

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** At this time I would like to apologize to all members of the Legislative Assembly for the Orders of the Day for today, which have not as yet been completed. Due to the exuberance of various members of the Chamber, there are numerous Orders for Return on the Notices for the coming Thursday, and as soon as that is printed it will be distributed in the Chamber.

I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery members of an adult education ' where we have nine group from Portage la Prairie. These people are accompanied by Mr. Roland Marcoux, and they come from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

We also have 20 members of an adult education group from Gimli. These people are under the direction and accompanied by Mrs. Pritchard.

We also have 40 students of Grade 8 standing from the Alexander Ross School. These students are under the direction of Miss Ann Stadnyk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the Minister of Labour.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table the Department of Cooperative Development Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1977.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland),** on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. James, introduced Bill No. 10, An Act respecting The Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation of Canada.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Now that we are a few days beyond the end of the last fiscal year, may I ask the Minister of Finance if he is in a position to provide a summary or documentation to show the extent to which the \$100 million of Capital Supply in Schedule B has been expended or committed by way of contractual obligation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition if he is referring to 1977-78 supply?

Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to give an up-to-date summary in the presentation of the Budget with regard to both the current and capital of 1977-78 although, as the Leader of the Opposition recognizes, the normal cut-off for the books for the last fiscal year was April 20th, and we won't have a complete picture of the financial affairs of 1977-78 until after that date.

I will, however, in the presentation of the Budget attempt to give an up-dating and to come as close as possible as to where we think we are at the present time.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the significance of April 20th, I recognize that the formal closing of books is said to take place on or about April 20th. But, Sir, my question is: Given the fact that with respect to current account there are adjustments of revenues forthcoming from Ottawa even as late as one and two years later — I am not asking about current account, I am asking specifically as regard to Schedule B of Capital Supply — whether, as at the end of the fiscal year, March 31, 1978, we could have a simple statement in the course of the next few days showing the amount actually expended and disbursed, the amount actually committed by way of contract and the

amount unexpended and uncommitted.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there will be a statement very shortly and we can provide some actual figures. By way of advance information, I would indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that the Capital Expenditures during 1977-78 will not be very much different from those which were indicated in the November statement that was produced after the government took office.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Task Force and ask him if he would favor members of the House with the detailed information that he alleges was available to the Task Force in coming to the conclusion that the Province was facing a \$400 million deficit for this current fiscal year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the information is contained within Volume I of the report and the Honourable Member is in a position to read that information. He will determine, I think or he will find that the Task Force came to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis, not of the Departmental Estimates but on the basis of the rise of last year which was the lowest in the last four years in accepting that or the capital requirements suggested for the fiscal year of 1978-79, that there would have been a \$400 million deficit.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, either I would ask the Minister to give me the page reference or to admit that there is no detailed breakdown of that \$400 million figment of his imagination.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Members opposite are not going to be prepared to acknowledge or admit that the Government of Manitoba would face a \$400 million deficit because that would be a reflection on their planning. It is not a figment of imagination, Mr. Speaker, it is the application of the previous year's rise in Estimates, together with the capital expenditures that were forecast. That is how the \$400 million was established. It was not the average of the last four years. The average of the last four years would have been a 22 percent increase based on the figures that are stated in the Task Force. Whether the honourable members want to accept it or not, the prospects for the people of Manitoba, in addition to the \$225 million was another \$400 million.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has admitted that there is no basis for the figure except his own imagination and an extrapolation which he has applied, is he still prepared to put the Task Force and all its members on record of saying that they are aware of the fact that there would be a \$400 million deficit for this coming year, and does that then mean that he is adding that possibly to moneys that the Minister of Finance brought out of his memory of \$300 million which related to unreviewed, unadjusted budgets supplied by all the different departments?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns if he would have read the report, would have realized that the Task Force. . . Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find the page for the honourable member if I can. I don't think there is an obligation, but I think it's very necessary because I think it's important. Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the Honourable Member to Page 26 of the Volume I of the Task Force Report. Mr. Speaker, expenditures showed actual increases between 1973-74, 1976-77 of 19.5 percent, 22.1 percent, 22.2 percent and 13.3 percent respectively. Applying the 13.3 percent which was the lowest and not the average, and adding to it the current capital requirements that were forecast, the deficit position would have been \$400 million.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have a question for the Minister without Portfolio and for the Task Force. In view of the statements made by officials responsible for organizations that will be affected by this report such as the School for the Deaf, major Winnipeg school boards, universities, the City of Winnipeg, that they were never at any time consulted by members of the Task Force, is the Minister now prepared to table or to issue the background papers, data, figures, whatever it may be, that would justify the kind of recommendations that were made in the report that affects these groups specifically?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that the Task Force Report has been tabled and the working papers are not part of the information to be supplied to the Legislature. I have also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of sources of information, including the program auditors' reports.

With respect to the particular question of the School for the Deaf, because there has been some misunderstanding of the actual portion which is contained on Page 80, may I say that it refers strictly to the question of cost reduction through contracting out of services in the areas of maintenance and food.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister for the Task Force — as long as he is Minister for the Task Force — indicate whether he and his staff, whoever they may be, will make some effort to contact or consult with the officials of these organizations who will be affected by the recommendations to determine to what degree their reaction is and what their concerns are and whether in fact the peculiar mental perambulations of his Task Force officers are in any way accurate or conform to the truth?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, the Task Force recommendations are recommendations to the First Minister and the Cabinet and they will act accordingly with respect to it.

The information supplied were supplies from sources that we feel are correct. I want to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, that in no way did the Task Force take note of or consider the program authorized by the Liberal Party in the last election.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, the weakness of the report reflects that omission in judgment. But I would simply ask a further supplementary to the Minister and that is, does he now or will he now provide any opportunity for those groups whose organizations are affected by these recommendations, to make in any way their representations known or provide in any way that members of this Legislature would have an opportunity to meet with them in formal session, through a committee, to determine whether in fact their calculation and assessment, that their findings in the report are concurrent with those of his internal Task Force teams who we can neither talk to nor find out what information they used?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, I would assume that one of the responsibilities of a member of the Legislature is to communicate with any interest group that have any particular information to supply to the Legislature. And I would think that the honourable member who has both the time and the energy and has in the past demonstrated that he's prepared to do that, will do that again. I think that that information can be communicated to the Legislature.

I think again that it should be pointed out, for the record, that the information that's supplied by way of recommendations are recommendations to be acted on by the government; that they are conclusions that were based on information and facts that were presented. They were based on an overview and insight into a number of programs. There is not necessarily going to be acceptance by everyone of those conclusions and there will be some debate, and that debate, Mr. Speaker, is healthy. And if any information is to be communicated it can be communicated to the government through the various Ministers and certainly can be communicated to this House through the honourable members opposite and through the members who sit on this side.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. On Page 15 of the Task Force Report it indicates that there were three causes for the deficit: government growth, the slowdown of the economy, and indexation of income taxes which reduced revenue. Will the Provincial Government therefore press the Federal Government to terminate the indexation of income taxes so that government attempts to get a balanced budget will be shared equally by the rich, as well as by the poor and middle-income people of Manitoba who are having their services cut.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I gather from the news comment that the Federal Government will be announcing, the day after tomorrow, the date of its Budget, which I presume is to be tabled very shortly. It is doubtful that we will have any significant influence on what is contained in the Federal Budget.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** What is the position of the government of Manitoba regarding indexation of income taxes?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, that topic will have adequate ventilation when it comes time for the budget here.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. At the last Finance Ministers' meeting, did the Minister of Finance ask the Federal Government to terminate indexation of income taxes?

**MR. CRAIK:** I don't recall that being a specific recommendation, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health. Is the issuing of these buttons in respect to dental care now going to be the policy in respect to the cutbacks and cessation of support for Denticare Program, and the abandonment of the people in training as dental assistants?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No, Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to draw that kind of a conclusion from this gesture. The buttons are offered to members of the Legislature by the Manitoba Dental Association simply to emphasize the importance of good dental health, and the effect that it has on one's mental, emotional, psychological and spiritual well-being.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Further to my question of March 28 dealing with one Julius Koteles in which the honourable member accepted as notice, my question to the Attorney-General is whether or not he has been correctly reported as considering the probe of allegations pertaining to a break-in of Mr. Koteles' office, involving the RCMP, and an investigation thereof as had been reported in the Toronto Globe and Mail of March 24 of this year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I am not yet in a position to reply to that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister reporting for the MDC. Was the Minister advised, prior to the sale of the M.S. Lord Selkirk, that the boat was worth \$350,000 for scrap value?

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

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, in checking around with several people before the sale of the boat, I was informed that it was worth less than that, Mr. Speaker, for salvage.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister inform the House of whom he enquired as to the scrap value, and what was the figure given to him?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, in talking to different people I understand that the value that was quoted was around the sale price of the boat.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the fact that his Deputy has returned from holidays, I believe, will he now be able to give us a report on the condominium development in the Whiteshell which he had instructed his Deputy Minister to sign?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I will be making that report shortly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**Tuesday, April 4, 1978**

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour please explain to the Legislative Assembly why she continues to exempt both Hooker Chemicals and Simplot Chemicals of Brandon from the provisions of the Power Engineers Act, which in effect circumvents the intentions of the Act to maintain high standards of safety?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, the two companies that have been mentioned have been operating for the past ten years in an illegal way and all we have done is stopped the harassment so they can continue to operate.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the men are having an ongoing process of education in both the companies. There are a number of them that have written their exams the week of March 20th, and they will be having the results of their exams this week.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary. I wonder if the Minister appreciates and whether she can advise the House whether she appreciates that the standards that are now set down under the regulation of the Power Engineers Act have been established after a considerable amount of study by a group representing both management and the power engineers themselves. So that they have attempted through this recommendation, as embodied in the Act, to provide the highest possible safety standards that we should have or that we can have in the Province of Manitoba. Is she understanding of that, and is she not therefore desirous of maintaining and securing this better standard of safety?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not only desirous of having the safety standards at the two companies in question, so are the two companies. I would like to tell the Honourable Member for Brandon East that there are some 20 engineers at Simplot and there are something around 16 professional engineers in Hooker. So I think they are working under quite safe conditions.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for her opinion on what is supposed to be safe conditions and what is supposed to be the required or desired professional level of competence.

I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if she is going to establish, as referred to by the — I believe it is — Power Engineers Act, is she intending to establish the Advisory Committee that is referred to in this Act, which can advise the Minister of safety standards and can provide a body of competence which may not be existing now within the personnel of her own department?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, the Power Engineers Advisory Group had disbanded last year. I have sent letters out to people getting an input into re-forming a new one and they have all received their letters and we have some of them ready now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable lady since she alleges harassment on the part of person or persons unknown, I would like to ask the honourable lady if she is prepared to provide a report to this House to specify and particularize as to what was the nature of the harassment and by whom? It can't be left there.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I would say the number of infractions that have just taken place since August — that would be the form of a harassment. For the past eight years the former government never saw fit to take any action in that respect.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, since the honourable lady's answer seems to imply — but I must say imply — that there was a pattern of inspection and attempted enforcement which cannot be justified, all the more reason, Sir, to ask the Honourable Minister if she is prepared to cause a report to be prepared and tabled which is more specific as to the nature of this harassment and as to who was perpetrating this harassment?

