational areas that we have in our region. You know, it's still possible to find lakes or rivers where it is possible to catch plenty of sport fish. I don't want to discourage any potential visitors we might have in that regard, we've still got the fishing up there. However, there has been a decline in recreational areas and this was recently highlighted in regard to Paint Lake, our prime recreational area in Thompson. I understand at the recent Wildlife Association meeting representatives of the Minister's department indicated that there has been a major decline in sports fishing in that area because of a decline in sports fish populations.

So I'd just like to briefly ask the Minister to look into this problem, perhaps to look at the aspect of providing greater access in some of these areas. For example, in the Paint Lake area there's the Partridge Crop Lake which offers great fishing potential, but which doesn't really have any access to it at the present time. Perhaps that's one way of looking at it, perhaps there are ways of increasing the fishing populations; either way, as one person who has gone out fishing in some of these areas and not had much luck in recent years, I'd certainly ask the Minister to look into it.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly we are conscious of the fact that there is a great demand on Paint Lake by the people who have cottaging there and fish there. We are quite cognizant of the fact that

there is a need to monitor that closely and we will. We do have a stocking program in lakes in the northeast, I won't elaborate on that. I confirm what the honourable member has indicated, that Partridge Crop Lake in the vicinity may become accessible with the development of forestry roads in the vicinity.

I want to, again, while I have the floor for a moment, Mr. Chairman, confirm to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that his observations are sound in connection with regulation. They must be clear and they must be readily understandable and I think that's one thing that we have to guard against, making it so complex that it is difficult for people to understand the limits and if you can't understand them, how can you follow them. I appreciate his observations there and I think the staff here is hearing that and hearing my confirmation of that concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(f)(1)—pass; 8.(f)(2)—pass; 8.(g)—pass; 8.(h)—pass.

Resolution 123: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,807,100 for Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak: We'll call the committee to order. We're on Education Estimates, No. 6. Universities Grants Commission. 6.(a) Salaries - the Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To begin with, I would like to ask the Minister if she has any current plans for dismantling the Universities Grants Commission and absorbing it into her department as a direct part of her department?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Starting really slow, starting with the slow one, Mr. Chairman.

No, Mr. Chairman, I can quite honestly say that I have absolutely no plans at present, or no thoughts of dissolving or absorbing the Universities Grants Commission into the Department of Education, Post-Secondary Education Branch. I do, though, still say that we will be looking at the role of the Universities Grants Commission, I think as our provinces' Universities Grants Commissions across the country doing so at this present time. I think that's probably all I have to say at this time. No plans. Certainly no designs or intentions or thoughts of rolling it into the department.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm glad to hear the Minister's assurance that she has absolutely no plans to dismantle the Universities Grants Commission and absorb it into her department. I remind her that last year she had absolutely no plans to change the Field Services Branch of her department and things happened very quickly, so I just want to get that on the record and we will follow, with interest, the pursuit of events with respect to universities and the governance and operation, funding, in the future.

The next question I'd like to ask the Minister is, when was the last time that she met with the presidents of the three universities, the three Manitoba universities?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, approximately four to six weeks, I think in that range, as my memory serves me.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm sure that the Minister's memory is accurate and I will accept her response. I then ask, how many times she has met with the Presidents of the three universities formally, I don't mean as guests to the opening of the Legislature or that sort of thing, in her 16-or-so months as Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: As I recall, I think that perhaps the Member for Tuxedo has a letter that spells out exactly, or he might have in his possession, that spells out exactly the number of times and the dates of the meetings because it was a question that came up previously and I think the question was, when had I last met. What I did was send a letter that communicated the exact sequence of events and the numbers of times that I had met. So I would just say that, while I am going from memory and haven't reviewed the letter, I would be guessing in trying to think through which times or which occasions we met. He probably has the more specific, the exact information in front of him.

I would think that it was a few times, that there were about three times.

MR. G. FILMON: Two or three. Would it be safe to say that the Minister meets more regularly with others in the field of education, for instance, the President of the Manitoba Teachers' Society or the Past President of Manitoba Teachers' Society than she does with the presidents of the three universities?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's hard to make a direct comparison because then I'd have to stop and think of what were formal meetings with other organizations. Had I known the member wanted a complete record of all my meetings with organizations, I guess, we could have added them up and given an exact reply. Since he's going after sort of a general point then I'll try and respond in that way. His first question, about how often I meet with the presidents, I took to mean how often do I meet with the three presidents of the universities together, and that is something that happens less frequently because the times when the three are coming together it means we're discussing general issues or trends or sort of general agendas, and there is also meetings with individual presidents, meetings and discussions on the telephone with the individual presidents related to items of concern or interest to them, or particular to their university. So I don't think we can just go by the formal meetings that I have with the three university presidents together.

It changes, there are times when I might meet, I guess, first of all, we can say that the school section of my responsibilities, which is the Educational Support Program portion of it is about four times as large as

is the universities of the post-secondary section. Even by that alone, in terms of the numbers of people, the size of the beast, the complexity, the structure of it, one would assume that it would take more time and more attention, in terms of dealing with all the issues, just because of its size, if no other reason alone, than would the smaller area of the universities.

There are periods where I am meeting more frequently with one organization or another, depending on the time of the year, and depending on the kind of activities, for instance, when we're looking at legislation or something like that, then there might be a high degree of interest. An example would be the sick leave changes that we made last year where there was a lot of interest in the changes and the wording and understanding what we wanted it to say and what it was going to say, and during periods like that you meet more frequently with a group that has an interest in a particular issue.

When the grants are coming out, or just prior to the grants coming out, when decisions are being made on allocation there is a lot of meetings and discussion with school boards and school trustees who are particularly concerned about lobbying, giving information, getting support and making recommendations about changes. So I don't know if it's possible, and I guess the Member for Tuxedo can try to make a point about numbers of meetings in relation to activities, but I would suggest that because of the nature and the complexity of the thing that it's very hard to make a general statement about how often I'm meeting with groups and why.

MR. G. FILMON: Since the Minister has already responded in anticipation of what direction she feels I'm pursuing, I'll accommodate her and pursue that direction and say that there is a perception - and let me state clearly for the record that this is not a perception that has been expressed to me by any of the three presidents of the Manitoba universities - in the academic community that the Minister is less concerned or interested in the university level of education than she is in the public school side of things, not just in proportion to the 3 to 1 or 4 to 1 ratio of financial commitment, but in terms of overall interest and concern, funding aside. Whether the point of the number of meetings makes a case or whether it's just overall, her involvement with the university level of education in this province, I say that point has been made to me, and it's one that I agree with. Whether or not that's a matter of concern, I leave it up to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister whether or not she did any analysis or studies or had any recommendations made to her that caused her to fault the university tuition freeze this year.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm getting a little slow as the evening wears on. I think that there was a recognition everywhere, Mr. Chairman, that we had less money to go around this year and that we were going to have a difficult time, and we did, in being able to fund the universities and the school divisions, in fact, the entire education system to an adequate level where they could maintain programs and staffing. There were some limitations placed on the resources of the province that meant we had less money that had to be shared by

more people and we, in general, had less to go around. So that I think we have to be realistic, and we certainly still want our tuition fees to not preclude people from having access to universities, I think that's a very important issue, but also recognize that there may have to be some tuition fee increase this year, but that it should be a reasonable one.

