



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



Vol. XXVI No. 46

10:00 a.m. Friday, May 19, 1978

Manitoba Legislative Assembly

Thirty-First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Political Affiliation</i>
ADAM, A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Robert (Bob)	Springfield	P.C.
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib.
BANMAN, Robert, Hon.	La Verendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas A.	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David R.	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J.R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
CHERNIACK, Saul M., Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Keith A., Hon.	Gimli	P.C.
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W., Hon.	Riel	P.C.
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell J.	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	P.C.
DOWNEY, James E., Hon.	Arthur	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	P.C.
EINARSON, Henry	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J., Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, James	Dauphin	P.C.
GOURLAY, Douglas	Swan River	P.C.
GRAHAM, Harry E., Hon.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
JENKINS, William W.	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank, Hon.	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JORGENSEN, Warner H., Hon.	Morris	P.C.
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C., Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
MacMASTER, Ken, Hon.	Thompson	P.C.
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward R., Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
MERCIER, Gerald W.J., Q.C., Hon.	Osborne	P.C.
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	P.C.
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Howard, Q.C.	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Norma Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
RANSOM, Brian, Hon.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
SCHREYER, Edward R.	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Louis R., Hon. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C., Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 19, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): 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 Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement regarding the disposition of the assets of Athapap Builders, a Department of Northern Affairs' house-building project which has operated in Cranberry Portage and Young's Point and employs 26 people.

In 1977-78, its first year of operation, Athapap will suffer a loss of more than \$200,000 and the projections have been for a loss of a similar amount in the year 1978-79. I am pleased to announce that this drain on the treasury will cease and the employment opportunities will continue because the assets of Athapap Builders have been sold to private firms which will carry on house-building operations at the same location. Both firms have agreed to give first consideration in their hiring to existing employees.

A house-building business will be carried on in Cranberry Portage by a subsidiary of Thyssen Mining Construction of Canada Limited which has purchased Athapap Builders equipment for \$48,000 and will lease the building for \$7,200 per year for five years. It expects to employ 20 people initially and 50 people when the operation reaches full capacity.

Four staff members of Athapap Builders have purchased equipment for \$7,500 and will lease the building at Young's Point for \$5,000 per year for five years. They will carry on woodworking and house-building activities and expect to employ four people initially and up to 20 people in the future as their operation expands. It is significant to note that these private firms which will operate without provincial subsidy expect to employ in the future a much larger number of employees than the very costly government operated project they are replacing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for bringing this matter to our attention and announcing it in the House so that we have an opportunity to comment on it. I note that there is no really firm agreement in this sale to ensure that these new firms will actually guarantee the hiring of the existing people that are working in that area. If past practice in the north proves true in this case, then I would predict that there is a good possibility that these workers will not get jobs with this new firm.

In many cases when outside firms move into the north to do private projects, they bring their crews with them, they don't hire local people except for maybe a few of the menial jobs involved and I hope that that is not the case in the announcement made here today.

But I'm disappointed that the Minister was not more firm in his negotiations with these companies to get the kind of guarantee that would make it possible for these workers to continue their jobs and not just have a wishy-washy commitment that they will give them a first chance at these jobs, because that has not proven out to be true in the past, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason that the government was involved in many operations in northern Manitoba, because the private businesses either were not going into these places or when they were going in they were not employing the local people in the jobs that were available through their operations. They were bringing their crews with them. All it meant was a lot of profits were going to companies from southern Manitoba or even from outside Manitoba entirely. I hope that that is not the case in this announcement.

I note the Minister has great optimism in this respect and we will be watching this development very carefully and I hope that my predictions are not correct, but I'm afraid that what will happen is that there will be jobs created for people who do not live in the north and that the people who are now working in the north will no longer have jobs.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements? The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make with regard to the proposed development by a certain Mr. Joe Jarmoc. I have copies here for members opposite and for the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I promised to review the proposal for a development in the Whiteshell Provincial Park which was made by a Mr. Joe Jarmoc.