The implication of the answer leaves it so vague as to imply that officers of the Crown, the Department of Labour were, on their own volition, without cause, without having any complaints to follow up, merely making excessive inspection and enforcement efforts. And that, Sir, simply cannot be allowed to stand there.

I ask the Honourable Minister, then, if she is prepared to cause a report to be prepared and tabled which will particularize what she is implying?

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe if the Leader of the Opposition will look in the Annual Report, he will see the number of infractions that have been handed out.

**MR. SCHREYER:** The Annual Report, Sir, of the Department of Labour may well list the number of infractions or alleged infractions. But, Mr. Speaker, that in no way constitutes harassment, necessarily.

My question is: Is the Minister of Labour now meaning to say that a listing of inspections and convictions constitutes harassment per se?

**Tuesday, April 4, 1978**

I would ask the Minister of Labour if she is wanting to leave the impression in this House that violations and convictions constitute harassment, necessarily?

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

**MR. A.R.(Pete) ADAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Tourism. I would ask him if he can advise the House if architects have already been contracted by the developer for the building of the condominiums in the Whiteshell?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm or deny that. If the gentleman is referring to a report that appeared in Sanford Evans, let me tell the gentleman that we have spoken to the people at Sanford Evans. I understand they received their information for that particular thing that they put in their paper from the newspapers. So, that's where they got their information. So I'm not aware of anything else happening.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In view of the fact that this company by the name of Jarmoc J.A. Project Management Limited is apparently not listed with the Companies Branch as being a company incorporated in Manitoba and is therefore illegally using the term "limited" in their name, has he taken this into consideration in his dealings with this company? And is he advising the Attorney-General's Department to take action on this person or persons who are illegally using the name "limited"?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed towards the Attorney-General. In view of the earlier answer by the Minister of Labour that charges have been laid since August involving Hooker Chemicals and that those charges involved harassment. I would ask the Attorney-General, since officers of the department of the Attorney-General were involved in advising and permitting the laying of these charges, whether he concurs with the statement by the Minister of Labour that, in fact, these charges in which the department of the Attorney-General participated in were the result of harassment?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the department, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk is well aware, acts on information supplied to it by other departments and in this case, particularly Labour Inspectors. I believe that what the Minister of Labour is referring to is the fact that for at least two or three years prior to the laying of those charges, in August and September of 1977, the Department of Labour and its Minister allowed the same conditions to carry on and continue at the two plants that have been referred to. And it is because of the vacillating position that was taken by the Department of Labour and its Minister that she has referred to this matter as "harassment".

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Supplementary Mr. Speaker, my question flows from that last reply. Is the Honourable the Attorney-General then meaning to say, and leave for the record, the contention that where no prosecutions have taken place in the past, that it cannot in all logic, it cannot then subsequently be commenced, because that's the net effect of his reply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** My question is to the Minister of Labour or the Attorney-General. To begin with I will direct it to the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour undertake to prepare a report for this House specifying the nature of the harassment that is being referred to and those allegedly responsible for it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Environment. Can he tell us exactly what actions the Government of Manitoba, in concert with the Government of Canada, are now taking in relation to the latest proposals on the Garrison Diversion that the Department of Interior has issued for congressional review down in the United States?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, there was a letter released this morning, a

**Tuesday, April 4, 1978**

copy of a letter from the External Affairs Minister in Ottawa to the Department of State outlining the concerns of the Canadian Government and the Manitoba Government with respect to the Garrison Diversion. It simply outlined our reaction to the revised Impact Statement prepared by the Department of the Interior in the United States pointing out that that had not eliminated the concerns that the Government of Manitoba had with the GDU and in fact, pointed out that the revised Impact Statement was prepared in response to internal pressure in the United States rather than to the recommendations of the IJC. So we have jointly stated with the Government of Canada that when the United States prepares a response to the recommendations of the IJC, a response that will take into consideration the concerns of the Government of Manitoba and Canada, that we will be prepared at that time to respond to it in detail.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Supplementary Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's last statement that they would intend to provide further replies, does he intend to request with Federal officials, the reinstatement of the research team that would undertake to assess potential impacts or damages that would occur if the revised program now being put forward by the Department of Interior were in fact, to be implemented; so that we would have an understanding as to exactly what changes in water quality and standards would be affected if that revised program was to go forward.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the response of the United States, the preparation of the Impact Statement by the Department of the Interior, was not prepared as a response to Canadian concerns and therefore we have only given our preliminary evaluation of it saying that it does not address the concerns of the IJC and therefore there is no point in us responding to it in detail. If and when the United States responds to the IJC, to the concerns that the IJC raised, then we will have to respond in detail to that and if that requires a putting together of a research team to assess the effects of the revised program, then that is what we will do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on that particular issue. Because of the differences in the American system where there is a split between the executive and legislative branch, it is my understanding that the revised impact statement has been officially corresponded with the congressional committees of the United States Congress and that therefore has a status unlike that which the Minister describes. It is now being considered by committees or officials of the U.S. House of Representatives in the United States Senate and I would like to know if the Minister, in consultation with Federal officials, in their letter has indicated opposition to the submission of that revised statement to the Congress, and also a submission to the Congress

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on that particular issue. Because of the differences in the American system where there is a split between the executive and legislative branch, it is my understanding that the revised impact statement has been officially corresponded with the congressional committees of the United States Congress and that therefore has a status unlike that which the Minister describes. It is now being considered by committees or officials of the U.S. House of Representatives in the United States Senate and I would like to know if the Minister, in consultation with Federal officials, in their letter has indicated opposition to the submission of that revised statement to the Congress, and also a submission to the Congress itself indicating what steps you intend to take to indicate to the Congressional Committees which do appropriate the budgets that in fact this is going against the Canadian interest as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well we have asked that the position of the Canadian Government and the Manitoba Government be communicated to those Congressional committees, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister: Given that the newspaper reports on Friday last in Canadian papers to the effect that at ranking members of the U. S. Congress and of the Executive Branch in the United States, Vice-President Mondale among others, reportedly are attempting to revive the Garrison Diversion in its entirety or in the larger scale. Can the Minister

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

indicate whether so far as the Government of Manitoba is concerned they are viewing those reports as merely speculative or whether they are making efforts to attempt to ascertain whether they are substantially correct and therefore requiring follow-up action on the part of Canada and Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have done in the letter that was just released was to reaffirm our faith in the undertakings of the Government of the United States that they would honor the provisions of the Boundary waters Treaty, not to cause damage to Canadian interests. We have reiterated our support for the recommendations of the IJC which recognize the substantial damages that could occur in Canada as a result of the Garrison Diversion unit.

We are pursuing all of the diplomatic channels that we believe to be available to us and we are trying to monitor the progress of what is happening in the United States; and if we have some indication that the previous undertakings of the Government of the United States will not in fact be upheld, then we would have to consider what other possibilities might be open to us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Labour would be good enough to assure this House that it will not become a policy of the government to exempt companies that are in violation of The Power Engineers' Act in lieu of prosecutions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Order for Return it told him that that was the only two companies that have been given that assurance.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I am also asking the Minister of Labour whether in indicating that there were many other engineers, whether she is prepared to indicate how many of those engineers do have power-engineering qualifications, because I understand engineering is a broad field. We have chemical engineers, civil engineers, electrical engineers and so on, not necessarily qualified to do power-engineering work or supervise it.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I can get the precise number of them for the Member for Kildonan but I know there's power engineers in both feed companies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. H. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister indicate what action she or her department has taken in regard to a call for a Royal Commission into fatalities and in accidents in the mining industry?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that was answered a couple of days ago. We haven't taken any action in that respect. We haven't been assured that this is really a necessity at this time.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the most recent fatality in the industry yesterday occurring in Leaf Rapids, is the Minister now willing to initiate that Royal Enquiry as requested by workers in the industry itself?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I heard of the accident yesterday and I've called for a report but I haven't had one, and until that time there won't be any decisions made.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then willing to table that report in full before this House, when completed?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the Member for Logan asked certain questions relating to the metric conversion of milk in Manitoba and price increases that related thereto and I think he asked me a supplementary question, whether or not the Milk Control Board had approved an increase in price to cover the metric conversion. I'm able to advise him now that the answer is "yes". The increase in price related to the metric conversion amounts to about 2.73 cents per litre.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** I thank the Honourable Minister for the answer that he gave. I'd like to ask him a supplementary. Will this 2.7 cents per litre be taken into consideration when the milk producers and the retailers of milk appear before the Milk Control Board in the near future?



**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that this increase was approved to cover the costs of the metric conversion. So it may well be that this will be considered in quite a separate category from any increases which will relate to the costs of producing milk in Manitoba.

**MR. JENKINS:** A further supplementary. Is the Minister now prepared to admit that there are 4.6 litres to a gallon? He said he was going to check it out.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, it was in relation to the members' concerns about gasoline, I believe, that he wished to have us check his arithmetic. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we're still in the process of examining his arithmetic in this matter. But on the general subject of price increases in the cost of milk in Manitoba, I know the member is aware that during his period of his government there were increases from March 6, 1974 to April 27, 1977, amounting to 26 cents roughly per quart.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented.**

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to take advantage of this, my opportunity to speak on a grievance at this early stage because of a matter which had come to a head within recent days but which had been dragging for quite some time since the government took office. But I believe that it is a matter of considerable concern, of tremendous concern to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Namely, Mr. Speaker, the conduct and the manner in which he goes about the business of his department, that of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, being blinded, in his capacity as Minister of Industry and Commerce, by the desire to cater to some investors, many of whom unknown to this House, which is tantamount to pimping the resources of the people of Manitoba.

**A MEMBER:** Pimping.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know . . .

**A MEMBER:** Because they're harassing the hookers, that's what it is.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** You know, a pimp is a go-between. A pimp is a pander and can be used in either form, as a noun or as a verb. And a pimp is one who ministers to the baser passions and evil designs of others.

I had originally intended, Mr. Speaker, to make these remarks. . . I think, Mr. Speaker — there's the Honourable Member for Minnedosa speaking from his seat again, I would consider him quite an expert on this too, perhaps more so than others whom he may accuse of such ability.

I had originally intended, Mr. Speaker, to make my remarks on this issue during the Estimates debate. But the matter of concern to me, it crosses two of his departments, that of Industry and Commerce and Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Gladstone wants to know what the urgency is. If he'll be patient he will know in a minute or two.