The time when we were hearing about 20 percent to 25 percent increases, we did not think were sort of acceptable, in terms of the level of increase or the impact on students. But that, under the circumstances, particularly because of the fact that our university tuition fees are one of the lowest in the country, that a reasonable increase of 9.5 percent could be tolerated, and the combination of the 9.2 percent increase that we gave universities this year, plus the offsetting of the health and post-secondary education levy at 1.5, which takes it up to 10.7, an additional 1.7 percent that they received through having access to the Skills Growth Fund, brings them up to 12.4 and a 1 percent increase coming through tuition fees is a reasonable balance, in terms of raising a revenue that doesn't place an undue burden on any individual sector. It gives them an overall increase that is - I've said this before and I continue to use the word - unparalleled by any other province in the country of 13.4 percent.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I make the point with the Minister that last year the tuition freeze was placed on, I believe there was a specific amount of money - and at the present time it escapes me - it was about \$2.3 million I think was set aside, and that extra funding was based on the commitment of the universities not to increase tuition. I said at that time that it was a phony tuition freeze and I repeat it again; I mean phony in the sense of having been based on rational policy. The reason the Minister says - and I'm sure that obviously that has proven to be the case because it has not remained a priority decision of this government - there is less money to go around this year than there was last year. But last year the increase in Estimates of the government were about 19 percent over the previous year. This year they're in the same range 18.5, 19, the same sort of thing, so the amount of additional money that this government is spending this year over last year isn't too dissimilar.

The deficit last year was \$496 million; the projected deficit this year is \$577 million, \$579 million, something like that, so we're still talking a half billion dollar deficit or more. The conditions are not that dissimilar. I believe that last year, as I said and I repeat, the freeze was done out of a political decision to sort of appeal to the kind of thinking that the Minister's colleague, the former president of UMSU, Thomas Thompson, and others. It was taken in a context of attempting to do some instant symbolic gesture towards the universities that would say to students, look, we are your friends. If that is the case, then I assume that this year they can say, look, we're no longer your friends, if that being your friends is or isn't based on whether or not the tuition is frozen.

The Minister made some reference to accessibilities to universities and I say to her, as I said last year, that accessibility is based on an adequate Student Aid Program. I complimented her last year in some changes

to the Student Aid Program, but I wondered out loud whether or not the \$2.3 million that was spent on the tuition freeze, or was allocated for the tuition freeze, could not have been better used in Student Aid, going to those who need it, and I tell her why. Because of the students attending the universities in this province, and I don't have the numbers in front of me, and with a nod or a shake of the head the Minister can indicate if I'm in the right ball park. There may be attending the three universities in the range of 15,000-20,000 students who might be eligible for Student Aid.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: 9,000 getting Student Aid? What were the figures? 20,000 for the . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Maybe 20,000. The number of people who received awards just two years ago - the figure can filled in now - but just two years ago the number of university students who received awards was about 3,100, it may be up as high as 5,000 if there's been a rapid increase. I'm saying that still, something in the range of 1 in 5 received Student Aid, yet the measure, and the concern for accessibility, by virtue of some freeze in tuition, was taken for all 20,000; whereas those who are receiving awards, 1 in 4 or 1 in 5. So obviously it would have been of much greater value to direct those resources toward those who really needed it if there was a concern for accessibility.

So be it, the Minister has changed her position. The freeze has begun to melt; the universities are applying increases not quite in line with what the Minister would have liked them to be, 9.5 was the objective or something like that, the ceiling it's, on average, 10.3 at the U of M and 11.-something at the U of W and so on. Some courses are greater experiencing increases of pushing 20 percent for particular areas of science at the U of W and so on, but leave that all aside. The fact of the matter is that we're going back on what was a policy last year. The only reason we are going back on it is because that policy was based on no information; that policy was based on no firm kind of footing for analysis or for determination that there was a need for a freeze. It was a straight political gesture, as I say, designed to be symbolic and the symbolism has changed this year.

It's not dissimilar to the sort of thing, and I understand that it's a highly political kind of thing, but two years ago the Minister's colleagues, when they were sitting in opposition, screamed about sort of tightening up on Student Aid regulations, the whole process of auditing and of ensuring that those people who need it, get it, and those people who don't need it or don't qualify aren't getting it by some other means. That whole process was something that was very greatly criticized by her colleagues in opposition.

Now with some variations, and we've had that discussion, the Minister is doing something similar a thing in tightening up and ensuring that there's more contributions from the families toward housing costs; that there's more contributions from savings toward this and so on and so forth. The fact of the matter is that we're going back now on the kinds of policy criticisms that were being laid on the former government with respect to Student Aid.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let me express the concern that the long-range picture ought to be looked

at by this government with respect to the universities. Let me say that I had intended to bring forward a Private Members Resolution this year to express that concern. I thought that I could adequately perhaps express the concern to the Minister in Estimates and lay the matter on the table, and say to her that, as much as it is important to review education financing in this province, by virtue of the Nicholls Commission that she has put together, I would say that one of the things that we were considering and, in fact we were searching for the right individual or group of individuals to act as a commission to review the role, function of the universities, because I suggest the role, the function, the financing, the concerns for accessibility, the whole picture, Student Aid, whatever, growth of faculties, expansion of areas, duplication of courses, one university to another, sharing of resources amongst the three universities, the whole broad gammit. It seems to me that it's been a long time since that was done. I believe there was a study done in the Schreyer administration which led to virtually no tangible kind of moves. I think, to a large extent, that study was rejected in a public policy sense. It was done by the former president of McGill I think. I'm trying to recall the name. It doesn't matter.

What I am saying is that there is a need today in the 1980s to look ahead for the next 25 years and say, where are we going, in terms of our public policy development for the universities of this province.

We have three of them. They all have strengths; they all have excellent qualifications and characteristics that they bring to the mix of post-secondary education in this province, but I sense a kind of a drift. I say this, having had discussions with the former Minister of Education, having sat in Cabinet with him and knowing that he had put together the case for this kind of over all commission and we were looking at, as I said, finding the right person or persons to do this.

