



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PUBLIC UTILITIES
and
NATURAL RESOURCES**

42 Elizabeth II

*Chairperson
Mr. Marcel Laurendeau
Constituency of St. Norbert*



VOL. XLII No. 14 - 9 a.m., THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1993

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Cliff	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	Rossmere	
<i>Vacant</i>	Rupertsland	
<i>Vacant</i>	The Maples	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES
Thursday, July 22, 1993

TIME — 9 a.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON — Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert)

ATTENDANCE - 9 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Ducharme, Enns,
Gilleshammer, Praznik

Mrs. Dacquay, Ms. Gray, Messrs.
Laurendeau, Penner, Ms. Wowchuk

APPEARING:

Marianne Cerilli, MLA for Radisson

WITNESSES:

Laird Crawford, Private Citizen

Gayle Stilkowski, Private Citizen

Jack McMahan, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSION:

Jorma J. Hannila, Inco Limited

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 41—The Provincial Parks and
Consequential Amendments Act

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Would the committee please come to order. When the committee last met, it was hearing public presentations on Bill 41, The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act. The committee today will continue to hear public presentations.

Before we get underway, I would like to inform committee members that the committee has received additional written submissions, and these have been distributed to the committee members.

At this time, I have before me an updated list of persons' names registered to speak to Bill 41. For the committee's benefit, a copy of the list has been distributed to each member. If there is anyone else in the audience who is not registered to speak on Bill 41 and would like to do so, please let the staff at

the back of the room know, and they will add your name to the list.

I would now like to call on Doreen Ander, Alex Spinak, Ronald Down, Roy Vickery, Willie Freund, Frank Reimer, Sheri Reimer, Doreen Kessler, Gary Swaffer, Alan Black, Brigitte Hebert, Carol Stevens, John Buchanan, Ron Hayes, Fern Pitre, Charles Norman, Laird Crawford.

You have a written presentation, I believe, Mr. Crawford. You can go right ahead.

Mr. Laird Crawford (Private Citizen): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Laird Crawford. I am from Pine Falls, Manitoba. I am pleased to be able to present this to you.

Having read the new act, it is clear to me that the government recognizes the fact that the word "park" can mean many things to many people. They have acted on that realization and have endeavoured to provide a true sharing of the many values that are embodied among people and the land in our province.

For those of us who spend our entire lives in resource-based rural communities, it is gratifying to know that this act considers us to be part of the overall environmental equation. This is in keeping with the position of the World Commission on Environment and Development, which stated: "The environment does not exist as a sphere separate from human actions, ambitions and needs, . . ." and further, "The environment is where we all live; and development is what we all do in attempting to improve our lot."

As people who are close to the land and depend upon its continued health for our own well-being, we want to ensure that we live and work under the best possible environmental and economic conditions by applying sound principles of sustainability to all our efforts. By so doing, we are confident that those who follow us in future will have at least the same or better quality of life that we have been so fortunate to experience.

The new act will provide for numerous designations of potential parklands. Where communities have been established that depend on resource extraction and do so by approved methods that do not significantly alter the environment, then land so utilized should be properly designated as multiuse. This would provide the preservation ethic to the human factor in our shared environment, while simultaneously sustaining renewable resources that ultimately benefit all Manitobans.

In my family's three generations in this area, there has never, to our knowledge, been a shortage of visitors to the region, with many returning again and again for the enjoyment of the forests, lakes and rivers. In all this time, we too have enjoyed those same esthetic experiences in our own back yard, while utilizing the renewable forestry resource to support not only ourselves but many other Manitobans who depend on our newsprint mill for a significant part of their income.

I am pleased to be allowed the opportunity to share my views with the committee, and I sincerely hope that Bill 41 will live up to its potential for providing something for everyone. There are many legitimate needs from numerous interest groups, and I believe that this act will address all but the most radical demands for pure and total preservation at all costs.

Thank you.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you, Mr. Crawford.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Crawford, just a word of appreciation for coming to join us on this fine morning.

Mr. Crawford: Thank you.

Mr. Enns: Your first sentence in your brief really put it altogether. That is what the department and that is what the committee is having to face, a very new, and in my judgment, restrictive definition of the word "park" that has developed in our system of how we look at things.

I tend to share it, and I have tried to reflect perhaps a more traditional or at least a more Manitoba way of defining the word park, but it has been evident to committee members and certainly to myself that that is being seriously challenged. I thank you for bringing that to our attention. That is what we are going to have to try to determine as we

make these deliberations in the next few days. Thank you.