Rather than run the risk, Mr. Speaker, of being ruled out of order by referring to a department that may not be dealt with under Estimates at that time, I therefore chose to use my Grievance Privilege for that purpose. And it is a matter of urgency because the disposition of resources and assets belonging to the people of the Province of Manitoba are at stake, and they are concerned about them.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, shortly after October 11, and in fact during the election campaign, the government had committed itself to the disposition of government-owned assets, amongst which one was the motorship Lord Selkirk. And you may also recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister had announced last fall that he had cancelled the bookings, the reservations that were made for the Lord Selkirk for this sailing season. In fact, he was asked in the House some questions before Orders of the Day, why the reservations were cancelled. If he intended to sell the asset, would not the sale of it be made easier and perhaps even command a better price, if it were sold as an ongoing concern rather than one that was closed down. Well, his response at that time wasn't all that clear, but

he did express the hope that the boat will continue serving the people of Manitoba under whatever new ownership it may fall.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation which the people of the Province of Manitoba had of the Honourable Minister's answer was, that when he spoke of the boat continuing to serve the public, he meant that the boat would continue serving the public in the manner in which it had previously served the public, performing that particular function. I don't think anyone in the Province of Manitoba had even dreamt that the Honourable Minister, or someone negotiating or dealing with him, had the type of scheme in mind such as we heard announced yesterday. So yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we heard the announcement made by one of the present owners of the boat as to what he intends to do with it, namely, establishing a floating condominium. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that when the Honourable Minister responded to questions on this matter during the first session of this House which was held last fall, and at times subsequently to that, that he was somewhat less than honest with the public. Less than honest with the public on a number of points related to the MS Lord Selkirk, his knowledge of future use, disposition of it, when he spoke about the operating statement of the boat and the figures he attributed to that, weren't all that accurate. The scrap value of the boat, today we heard, Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, that the information the Minister received prior to its sale was that the scrap value of the boat would not exceed that which was ultimately received as the sale price. When asked who provided him with that information, that he hasn't told us. Was it Mr. Cholakis? Was it one of the Einarson brothers, or who? We don't know. We don't know who gave him that assessment of its scrap value; nor will he tell us.

He was less than honest with the public with respect to what future plans for the boat were, because I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that at that time, in whatever discussions and meetings he had with the purchasers of the boat, who are now the owners, or with whom-ever else may have expressed an interest in it, that the Honourable Minister was well aware that whoever may become the purchaser, he may have considered several alternatives: one, the ultimate sale of the boat, selling it or leasing it to another operator in the Province of Manitoba; selling or leasing it to an operator beyond the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba, or perhaps even beyond the boundaries of Canada; converting it to some other use, such as the one announced yesterday - a floating condominium; or some other use; or scrapping it and making a hundred thousand dollar profit in a matter of months on a less than \$250,000 investment, all of which we do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the purchasers, at this point in time, have paid the amount in full or not; it may be the actual out-of-pocket investment of the purchasers was far less than that, and if it were scrap the investment return may run into several hundreds percent, depending on the amount that the purchasers paid by way of down payment.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province of Manitoba were misled to that extent, because as I have said, they thought all along that the boat would continue in its normal manner of operation, would continue as a tourist attraction, would continue to operate as a facility tied in with the Hecla Island Park on Lake Winnipeg, tied in with the development at Gimli, which also is a tourist attraction, and that it would be a contributing factor to tourist revenue in the Province of Manitoba, in addition to whatever it may earn per se, but some of the spinoff benefits, the multiplier effect of the operation of the boat, would result in tourist revenue to the public purse directly and also to other industries in the province; hotel industries, the merchandising industry, the restaurant industry, and the like, and others wherein tourists coming to our province may wish to spend their money. But that it would be used in any one of a variety of ways similar to the manner in which it previously was.

No one thought for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that the actual plan is to sell the boat to someone who would restrict the use of it to a few — 80 or so — of the wealthy in the yacht-purchasing category who are the types who are going to end up becoming owners of this boat if the plan for a floating condominium materializes.

Now, there was a comparison in the newspaper report today that would make it appear that this is something that really is available to practically anyone who is in a bracket to purchase, to acquire a \$20,000 summer cottage. Well, really, that is not an accurate comparison, comparing a condominium on a boat with a cottage; the purpose and the function that it serves, and the manner in which it serves the user are quite different. You know, if one were to make that type of comparison then one could perhaps also say that this is cheaper than acquiring a single-engine aircraft for pleasure purposes. Those two are quite different in the purpose that they serve, and so is a cottage and a water-based facility such as this. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the "horror story." That is another one of the horror stories that the Honourable Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs chooses not to listen to this afternoon. By taking a public asset, giving it away for next to nothing, allowing private profiteering at public expense by the purchaser's own admission. And that, Mr. Speaker, is ministering to the baser passions and evil designs of others; that's pimping.

A second example: the proposed condominium development in the Whiteshell. And on the basis of the response this afternoon, it appears there was nothing to indicate that the planning for the condominium has come to a halt, that the planning must be continuing. There was nothing confirmed or denied. But nothing having happened, I would assume the original plans that were made and the original agreement that was signed, that that is still in effect and that the government has no intention of rescinding it or varying it in any fashion.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the condominium agreement in the Whiteshell is merely the tip of the iceberg. That that is merely the tip of the iceberg that we have received notice of today. And proceeding with that agreement for the development of a few hundred condominium units in the Whiteshell will open the gates to others, too, to make application for similar developments, or for

other developments that may not necessarily be compatible with the use to which an area such as the Whiteshell Provincial Park ought to be put.

I say that's merely the tip of the iceberg because if this plan is proceeded with the Minister will put himself in a position where he will not be able to refuse permission to others for other developments because the precedent will be set. The precedent will be set. Some other private developer will find some other attractive portion of lakeshore property on which he would like to establish a certain type of development. And he will come to the Minister for permission to build there whatever it is that he would wish to build that, in his opinion, he would feel would yield him a profit. And the Minister will have to approve those plans. He will have to, because how will he be able to make fish of one and fowl of another.

He will not be able to hide behind the statement which he made on the opening day of this Legislature to the press, when he said that this was merely a pilot project.

Now that, Mr. Speaker — the development in the Whiteshell — is another horror story. And that, I suggest to you, could conceivably lead to a series of horror stories developing in the Whiteshell Provincial Park and perhaps in other provincial parks in our province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that even at this point in time, even in considering such a proposal, even in giving it the slightest shred of thought that that is pimping.

Now I mentioned a moment ago the Honourable Minister, who is back in his seat, called this a pilot project. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know what other pilot projects he has in mind. He may have many pilot projects. And, Mr. Speaker, we would like to hear the other horror stories that he intends to tell us. His First Minister indicated to the House the other night that during this session he is going to disclose many horror stories. Well, it is quite apparent that the Honourable Minister of Tourism has all kinds of horror stories of his own to unload in the House, and we would like to hear the rest of his horror stories.

You know, Mr. Speaker, having at least opened the door to allow a developer to get his foot in the door, as it were, with the one project — the condominium project — what else does he have in mind? And you know, he also wears his Industry and Commerce hat. It would seem to me that in his mind it may seem appropriate to allow for the establishment of a smelting plant in the Whiteshell. It is served by two transcontinental railways. There is an abundance of water supply and electrical supply. It is close to a metropolitan area, and within a stone's throw of one. Just an ideal place for a smelting plant. Perhaps more ideal than down south near the American border. Perhaps a paper mill. You know, all so close to the supply of raw materials.

You know, after all, the Honourable Minister is very very concerned about cost benefit. Cost benefit, you know, that the use of every square foot of our property has to show a profit. Now, that might be something that he is considering. Maybe he should tell us. He should tell us if that's what he has in mind.

You know, Mr. Speaker, some honourable members in the House may think that I am being somewhat facetious. But you know, I am not. I am not at all.

Yesterday . . . And you may not have heard this, Mr. Speaker, because I believe this was . . . No, I think you did; I think you did. Whether this was during Committee of Supply, or while you were in the Chair, Mr. Speaker . . . No, I think you were in the Chair. And the Honourable Member for St. Johns raised this matter with specific reference to the MS Lord Selkirk. And the Honourable Member for Wolseley — speaking from his seat as he is accustomed to do and as he most usually does. There he was, yes, perched on his seat of intelligence. And the Honourable Member for Wolseley made the comment that there is nothing to do at Gull Harbour. Well perhaps for him there is nothing to do at Gull Harbour. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that for others there may be. And I would like the Honourable Member for Wolseley to go to the east side of the Constituency of St. George, go on Hecla Island, go to the people living around Riverton, go to Gimli constituency and tell them "I've been to Hecla Island. There is nothing to do there. There is nothing to do. We have got to develop something. There is nothing to do."

You know, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasant fortune and experience of participating in the official opening of the Gull Harbour Lodge on July 15th, I believe it was. And at that time, I happened to run into the father of a classmate of mine — a one-time resident of Riverton who was born and raised there — a Dr. Guttormson, of the Icelandic community originally settled there, and his son, Thor Guttormson, took him around the island, showed him the development. Dr. Guttormson was very impressed with what he saw, with the manner in which it was developed. Looking at Hecla Island, he said to me, "What a fine memorial and tribute this is to the Icelandic pioneers of the Province of Manitoba".

Now you know, Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Wolseley when he says there is nothing to do for the people who may dock on the boat and get off and spend a couple of hours on the island, what the Honourable Member for Wolseley has in mind is the boardwalk and midway type of operation marring the beauty of the island. Ferris wheels, roller coasters, pinball machines, games of chance, trinket and junk shops, tourist traps — that, to him, Mr. Speaker, will give him things to do. That's the kind of things that he would want to do on Hecla Island. To hell with what Hecla Island stands for. To hell with what it's meant to represent, but that's what he would want to see there.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if what the park presently offers gives him nothing to do then the alternative must be what I have just suggested.

And I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister may be influenced by the type of

thinking that was voiced by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and there may be other members in his caucus who think similarly, and I believe that there are from the response that we have just heard over the last two or three minutes. If it is, and it appears to be, then what the Honourable Member for Wolseley seems to imply of the type of development, the type of things to do that should be provided the tourists on Hecla Island will be the types of things provided for the holidaying public in the Province of Manitoba, not only in Gull Harbour — but we will see a repeat of it on the site of the old boardwalk which has been beautifully landscaped and which is a jewel to look at in the Town of Winnipeg Beach — in Grand Beach, in the Whiteshell, in Duck Mountain, in Spruce Woods, and other provincial parks in our province.

You know, the Minister of Tourism seems to be obsessed with his cost-benefit rationale, that everything must pay its way, everything; charge a user fee for everything, everything must pay for itself. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the way the Honourable Minister thinks then he ought to carry his rationale to its logical conclusion and let everything pay for itself. If I were him, I would bring in a bill to repeal the bill limiting the height of the buildings around the Legislative Building area to allow for the construction of 30, 40, 50-storey office buildings in order to enable the private entrepreneurs, completely unrestricted, to reap as many dollars profit as they possibly could from every square foot of real estate around here. In fact, I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister — you know, with that type of thinking I'm surprised that he hasn't instructed the Minister of Public Works to sell Memorial Park. Now, there's a choice piece of real estate for the development of a shopping centre, an office tower, a hotel tower, an apartment tower, a condominium — goodness knows what else — and that too will generate a fantastic amount of profit and income. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a Minister with that type of reasoning, I'm surprised that he can come into this building — you know, one of the 11 most expensive office buildings to maintain and operate in Canada — this one, and the Legislative Buildings in the other nine provinces, and the Houses of Parliament in Ottawa. I'm sure that if one were to make a cost-benefit comparison strictly in terms of dollars and cents, it's a very expensive building to maintain.