At an early stage in this review I found that discussions took place on a development proposal between Mr. Jarmoc and officials of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs in early September, 1977 under the former administration. Mr. Jarmoc's relationship with the previous administration has been traced back to 1973 when he dealt with Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs on a similar proposal just north of the Lac du Bonnet airstrip. The review also disclosed that the developer, Mr. Jarmoc, had been employed as a Planner 3 by the Department of Northern Affairs from August 12, 1974 to July 30, 1976.

Starting in September, 1977, Mr. Jarmoc held meetings with departmental officials and was advised that the department would require more specific information and detailed proposals before any consideration could be given to his plan.

On October 14, during the former government's administration, the officials of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs prepared and forwarded a draft proposed agreement to the Attorney-General's department.

I was first made aware of Mr. Jarmoc's proposal shortly after being sworn in as Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs at the end of October. It appears that a decision had been made at senior levels in the department to explore opportunities for the private sector development in the Whiteshell Provincial Parks. I must assume that the approval for this decision was made with the consent and advice of the former Minister, the Member for Burrows. It now appears that this proposal resulted in some professional differences of opinion among departmental officials. On November 14, 1977, the Deputy Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs signed, together with Mr. Jarmoc, the same proposed agreement that was forwarded by the previous administration to the Attorney-General's Department on October 14. This memorandum of agreement was identical in form but deleted the clause not allowing the developer to use the borrow pit materials for construction and maintenance from the nearest pits without charge and adding that the developer must comply with VIII and IX of the Parklands Act and that the wording was to be reviewed by respective solicitors.

Pursuant to the agreement, Mr. Jarmoc was granted permission to build a road at his own expense, a road across Crown land to his own property. Any commitments made by me were made with the firm assurance of departmental officials that no binding obligations regarding further development were implied. This opinion, that only an easement for the road was being granted in the proposed agreement signed November 14, has been confirmed by Mr. Jarmoc, the Attorney-General's Department and outside legal counsel.

Subsequently I am informed that in the period from late November 1977 until mid-March 1978, Mr. Jarmoc and his representatives entered into a series of discussions with various officials of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and the Department of the Attorney-General, regarding the form a proposal would need to take in order to receive consideration by the Parks Branch. This discussion involved clarification of legal details which the developer would be required to furnish as well as the degree of design detail and specifications that would be needed before any proposal could begin a process of evaluation and review.

The review undertaken by me indicates clearly that we cannot at this time proceed with any major development in the Whiteshell Park which includes the Jarmoc proposal, until the management plan is completed and approved.

A zoning plan completed in 1973-74 by the previous government froze development in the provincial parks all over Manitoba pending further study. This further study was never undertaken and the zoning plan itself has never been acted upon, nor has it been formally adopted as policy, nor received public input. It further emerged that in fact, professional opinion as to the economic, environmental and social impact of the development in this area was divided. It was also evident that because of these facts, all decisions taken in the past regarding park development and planning had been on an ad hoc basis.

Therefore, since there were no established criteria for evaluating a proposal such as Mr. Jarmoc's, it was agreed to suspend any further consideration of the terms of his proposal, or any major development, until a detailed analysis had been undertaken to assess the differences of professional

opinion and clear understandable criteria developed against which such a proposal might be evaluated.

Accordingly, again last fall, shortly after assuming responsibility for the department, I asked that a team be commissioned to conduct a detailed study of the Whiteshell area. This team since the fall has been studying various site plans, seeking public opinion through newspaper advertising and contact with different groups, such as the Cottage Association, environmentalists, and other interested parties. The team's report, expected in about six months' time, will provide a framework for development of the Whiteshell Park area. 'ntil such a time as this team presents its report, its members will continue the process of meeting with concerned sectors of the public to collect data, trade ideas and learn responses to elements of the plan under consideration. This is a vital part of the process of refining a concept which will identify all the critical requirements of an acceptable management plan.

And further, Mr. Speaker, our commitment to public input does not end there. Once the team's proposed management plan has been completed and presented it will be released to the public for examination and we will once again seek responses and suggestions from groups and individuals concerned.