Mr. Crawford: Thank you, Harry. One thing I would say, too, is that I feel that from what I have noticed in the papers and other places, other media areas, it seems to me that some environmental concerns are degenerating into a fundamentalist attitude, and that is not going to serve anybody well because that is too narrow a focus. Thank you.

Mr. Enns: Thank you.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Crawford.

Kevin Allan, Susan Bosecke, Harvey Ander, J. Weldon, S. Jenks, Charles Watts, Edna Leeper, Lawrence Ogrodnick, Gene Hrabarchuk, Clifford and Muriel Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. George Leeper, Adrienne Hrabarchuk, Larry and Joan Dick, Tom Crowhurst, Dwight Lysak, J. E. Atkins, Doug Fahlgren, Glen Ridings, Beth Ridings, Laura Reeves, Gayle Stilkowski. Do you have a written—

Mr. Gayle Stilkowski (Private Citizen): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would just like to make a short oral statement.

Mr. Chalrperson: Go right ahead then, Mr. Stilkowski.

Mr. Stilkowski: As an individual, I would like to state my position on Bill 41 which is to the affirmative. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Stilkowski. I think that was the shortest one yet.

Lorrie Hutton, Mr. and Mrs. Louis LaFontaine, George Harbottle, David Shefford, Stan Martin, Peter Marchenski, M. Reid, Barry Christie, Ida Grant, Barbara McLeod and Tim Williams, Michael S. E. Dickens, Susan Lorden, Walter and Lesia Whyte, Frank Rogowy, Leo and Pat Langlors, Terence A. Kane, Arnold Watts, Ray Mackie, Jim Campbell, Chris Christensen, Alex Pylypowich, Garry Halstead, Maureen Monczka, Don and Judy Parkinson, Eleanor Douglas, Ken Dunsmore, Nancy Lamb, Adam Sus, Marguerite Smith, Dan Taylor, Lionel Vincent, Shelley Chetyrbuk, Dave Belza, Archie Cinq-Mars, F. Ellis, Armand and Florence Dupas, Dave Low, Ken Lesosky, Roman Osadchuk, Gordon McIlroy, Bev and Harvey Richardson, Dave Fetter, Angie Fetter, George Scham, Arthur Kvern, Lorraine Kvern, Wayne Neily, Edward and Donna-Mae Burgener, George Holland, Stuart Jansson, Cherry White, Eileen Marvin, John Kith, Ross Framingham, Wes

Wasylnuk, Diane Wasylnuk, George Harris, S. Olbrecht, Chris Olbrecht, J. Garth Guttormson, Lea Scott, Denis Pereux, Marten Toews, Elaine Pinnell.

We have one new presenter from this morning. He is registered. Mr. Jack McMahon. Mr. McMahon, do you have a written presentation?

* (0910)

Mr. Jack McMahon (Private Citizen): No, I am just going to give a short little verbal blast. I am a lot owner, and I paid a premium for my lot which was on Crown patent land. Why I paid that premium on the lot was because there was no taxes assessed to it. Now you come along and you assess a fee.

I get absolutely no services. I have to go in by boat. I do not understand it. I do not understand what you are trying to pull at all. This land was actually handed to the people that subdivided it by the king of England, so you are going against monarchy and everything else. You know, you are opening up a whole new can of worms. I am against that portion of it. That is all I have to say. I am just against the service fee in principle.

Mr. Enns: I do not take it lightly when I am being charged first thing on a nice morning that I am doing something against my sovereign to whom I have sworn dutiful allegiance.

I want you to understand this, sir, and I will just take a half a minute with you. There is nothing that is being attempted to be pulled off here, something like that. There is a genuine disagreement or a belief, as there can always be a different level of opinion, but the majority of persons living on private lands within the confines of a park do in fact receive some level or form of service from the general public at large for which we believe a reasonable service fee is legitimate.

I would be more than pleased to look at your specific case if you say you are not accessible, you access your property by boat, that you really and truly cannot be availed in any sense by a service. Even in that sense service is not necessarily restricted to the immediate ploughing of one's road—and if one does not have a road you obviously cannot do that for you—or the picking up of one's garbage or the provisions of warm water.