Well now, the Minister with that type of rationale, with what he is doing to Whiteshell Park, should also urge the sale of Great-West Life — that's a Freudian slip — the sale of this building to Great-West Life, because there's probably a purchaser ready, willing and anxious to buy right at the moment, and sell it, and he should be able to say to the public that this building is too expensive to maintain, the cost-benefit ratio doesn't justify the public's retention of this building. In fact, I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, although I've been told, that he has cut down the number of tour guides, and the number of tours that are available in this building. You know, he ought to be charging a user fee; anyone who wants to see their own building, let them pay to see their own building. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what about the choice real estate around the building? You know, wouldn't he consider it a shame to have it lie in waste, just seeded with grass, flowers, shrubs and so forth? Of course, it could well be that maybe there's an option to purchase on this submitted by someone.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister were Minister of Cultural Affairs in France, probably the first thing he would do is close down the Louvre. He would say to the people of France, "I cannot justify keeping it open on a cost-benefit basis." You know, the Louvre is a very expensive building, it's a very large building. It has within it billions of dollars worth of works of art, of historic artifacts, of museum pieces and so forth, and he will put a price on that and he will say, "Well, on a cost-benefit analysis I've got to charge every person coming in here hundreds of francs a day to tour the building," and then he will find that nobody will pay hundreds of francs a day, because they have been accustomed to paying one franc and fifty or something, and on Sundays, free admission, and free admission to senior citizens and students and so forth. So he will sell it because he will say that on a cost-benefit analysis there is no justification to keep it open. That is the rationale, the thinking of this Minister, and that he has demonstrated in his attitude toward Whiteshell Provincial Park, Mr. Speaker.

You know, in his drive, or commitment to allow private entrepreneurs to reap a profit from every square foot of Manitoba soil, in addition to his government having already demonstrated a complete disregard for the economic welfare and plight of the average individual, in addition to that he is now in his pimping process, raping some of our natural resources and thus denying the people of Manitoba the right to enjoy its natural beauty with which it has been so abundantly endowed.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the Minister to assure the people of Manitoba of two things: one, that those assets already disposed of will remain for the use of Manitobans generally and not for a select few at an unconscionable profit to a select fewer number — that's point number one. Now yesterday the Honourable Minister in response to the Member for St. Johns said words to the effect that it's none of his concern, what private individuals do in the disposition of their property, none of Manitobans' concern.

But Mr. Speaker, this chattel did belong to the people of the Province of Manitoba and surely Mr. Speaker — and for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, who is speaking from his seat again, as I said that he is accustomed to do — it is not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, for an individual in transferring and selling a piece of property to impose some conditions upon the manner in which the purchaser will ultimately use it. People have been known to give property away and impose conditions, give property as a gift with certain conditions attached to it, that it's given for a certain purpose, that it's sold for a certain purpose. And if it should cease being used for that particular purpose then it reverts back to the donor, to the vendor. That's not unusual. And if the Minister of Tourism was really sincere — as last fall I was inclined to give him the benefit of the doubt, and I thought that he was sincere when he said that the boat will continue . for the use of the people of the

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

Province of Manitoba — if he was really sincere then he would have kept that factor in mind in his negotiations with Messrs. Cholakis and the Einarsson brothers — obviously, he wasn't.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like assurance from the Honourable Minister that the preservation of our natural resources — (Interjection) — No, he's still in the House, only he is not in his seat. He is seeking advice from a Minister Without Portfolio — And that the preservation of our natural resources such as our parks shall be of paramount importance in planning the future of our parks, and that he would not even entertain the notion of pimping our resources to minister to the baser passions and evil designs of those whose prime motive and purpose is capitalizing on a people's asset, and to hell with the consequences, and to hell with whether or not their project is or is not consistent with the purpose that traditionally parks have been designed to serve.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you now ready for the question on the Motion to go into Supply?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

### SUPPLY — INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Department of Industry and Commerce, Resolution No. 74, Item 1.(b)(1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, unless the Honourable Minister wants to reply to some comments made yesterday, I'd like to add a few words to what was said last night, and a few remarks made recently, a few minutes ago, by my colleague, the Member for Burrows. But in the context of job creation, and techniques of creating jobs in the Province of Manitoba, if there is any challenge facing the government of Manitoba today, surely it is the challenge of attempting to stimulate the economy of this province; surely it is the challenge of trying to bring about adequate industrial development; surely it is the challenge of attempting to realize our economic potential; surely it is the challenge of trying to provide jobs for our people.

With nearly 40,000 people out of work in Manitoba, we do not face a very happy situation in this province. We have young people, fully qualified, well trained in our institutions of higher learning, whether it be the technical colleges, the community colleges, or the universities, or the high schools, or whatever institution, we have unfortunately hundreds if not thousands of these young people who are jobless, who want to work, who are capable of working, who are eager to work, but who cannot find jobs. And I say, the number one problem, the number one economic problem facing the province today is the problem of creating sufficient jobs. Of course, this gets us back to the whole question of the economic thrust of the current government, and as I indicated yesterday, last evening, the economic thrust of this government is just the reverse; it's not to create jobs, but it's to eliminate jobs. Not only in the Civil Service, because what's happening in the Civil Service is only one dimension. What I'm talking about is what might be happening, in fact, what I know is happening in the private sector, where we have a shrinking of opportunities, where we have shrinking markets and therefore a shrinking demand for manpower.

And we get back then to how do we resolve the problem. And I suggested last night, try as the department and the Minister may try, with all the best of intentions, with all the energy they can muster, that it's an insuperable obstacle to overcome, given the general economic philosophy of the present government. I suggested that they put private enterprise on trial, as my colleague from Inkster did a week or so ago, they put the private sector on trial to produce. And I am suggesting — (Interjection)— Oh, yes they have, yes you have. They have put the private sector on trial. The First Minister, the Premier of this province has said so, in so many words, that government spending is to be reduced, taxes are to be reduced, government is going to stand aside and let the private sector do the job that it's supposed to do, and that is, to make the investments, decisions, to cause the economy to expand, and to provide the job opportunities to our people. Well, they are on trial, the private sector is on trial. They are going to change their mind soon.

Well, this is the point that I was coming to, Mr. Chairman' because, as I indicated last night, it was this party, the Conservative Party of Manitoba, under former Premier Duff Roblin, that set up a government — believe it or not — investment agency, MDF now known as MDC. And it will be interesting to see whether this government is going to obliterate MDC entirely — wipe it out entirely. I'm not sure, maybe they are.

But I then come back to the question as to how are you going to create jobs in this province. You are not going to create them through promotional efforts, advertising efforts, trying to assist would-be private entrepreneurs with information — market analysis and so on. That's all very good. The department can do that very well. But that is not the solution to the problem. I believe that eventually we will see this government go back to the style and methods that we witnessed during its days in office under Duff Roblin and Walter Weir, and that is a method of giving away public resources to the private sector with the hope that maybe something will happen.

We have seen much evidence of this back in the sixties and now we're beginning to see evidence of it today. And, yes, the Lord Selkirk is a classic example. It is a good example of give-away of resources of the people of Manitoba to a private group.

In fact, you could go on and discuss the pilot project of a condominium in the Whiteshell

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

Provincial Park, because there is another case of a give-away. Because a give-away in the sense that anyone who is given the opportunity — the right — to build a profit-making hotel or apartment block, or a condominium, or what have you, has been given some net benefit because the infrastructure is there. The various roads leading into it I'm not talking about that one road that has been in question, but I'm talking about the road network in the area. I'm talking about the various recreational facilities that have been developed. This infrastructure is worth a considerable value and anyone who is given the permission and right to build there is given, in effect, a type of subsidy, a benefit, a privilege to make money and is given a guarantee, really, to make money by virtue of the location we are discussing.

So that's another example. And the fact that this government chose to sell the Lord Selkirk without any conditions, without any requirement that the vessel be continued in operation to be a tourist attraction for the province.

I wonder if the Minister and his department, or MDC, or the Department of Industry attempted a cost-benefit analysis on the operation of that boat. True enough, there have been losses too frequently in the operation of the boat, but has the Minister considered the benefits that accrue to the province in terms of the general tourist industry? Has there been any study made of tourists that have been attracted to Manitoba to have a unique experience in sailing on that vessel on an inland sea? Virtually, it's an inland sea.

Have they examined the loss of a tourist attraction, and what that will mean in terms of tourist dollars coming into Manitoba? Tourist dollars not to the government but tourist dollars to all the operators, the hotelkeepers, to the suppliers of goods and services, to these people who come in and who are attracted here in the first place because of the existence of the Lord Selkirk. And if that study has not been done, then I say that the government has been very rash, indeed, in disposing of that vessel in the way that it has.

In fact, as my colleague has pointed out, it has been not only very rash but it has in effect given away some value to the Crown, value to the people of Manitoba, value to the taxpayers, if it did not thoroughly check out the scrap value of that particular vessel. And I can't fault the current operators; I'm not blaming them' they're out to make a dollar. They are in private enterprise and that's their privilege. They bought it with no conditions attached — with no strings attached — for approximately \$250,000 and now they have reported that they have checked it out. They have checked it out and they think that if worse comes to worse they can sell it for scrap value for about \$350,000.00.

Well, I ask why didn't the Minister and his department do that type of thorough investigation? — (Interjection)— Beg your pardon? It's less than \$250,000.00. Well, that's the point; we don't know what the source of the information is. And I'm inclined to believe Mr. Cholakis, when I heard him yesterday, when he said, and I think it was reported in the paper, too, that they could probably sell it as scrap for \$100,000 more.

Well, if that is the case, then this government has given away \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money. It has given \$100,000 to a private group. And I say, talk about waste of the taxpayers' money, talk about waste of resources, here it is in one fell swoop. One really small example I guess in the total spectrum of things, but it is indicative of the policy that I know this government is going to begin to pursue, and has begun to pursue, and that is the policy of give-aways to the private sector — giving away resources of the people of Manitoba to a particular group or another so that something might happen because private enterprise can do it better. Well, private enterprise has decided that they are going to obtain a fair return for their investment, and if they can't utilize it for condominium purposes, they will cut it up and ship it out of the province. I think that that will be a very sorry day, indeed, if that happens because, as I indicated, I am convinced that it has a great tourist attraction benefit that can be measured if a proper study were done.

But the point at issue here, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we have seen an example of a technique of giving away of resources of the Crown, and not only did they give away resources put in by the taxpayers but you know, in a way, they have given to a particular group something that hundreds, if not thousands, of Manitobans put their faith in back in the late sixties. Because please remember, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, that this was a private investment; this was not an NDP creature. This was not a public investment from the start. This was a private investment involving hundreds of Manitobans who had an interest in seeing this kind of facility available for tourism in Manitoba, this kind of facility to replace the old SS Kenora, as it was called, that plied the waters of Lake Winnipeg for many decades. There is quite a history of navigation on Lake Winnipeg. These people that lived in Winnipeg, that lived in Selkirk, that lived all over the province, they put up hundreds of thousands of dollars for this vessel — not to speak of the MDF moneys that the Conservative government, through the MDF, put into this facility back then in the 1960s.