It goes beyond the mere act of funding; it goes beyond the kind of exercise that is gone through every year, where the universities submit their budgets and say that we can't exist or we're being cut to the bone, we've gone beyond the flesh and this whole thing that goes on. I accept all their arguments and I accept all those things, but there's always been the constant conflicts about internal utilization of resources and whether or not there should be reallocations, whether or not we should be endeavouring to set out our speciality areas. Brandon University has a wonderful School of Music; build on it, don't duplicate it or don't conflict with it by developing further schools of music elsewhere. This university, say, the University of Manitoba, strong in Physical Education and other programs, don't set up two law schools. I'm not suggesting that it's going to be done and so on, but there are overlaps. There are constant kinds of conflicts for the same precious resources and all of those things.

I'm not suggesting that, and because if it's done in the course of decisions that just take the view of one proposal to the Universities Grants Commission, I'd say, then it can tend to be a rather narrow view. Whereas if these decisions are taken in the context of an overall commission that studies the thing that goes throughout the province, that talks to people from all sectors of society, everyone who has an interest and a concern about the universities of our province, if it's done on

that basis, it can be done I believe on a more objective basis with some idea of setting up a master plan and a master view that says where our university is going in the next 25 years; what are we looking at in terms of demographics, in terms of growth of enrolments or decline or whatever; what are we looking at in terms of need for new buildings; need for expansion of certain faculties and on and on. As much as possible, look at it at a time when we're dealing with these things on a non-pressure basis. I say that can only be done on this kind of basis where you're trying to take the long view of it. That will get away from these kind of short-term measures, this snap reaction that says we'll freeze tuitions and the next year we won't freeze tuitions. Another year, well, we'll give them 9 percent because that's all we have; another year it's an election year, we'll give them 15 percent or whatever, whatever, whatever.

That kind of view is not good; that kind of political response is not good. I think it leaves the universities, their staffs, their administration, their supporters, their constituents wondering what do they really have in store for universities. Every time there's a new administration or a new Minister, does this mean that the new Minister is favourable toward us? Does this mean that the new administration is going to give us what we ask for? Does this mean - and so on?

So I say that there's a need to take a very very long-range view of our universities now. It's been a long time I think since we did it, and many things have changed in the university community. I remember when - I'm not that old - we only had one university in this province. The others were colleges and so on. It was a great change to have, first, the University of Winnipeg and then Brandon University.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Did you attend university? Which ones?

MR. G. FILMON: Did I attend university? Yes, I'm an alumnus of the University of Manitoba - to the Member for St. Johns. I'm a Past President of the Alumni Association of the University of Manitoba. I spent seven years, more or less, as a student there. But that doesn't mean that I'm talking to the Minister only on behalf of the University of Manitoba, I hope that I'm taking a broad view and I'm saying to her that a broad view ought to be taken of all the university affairs, concerns, objectives, goals, and whatever, organization, administration, funding, everything, for the future.

So this is as good a time as any for me to go on record as saying that to the Minister, because I'm not going to argue with her on details. That's not because I'm not interested or concerned, but I do my research and I've got tons and tons of clippings. For every comment that the Minister would like to make to me about the universities, I'll give her another comment from somebody else in response and so on. This will go on and on.

I say this to her, that what she has done for the universities this year is respond, and I believe the best way in which she could, according to the resources that Cabinet and her colleagues would allow her. Whether or not that was adequate or is adequate remains to be seen. Right now the universities are our

growth industry in this province; the universities are growing by leaps and bounds in terms of their enrolment. I believe it was up something like 12 percent last year; they're projecting an even greater increase this year. That is a reflection of course of the fact that people cannot find jobs, so they're staying longer in education, longer particularly in post-secondary education, so enrolments are burgeoning.

We have the projected demographics of the '80s before us and we know that there will probably be a continuing growth for a little while. All of these things will have effects on the universities; all of them will cause decisions to be made. I say to her that there's a need for her to withdraw herself in terms of a political response on a year-by-year basis to the universities and give it the long-range, broad view. I commend to her the idea that, as I say, we were pursuing of striking a commission to do this for Manitoba's universities.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Member for Tuxedo for perhaps not getting into the nitty-gritty, as he suggested, not because I don't think he has the material, I'm sure he has. For every quote or statistic that he has, we probably will find one in response. I think the point he was making is that he's not sure at what we accomplished by getting into small detail when what we really have before us are big issues. I appreciate that and I agree with it.

We could go on and I suppose from my point of view, and I think he will understand this, that while I don't want to get into a back and forth debate at this time and I want to address some of the issues that he talked about, I do want to say that - and I think it's important for me to go on record as saying - I believe this government has been very supportive of both our education system, our post-secondary education system and particularly our universities. It's been demonstrated by the fact that we are continuing and recognizing the importance of the role they play, and we're building, we're adding to their equipment in their buildings, we're giving them quite a good shot in the arm to maintain their buildings, to upgrade them. We're giving significant increases in grants; we gave new program money that was the first new program money that had been available for years. I reiterate that giving them access to the Skills Growth Fund, which was unusual for provinces to do, was an indication of how strongly we support them and how important we believe their expansion and there were gives by giving them an additional \$2.5 million through the Skills Growth Fund. Having said that because I felt that there were some points made there that I should respond to, I do want to say that I agree with the Member for Tuxedo when he talks about not going year by year and not making decisions, either by the government or the Universities Grants Commission on programs, expansion and major decisions without really looking at the role and functions of the universities, where they're going, what they're doing, who should do it and how they should do it, because I think those are the major questions. He raised some of them, and we do have to look down the road.

I also agree that I think the Universities Grants Commission is not either set up or does not have the capacity for that long-range examination at this time,

nor was that perceived to be a function of theirs, although they do have some responsibility to do some projections. They clearly are dealing with funding, allocation of money and decisions that are on their plate about expansion of buildings or expansion of programs that they have to deal with. It does not give them the time to look at the big questions, they're there and we have begun to discuss them.

I fully support the notion that he raises and in fact I think that it was one that I communicated to the three university presidents in our first formal discussion about two months after I took office and the point was, that the universities should be centres of excellence; and that they should be unique; and that they all do some things very very well and are set up to do them better than others; and we should be identifying those; they should be doing them; they should not be trying to have everybody do everything and do the same things; and build and copy just because you get a program or just because somebody else has it.

The Brandon University is an excellent music centre and is recognized, I think, certainly beyond Manitoba's borders for that. Of course I think the University of Manitoba clearly sees its unique position and potential as a university that serves the urban centre of the city; that they are doing a lot of thinking about how to serve their unique target populations and people and how to be what they really can be, given the advantage they have of being in the heart of the city.