It is the cost to government, it is the cost to the public at large or the general ambience of creating a major provincial park that makes that area an attractive area for you to cottage in. Is it fair or

unfair for you to make some contribution to the maintenance of that setting? I think that is the kind of debate I suppose that we could get into, but it is not viewed, the action that is being contemplated, as some draconian way of impinging on your property rights. There is an onus on government to try to create some degree of fairness in the system.

I appreciate that there is a difference between the lease holder cottaging on leased land and cottaging on patent private land, but the one thing that you share in common and the one thing that the public shares in common with you and pays for is the ambience of a provincial park that we give time and thought to, and we employ people to try to operate and run the business of provincial parks. We have some three and a half million acres of land in that category of parks.

We have heard throughout these hearings how important these parks are to people of Manitoba and some even more. I am assuming you are within the boundaries of one of these parks, you are enjoying the environment that we try to create in these parks. I want you to take my word for it that I am asking my people to enter into very serious negotiations with the association representing private landowners to in fact determine a real and legitimate, not in any way a punitive, fee structure that reflects that.

I have heard from enough of your colleagues who are in a similar situation saying that they in fact have never resisted the concept that a reasonable contribution, if you like, or fee to the general park structures of Manitoba is in order and one that they have never denied paying. What we have quarreled about is the method and the way in which the relationship between the Parks Branch and the private landowner has been allowed to perhaps deteriorate. I accept my responsibility. I do not pardon the actions of my branch.

I am disturbed when I hear some of the individual stories about what I have described earlier as an obvious, just a petty hostility towards the private landowner within this system, and I will do my very best to change those attitudes.

That is my response to you this morning, but you twigged me, sir, when you reminded me of my allegiance to my sovereign, sir. I happen to be a monarchist.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much, Mr. McMahon. Did you wish to comment?

Mr. McMahon: No, that will be fine. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: As this completes the public presentation, did the committee wish to proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of the bill? [agreed]

Does the minister responsible for the bill have an opening statement?

Mr. Enns: Yes, Mr. Chair, members of the committee. I really want to express my personal appreciation to the presenters who have made their views known, some in very forceful fashion and coming to this bill from virtually all angles. I want to indicate to honourable members of the committee that I appreciated their participation in the hearings that we have just concluded.

When we were drafting this piece of legislation we were acutely aware in the department that we could have either made a decision that would have made this bill into a rather attractive bill to certain members of our community, and I think members of the committee, particularly my opposition colleagues on this committee, would agree with me.

It was perhaps best summed up by one of the last presenters last night from the Sierra Club, and we heard it from different members of the committee, too. I am speaking of those who have this very specific definition of the word "park" and what ought to and ought not to take place in the word park.

It is abundantly clear to me that if the government were prepared to drop two words out of the bill, delete two words from various portions of the bill, this could well be viewed in the circle of those park watchers who believe that the role of parks is to preserve and to protect our wilderness areas, if any references and deletion to the words economic development were to be deleted from the bill before you, if indeed the government had chosen to delete and take head on the question of resource extraction that is currently taking place within our park system and would have even on the basis of some phasing-out period, which has been recommended certainly by the member for Swan River and/or others, that this bill would have found much greater acceptance in the views and the minds of those persons who look to Parks as having that specific responsibility that was reasonably clearly enunciated by Mr. Hendrik Herfst this morning on CBC Radio as I came in this

morning from the farm. I appreciate that point of view.

If I would reflect that attitude in this act, I suspect that there would have been greater acceptability of this legislation. However, that was a decision that government had to face and was not prepared to take.

What for me privately is interesting, and I was pleased that I had the senior staff people with me throughout these hearings, was that there was another element that came to fore in the discussions. That was prompted perhaps, again articulated very clearly by the member for River Heights, Mrs. Sharon Carstairs, late last night as the hearings drew to an end, under questioning that she made to I believe the representatives of the Sierra Club. That, you see, is what quite frankly I believe that my department and this government will have to tackle.

* (0920)

There was a suggestion, and it was prompted and prodded by Mrs. Carstairs, and it was alluded to by other presenters that we, the government, should accept the definition of parks as it is now being presented to us. Parks is and has the sole responsibility of maintaining an undisturbed wilderness area, the responsibility of ensuring biodiversity in all its forms. Even recreation, human recreation, cottaging, other forms of recreation, are merely incidental to the purpose of parks. Of course, there ought to be absolutely no concern for any continued commercial activity, resource extraction, be it mining, logging, something like that within the park system.