So, you've sold them down the river in a sense. You've sold them short. I know some of those people who had great faith and great pride. They put money into that vessel not expecting to get any real return on their money. They were putting it in because they had . . . The Member for Selkirk said he is one of them. Because he had some faith and pride in his province, he thought that it would be good for this province, good for our people, if they had a vessel that they could enjoy sailing on over Lake Winnipeg — one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world.

Now, it looks as though there is the demise of this particular attraction and I say that it is shortsightedness on the part of the Minister, and shortsightedness on the part of the government. As

a matter of fact, I'm sure you could make an argument to take it and remove it entirely from the commercial sector if you wanted and get full benefit. Get full useage out of it. Put the senior citizens on it. Put children on it. Put school groups on it. Put other people on it. Give them a chance. Use the facility, just as those people use the facilities of Assiniboine Park or Birds Hill Park, or the Whiteshell, or what have you.

I'm sure if you looked at the balance sheet of the Whiteshell Park, or Birds Hill Park, or Assiniboine Park, you wouldn't see any net profit by those parks whatsoever. Nor do you expect it; nor do we expect it; nor do the people of Manitoba expect it.

I say rather than sell that vessel, the Minister could have considered benefits that could be accrued to various groups in Manitoba that could make full use of it. Yes, at some cost. But so what? The main thing is to make the use of it. If you have a Birds Hill Park, or if you have an Assiniboine Park, it should be used to the fullest to get the benefit to justify the costs that go into it, and similarly in the case of this vessel.

But the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister has demonstrated a technique here and it's a technique that we are going to see more of as the days, the weeks, and the months, and the years pass by in order for this government to try to create something in the private sector. They put the private sector on trial, but in the meantime they are going to try to give them a little boost, a little bit of assistance to demonstrate that they have the ability to create jobs. And the sad part of it is, of course, that at the same time, the government has made the job of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that much more difficult by pursuing very negative policies. By pursuing policies that are going to reduce the gross provincial product of Manitoba through the negative multiplier effects that we have spoken of previously; by these reductions in government spending, we are going to see the private sector suffer and there is going to be a reduction of the gross provincial products simply by virtue of the general economic policies of this government. And therefore being the Minister of Industry and Commerce becomes a less-enviable job — even more unenviable than it was previously.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like to just add a few words to those already spoken by the Member for Brandon East. I recall in June of 1969 a very proud moment when the member who is now the First Minister of this province presided at the ceremonies involving the launching of the Lord Selkirk.

The launching took place during the June, 1969, provincial election. There was a great deal of fanfare and a great deal of publicity as to the contribution that this boat would make to the provincial economy. And the First Minister of this province represented the then Weir government at that launching; it was well-covered, well-publicized, great fanfare, and much of the money that was involved was public money. But there was no hesitation by the First Minister to preside at that launching.

We all know what happened. Within a short space of time the money that was invested by the then Weir government in the boat was lost due to the bankruptcy of the boat itself.

Mr. Chairman, there is an aspect of this entire matter which concerns me a great deal, and other clues are beginning to unfold as to direction of this government in an entirely different area, that is that the New Democratic Party government during its tenure of office from 1969 to 1977 worked steadfastly towards promoting the stay option, towards encouraging regional development throughout the Province of Manitoba recognizing the fact that the majority of the population in Manitoba resided in the City of Winnipeg, but also recognizing the fact that there are many other areas and regions to this province, and there are areas and regions to this province that require economic development and the creation of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I recall very well in 1969 at the time of the launching of the boat that one of the major side effects that was proudly proclaimed to be involved insofar as the launching of that boat was concerned was the contribution that boat would make towards regional development vis-a-vis the interlake economy.

Now whether we speak of the economy of parklands, or the interlake, or eastern Manitoba, certainly what is required is an activist government encouraging active industrial development in order to stimulate jobs in the regions and areas in Manitoba outside of the City of Winnipeg.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have seen announcements within the last few days by the Minister, of the closing up of office in the Town of Selkirk, involving the Department of Industry and Commerce.

My colleague, the Member for Brandon East, while he was Minister, saw after, I believe, considerable foresight the importance of participating in the stay-option process, decentralizing government offices, decentralizing government services, so those public servants that worked within our regions outside of Winnipeg would also be available to the people outside the City of Winnipeg, to serve the people outside the City of Winnipeg. That was a fundamental principle; a principle which I feel proud to have been part of and to have been associated with the Member for Brandon East while he was Minister of Industry and Commerce in promoting this.

And let me say to the present Minister that I believe it to have been a policy that was well accepted generally in the Province of Manitoba, because it was recognized as a change in direction from that which had preceded the New Democratic Party government; a policy which was one of centralization which basically had been pursued by the Roblin-Weir governments prior to 1969.

What we are seeing, by the Minister in respect to the Lord Selkirk, what we are seeing by the closing of a regional office is a betrayal, a betrayal of any attempt to recognize the importance of regional development, the creation of jobs in various regions of the Province of Manitoba that require

the encouragement in the creation of those jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore would like the Minister's comments in connection with his position pertaining to the stay option in relationship to the regional development because I do believe and I commend the Member for Brandon East, that he contributed through his efforts as Minister of Industry and Commerce in this province, to arrest what was a steady erosion of job opportunity in rural parts in this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask the Minister a number of questions which I do feel that we should have some answer to, in view of the Lord Selkirk situation.

There is implied within the statement issued by Mr. Cholakis that if his scheme is not successful the boat will be removed from the Province of Manitoba, sliced up as I understand, and taken to a more lucrative area. He gave as an example the Caribbean.

I would ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether he intends, in any way, shape or form, to attempt to dissuade the owners of this boat from this intention and whether he intends to encourage the retention of that boat in the Province of Manitoba. It appears that we only have about four weeks to six weeks in which this so-called testing period is to take place prior to the possible departure of the Lord Selkirk from the Province of Manitoba.

Does the Minister intend to remain passive throughout this four to six-week period? Does he intend to develop a program of action? That's the first question I would like the Minister to deal with.

Secondly, I would like to know by what means, because I think it's important in the interests of perspective purchasers, by what means the owners of the Lord Selkirk intend to sell off suites from the Lord Selkirk, as they describe "Converting the boat into 80 state-room condominiums".

Mr. Chairman, I am unaware of any legislation in the Province of Manitoba that permits a chattel to be converted into a condominium. And yet we have seen already an invitation to the public of Manitoba to participate in the purchasing of suites in these condominiums from a chattel. I'm just wondering if the Minister feels any moral commitment or responsibility to check out the legality of this invitation to Manitobans in general, or whether he is aware that in fact there may have been for all I know a request or petition already in the works to the Legislature to permit legislation which would allow a chattel to be converted into condominiums.

I think Manitobans ought to be aware, they certainly ought to be aware before moneys are invested by any Manitoban in this venture as to whether there is lawful authority for this type of action.

I would also like to ask the Minister if he is aware if this scheme that was announced yesterday is, in fact, successful. How many jobs will be put in motion compared to the number of jobs when the boat was operated by the Crown? If jobs are to be put in motion — I note that the owners have indicated there will be less jobs but they didn't indicate how many. If there are to be jobs, good, because I think that's a function of the Minister's efforts to create jobs. Then, how many jobs and where will this floating condominium be ported?

I want to also just say that I'm disappointed that the Minister did not use some imagination when he recognized that he had a bid for only \$250,000.00. I want to say to the Minister in all sincerity, that I do believe that there are plenty of individuals — certainly in the Interlake because the Interlake felt very close to that boat and I think the Minister should realize that; the Interlake identified with that boat — there are plenty of individuals within the Interlake that would have gladly contributed money towards some sort of community corporation, to have kept that boat in operation and cruising in Manitoba. Did he feel that he had no obligation at all to see whether or not there were any in the Interlake area that would have preferred to have attempted to ensure that that boat continued to contribute towards the economy of this province?

Did he not feel there was any obligation on his part also to tie down the new purchasers of the boat, that the boat would continue to contribute towards the economy of the Province of Manitoba, certainly when the new purchasers had obtained the boat at a fire-sale price, which they have?

I think the Minister should also assure us that there were no provincial moneys of any type, shape or form invested in this boat or loaned to any of the purchasers, in any way, shape or form. I think we should have an absolute guarantee that that, in fact, is the case.

Mr. Chairman, all we have really are the resources of this province, the people of this province. The two have to be brought together in order to create economic activity. Each area has to be served in this way in its own manner. Some areas are more unlimited in their potential than other areas. I think the Minister's responsibility is to encourage development according to the resources and the people in the various regions of this province. I haven't seen much hope that the Minister is really interested in regional development; isn't interested in the stay option; isn't interested in encouraging the continued viability in health of our rural communities.

I see only a government, unfortunately, that seems to be more intent on bettering the lot of the favoured few rather than in the provincial community as a whole. It may be, as I heard someone jokingly say this morning on the radio, that maybe there's good reason that the Minister of Highways is the only one who's seen a substantial increase in his budget. It may be that we'll need quite an improvement in roads in order to carry all the bulk of the population of Manitoba when they decide to leave this province because there are no other active programs being developed throughout the province to retain Manitobans here at home.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable House Leader.



**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN** Mr. Speaker, I could rise on a point of order but per (Morris): / haps it's just as well that I don't use it as a point of order but simply as a suggestion that the manner in which we are proceeding now is going to create some problems for us.

When the rules were designed, when the change in the rules was made, they were intended to give members of the opposition every opportunity of examining every aspect of the Estimates and to, as much as possible, to avoid repetition and duplication.

The first item of the Estimates is designed for general discussion and it was ruled that the Minister would introduce his Estimates under that first item and then we would reserve debate until we had completed the item by item considerations. There was a very good reason for doing that. That reason was that there was always a tendency to begin debate of the entire set of Estimates on that first item, and then when you come down to the item by item discussion there is a repetition. The whole intent was to avoid that repetition.

I see now in the manner in which we're proceeding there have been four or five speeches on this first item and not one of them is related to the item itself. The Member for Selkirk who just sat down has been talking about the stay option. He's been talking about highways. He's been talking about rural communities. He's been talking about everything but what the particular item is that is now under discussion. And much of the discussion this afternoon has related to the development agencies, which is a separate item under the Estimates, which deals with the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Communities Economic Development Fund.

If honourable members will look at their Estimate Books they will discover that those development agencies are a separate item apart from Industry and Commerce. So the discussion that has been taking place is, to me, Mr. Chairman, out of order and should be confined to the item that is under discussion and that is the Administrative Salaries of the departmental officials, Administration, and we're abusing the rules if we attempt to use this as a general debate to cover the entire department. And I can tell my honourable friends right now that the Minister is not going to answer any questions until we get down to the items; because to do so now will mean that he will be doing it again when we get down to the particular items. I don't think that we should be duplicating or repeating the debate; but that's what we will be doing if we continue to pursue the course of action that is now being pursued.