I would stress again that no major developments will take place until this management plan has been accepted. This final step in the process of consultation with the public will ensure that the team members have correctly understood and interpreted the needs and expressions in the first stages of discussion. Only after the final public review has occurred will we consider moving toward implementing a proposed management development plan.

This plan is badly needed, Mr. Speaker. In spite of what would seem to be an abundance of recreation land in Manitoba, applications for annual draws of Parks Branch cottage lots have exceeded the number of available lots by about 128 percent. Cottages in the Whiteshell are being sold at prices in excess of \$40,000 because the demand is so much greater than supply and thousands of Manitobans have had to go into Ontario to find lakeside lots on which to build a cottage they can afford.

Although a great many cottage lots are sold each year in the province, still the cost under the present system will prevent many of our citizens from realizing their dream . . .

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that he was going to make a statement on an announcement of his investigation into the Whiteshell program which is perfectly legitimate. The balance of this statement, Mr. Speaker, deals in no way with his investigation of that development but is a debate on the Whiteshell Development Program and if the Minister is using, Mr. Speaker, this Ministerial announcement in order to start a debate, then I say that that is improper and it will not be conducive to the proceedings of this House because there will be a debate on this side of the House with respect to that.

If the entire review has now been dealt with then we are now dealing with something which the Minister should deal with under his Estimates and has nothing to do with Ministerial Statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statement contains not only the question of the review but it does deal with the rationale for decisions that will have to be made and I was under the impression that my honourable friends opposite have been seeking this information for a long time. Now that they are getting it not in the form that they wanted it, they are objecting. You know, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to determine the form in which a Ministerial Statement is made if it's appropriate to the decisions that have to be made, and there has to be some rationale. What the Minister is attempting to do is to point out the reasons for decisions that are going to be made in connection with the Jarmoc proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I would like to point out that the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster is probably a very valid point. However, because over the past several weeks we have had numerous requests for information in this particular thing, I think that at this particular time we could probably spend a little more time getting the information that the Minister has been requested to give on so many occasions.

The Honourable Member for Inkster on the point of order again.

MR. GREEN: I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that you recognized the validity of the point of order. I say

with respect to you, Sir, that we have not been asking for many weeks the Minister's development proposals or debate on a Whiteshell development plan. We have been asking for what he was talking about, an investigation with regard to the Jarmoc deal. Now, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what my learned friend says, we're not worried about the information. I just say, Mr. Speaker, that if you relaxed the rule, then you can expect a 40-minute speech in debate on this debating point that is being made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: On that same point of order, that's a favourite technique of my honourable friend. The moment that things don't go his way, then he begins to threaten the House and threaten the Speaker and I don't think, Sir, that you should be submitting to threats from my honourable friend on a daily basis as has been the case in the last couple of days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the plan we believe is badly needed in spite of what seems to be an abundance of recreation land in Manitoba . . . —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, probably a lot of this stuff bears repeating and it will probably be mentioned during the Estimates. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say that less than 2 percent of the 4,000 square miles of park system is dedicated to the facilities for people. There are 6,200 camp sites, only 260 of them are fully serviced, compared with a population of 330,000 households.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the non-policy of frozen park development has resulted in confining the access of the provincial park system to a few who are able to afford the high cost of owning cottages. The average person can no longer afford to buy a cottage lot and build a place in the woods for his family on weekends.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, any development in the park will require sensible planning. We are committed to seek input from many individuals and groups in order that the resulting development plan will be truly representative of the needs of those concerned with the area in question. The final decision on what shall happen in the park system will be a balanced result of proposals from the department staff, from the public and from the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that in doing this review I have found no development policy for the Whiteshell, a lack of consensus of opinion of lake capacity and a lack of the recognition of the rights and needs of the average Manitoban. In keeping with this review which is now under way in the Whiteshell Park and which includes public input and further study, I believe it would be inconsistent to continue this project.