There was a suggestion, again under Mrs. Carstairs's prodding, that perhaps it is time and perhaps there is an acceptability out there that we could redraw parks' boundaries to reflect that, particularly if we could come up with a situation where there would be no net gain, that we would add new territories.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

I know that the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) has specific territories, Bell River gorge, Roaring River, other places that she has mentioned that could be and should be added to this protected list as we perhaps depark, if you like, some of those areas which, quite frankly, the government and this department have no intention of taking out of the

realm of continued responsible and managed resource extraction that has taken place for the last hundred years.

For the first time, I have the opinion that had this minister, had this government, presumed that on our own, we would have been covered with a ton of it. Buckets of it would have descended on us from all quarters for daring to suggest any revision of park districts or park boundaries. However, I am a great believer of the usefulness of these hearings. We have had reasonably responsible environmentalists, quote, unquote, tell us that we should redraw the parks boundaries.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Nobody got upset when Mrs. Carstairs suggested, well, maybe we should take big chunks of the existing parks out of the park system. Not to put words in her mouth, she also said that we should replace it with other pieces of land or equipment or more pieces of land that more suitably fitted the definition that Mr. Herfst and other people put on the word park, that my friends from the cottaging industry have trouble accepting, and quite frankly I have trouble accepting, but I am prepared to acknowledge that things change.

I suppose my learning English was not my mother language to me either and my first learning of the English language and the first time I learned of the word park, it meant a quarter acre of land, a two-foot shallow swimming pool just off Alexander Avenue, because I am an inner-core city child. I grew up between Higgins, Logan and Pacific Avenues and got all my schooling in that area. That was my definition of the word park.

I later expanded that to believe a park meant enjoying a lovely weekend at a cottage site at Brereton Lake or perhaps enjoying a golf game at Riding Mountain National Park.

All of these activities are really just barely tolerated in the new lexicon of the word park, and I appreciate that. Maybe we will have to change things.

Mr. Chairperson, I know you have offered me the opportunity of making these opening remarks. I would be prepared to hear some similar discussion from other members of this committee, but it is my intention to ask the committee to rise, because we have received some advice with respect to changes to the act. I think we have been working diligently as a committee. My staff officials have not had the opportunity to review with myself,

mainly because we have been in committee all this time, any potential changes that perhaps Mr. Pannell or others have made to this committee.

I do not want to suggest that I want to telegraph fundamental changes to the bill, but there were suggestions made to us that even just some looking at specific wording and how they were placed in the act—of course, it is open to the opposition members to draft or consider some amendments to the bill.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairperson, following the opportunity of opposition members to make some similar-like statements on the general nature of the bill, that this committee then rise at the call of the Chair to be reconvened for clause-by-clause consideration.

Mr. Chairperson: For clarification, Mr. Minister, are you saying recess for a period of time or rise until this evening?

Mr. Enns: We are tentatively scheduled for this evening. That would be suitable to me if it is suitable to members of the opposition. That would give us the day to look at the amendments.

I quite frankly need the time, and I need to give my officials time to look seriously at some of the proposed—if you will recall, there were some very specific amendments recommended to us, and I have not had the chance to sit down with my officials to take a hard look at them.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Does the critic for the official opposition party have an opening statement?

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I was going to make a committee change, but I guess if the committee is going to rise and we are not going to be doing amendments right now that we will set that committee change aside for now.

I would like to make an opening statement, but I want to agree with the minister that it is a good idea to have the committee rise because we have some amendments that we want to bring in, but certainly because we have been sitting in committee so long we have not had a chance to get them ready.

We have spent many hours listening to presenters and, certainly, those presenters have been very divided. There have been those who support the bill but also who have indicated that they could continue to operate under the old act.

There is no great rush to get this bill passed. They could continue operating under the previous bill.

We have also had many presenters who are opposed to the changes that are being made and people who have suggested that if this act is not clarified more and there is not clearer definition, that it will lead to more confrontation and make it more difficult for those people who extract resources from within park boundaries, whether it be in the logging industry or in the mining industry. The way this bill is presented now, it could lead to more confrontation, and that causes some concern.

I think that there is also a concern about the definition of parks, of various parks, and I think that we have to have some clearer definitions of them, some clarification. As the minister mentioned, there have been suggestions made. We would like more time to look at those. Perhaps the minister, when he looks at these recommendations, he has not indicated but perhaps he may even be bringing in some of his own amendments.