When we were in the opposition we endeavoured as much as possible to avoid debate on that first item until we got down to the particular items. — (Interjection) — No, my honourable friend, if you will check the record you will find that we, at least members on our side of the House will be able to tell you that I attempted to discourage as much as possible debate on that particular item. As a matter of fact several times in the House I rose on my feet when our members were speaking and asked the Chairman to rule them out of order because I said the debate was out of order at that particular item. I think the Member for Kildonan will back me up in that. I'm suggesting, Sir, that the debate that is taking place now is out of order because it is not relating to the particular item that is being discussed. And if we're to have orderly debate and prevent repetition, then we've got to stick to the particular item that is being debated, and this one, in my opinion, has a somewhat narrower interpretation that is currently being placed by honourable gentlemen opposite.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I must recognize, Mr. Chairman, how new you are in this job and how anxious you are to do the right thing and to still come out in the correct way. May I point out to you that the honourable member who wasn't sure when he rose whether he was raising a point of order or not and then said he would rather make a statement rather than raise a point of order, then proceeded to make a lengthy speech which became completely out of order once he embarked on a whole tirade which had nothing to do with Item 1.(b)(1), which I think is the matter before us.

So I do agree with most of what he said, until he became very self-righteous on behalf of the Conservative Opposition, as it was, because, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that there was some variation from the principle which he enunciated today with which I happen to agree.

Having said that he also said that the Minister will not answer questions. I think he will answer my question. — (Interjection) — I heard you. Mr. Chairman, I think he will answer the question I'm about to direct.

Mr. Chairman, of all people the House Leader should be an example, not only to his own side but to us as well, so let him wait and see whether or not the question I suggest will be answered. I would like the Honourable Minister to give us a resume of the staff man years and the salaries which total \$116,500 and which of those positions are now filled, and I would like him to indicate whether there are any unfilled positions and who are the people who have filled these positions to date.

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the provisions include seven staff people; two are for the Deputy Minister's office, one is the Deputy Minister and his secretary, five staff members for the Minister's office, one executive assistant, two secretaries and there are two vacancies.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** May I ask the Honourable Minister whether those two vacancies are going to be filled or are they included in the freeze?

**mr. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, they are included in the freeze.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Sure but do I then understand that the Honourable Minister is asking for salaries for two people whom he does not intend to hire?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I understand the funds have been deleted.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, do I then conclude that the Honourable Minister was wrong in saying that there were seven staff members, five filled and two yet to be filled. I assume then he must mean either that there are five staff man years here for staff or that there were nine which have been reduced to seven. I am not sure which it is now.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I said there were provisions for seven staff; two of the vacancies will not be filled.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I am still not clear whether this sum of \$115,500 includes salaries for those two vacancies.

**MR. BANMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, Mr. Speaker, I have to assume then there are no vacancies. The Honourable Minister now seems to agree that there are no vacancies, that there are five staff members. I asked him if he would give us the salaries payable to each and who they are. I am really not concerned with the names of the secretaries but I would like to know the salaries payable to each of these positions and the names and the designations of the five staff members.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the Deputy Minister at \$41,000, the Executive Assistant at \$20,000, the secretary — \$14,600; the DM secretary at \$16,800, and another secretary for \$12,700.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Executive Assistant, could the Honourable Minister indicate. . . I believe there are two classifications for Executive Assistant. . . could he indicate which classification the Executive Assistant is in and what step of the pay scale he is at.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly what classification. . . I know that the present salary is \$16,700.00.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I'm sorry, I thought I understood the Honourable Minister to indicate that the salary of the Executive Assistant was in the order of \$20,000, not \$16,700.00.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, that is the allocation of funds as the Member for St. Johns wanted to know, but the current salary this year was \$16,700.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to do some quick addition and I don't think that my notes are accurate. I have here the Executive Assistant, \$20,000, the Secretary to the Minister at \$14,600; a Deputy Minister \$41,000, Secretary to the Deputy Minister \$16,800, and an additional Secretary at \$12,700.00. If that totals \$115,000 then my addition is not correct and I would like clarification. While that is being checked out Mr. Chairman, I want to ask, is it correct therefore to assume that this budget compared with the amount acutally payable to the Executive Assistant has been padded by the Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** I'm sorry, I wonder if the ...

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that was one way of getting the attention of the Honourable Minister. It would appear that he is paying his Executive Assistant some \$16,700 but he is asking for \$20,000 for that job.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I am informed by staff that one of the vacancies. . . there was money allotted for that but she has left our employment and as a result there would be provision for that particular vacancy which is \$11,300.00.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I now assume that my arithmetic was correct and that we now have clear we have an Executive Assistant to the Minister at \$20,000 even though he is getting \$16,700; that we have a Secretary to the Minister of \$14,600; that we have a Deputy Minister at \$41,000; that the Deputy

**Tuesday, April 4, 1978**

Minister has a Secretary at \$16,800 and a secretary at \$12,700 and there is a vacant position at some \$11,000 which is going to be filled.

**MR. BANMAN:** Not as we foresee it right now, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, so far I find certain conclusions as a result of the information given which I want to set out in a blunt form. Firstly, the Minister is asking for something over \$3,000 more than he is paying his Executive Assistant. Secondly, he is asking. . . well let me spell it out, he said the Executive Assistant is getting \$16,700 and he is asking for \$20,000 for that job. Secondly, he is asking 11,000 and some dollars for a position which is frozen and which is not to be filled. So that I come to a conclusion that there are two salaries which are inflated in accordance with the intentions of the Minister. To go a little further and suggest that a secretary at \$16,800 would not be to my recollection a salary payable to a secretary at the highest level in the establishment — and of course I may be wrong about that. And then I have to ask the Minister whether indeed he has only one secretary or maybe he and his Deputy have more secretaries under the Department of Tourism since they are both, I believe, occupying dual positions.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, maybe to clarify the particular point as far as the Executive Assistant. . . to date, Mr. Chairman, I understand the \$20,000 was put in there because that was last year's vote and was what the previous Executive Assistant was receiving from the previous administration and it was left in there.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Then, Mr. Chairman, I assume this is one of the horror stories that we have been threatened with that the Executive Assistant last year got. . . or they say he got \$20,000? I think he said it was in last year's budget at \$20,000 since I can't challenge that statement, I have to accept it, that therefore they are continuing that high salary even though they don't have to pay that to the present Executive Assistant. Mr. Chairman, I also again ask whether there is \$11,000 allocated for a secretary who is not going to be hired, and therefore, has the budget been padded to that extent?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, first of all referring to the Honourable Member's horror story, the previous Minister had two Executive Assistants a shade under \$19,000, and the other one at \$19,700. I have one for two departments. Let me further say that the allotment for the \$11,300, Mr. Chairman, is there because the secretary left and we are not sure if we will have to replace her. We have another girl in there right now and we might be hiring another one, so that's why it's left in there.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So, Mr. Chairman, it now appears that the position which the Honourable Minister said was frozen, may well be unfrozen and still being asked for. Is that correct? That's correct. Mr. Chairman, I was asking for the names. . . Oh, I asked the question about the Deputy Minister's secretary's salary at \$16,800. Is that in accordance with the pay schedule for secretaries?— Number One. Number Two, what is the name of the Executive Assistant?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, my Executive Assistant is a gentleman by the name of Bob Frey and I am advised that Miss Barbara Hainsworth who is the Administrative Secretary and the Deputy Minister's Secretary is within those guidelines.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the words "administrative assistant", I think, has just come up for the first time since we have had this discussion so now I am not clear about the position of that person and whether the salary is in accord with the pay scale.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that she was made administration officer several years ago and she is functioning in that role, and I understand that the salary range is consistent with that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then I assume that the Minister was wrong when he described her as a secretary. She is indeed an administrative assistant and therefore there are now two secretaries being paid out of this allocation and there is one vacancy for a secretary which may or may not be filled depending upon the position of the freeze.

**MR. CHAI 1.(b)(1). AN:** Item . The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm sorry, I am waiting for 2, not 1.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I gather that the Minister indicated that there is a surplus of \$11,300, now that a position that was originally planned for is not being filled. Is that correct?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman, as I explained, that person left employment a little while ago and we might be filling that position.

**MR. PARASIUUK:** Will you be filling the position, or if it is vacant will you remove that item from the budget?

**MR. BANMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk on this item, but relate my remarks to remarks made by the Government House Leader because he lectured us in his usual fine form on what's right and what's wrong according to the rules of the House, and argued that we were to confine all of our questions and all our remarks to Item 1.(b) Executive I would like to remind the Honourable Government House Leader and everyone in this House that when you are discussing executive you are discussing the senior level in this department that provides for the overall coordination of branch operations and I submit, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that it is quite fitting and quite proper for any member of this House to get up and discuss the entirety of departmental operations, including the policy thrust, because that — well, then, I'll ask the Minister: what is the function of the executive? What is the purpose of the executive? Is it a narrow purpose or is it a broad purpose? I am suggesting to you that it has an overall purpose, the executive of any department has an overall purpose, has a coordinating purpose, and therefore I think it is quite in order, it's quite proper, it's quite legitimate, it's quite within the rules to discuss the generality of the thrust of the Department of Industry and Commerce and to discuss therefore general industrial development policies as I was trying to do earlier today, and indeed yesterday.

But having made that comment and not having received any response from the House Leader, I would like to ask the Minister a specific question with regard to his executive assistant. Could he advise us as to the level of pay that his executive assistant is now receiving. In other words, is the 20,000 figure that's in there for possible expenditure, or is that the actual salary paid? I would remind the honourable member that the previous E.A. arrived at that level after, I think, five-and-a-half to six years of service. He eventually arrived at that particular level.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The "20" is possible, it's not the salary.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, could the Honourable Minister tell us what the salary is then?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion while we are speaking about the administration of Industry and Commerce to put on the record a few remarks. Under the prior administration I had what I considered the privilege to be the Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Industry and Commerce for some time, and it was one of the most enjoyable experiences that I have ever had. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the staff, and I've been reading the survival lists in the paper to see who is surviving, and it is nice to see that the staff is pretty well staying intact.

I really would like to take this opportunity to wish the Minister well, because a lot is depending on the Industry and Commerce in the Province of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the administration of the policy of the government, which it is incumbent upon the department to do, and I think that the professionalism of the staff that exists, that has existed and will exist, will do Manitobans well and in many cases the present administration would do well to listen to them. But in thinking about the industriousness of Manitoba, I can't help but reflect that the tone will be set by the government, and when we are talking about the administration of the policy of this government — I digress a moment, Mr. Chairman. We were speaking earlier about the salary of an administrative secretary or something like that, I would like to support the Minister in this particular case because I think in many instances the Minister should get \$15,600 and the secretary \$16,700, because in many cases the secretaries in the office do more work and know more about the operation than perhaps the Minister does on a day-to-day and a minute-to-minute basis.

But back to the case at point. One of the reasons yesterday in the debate that I was so angered by some of the events which have taken place in the operation of the province as far as business is concerned, that we are losing in Manitoba the entrepreneurs who made this province what it is today. You don't have to look around too far to find this to be true.

I understand that in the public eye for example, people see Great-West Life, and they think of a Manitoba company. Well, I understand that 51 percent of that particular corporation is now controlled by such small groups as CPI and Power Corporation and it was interesting to note that Investors Syndicate, which local entrepreneurs got together and really were instrumental in building a financial institution of some repute, but nevertheless some weeks ago I read in the paper that the trading had been suspended because of a take-over bid of Power Corporation.