I have, therefore, Mr. Speaker, instructed staff not to consider any major development in the Whiteshell Provincial Park which includes the Jarmoc proposal until a management plan for development is completed and approved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I hope honourable members opposite brought their lunch because I intend to take at least as much time as the honourable member took and I believe that given the number of issues that he raised in this statement, that I'm entitled to a full 40 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with this statement that the Minister made, which is the most incredible statement I have ever seen made on the kind of issue, that is before us with this Jarmoc agreement in the Whiteshell, and it shows the complete abdication of responsibility on his part when he promised to bring forth a true statement to the House giving the background to this issue and explaining why he as a Minister had instructed his department over their objections to sign an agreement in the Whiteshell with a private developer on private land which the department had previously recommended against, and for him to now say that somehow — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Would you please allow the honourable Member for Rupertsland to continue.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to look at his statement. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that the Honourable Member for Inkster allow his own colleague the right to speak. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague from Inkster is correct when he says that

this statement by the Minister to the this House reveals a lack of courage on the part of this Minister and on the part of this government to make an honest statement to the House on a decision which they made and they can't pass the buck by saying that this was something that was started before this government came into power and they can't pass the buck by saying . . . — (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to all members that you allow any member of this Chamber the right to speak when he is recognized by the Speaker. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They can't pass the buck by saying that this is something that was started before their administration came into office. This Minister, under pressure from this House, after denying that he had instructed his, even denying any knowledge of this agreement, came into this House a day later and said that, yes, he remembered that he had indeed instructed his Deputy Minister to sign this agreement, so he had the knowledge, I submit that he had that knowledge the day that he came into this House and made the statement that he had no knowledge of that agreement. It's not something that you go back and check with your department and ask them, "Did I give you instructions to sign this agreement," when it's only a few months before. Someone's memory is not that bad, Mr. Speaker. I believe he had knowledge of that when he came into this House and denied having any knowledge of that agreement.

I want to go directly into this statement which the Minister made to the House today and right at the beginning of his statement, Mr. Speaker he attempts to somehow bring this Jarmoc fellow into a connection with the previous administration. It's a feeble attempt, Mr. Speaker, to make it look like the previous administration was involved with this person in development. He even refers to his employment with the Department of Northern Affairs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this fellow was employed by the Department of Northern Affairs doing a project in the north, and yes, Mr. Speaker, he did, as I understand it, he had some knowledge. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, having told me to shut up would you kindly tell the Minister without Portfolio to shut up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that when someone is trying to point out the facts in this House contrary to the information which we have received from the administration, from the government, members especially like the one that represents the task farce, gets very upset with this kind of information, Mr. Speaker, and for the Minister to start out his statement by trying to implicate and make it look like Jarmoc was somehow involved with the previous administration is really incredible, Mr. Speaker, really a gutless kind of way to bring in a report to this House.

If the truth is known and the Minister well knows the truth when this fellow came forward and tried to get an agreement on a similar deal in the Lac du Bonnet area, he was turned down by the previous administration and whether or not he has been having any discussions with the Parks Branch, I respect the integrity of the people in the Parks Branch, I would like them to say that they were in any way seriously considering this proposal that he was making with respect to this lake in the Whiteshell. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the truth is known by the copy of the memo which I tabled in the House about two weeks ago when I was trying desperately to get some accurate information out of this Minister, I tabled this document in the House to show that this Minister had this information readily at hand and he was stonewalling this House, holding back information, and even now today when he comes in here and we expect a full report on this issue, he gives us a pile of crap. And just to look. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he choose his words very carefully. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order the words "crap" and "shit" have been introduced to the House by the Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.m

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I intend to choose my words carefully and I intend to call a spade

a spade, in a memo which I tabled in this House relating to this issue and this memo was written by the Director of Parks to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Danyluk and it was written on the 7th of November, it was written a week before this agreement was signed with Jarmoc and I believe from the information I have that the Assistant Deputy Minister upon receipt of this memo passed this information on to the Deputy Minister, strongly recommending against any kind of agreement with a Mr. Jarmoc in this proposed development. And, Mr. Speaker, they had good reason to oppose this development.