We have been talking about not duplicating, not overlapping and making very careful decisions about where program expansions will come and who is going to do them. So I think, having both said that and both having recognized that point and both admitted - or I have suggested and I saw some nods from the Member for Tuxedo - that we probably don't have the present capacity now. I think we are looking at having a study on the role and function of the Universities Grants Commission and the universities; and making some important decisions about the universities of the future, who they are and what their role is, both in our education system and our society because they have a much larger role to play than just the education of our children.

But the programs that they undertake, the training and the teaching that they do has a tremendous impact on the quality of life, partly because they are the institutions that have the academic sort of freedom and thought where they should be going beyond the traditions, the norms and the usual; and looking down the road, exploring, researching and defining, that we want them to do those things.

So I appreciate that we both feel strongly about their importance; that we both agree on the importance of looking at the big picture and not getting caught up in all the small detail. I hope that when we are going through our next set of Estimates, if it is you and I or the members of this House, that we will have something more specific to talk about and report to this House on about how we either want to or are able to start dealing with these important questions.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for her remarks on that. I just wanted to say that this whole area of what's adequate and what isn't adequate is like a lot of things, I suppose, open to argument and

open to discussion. As I go through all of my clippings here, amongst all of the various things, the Minister has indicated that I think she gave an increase of 9.2 plus the 1.5 percent, plus some out of the Skills Growth Fund — (Interjection) — 13.4 is the additive, yes, some of which came from the federal Skills Growth Fund, and not all of it was exactly in line with, say, the manner in which the universities were budgeting and I say this because I'm reading from the Winnipeg Sun here, "U of M goads for cuts. University of Manitoba Deans predict they'll have to take drastic steps if the university doesn't receive a requested 18 percent increase in funding from the province. Students could face tuition hikes; teaching and support jobs could be cut, enrollment restricted, if the province sticks to its tight-funding policy. The Dean of Science, Dr. Charles Bigelow, said a 20 percent jump in his faculty's enrollment this year has left the department understaffed and facilities overtaxed. Any cuts would mean teaching science without a laboratory; that's like teaching swimming without a pool, Bigelow said," and so on and so forth.

Dr. Bigelow, I think, is well known to the Minister and some of her colleagues. In fact I guess he's the current President of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba so I suppose he speaks with authority on this. So you have that kind of thing. You have another article in the University Bulletin saying, "18.3 percent needed to maintain university's current activities," and then the Minister says that the universities were satisfied with getting considerably less, 5 or 6 percent less. "University sites battle to keep researchers," is another one. Incidentally, this university, as the Minister well knows - the University of Manitoba - probably on a per capita basis, gets more research funds than any other university in Canada, certainly maybe even North America. It was very high. I recall that in terms of the medical research, when I was President of the Alumni Association. They used to get a great deal of medical research money from all over North America, including from the American Medical Association and so on.

We have standards of excellence that are recognized, recognized throughout this continent, not only by the award for instance that was given to the Brandon University for their BUNTEP Program; not only for the great awards for research that are given to many of our staff, professors and so on at universities, not only U of M, U of W, Brandon and so on, but there are all sorts of indices that will tell you of the excellence of reputation. Yet, as I say, there are always these constant letters and articles and so on. There is one here from the Faculty Association, an open letter to Dr. Naimark about the underfunding of the library. I know these are ongoing problems; these are certain faculties, their accreditation is at risk; this is an ongoing thing. When it happened under our administration there was great hue and cry and great concern on our part, I know, as well as the public's.

I am sure that the Minister has the same concerns which she reads about possible damage to the reputation of the university, or a particular faculty, because what it means is that the reputation of the graduates is at stake. Those people who go out looking for jobs may not be able to find good jobs if they are not recognized as coming from a faculty and a university that turns out an A-1 product. That's why I, as an

engineer, have great concern when the Engineering Faculty is having its accreditation reviewed; that's why dentists, similarly, because they may not then be accepted into graduate studies in one of the large and impressive universities in the United States.

All of these things have an effect, so I say that we're not just dealing with these comments because, as much as I have clipped them from this year, I can bring the Minister the clippings from two years ago when we were in government and there will be other concerns, but these are ongoing. So let's take the opportunity to agree that what we need to do is look forward in a much broader context and the whole thing, the role of how the universities are going to be funded, administered, the role of the UGC, the role of the government, the role of the universities and all those things, let's take the broad view on it.

Mr. Chairman, just one minor question. The decrease in salaries, does that mean that the staff of the university, the overworked staff of the Universities Grants Commission is more overworked now because we have less salaries? Have they agreed to take a reduction in their pay this year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I believe that we have a saving there because we're getting two for the price of one in the form of Dr. Duhamel, we have eliminated one staff year.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, I already expressed my concerns about the excessive workload that Dr. Duhamel has and I know that the Minister will be looking into that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I would like to know the amount of the grant that the Department of Education gave to the Marxist Study Conference at the U of M, it was held in March?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: My recollection, because we are not on that section right now, and have passed that, my recollection is that it was \$3,000.00.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a further question. Were any members of the Department of Education, any of the staff involved in the conference?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have an editorial from the Manitoban, it was dated, Thursday, March 17th. The heading is A New World Order. I am not going to go into the hole editorial. I am just going to read the last paragraph, and I quote, "There is no doubt that the conference was a huge success. Everyone involved should feel a keen sense of accomplishment to helping propel forward a new generation of Marxists, and hopefully, a new world order."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent an area that certainly is not thrilled to have anyone involved in this government help propel forward a new generation of Marxists. I would suggest that probably in the whole of St. James-Assiniboia I doubt if we could find half

a dozen who would be very thrilled that this is where their tax money was heading and this is what their students might be propelled into. I would suggest even the Minister for Natural Resources, the Member for St. James, would probably have the same problem with parents in his area just being a trifle concerned about that kind of funding, and then the hopes coming out of the Manitoban that this would be the results. I really question that the funds used for this kind of a conference under the guides of hospitality grant giving it respectability.

When I go back to the Hansard where the Minister of Economic Development was answering a question. She seemed to feel that it was in the same category as giving a grant to the Association of Gerontology, a national conference, or the Canadian Physiotherapy Association.