But when they talk about creating a *milieu* in which the private sector can function, I think it is incumbent upon the Minister at this time — I took the House Leader's point of order or non point of

order that he raised earlier as being well taken, because some of the broader philosophical questions we were supposed to leave to the Minister's Salary, which is the last item to be considered — but nevertheless you are asking us to vote funds for the administration of a policy and if we don't know by and large what this policy is at this time, I don't know how we can really approve these funds. We haven't had a definition of private sector. Now I know that we as members of political groups get swept up by the general tone of the party machinery and the advertising people that we hire and everything else. I, for one, kind of cringe everytime I hear of the corporate welfare bums, because what that means in many people's minds is that I am calling people who work for corporations bums, which I don't. If I worked for a corporation I would do my damndest to maximize their profit as I think is incumbent on anybody who works, no matter where, in the private or the public sector.

But nevertheless, as mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge, if we are being asked at this point in time to vote funds, what does the Minister mean by the private sector? Does he mean that we are talking about Great-West Life or these people who really aren't Manitobans? I am a Manitoban and these are Manitoba tax dollars that we are talking about.

If you are talking about the small businessman, the people in the Co-ops and all the rest of it, these are Manitobans. But if you are asking us to just vote funds for the continuation of Manitoba becoming nothing more than a colony in the economic world, then it is most difficult. You know when we talk about private sector here, one of the experiences that I had when I was on the other side, it just seemed incredible to me that another local entrepreneur, the Speers family, had built one of the largest, the largest I guess, milk distributing business in Winnipeg. I understand that he had about 50 percent of the milk distribution in the City of Winnipeg. Why in heaven's name do we need Beatrice Foods? I can't understand this. And the only reason Beatrice Foods was interested in coming to Winnipeg was because the United States was restricting their expansion in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it used to be that all of the beer was manufactured by local Manitoba people, the Riedel family, the Shea family, these were private businessmen albeit perhaps their efforts were misdirected, but nevertheless these are what we are talking about, at least in my mind when you are talking about the private sector, people who saved their money, invested and hoped for a return.

But this from what I can hear from the Minister is not what he is asking us to vote funds to administer. We are trying to create a *milieu* in which there is no other alternative but for you people to subsidize the larger, multi-national corporations to come in and bail you out. If this is the challenge that you give the staff which is to administer this particular expropriation, then Mr. Chairman, I think that the people in the province are entitled to know, and not at the end of the debate as suggested by the House Leader, but at this particular point in time.

What does the Minister mean by the private sector? And what does he hope to administer through these some — well, the total for this particular appropriation as far as administration is concerned is some \$3.1 million. So perhaps the Minister without being called out of order by the House Leader can at this time tell us and tell Manitoba what he means by the private sector.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, very briefly just to reply to the Member from Winnipeg Centre.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the programs conducted by the Department of Industry and Commerce are those which are geared for small business, the support of small business, as well as trying to teach managerial skills, entrepreneurial skills. As the Member knows Manitoba's largest number of industries are in the small category bracket. Having been in business himself he will appreciate the problems that are faced by small entrepreneurs from time to time, whether it be problems with accounts receivable or whatever. That is one of the larger functions of the department, to help out small business.

It is also there through several other different agencies to provide some incentive as far as design. Also we have several branches within the department which deal with the attraction and location of industry, whether it be large or small.

The Department, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is one which acts sort of as a support-troop to industry in the province as well as trying to contact and also trying to encourage investors and companies from outside the province to come to Manitoba and locate here. So that is a very brief overview, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is with respect to the Task Force Report, which gives certain indications as to the direction that the Task Force is recommending this Department undertake in putting forward their new budget for this year, for the coming fiscal year.

I note from looking over the Task Force that many of their recommendations appear to be implemented in the body of the Estimates before us and I refer also to another section of the Task Force which refers to the Department of Northern Affairs, that is the recommendations of the Task Force on that department.

Now I note that in the recommendations of the Task Force, they say here, "Line delivery programs of Northern Affairs should be transferred to the appropriate line delivery departments, that Northern Affairs' role should be one of monitoring, co-ordinating and advising government on its activities in Northern Manitoba."

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

Further on in their recommendations it says and I quote, "It is important that the Department of Northern Affairs monitor all activities in the north to ensure that the provision of services continues to improve."

Now given the two aspects of this report; number one, the recommendations of the Task Force with respect to Northern development, and the fact that certain functions of Northern Affairs should be carried out by line departments, I would like to ask the Minister with respect to the Estimates he has before us here, how he intends to carry out those functions with respect to Northern development, development of business enterprises in northern communities, development of various types of entrepreneurial activity, assistance, counselling and so on, that would be required to assist in the establishment of enterprises employing northern people, where in his Estimates he would have a line for this, and could he please indicate what exactly he intends to do with those functions of Northern Affairs, if any, that have been transferred over to his department?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. While the Honourable Minister was responding to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, he had indicated that one of the functions of his department is an educational one to teach the private sector managerial skills. But, Mr. Chairman, I was of the impression that this government had gone out and recruited help from the private sector to teach the government managerial skills, that this was part of what the Task Force was all about, and it really makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, who is attempting to teach whom.

Now I am directing this question to the — I believe that there was a new rule on that side of the House which really doesn't affect House procedure or Committee procedure but the manner in which the government chooses to respond during Estimates, that questions have to be directed to the House Leader because the House Leader is the one who makes the decision whether the minister ought to respond or not — so to save time I am directing a question to him and the Minister can do with it what he wishes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, to answer the questions of the Member from Rupertsland the report as such, I have not been told to implement any of those particular recommendations in there. We are proceeding with our Estimates in a manner that has been undertaken in successive years and the different assistance as given to northern and different communities will continue. I just point out in reply to the Member for Burrows there are several managerial courses where people are hired to conduct courses — one is just completed in Thompson, which I understand was very successful.

Further to his question as far as managerial capabilities, let me tell you just because you are in a particular line of work, whether you be a teacher or whatever, there is always certain things that you don't know and if you can pick up one or two helpful hints when you go and attend a course it is of benefit to everybody.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member from Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Just to clarify that point, Mr. Chairman, were those being taught managerial skills by government the same ones who were teaching the government managerial skills in public administration?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that the majority of these people are people who are hired for fee for service with certain expertise in that particular field.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note the Minister is saying that he has not been told to implement any of the recommendations of the Task Force which was just tabled in the House yesterday. It appears to be, however, too much of a coincidence to look at the Task Force Report and recommendations and compare that to the Estimates that are before us, and note that almost all of the Task Force recommendations in the case of the Department of Industry and Commerce are being implemented.

Executive expenditure reduced by 20 percent for example. It appears as though there is at least some reduction there, if not the 20 percent at least a portion of that has been implemented. In the case of Enterprise Development the recommendation is that, from the Task Force, and I quote, "That Enterprise Development Group expenditures should be reduced by 20 percent with general reduction in all areas including administration, small enterprise development, human resource development, technology and supply, marketing distribution and design and regional co-ordination."

So when I look at the Estimates before us, Mr. Chairman, I note that there is a reduction in all of those areas that are recommended by the Task Force Report, and if you look further in here to look at the other things which they are recommending, I think the point could be argued with success that the Estimates that are before us reflect the recommendations that are made in this Task Force. Now either the Task Force were making these recommendations to the department on an ongoing basis

whereby the Minister was able to implement them into his Estimates, or there is some super coincidence here which we appear to have before us, where there is almost a complete correlation between what is being recommended in the Task Force Report, and the Estimates that are before us.

I repeat the question that I had earlier with respect to this information and that is, how does the Department of Industry and Commerce intend to provide the service that was provided in Northern Manitoba by the Department of Northern Affairs, given that there are cutbacks in Northern Affairs? I think when we get to the Department of Northern Affairs we will see that the Task Force recommendations have been adopted there as well as they are being now adopted in the Department of Industry and Commerce.

So who is going to pick up that slack? That is the question that I have, Mr. Chairman. If Northern Affairs is no longer going to operate as a department that is going to provide a front-line service, they are no longer going to be the front-line troops being out there in the northern communities where work is really needed to be done in order to create enterprises that will employ people where there is 75 to 90 percent unemployment in many of these communities, and if Northern Affairs is going to cut back on the kind of activity that they have been doing — and it appears from the Task Force recommendations that as far as the Task Force is concerned there has been too much work done in Northern Manitoba. But I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that that is a deliberate deceit because there has not been enough work done in Northern Manitoba. I was one of the biggest internal critics of my own government, that we were not doing enough in Northern Manitoba. We should have been doing more.

Mr. Chairman, for the Task Force to now say that it was too much too soon is a lot of crap, and I would like the Minister to respond as to how his department is going to pick up the slack, the big gap that is going to be left by the pull-back in services by the Department of Northern Affairs. I would like him to answer that in light of the reductions that we see in this department. While on one hand the government is saying they are going to be promoting enterprise in Manitoba, we see this department coming before us with reductions in all the areas that the Task Force have recommended, and Mr. Chairman, they are doing this in spite of the recommendation of the Task Force that the line departments will pick up the slack or pick up the activities that were formerly carried out by the Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to add on to what my colleague began in terms of the Task Force and to try to get some clarification from the Minister as to how he was plugged in to that study, if at all, because a whole series of recommendations were made in each department, and I refer in particular to pages 113 and 114, where we are left with some very brief, bare-boned statements; namely, that the Economic Development Advisory Board should be disbanded; the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics should be substantially reduced; the Manitoba Transportation Economics Secretariat should be reduced by 50 percent; another 20 percent, another 20 percent, and so on and so on.

I would like the Minister to describe his association, his knowledge of the operations of the Task Force as it affected his department, or as it affected the senior civil servants in his department, because I assume that if the Task Force operated in a vacuum and was not in close liaison with the Minister, the Deputy and other high ranking officials, that their recommendations are made at a considerable distance and without any real input from the department, that in effect they are making philosophical deductions based on certain premises. So I would like to know what involvement he had.

And secondly, if he is going to follow the recommendations of the Task Force, again on what basis is he going to make those decisions. Because all he's being told is this should be reduced and that should be reduced. So I would like to know whether he has access to the complete documentation of the Task Force. I had the impression yesterday, Mr. Chairman, from listening to the Minister responsible for the Task Force, that he was going to sit here during all of the departmental examinations. That was an impression that I had, that we either have to wait for weeks until we have an opportunity at questioning the Minister responsible for the Task Force, or else he should be here at all times for each departmental examination, because he is trying to impose a certain pattern on the department and I am curious as to how the Minister is going to relate to Task Force recommendations with which presumably he had nothing to do.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that with regard to the Task Force report, the recommendations in there, as I understand it, are recommendations and the implementation of those will have to be done if the Cabinet and the Executive Council so wishes.