So, it's unfair and unjust for the Minister to come in here and try to make the impression that the former administration were seriously considering in any way this kind of an agreement with this fellow because, Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can find a case where the Minister, under the previous administration, would have overridden the strong objections of his staff like this Minister has done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to those objections and they are very valid objections and they're based on sound environmental professional advice. Mr. Speaker, the Director of Parks in his memo states and I quote, "After conducting an investigation into this matter, I am convinced that we should not grant the easement nor allow the development to occur as planned", he's referring to the road easement and the Jarmoc agreement. "This recommendation is based on a number of factors: (1) the capacity of the Big Whiteshell to absorb uses at its limit; based on the lake alert methodology for determining lake carrying capacity, which is the best tool we have at our disposal at this time; based on boating figures — the standards for boating use indicates one boat per 10 acres of lake surface. Big Whiteshell is 3,200 acres in size, allowing 320 boats. There are currently 385 boats on the lake."

And then, Mr. Speaker, this Minister is trying to make the case that somehow these staff were seriously considering this proposal on behalf of the government. Mr. Speaker, the further information in here states that the environmental impact of a development of this nature would no doubt be significant. He further goes on to say that this could establish a rather dangerous precedent, by allowing this kind of development to occur. And Mr. Speaker, the most revealing words in this document — and I hope the Honourable Minister has read it because I think it points out the way that he is operating, and the way that this government is operating, and the way this government intends to operate with respect to our parks and our resources in this province. And he says, "As I suspect that Mr. Jarmoc will be seeking ministerial assistance in this matter, I am seeking your concurrence to deny an easement to him and further disallow the planned development." And Mr. Speaker, the Director of Parks is recommending this to the Assistant Deputy Minister, and I submit that that Assistant Deputy Minister was using everything in his power to do what this Director had recommended. And Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Minister knew that the staff were recommending these things because this staff made this recommendation to his Deputy Minister, and his Deputy Minister, I am sure, had brought this matter to the Minister's attention and only signed that agreement with Jarmoc after the Minister directly instructed him to disregard this information, to disregard the professional advice of his staff. And Mr. Speaker, this reveals the attitude, this reveals the policy, this reveals the proposed operating procedure of this government, that they are going to decide what is best for the environment, they are going to decide what is best for the resources of this province based on who are their friends, not on any kind of professional advice, not on any kind of professional advice from their department.

Mr. Speaker, when a man like Jarmoc comes in, seeks ministerial assistance, as they call it here — (Interjection) — Oh, sure, we'll put in that project for you — and when his Deputy Minister comes to him and says, "Well, look at all the professional information we have which is strongly recommending against this," I submit this Minister said, "Don't worry about that, you sign this agreement." And Mr. Speaker, he admitted in this House that he instructed his Deputy Minister to sign that agreement. And now, Mr. Speaker, for him to come in here and say that a decision had been made at senior levels in the department to explore opportunities in the Whiteshell area — and I assume that the approval for this decision was made with the consent and advice of the former Minister, the Member for Burrows — Mr. Speaker, this is really an abdication of responsibility, to try to pass the buck to the former administration. Mr. Speaker, this government was elected to make decisions, and when they make decisions they can't turn around and say, "Oh, that was brought on by the previous administration." The buck stops there; they had the decision-making authority . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Will the Honourable Member for Lakeside please respect the Chair? I want to at this time introduce to the Legislature 25 students from Warren Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Wiebe. This school is located in the constituency of the

Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This statement to the House today does not clear up any of the questions that we have requested information on from the Minister. It's an attempt to whitewash this whole affair; it's an attempt to cover up the information behind this. Mr. Speaker, he does not say that the Jarmoc development will not go ahead; he does not. He says that this agreement is held in abeyance until they finish some kind of management plan. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to proceed in the future the way they have proceeded to this date, what they are going to be doing is not respecting the professional advice of their department, or the so-called Task Force that they set up to review this issue; that's a farce; it's going to be another task farce, Mr. Speaker. They will be looking to their friends like Jarmoc, and others, and saying, "What kind of developments do you want to put in?" And then they will be going to their staff and they will be saying, "This is the kind of agreement, this is the kind of land that we want you to come up with." Mr. Speaker, if that kind of policy and procedure is followed, our parks are going to suffer. They're going to suffer from the sell-out that this government is practising.