Mr. Chairman, my own feeling, and I would suggest that a great majority of Manitobans would not put these in the same category. I would like the Minister to comment on that particular grant please.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I think I would like tell the Member for Kirkfield Park that I gave that grant on the basis of a request from the, if my recollection is, the Faculty of Arts at the University of Manitoba; that we have just spent a lot of time talking about the role and function of the universities and, of course, one of them is to explore ideas. I don't think they're supposed to be sort of closed shop and that the question of academic freedom and the right to explore lots of alternative thinking, is one that we would fight for, one that we would fight to maintain. So that I have a grant request coming from what I consider to be a very legitimate organization and respectable group of people, the Faculty of Arts at the University of Manitoba, and that my recollection is that they brought about 650 people into the city from dozens of countries. My guess is that had the university put an international conference on in bringing that number of people in from so many countries on any other subject, perhaps, that it would have been acclaimed as an achievement in terms of being able to host a major international conference, bring that many people into the city which sort of is a boost to our tourists and also stimulates thought and a variety of thoughts and opinions at the universities which, heaven knows, none of us want to stifle.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the reason it wasn't acclaimed as an achievement is because that is not the sort of conference that the people in Manitoba wish to have their money spent on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)—pass; 6.(b)—pass; 6.(c)—pass.
Resolution No. 58: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$148,594,000 for Education, Universities Grants Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: They're just wishing me luck.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(a) - the Minister's Salary - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks before the department ends, and I also want to make it worth the Minister's while so that she doesn't feel bad about not being able to go to British Columbia to celebrate the victory of the Barrett forces. We'll celebrate them here tonight. — (Interjection) — Yes, I have, right here.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks. I wasn't present for the Earl Grey demonstration this evening. I don't know whether the critic for the Conservative Party was present at that rally or spoke to them, but he should have some interest in their particular plight. I just wanted to point out that the whole school question in Winnipeg south is all interrelated, and that the responsibility of the Member for Tuxedo is also somewhat involved or he should have some interest in the outcome of that particular complicated set of circumstances.

I want to point out though, in particular, that the closing of the Junior High Program at Earl Grey is causing a great deal of concern in the area and that people are saying, for example, Olive Reimer, who is the Council President, that people in the area are extremely distressed and she went so far as to say at one point, "We pay large school taxes but maybe not for long. No school, no taxes." That was one of her particular comments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to note that there is an amount of money that could be put into this program that might in fact save that school. I notice, for example, that the Member of Parliament, Mr. Axworthy, has indicated an interest in that particular question. I note that, for example, the division administrators project - and I'm talking now about today's Free Press - according to the Free Press report they project \$139,500 a year can be saved by eliminating three teaching positions and a school administrator's position and sending the 125 or so Earl Grey Junior High Students to Churchill and Grant Park Junior-Senior Highs which are up to three kilometers from home, that's a quote from the Free Press. So they are claiming, Mr. Chairman, that \$139,000 could, in effect, save that school.

Also, I note that in terms of Robert H. Smith that there is a structural problem there and according to another article in the Free Press and this is again a quote from one of the citizen members, a person named Debbie Riley, who is an Osler parent spokesman, and I believe that William Osler is in the Tuxedo Legislature, and she said that the boards whole reorganization proposal would, "Fall like a house of cards if the province doesn't spend \$600,000 fixing up Robert H. Smith . . ." Then this quote goes funny, Mr. Chairman, I'll just read it as it is because it's some typographical confusion here. The figure quoted was \$600,000 to fix up Robert H. Smith School and . . . I raise these points, Mr. Chairman, because I think it demonstrates and underlines how regardless of whether the Winnipeg School Division should provide these funds, or whether or not the province should get involved, or whether or not Mr. Axworthy can spring some funds free somehow or wave a wand, regardless of that, it is a relatively small amount of money that could make a big difference in two public schools in Winnipeg south. In one case \$139,000 on an ongoing basis; in the other case a one shot \$600,000 grant.

I also want to mention that I was very surprised that, first of all, we have had not comment at all, have had

no comment I don't think since this whole affair started from the Member for Tuxedo, nor have we had any comment from the Member for Roblin-Russell about the fact that there are some serious school cuts being contemplated or implemented right now in his division, talk of eliminating Industrial Arts and Home Economics classes in Grades 9-12, eliminating Music in Grades 1-7, cutbacks in sports, cutbacks in the teaching staff from 83 down to 73, for a total projected saving of \$200,000 this year and \$500,000 next year.

Mr. Chairman, in my own constituency there are some cutbacks in Glenelm School, which is a local elementary school; violin programs being eliminated for some 30-odd students; nurses' visits being eliminated - not eliminated but reduced from a half day a week to a half day every couple of weeks; gym equipment that isn't forthcoming that is needed; and a staff reduction which means that instead of having a small number of students in particular classes, a much higher ratio will be in effect.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I mention these particular incidents and, at the same time, compliment the Minister on her Small Schools Program which, I think, really is a progressive step and a very good and carefully thought-out program to save some of these schools, rather than see them turn into other functions or be lost forever in the inner core or the older part of Winnipeg. The reason that I mention this, in particular, is that I don't see any concern being expressed by any member of the Conservative Party for the deterioration and for the brunt that is being felt by certain schools throughout the province.

Now the Minister has come up with money on a couple of occasions this year and if it hadn't been for one of her last major policy thrusts and some money behind it, there would have, of course, been greater stresses and strains yet, but she has come up with some money and but for a few hundred thousand dollars here and a hundred thousand dollars there, etc., etc., more schools could have been saved and more programs could have been saved. I don't hear anything here, coming from the members opposite, about this. I tried the other day to point out that there was a \$3.3 million amount that is in our budget that is being transferred out and given to private and parochial schools that seemed to make no impression whatsoever on the Member for Tuxedo. He doesn't seem to appreciate what that amount of money could do in the public school system; he doesn't seem to appreciate what that amount of money, a portion of that money, could do in his own area, in his own section of Winnipeg, or in the sections represented by some of his colleagues in the backbenches.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is somewhat shocking. In my own case, I have gone to bat a couple of times for schools. In the Elmwood area I have worked with the parents; I have talked to people in the area; I have done whatever I could to help them save a couple of schools and I give you, as an example, one victory that we had which was at George V which was a structural problem, a couple of hundred thousand dollars; the parents fought that all the way and they successfully got the money, they successfully kept that school open and that school is prospering. If that school had been closed down it would have had a severe adverse effect upon the area and upon the children and it would have

had a terrific social impact in the sense it would have meant that people didn't move into that particular area because they wouldn't have had the neighbourhood schools; they would have gone elsewhere. In the case of Sir Sam Steele School that was a losing proposition. That school was eventually lost because of declining enrolments but it is a chicken and an egg situation.

So I want to make these particular points, and I also want to indicate that a couple of the arguments given by the Member for Fort Garry the other day, I think, were pretty weak and I think his arithmetic was somewhat lacking. For example, the Member for Tuxedo, first of all, did not seem to be concerned about the fact that \$3.3 million was being, in effect, transferred out of the public school budget. He then argued that the addition for an influx of private and parochial school students into the public school system would cost so much.

How would he get that figure? He took the number of students, divided it into the total budget and came up with some average figure. But I have to tell him, and he should know very well, that when you have a system in place and you add increments, the addition of each increment is not equal to the average. If a person is producing motor cars in Detroit, the first one you take off the assembly line might cost a couple of million, the second one might cost \$800,000 and on and on until you hit your full production stride and the price comes down to \$10,000 or \$12,000 each.