* (0930)

We will be bringing in amendments, looking at them, but as the bill is right now, I feel that it is going to cause many serious concerns for people. I believe, as was suggested last night, that perhaps this bill should be set aside. The department should take more time to do consultation. We heard last night that people talked about the round of consultation, that the area on parks which is causing the most concern within this bill, the books that were out and the discussions that were out, people did not have very much time for input.

The other area of concern which we heard the most presentations on was the parklands owners. We also heard presentations on various suggestions on how this could be handled, but certainly people who own private land within the parks are not happy with this. They talked about the service fee program that was negotiated earlier, in earlier years by the previous government but was not acted on.

In reality, I think that this should go back to the drawing board. We will see what the amendments do to it and take more time for consultation and try to avoid the confrontation that could arise out of the bill from those people who are involved in the various industries and with those people who would like to see parks stay, as the minister said, in their natural state.

Now I know that in saying that I am sure that there is going to be many people who are saying that I am opposed to logging in the parks and that by asking for this bill to be delayed that I am hampering those people within the logging industry. I want to put very clearly on the record that I recognize the importance of the logging industry in this province, particularly in the Swan River area and in the Lac du Bonnet area. It is very important for the economy of our province, as is the mining industry. But we have to, if there are concerns about this bill, then we should take the time and do proper consultation and look at how we can improve this bill so that those people who work in the logging industry and extract resources from the parks areas can do some long-range planning.

When I talk to people who are in this industry, there is concern that they will be faced with more confrontation. I think that people who are on both sides of the issue should have the opportunity to sit down, and I realize full well that there are people within the environmental groups who would like to see all logging banned from those parks areas. Those of us who live in those areas recognize how important it is to the economy and that we cannot just ban logging. Again, I refer to the Duck Mountain provincial forest area, provincial park, we cannot completely ban it without affecting the economy, and I certainly do not want to see that happen.

So, Mr. Chairperson, with those comments, I think that I will defer to my colleague who also has a few comments, and I believe the Liberal Party probably has a few comments. Then we will take the time to look at our amendments and come back to discuss it a little later.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Wowchuk. At this time, does the critic for the second opposition party have an opening statement?

Mr. Enns: Excuse me, I just do not like the way you are running the meeting, and I have never laid back from telling you that. This is not a formal thing. Any committee member, including my colleague the member for Rhineland or anybody else that wishes to make a comment, I am seeking some advice of the committee as to how we should proceed from here prior to adjourning for a while because of some amendments. Also, I would ask you to get off your formalized high horse and run this as though you were the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for that advice, Mr. Minister. But as I am the Chairperson I have recognized the honourable member, the critic for the second opposition party, and I will give Ms. Cerilli a chance, and I will give Mr. Penner an opportunity as well. Thank you for that advice.

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): We are certainly quite prepared to have this committee rise, and we would look forward to any amendments in this particular bill which might be of a positive nature. So we will wait until this evening to see what they may be.

As I am sure the minister is aware by the comments from my Leader in the House in regard to this bill, we have two main concerns with Bill 41. One, obviously, has been very well discussed in the hearings over the last couple of days, particularly from a number of cottage owners, and that, of course, is the taxing of the land. Obviously, no one, I do not believe, and I think some of the owners who spoke as well said they do not have difficulties with paying their rightful taxes, but there seems to be a lot of conflict and miscommunication in regard to exactly what should occur.

I believe that one of the presentations—Mr. Mayer actually presented some, what seemed to be, agreed information on behalf of the cottage owners and the department. I would hope that the minister and his staff would continue to look at something that would be a mutually agreeable solution for the owners and for the department.

Secondly, obviously, there is a big discussion, a huge controversy, as to the fact that the minister of the Crown in this bill has absolute authority to determine the usage of land within park areas, and the questions becomes, what do we want to see our parks as, and do we want to see them as multiuse? Certainly people who are concerned about preservation of parks would say no. On the other hand, there is certainly recognition that we have had mining and logging in park areas for a long period of time. So the question becomes how does the minister and his government take some leadership, work with the various interest groups and determine what is reasonable in regard to what our provincial parks should be.