As far as identifying some of the areas within the department that we thought we could effect some savings on, the Task Force has identified the same areas that we have in their dealing with the staff. I have spoke to the Task Force they spoke to members of the staff, and if that is what has happened that's what happened then, but the cuts were done working together with staff and that is how we arrived at them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Honourable Minister's reponse to the questions put by my colleague, the Member for Ruperstisland, I believe that the Honourable Member for Roblin had something that he wished to add, with particular reference to Churchill, as to what was done for the north and I think that in Committee we would all want to have an opportunity to participate in the debate and all would want the benefit of whatever comment he has to offer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** I gather we are still on Executive Salaries. We are still on Item (b), Executive Salaries.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1.(b)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the various newspaper reports of some changes in the department's organizational structure, whether he could provide us with an organizational chart of the department to members of the House, or one or two copies, and also provide some rationale for these changes.

It is interesting to note, indeed as the Task Force on government organization has noted, that there have been a number of re-organizations take place over the years, which is fine, because one should change and adapt to changing circumstances and there is always room for improvement. This is noted in the Task Force report. It says, "Although the department" — this is in Volume 2, page 112 — "Although the Department of Industry and Commerce has undergone regular re-organizational changes its structure is still very complex, it needs to effect economies." Now there have been some announcements in the papers, and I was just wondering if the Minister could explain or provide us with an organizational chart and also provide some rationale for the changes.

Also, I wonder if he could indicate whether there are any — I think this is the proper place under the Executive Salaries, under the Executive portion of the department that is concerned with the total coordination of the department — just whether there have been any reductions in staff now. Have any reductions taken place? We have heard of transfers of people, but just what is the staffing situation now?

The other question I have, the third question, and perhaps it is uypothetical, but nevertheless it's a very real or very current question and that is what about the proposal, the major proposal of the Task Force of the establishment of the Department of Economic Development, which would amalgamate Industry and Commerce with branches of other departments that now exist: Tourism, Mines, and so on. And what would happen in the case of executive organization if this is to occur.

If this is to occur, can the Minister advise us does he expect to have a larger executive on that account, or will there be economies made in the executive function, or just what does he anticipate happening?

Now, he could say, "I can't answer that because it is a hypothetical question at this time." It may be hypothetical but it seems to me that there is a very good possibility of this amalgamation taking place, and I'm wondering, if it does take place, whether the Minister can indicate whether he expects to see much change in the executive branch or the executive section of this expanded operation — if it should come about.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, to be very frank in reply to the member, I have no idea. We haven't discussed that particular report and I have no idea what the ramifications are. We haven't done any work along those lines. We have conducted our Estimate review and everything on the basis of the book before the gentlemen, and I haven't done any work along those lines.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Just to go back, I asked three questions. The other two — one was with respect to the organizational chart because we heard of some changes, and the second was with regard to the size of the department, the staffing.

Can the Minister advise us of any reduction or expansion, or what numerical change has taken place in the staffing in the department?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I can provide an organizational chart. I can tell the member that the organization of the Department of Industry and Commerce is the same as it was in October, and there have been no major changes. The only thing that would be different is that the Economic Development Advisory Board has been disbanded and that's about it. But I can provide the member with a chart.

The total staff man years, I understand, was 171 last year and 167 this year. Contracts last year 36; 16 this year. And of these there were 17 vacancies last year and 27 this year. That makes a total staff complement right now of 190 last year and 156 this year.

**MR. EVANS:** Do I understand from some of the figures on contracts — reduction in contracts from



Tuesday, April 4, 1978

36 to 16 — that some of these people . . . I heard the figure 171 last year, 167 now; 36 on contract last year and 16 on contract now. Because there is a reduction of only four in totality in that first set of figures you gave, and yet there is a reduction of 20 in contracts, does this mean that some of the contract people have been put into what is referred to as regular or bulletin jobs? Are they in the sort of regular staff man year complement as opposed to the contract type of position?

**MR. BANMAN:** No, I just repeat this one line that I mentioned. Of the numbers that I mentioned the SMYs and the contracts, there were 17 vacancies last year and there is 27 now. So that's where the figure difference comes in.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** The Honourable Minister will agree that from time to time individuals are hired on contract for certain particular specific assignments, where it's known in advance that the assignment will take six months, nine months, twelve months to complete, or whatever.

Of that reduction in the number of contract persons, to what extent was the reduction brought about by the fact that the assignment for which they were hired had been completed and terminated and hence there was no need to continue the contract — that the job came to an end.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't got those figures right now, except that I could tell the member that in some instances civil servants took the place of some of the people that were doing the contract work.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask two or three questions. I will try and confine my remarks to the Minister's opening remarks and avoid getting into the wider and broader comments on the policies of this government and the future of this province.

But I am wondering, in reading the Minister's opening comments, whether he is in disagreement with his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. And I would quote the record, number three in his opening comments: "Minimizing government interference, disruptive regulations, unnecessary cost burdens on the economic progress."

He is referring to the small business people. I am wondering if he has had any discussion with the Minister of Agriculture who is about to impose that very thing, that very interference, disruptive regulations in requiring the small auction marts or even the large packers with the necessity of keeping track of the beef checkoff.

This, in my opinion, would be disruptive. I have had conversations with some of the packers and the local auction marts and they already are overburdened with federal regulations such as looking after payments for testing cows and livestock in the auction marts. And it appears to me that they are very imposed to any more disruptive and interference of this type.

So I am wondering if the Minister would perhaps talk to his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, to try and avoid this. Not to impose any more burdens on these small businessmen out in the rural areas.

Another comment I would like to ask the Minister, and I believe he also mentioned that in his remarks today, but I will quote from Page 380 at the top of the page, April 3rd. It continues, "embark on a specific and continuous program of consulting individuals, corporations, and associations in the process of planning ways in which the government can be most supportive to them".

I wonder if the Minister could identify who are the individuals that his department is consulting? Who are the corporations and what are the associations?

It would appear to me that some of the recommendations in the Task Force Report are already reflected in the Estimates. For instance, the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, in which the report states, "The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics is providing a lot of information of doubtful value."

Now, I would like to know in whose opinion they consider it to be of doubtful value and what this information is that they consider as doubtful.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, apropos to the questions posed by my honourable colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, I would also like the Honourable Minister to explain . . . And I believe that I am in order in asking this because this is with reference to his opening statement that I want clarification.

Yesterday the Honourable Minister stated, "We have already been active in improving the business environment by reducing the personal income tax, reducing corporate tax on small business, and eliminating succession duties."

I would take it that the Honourable Minister must have some evidence of his success in improving the business environment by taking the measures that he has. Could the Honourable Minister indicate to the Committee what evidence he has of being successful in this area and the extent to which he has been successful in improving the business environment by taking the measures and the steps that he has indicated he has.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Member for Ste. Rose, first of all let me say that when we are talking about setting up a dialogue with people what we have asked, and what we have received from a number of people, is identifications of certain businesses that might be interested in locating here, which the staff then follows up.

We receive hundreds of calls everyday which are processed, either for people inquiring how they can start a new business or how they can receive some assistance in filling out DREE applications and things like that.

So we are asking for that type of input so that we can go ahead and develop a good solid industrial base in the province, as well as helping the smaller entrepreneurs who want to maybe start a new business in some service sector in the country.

With regard to the statement made by the Member for Burrows, let me just say that we could sit down and start throwing all kinds of figures around here which would be hard on either side to verify. I think the stated intention of the government has helped to create a little more confidence in the business community — both small and large — and I think that even our sister province, Saskatchewan, has found out that that is maybe the kind of thing they should have followed our lead in announcing their new cuts.

So I think that people realize that we have to maintain a tax structure in this province which is competitive to others in the North American market. And therefore I think that that particular line of reduction will help the Manitoba business environment in the long run.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, if I may I really would appreciate the Honourable Minister to be a bit more specific. My question was: What evidence does he have? Because he says that he has already been active in improving the business environment.

As I understand that sentence, it is that he has improved the business environment. What evidence has he that he has improved the business environment, and to what extent has he improved it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, if I could just expand on the question posed by the Member for Burrows, I wonder if the Minister would have information as to the number of new jobs created within the past six months in the Province of Manitoba? And also whether or not he has the number of jobs lost in the Province of Manitoba?

I know that certainly there have been jobs created and jobs lost in the past six months. — (Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not really interested at this point in answering the Member for Roblin. If he would wish me to, I would be delighted. He is speaking from his chair. But I am more anxious now to obtain some information so that we can ascertain whether the Minister can in fact justify the statement which he did make in his opening remarks to the effect that there was some revival of interest in the business community in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** If I can just quickly . . . With regard to the jobs lost and jobs created, I understand that we have a total for that and I will provide the member with that.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not happy with the response I got to my previous questions. In fact, the Minister only answered one. I suppose he doesn't have to answer if he doesn't want to.

I will ask it again, because his comments indicate here we have also embarked on a specific and continuous program of consulting individuals, corporations and associations. I'm saying that in the context of these remarks, that it is presumed that this is something new, something different. Now we all know that there has been ongoing consultations with private enterprise and assistance of all kinds in the past. This is something new and I ask him again to identify the people he is specifically talking to. He didn't reply to my first question in regard to the government interference and disruptive regulations. How can he justify making those statements if the Minister directly behind him, the Minister of Agriculture, is about to undertake to put into practice this kind of disruptive interference to the small auction marts in the rural area of our province?

In answer to the question put by my colleague, the Member for Burrows, on what actually has happened to the economy up to this point in time, maybe he should ask the Bureau of Statistics to give him that information, that he wants to do away with his department, maybe they can give him the answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

Tuesday, April 4, 1978

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, may I inform the Member for Ste. Rose and the other members of the Legislature, that this is the first government that's spoke to the people of Roblin constituency for eight years.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, after that profound speech from the Honourable Member for Roblin, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, in responding to my colleague the Member for Selkirk, in giving the numbers of jobs created, I would like to know, in line with the Honourable Minister's own statement, how many of those jobs were the result or flowed from the Minister's reduction of personal income tax, reducing corporate tax to small business and eliminating succession duties? I think it will be important, Mr. Chairman, to make a distinction between those jobs that came into being because of these measures taken by government and those jobs which may have been in the process of formulation while we were still the government, but it just so happened that they came into being in November or Deceer, but they would have come about anyway. So I would like to know precisely how man: jobs came into being because of these legislative measures that the government had taken, that had the government not done what it said that it did over here, that those jobs would never have come into being?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one short question to the Minister as a supplementary to the question put to him by my colleague from Selkirk. Would he endeavour to isolate those figures for job creation and loss of jobs for the geographical area north of the 53rd?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** . . . before the Minister responds to it, is it possible to divide it into north of 53, rural and City of Winnipeg?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** We'll check into that; see if we can do that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I still don't know from the Minister's previous answers if he has really looked at his department as being one which covers all of Manitoba or if its activities end at the Trans-Canada Highway going north. I would still like him to explain and to outline which areas of his department will be serving the remote communities of Manitoba that are in the northern area of this province, that are presently being served by the Department of Northern Affairs and whose services are being eliminated through this Task Force report. I believe that since we are seeing the implementation of the first part of this Task Force's report in this first set of Estimates that are before us, I believe this is just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to be seeing each department coming in here with an implementation of each and every one of the recommendations that are contained within the Task Force report.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Task Force report was actually written by the government and that the government supplied these recommendations to the Task Force for them to, in turn, give back to the government, because that is what we will be seeing in these Estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. The hour of 5:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.