It does not cost the kind of money, the order of financing, that the honourable member said to add 8,000 or 9,000 students to the public school system. I simply say, as well, that I discussed this matter with a constituent of mine and I think he made a very valid point. He said, "Look, this is an average guy, but a good-thinking, clear-thinking person." He said something along these lines, he said, "Look, we have a good public school system, some of the schools are half empty." He said, "What we should do is," and I use his words here, he said, "let the private and parochial school students come in; we'll save money and we'll keep these schools going."

So I don't think people, like myself, who believe in the worth of the public school system, are afraid of an influx of people who would come from private and parochial schools. What we are afraid of, and what I am afraid of, is financing a private system, putting more money into a private system and the possibility of that escalating and the possibility of that eventually weakening the public system.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say that I find it passing strange that there is little or no evidence that the Conservatives are concerned about the plight of certain particular schools in the public school system - some of them in their own Ridings - and yet seem to be obsessed with the notion of improving and building a private, rival system. I think their concern would be better directed at improving and building the public school system. That is their responsibility and that should be their concern.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Elmwood must have a pool on as to when he believes

the Estimates are going to finish this evening because I can think of no other reason for the contribution that he's just made.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I do think that some of the points he has raised ought to be addressed because I think he fails to understand the issue and he certainly doesn't seem to understand what role and responsibility the Minister of Education has, and what role and responsibility school boards have, and what role and responsibility MLAs have. If individual MLAs are going to make decisions as to whether or not schools ought to be kept open in their areas then, I believe, that we will have chaos. Certainly if the MLAs are as ill-informed as the Member for Elmwood and I tell him, he says that I have not gone to bat publicly urging the opening or closing or repair or renovation or whatever of schools in my area and that is because I understand what the role and responsibility is of the school boards that we have set up in our democratic system of government. I say to him that he may not understand how that works, but the Member for Burrows has repeated over and over again, as Chairman of the committee, that with authority must come responsibility, hand in hand. If you give the authority to the school boards to make those decisions, to take those studies, to strike the committees, to ask for public input to do all of the things and then say to them, that's fine, you can do that but you can't make the decision. That's what you're saying, that's exactly what you're saying. I tell you that, fortunately, even most members in your government understand the rights, roles and responsibilities of the other levels of government.

The Minister of Urban Affairs, I could ask him, as the Member for Elmwood has asked me and others on our side if we're not concerned with certain moves that are being made by school boards in our area. I could ask why the Minister of Urban Affairs, who is also the Member for Seven Oaks, why he's not coming and making pronouncements in front of the public about his concerns for the fact that in his area the school board this year is decreasing its professional staff by 12, in the light of an increase of enrolment of about 150 students in that division. Certain courses are being cut and so on and so forth.

I know why the Minister for Urban Affairs isn't speaking out on that and isn't criticizing his local school board for their decision, because he understands what responsibility and authority they have to make those decisions — (Interjection) — Well, that may be another matter. My colleague from Sturgeon Creek says that the Minister of Urban Affairs unfortunately tries to duplicate and second guess the decisions of the city council from time to time, but that's a different matter and I know that.

I believe that the Minister, at least, wishes to give local school boards the authority that they have and are entitled to under our legislation in this province, and I believe that she would be reluctant to countermand decisions of local school boards. Certainly not based on the urging and the intervention of one member of the Legislature, whether it be on this side or that side, I believe that the Minister has better sense than to do that.

The Minister has her own problems with local school boards and their perception of whether or not she's overstepping her authority and intervening with them.

I have a copy of a letter here which she received not too long ago from the Beautiful Plains School Division No. 31, in which it says:

"The trustees of Beautiful Plains School Division were appalled and disappointed to learn that the School Division's 1982 Budget, including worksheets and supportive material with salary information of all division employees, was transmitted to the Manitoba Teachers' Society. This information has now found its way back to the local teachers' association. You may be sure it will be put to good use during the next round of salary negotiations.

"This action, Madam Minister, begs a full explanation from you and the assurance that such indiscriminate use of school division reports will not be repeated."

So the Minister has her own problems in dealing with local school boards, she doesn't have to get in and starting arguing with them about decisions that they are making within the realm of their authority and responsibility under The Public Schools Act. That's why members on this side have not been speaking out and arguing publicly with decisions taken by the local school boards.

We have been encouraging our constituents to go to the people who are responsible for those decisions, to deal with them in a fair and rational and open basis, to make their views known, to appear before school boards, to submit briefs, to do things in a democratic process; not to get an MLA to lobby and to intervene with the Minister of Education.

MR. R. DOERN: Were you in Public Utilities today when the Member for Lakeside was arguing on behalf of a constituent?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, it's one thing to argue on the behalf of a constituent for something that is within the purview and authority of a particular area that comes under the Provincial Government, and something that comes under Autopac comes under this Legislature. A decision with respect to the renovation or closing of a school in a certain school division comes under that school board, not under this Legislature. The Member for Elmwood still doesn't understand and there's no point in my carrying this further. I have, after all, a responsibility to deal with the Minister because it's her salary, it's not the Member for Elmwood's.

I won't respond to his comments again about the matter of public aid to private and parochial schools. There is ample information in Hansard from the evening in which we had our debate and discussion, and I say that he demonstrates again that he doesn't understand the financial implications and/or the comparisons that I was making between the \$3.5 million being spent on private and parochial schools versus the \$677 million being spent of taxpayers' money on the public schools in this province. He doesn't understand the kinds of financial ramifications that would occur and I know why. He has not had the background in business, he has not had the opportunity to deal in finances and perhaps he finds it difficult, but the kinds of figures that he is bandying about are meaningless in my view.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the Minister, in looking at her department for this year and the things that she has done and the things that she has not done.

Those sins and errors of commission and omission are ones that, I think, should be put on the record, at least from my perspective, and as we go through the major items that we touched on, and I recall the discussion and the answers that the Minister gave, I say that there are some overall fundamental issues that, I believe, the Minister stands to be criticized for.

One of them is that despite putting on a good front that I don't think very much of importance that's new from a policy standpoint, from a priority standpoint, I don't think that a very much new and different or of great importance to the delivery of education in this province is occurring. It's "little puffs of powder, little dabs of paint, trying to make the department look like something it ain't." That is, it's not breaking new ground, developing into some sort of new approach to education in any areas.

Starting on that kind of discussion is the first and foremost cornerstone of all of this. We were told last year, I believe, and fairly forcefully by the Minister, that she believed that we needed a whole new system of education finance in this province, that what was in place was just unacceptable and we've backed off on that now. We are modifying it now to the point that she is now talking about at least some initial changes prior to the next Budget year. Well, that's not a whole new education finance system for the province.