I'd like to point to some of the other statements that he makes in this agreement, which are really misleading in the form that they're presented to us. On the second page, Mr. Speaker, he refers to the fact that on November 14, the Deputy Minister signed, together with Mr. Jarmoc, the same proposed agreement that was forwarded by the previous administration and the Attorney-General's Department on October 14. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General's Department never signed that agreement or approved it as to form until six weeks after the agreement was signed; six weeks after the agreement was signed; and here he says it was forwarded by the previous administration for their concurrence. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that.

Mr. Speaker, what is missing here in his statement is the admission that he gave to this House that he instructed his Deputy Minister to sign this agreement; he's left that out, and it's conspicuous by its absence, and that is why I say that this Minister lacks courage. He lacks the courage to admit the decision that he took in this case and he can't pass it off by saying that this is something that was forwarded by the previous administration and that the Deputy signed it because the Attorney-General's Department and the department had forwarded it up. The department that he is responsible for was strongly recommending against this, and they said in the memo here, Mr. Speaker, they said in this agreement that they knew, they had the feeling that this fellow was not going to wait for them to turn down their proposal, that he was going to go around and he was going to go and seek ministerial assistance. And Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what he did. His government was elected on October 11th. On November 14th, about five or six weeks later, this government signed this agreement and this Minister instructed his deputy to sign this agreement; it had absolutely nothing to do with the previous administration and for him to try to make that implication in this messy-worded agreement or messy-worded statement to this House and the agreement was messy-worded, too, it's pure deceit to this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOSTROM: And I want to read directly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member I have already given him five minutes more than the Minister had and if he wants to debate I think he has lots of time to debate. I hope that he does curtail his remarks shortly.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, the kind of statement that this Minister made to the House when he drags in every issue other than the Jarmoc affair which he was supposed to report on is enough for 23 forty-minute speeches on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, because this is a serious issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. BOSTROM: I'm not saying that that . . .

MR. JORGENSON: On a point of order, then in that case my honourable friend will have all the opportunity he wants when the Estimates are before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. Does the Government House Leader have a point of order that he wants to raise?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my honourable friend that if he has 23 speeches

to make, they can be made during the course of the Estimates. The rule is in dealing with these statements quite clear and my honourable friend now is straying some distance even from what was contained in the Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I think the point was made that the Honourable Minister had strayed from the rule as far as making Ministerial Statements to the House. So if I have also strayed from the rule, it's just some measure of equality in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will respect your decision and I will wrap up my remarks in a couple of minutes.

I would just like to wrap up by saying that there are so many statements in this review, as it is called, that was submitted by the Minister today, that are complete nonsense and that we will be taking issue with today and in the days to come, and there is so much more that we must know about this Jarmoc agreement that we will be asking questions. And when the oral question period comes up and when we ask this Minister questions — detailed questions — on this issue which have not yet been answered, I hope that we will get answers this time and not the stonewalling that we have been getting to date.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in conclusion that this whole issue has been so clouded and fudged by this Minister that we still do not know what the real information is behind this issue and we have to get documents like this, which are leaked to us, that we manage to get through one way or another, to find out what is happening behind this issue. The Minister never admitted to this House that the department officials were strongly recommending against this. So there is evidence right there of the cover-up that he is trying to practise.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister misinformed this House when he said that he did not know about this agreement and he admitted it the next day when he said that he instructed his Deputy Minister to bring this information, to sign this agreement, and in this statement he is abdicating his responsibility, attempting to fudge this issue and cover up his lack of responsibility in this matter. And, Mr. Speaker, I say that this Minister is attempting to misinform this House by the kind of statement that he has made here today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege, in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister in making his review, as the document is titled, had made reference to me. I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that his assumption that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Member for Burrows is dealing with assumptions, he has not got a point of privilege.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am referring to an assumption made by the Honourable Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Burrows, if he wishes to challenge the ruling of the Chair, knows the manner in which he can do that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, with deep respect and regret I feel I must . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before a ruling is made we would like to know what ruling we are challenging. The Minister indicated that he assumed that the former Minister knew certain things. The former Minister is now getting up to — and conveyed that assumption to the House. The former Minister is now getting up to say, on a matter of privilege, what the facts are. If you, Mr. Speaker, will not permit him to say it, then we will have to challenge your ruling but that is what he intends to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to all members that they read the rule very carefully on the matter of privilege. There can be a difference of opinions on a matter of privilege, but when a member stands up and raises a point of privilege on an assumption, then I say it is not a point of privilege.