I would suggest that that has not occurred and certainly is not reflected in Bill 41, so we do look forward to any amendments that the minister will bring forth. However, I do not have a lot of faith that the spirit and intent of this particular bill will be

substantially changed by the amendments brought forth this evening. I certainly can always hope, and I hope that I am wrong and that, in fact, there are some major changes.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Chairperson, I really want to let the minister know that I appreciate his asking for the committee to rise, and I think that will go a long way in having—some of the members of the community that made presentations regained some faith in this process. I know that a number of people were quite concerned that they were going to go through with their presentation, and it really was not going to be considered. I think that a lot of people have spent a lot of time, a number of the presenters are quite knowledgeable, and it is wise that we are going to take some time for all of us to have a chance to digest what has been said and make some recommendations.

So I will look forward to seeing the recommendations that the minister comes forward with, because unfortunately the presenters, particularly on the question of resource extraction in parks are quite far apart, quite distant from having any kind of an agreement, and that is a big concern to me. It is a concern that there has not been a lot of attempts before this bill to bring these different bodies together. When I listen to members from industry say that they want less protection in wilderness areas, I am very concerned about that and that they do not want, in some cases, any protection for any lands from resource extraction, any lands to be set aside.

I think that we have a long way to go in moving towards the kind of park system that is going to truly protect the biodiversity in our province and ensure that in years to come we are going to have the commitments lived up to that we have said we want to commit to. I am concerned that we have not learned anything from the past when I look at the lack of foresight it seems that the current parks system was developed, where we have had concentration of area allocated for resource extraction and park concentrated in certain areas of the province.

I think we have to realize that if we are going to be serious about protecting biodiversity and endangered spaces and critical habitat that that at some point is going to have to come first, and we have to get away from the idea that we can simply have certain areas of the province that are left over

and designate those as protected. Those are the kinds of things that I think will need a great deal of research. I am quite concerned that this legislation is going in a way because of the way that it places a heavy emphasis on maintaining legally resource allocation in all parts of the province and partially because of the weak protection for wilderness areas that this is not a balanced bill.

* (0940)

I think one of the other things that has become clear from the bill is that even members from listening to presentations, as members of industry want to have at least a clear indication of what the parameters and rules are. I think that in the lack of definition of terms and the amount of interpretation that is going to be left up to various governments under the bill, that in a way this bill is just continuing to delay a lot of the difficult decisions that are going to need to be made.

I think that it would be reasonable at this stage in our development to simply expect that there would be more leadership in bringing people together to consider all these questions beforehand, and that goes both for the cottagers as well as other users of provincial parks. I think when we have heard that overwhelmingly the public is concerned about consumptive use of lands and parks that we have to start looking more seriously at how we are going to deal with this in a way that is going to reflect public interest.

I think that in some ways the way that this bill has been presented is quite crass, and although we have heard from the minister that there is an interest in sustainable development and moving to protect areas, I do not believe that the way that the purpose of parks has been outlined in this bill is going to move in that direction. It is unfortunate that Manitoba is going to not only have The Wildlife Act, but now this bill which is going to be so biased towards economic development.

So with that, I would conclude my comments, but I will look forward to seeing the amendments that the minister has.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Cerilli. Are there any other committee members that wish to put their statements on the record? If

not, thank you very much. I believe we will adjourn, and we will meet again at seven o'clock.

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 9:44 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

**Presentation to Public Hearings to Review Bill 41
The Provincial Parks and Consequential
Amendments Act**

By:

Jorma J. Hannila
Manager

Inco Exploration and Technical Services Inc.

Inco Limited, Manitoba Division, is a significant contributor to the economy of Manitoba in general and to Thompson in particular. Inco currently employs approximately 2,000 workers in Thompson to provide nickel for the world markets.

The discovery of the world-class nickel deposits in the Thompson area was made possible through the efforts of a large mining company willing to invest large sums of money with the hope of discovering an economic mineral deposit. The Manitoba government played an important part in the discovery by providing the following: 1) stable investment climate, 2) a fair and equitable taxation system, 3) most importantly, access to highly prospective land for mineral exploration.

Inco Limited considers it vital to have and maintain continued access to these areas with high mineral potential so that new deposits can be found, and the mining industry in Manitoba will remain a strong part of the provincial economy. This can best be accomplished by designating all provincial parks with high mineral potential as multiuse. The spirit of Bill 41, in keeping with the principles of sustainable development, suggests that the legitimate aims of all the stakeholders can, indeed, be realized. Inco Limited also supports the planned public consultation prior to implementing the regulations and system plan as set out in paragraphs 6(1) and 9(1).

In addition to these brief comments, Inco Limited fully endorses the views set forth in the presentation by the Mining Association of Manitoba.