We spent a lot of time and hired a person who I believe is well qualified to do this kind of analysis and study. All of the hearings and meetings have taken place, and all of the submissions made and we were promised by this Minister, a new education financing system in this province for the next Budget year I believe because the Education Support Program completes as of this year. It's the third year and there was to have been the new approach in place. It appears now, perhaps I am wrong, the Minister can correct me, that she is now just talking about some minor changes which is a different view than we were given last year.

So what is, and what seemed to be are two different things. I believe that many of the loudly-hailed announcements of major change in the department, the so-called reorganization are largely cosmetic. When we look at what is being done with respect to the increase of the Native education section to branch status, there are no more people involved, they're not doing anything differently than they were before, that to me is a symbolic change, but not one of substance.

As we go through the whole thing, page by page, section by section, the changes that were loudly trumpeted in terms of reorganization of the department are cosmetic at best.

We are not looking at the department undertaking any new initiatives, any new thrusts that are of any import as far as I can see. We're doing a little reorganization of staff, taking them from here to there and I am talking about the change from field services to regional services and on and on. Yet, they turn up doing very much the same as they always were with really very little more in the way of staff. I am concerned that all of those loudly hailed and trumpeted changes that were being made are really not changes in substance in the department.

I believe that the Minister has not been able to enunciate clearly what the philosophy and objectives of her department are. What is this New Democratic

Government's belief as the priority and the future delivery of education in the province, or the major thrusts. They are obscured. They're obscured by a great deal of rhetoric.

I compliment the Minister on her speaking ability. The Minister has given me, to be brief, in her words, has given me a great deal of information on the record. In many cases it was not directed at the questions that I was asking, but that's okay. The Minister chose to give me some rhetoric about the things that she believes her department is doing, and should do and will do. But, the objectives and the philosophy are rather obscure. I'm finding it difficult to wade through them to the essence and to the direction.

There seems to be implicit in some of the moves a desire to put up a good front. Certainly the raising to branch status of the Communications Section, the hiring of a number of people to churn out the news releases and the publicity and the material to make the department look good and make the case as well as it can that we are doing many great and wonderful things in education in this province, is really, I think, a very key indicator of just where the priorities are. The priorities are in looking good.

Just as today we learned I understand that it's been confirmed that the government's doing a major thrust to change the logo of the Province of Manitoba. We hired somebody to redesign the logo and so. Well, we're just trying to do all of the cosmetic changes. We're looking at simply the paint and the finish and like Main Street Manitoba, spruce up, fix up, but nothing of substance behind it. I am concerned that that's a big priority, to make the department or the government look good by hiring communications experts, apple polishers for the Minister, I think the President of the MGEA called them a year or so ago or a little while ago when he heard about the Wepler Report.

I am concerned that it is probably the major initiative of this Minister's department in the past year. We talked about a variety of different things that were done, as I say more for their symbolism than for their real substance. One was the phony tuition freeze last year for the universities, a freeze which melted this year because it was based on really no strong firm groundwork in terms of logic, reason or rationale. That's indicative of so many of the things that have been done in respect to education under this Minister.

The whole area of the reorganization of the department holds some serious concerns for me, ones that I shared with the Minister during the course of our discussions here. One of them was the fact that we have had a major major change in the faces and the people in the senior positions in her department. In 16 short months, we've had 16 of the 32 senior people, from director on up changed. That has to be of concern, I am sure to the senior civil servants in her department. That can't do a great deal for morale particularly when half of those changes are people brought in from outside the department. Regardless of their background and qualifications, that has to be a signal for those who are in the department and have been there as loyal, faithful civil servants for a great deal of time. That has to be of concern and I lay that on the record as I did earlier with the Minister.

I am concerned that in the reorganization it has been done in such a way that it concentrates far too much

power in the hands of the Deputy Minister and Minister per se. The fact, that 10 different sections report in to the Deputy Minister and through him to the Minister says to me that there's going to be a bottleneck in decision-making, it says to me that it's not going to be a good administrative structure, but it serves the purpose of ensuring that everything is right under the Minister's thumb. If that's a purpose that is an objective of the Minister's, so be it, but I signal a danger in that kind of administrative organization.

The other area that we talked about that remains a major concern is the continued and increasing dependence on the property tax funding of public education in this province. I said that last year despite the promises of the New Democrats when they were in opposition to relieve the property tax burden on taxpayers throughout this province, we have seen a continued and increasing dependence in their first two years of government.

I made the point because it is fundamental to understanding what's happening that last year some \$37.4 million was added to the property tax rolls of the province, something in the range of 11 to 12 mills. This year some \$29 million was added to the property tax rolls of the province to fund public school education, something in the range of 8 to 9 mills right across the board throughout the province and that is evidence that the New Democratic Government is not doing what it said it was going to do which was to ease the property taxpayer.

Some areas have been hit a great deal more, I'm sure that the Minister should be very concerned and probably is that ratepayers in Winnipeg School Division have been amongst the hardest hit. I think it was my colleague from St. Norbert who made the point that in their very first year of office this New Democratic Government saw the increase in property taxes in their first year of government be double what it was in our whole four years of government in Winnipeg School Division No. 1. That's an astounding figure and one that, every time I tell it to people, shakes them. They go out and compare their property tax slips for the years '77-81 and then 1982 and they see what we mean. That kind of increasing dependence on the property taxes will, obviously, come back to haunt this government and this Minister.

As I reviewed all of these various items that I had made note of as we went through the Estimates, it occurred to me that some comparative kinds of analyses could be made of the things that have been said by the New Democratic Party and this Minister in respect to all the wonderful things that they will do and have done for education in this province. It occurred to me that as I sort of reviewed history a bit and looked at two terms of New Democratic Government in the '70s, interspersed with Conservative Governments before and after and then another New Democratic Government following, that there weren't too many things that happened in the two terms of New Democratic Government with respect to education that one could point to as having been a significant development and so, therefore, I guess that it's not unusual that I don't anticipate or see signs of any significant developments taking place under this administration with respect to education.

Conservative Governments, for instance, were in power when a number of significant things happened.

The establishment in 1958-59 of the non-unitary school divisions, the first time children had the right to go to high school in their own school divisions. A new grant system was established under that administration that would pay a minimum of 50 percent of the cost of education under the Foundation Grant System. In 1967 the building of another new grant system, the building of comprehensive secondary schools throughout the province. The establishment of the community colleges system, again under our administration in '77-81 and it takes a great deal of work, it takes a great deal of research and development and co-ordination to come up with a better mousetrap, so to speak, a better way to fund education, get it back on track and have less of it come out of the property tax rolls of the province and so on and a great deal of work went into it before it finally was established. The Education Support Program saw greater equalization on a province-wide basis through the Education Support Levy, making sure that all divisions participated in and benefited from commercial-industrial real estate throughout the province, not just where it was concentrated, not just those divisions were given the benefit of the commercial-industrial assessment in their areas.

The complete review of The Public Schools Act that was undertaken, finally, finally coming to a clean decision on the relationship with private schools and that was an area that the Member for Elmwood gave the history of, a litany of different quarrels and arguments that took place within his government and they were never able to resolve that issue. They were split with some high profile people including their Premier on one side and the majority of them on the other side and they could not rationalize or deal with that problem. But we did and I think it's significant there is a clean and understandable relationship for public funding for private schools and it's there because we wrestled with and solved the problem.

Here we're back into the syndrome that we were in in the '70s and I referred, at that time, to the study that was done in post-secondary education in this province - a study which produced very limited results, quite honestly, and we're back to that syndrome of studying and reviewing and all that sort of thing. I realize that I just asked for another commission earlier this evening but it depends on what we're looking at and what we expect to come from it and I believe that if properly structured with the proper mandate and if they're not set up as perfunctory exercises then, just ones of saying, look, we're open; we're asking you all to give us your views. I say with all due respect that even the Nicholls Commission, with some of the briefs that were made to it, were made more for a cosmetic purpose. They were people who had contacted the department or the Minister with a problem and they were asked to come before the Nicholls Commission to make a brief. The problem had nothing to do with education financing in some cases in this province, and as a forum, I'm not sure what purpose it will have in solving the problem that was brought forward; but it could have, in my view, just as easily been handled by a direct communication to the Minister, studied by her department, and a decision made, but it was drawn out into the public saying here's another brief we had. We had 436 briefs and all these people got a chance to have their say. The point is, are you really going to

do something for them? Are you really going to come up with some answers that are going to be worthwhile, or are you just saying to them, come and give us your briefs, and now look at what we've done; we've been so open.

I said that about the Minister's news release that told about how she was going throughout the province to listen to the people, hear the grass growing and get an indication of what people were thinking about education; except that when she went out into certain areas, people who had a gripe or a beef on a particular issue couldn't get to see the Minister. It was only certain people who were allowed to see the Minister when she went around. These were people that maybe the Minister had reasons for avoiding, but if you're going to advertise that you're going out and soliciting views and you're going out to listen to the people, listen to the ones you don't want to hear at the same time as those. Don't just listen to those who are telling you what you want to hear. I probably said this before; you learn more from those who disagree with you than those who agree with you, because you already know what they think.

It seems to me though that we're in this kind of syndrome where we - there was the old story about people being placed in a position of awe of the ruler. The emperor, he had such power over his servants and his people, the serfs out there, that he could do no wrong in their eyes, and they couldn't see any of his faults or weaknesses. They were blinded by it. So the emperor was trotted through the streets, and everybody said, oh, the emperor, isn't he wonderful, isn't he beautiful, and all that; and some little child finally said, the emperor has no clothes. Of course, none of the adults who were in awe of him would dare to say that the emperor was out stark naked. I'm not suggesting that of the Minister, but somebody's going to say at some point in time, the emperor has no clothes. We're not getting anything out of all of this wonderful listening and communication. We're not getting anywhere; nothing's different. What are we accomplishing? That's what I'm saying.

The great concern I have is that all of these special little grants that allow the situation to develop where the school boards get a certain amount of funding as a result of the broad system, the Education Support Program, and then we can hold off with that extra little bit out of the kitty and zap we come out and we give them a little more when they weren't expecting it, and they say, isn't that wonderful; we didn't have to raise our property taxes. It would have gone up by 1.5 mills or 2 mills or whatever, and everybody comes out with a complimentary statement to the Minister. That can only go so far.

I say that those special grants, although they may overcome an inequity and I'm prepared to live with them, the new system that the Minister is coming out with had better be one that doesn't require little extra special grants along the way, because I don't believe that they are good from the standpoint of people not knowing how they qualify for them, what the criteria are, and all those things. If they're sound, then they ought to be built into the program to overcome the inequities in the program, but they shouldn't be outside the program.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I say that we've had a very lengthy review of the Minister's Estimates again

this year. More lengthy than I had expected, but as you gather information during the course of a year, it seems a shame not to use that information. We on our side, of course, have the opportunity to talk with our constituents and to have them bring their concerns to us. We clip newspaper articles and we clip other missives from other people, and we receive letters and we receive concerns and complaints, and so on and so forth. This is our opportunity to have them dealt with or at least answered.

I thank the Minister for her courtesy in dealing with us. I would hope, having gone through a rather thorough and gruelling process, that there will have been some use to it and some good come out of it. I just at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, am prepared to pass the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 53 - the Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief and short. First of all, I would like to congratulate our Minister of Education for the wonderful handling of her department and also for the staff from the Education Department.

One thing I would like to also mention is that I was a little surprised concerning my colleague from Elmwood, because for instance being a preacher myself, consciously, I will be unable to criticize my colleagues who are preachers. He, being a teacher, and he's coming with a different point of view. Mind you, he is entitled to express his opinion, but I would like to put on the record that I am not from the same kind of source with the same kind of a point of view as he has. I am for private and parochial schools; I was. For me it doesn't make any difference, Mr. Chairman, from what source, from what site we will get education.

Department of Education is the most important one in our society. This is the most important one because we are just preparing children. It means a new generation for a future, and this is the most important, this is our investment. Even if we'll be talking, I think, from the financial point of view, we have the most expenditures with the Health Department. We are dealing with sick people in that field, but education, this is most important. For me, it doesn't make any difference, for instance, if I will have a private school for driving licences, or will be a government, whatever, as long as this pupil will be prepared for his profession, whatever he is starting.

Also I would like to mention that I don't agree with the The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park when she was talking about marxists. This is far far away of it. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure you and the rest of the members, who are not marxists, no way. — (Interjection) — Well, wait a minute, if you would like to know marxists, how do you find out? From a cloud? You have to talk, you have to meet those people, you have to read about it. Isn't it? What is the other way to find about any kind of ideology, it might be marxists, leninists, capitalists or fascists, whatever? You have to find out. — (Interjection) — Don't tell me that. Well, listen, you can deliver a baby, you know . . . I am awfully sorry.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I've read enough about it.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Well, you heard about it, that's good.

So, Mr. Chairman, in closing my few remarks concerning the Department of Education, again I would like to congratulate our Minister of Education, not because she is my constituent, but because she is doing a good job; also the other persons, who are in the gallery down there, who are helping her from the Department of Education.

With those remarks, I would like to close this.
Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 53: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,381,700 for Education, Departmental Administrative Support Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1984—pass.
Committee rise.