Now, if the Honourable Member for Burrows wants to further clarify his point, let him proceed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, then if you do not wish me to quote, to make direct reference

to the Minister's statement as he made it, then I will not. Because I felt that in that manner I was best and most clearly indicating to you, Sir, and to the House, what my matter of personal privilege was.

So then I will say that the Minister stated that he must assume — I am not making the assumption, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that very clear, nor am I basing my matter of privilege on a matter of assumption — my matter of privilege is that he stated that he must assume that the approval for this decision had been made with the consent and advice of the former Minister, the Member for Burrows.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that at no time did I offer my consent to this agreement or to any agreement resembling it.

Now, if the Honourable Minister has evidence to substantiate his assumption, then I would hope that he has come into this House prepared to table such evidence of his assumption and if he has not I would hope he would be man enough to retract.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened very carefully . . . —(Interjections)— Order please, order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the same point of privilege.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS: On the same point of order, if one has listened to the statement made by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation this morning, I would expect that the honourable members of the previous administration would have taken it as an affront for him to do anything other than to assume that while things were taking place, while he had the jurisdiction and the responsibility of that department, that it was done with his consent or with his advice. The fact that the proposed agreement was sent to the Attorney-General's Department on October 14th — was forwarded by senior officials of the Department . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside had no point of order.

I also want to say that I listened very carefully to the remarks of the Member for Burrows and I have to, with much regret, inform him that he had no point of privilege. What he was talking about and what he referred to was a difference of opinion and that is not a point of privilege.

Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation. I wonder whether the Minister can tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether in his meetings with Mr. Jarmoc which he had after he became a Minister, if Mr. Jarmoc ever indicated to him that he was in communication with the previous Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that at that particular meeting I met with the gentleman, that that was discussed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I would like to know whether it is now the Minister of Urban Affairs' position that the new administration is required to go through with what happened by the previous administration even when a contract was not signed, when he previously said that the New Democratic Party government should not have gone on with the CFI agreement, although it was all signed during the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether the Minister of Finance, as the Minister to whom Hydro reports, Mr. Speaker — I'd like to ask whether the Churchill River Diversion project operated at full capacity this winter and spring and whether there was any land on which the Nelson House Reserve where people live, any buildings or land, had flooding by virtue of the full operation of the Churchill River Diversion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, that question will have to be taken as notice.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE (MAY 17, 1978)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a question of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on Wednesday in which he alleged that I had misled this House with respect to approximately 4,000 letters I brought into the House last Friday.

First, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member claims that I committed myself to supplying the House with a complete copy of all the letters and then reneged on that commitment. In fact, the honourable member requested only one copy of the letter — I quote from Hansard, Page 2148, the honourable member's statement:

"Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he would be prepared to give the opposition a copy of that stack of documents that he referred to last week in the introduction of Bill 25 as being letters in support of Bill 25, whether he would be prepared to give the opposition one copy."

This, Mr. Speaker, was my reply: "Mr. Speaker, I believe in my statement, that there were letters received that were in support of an organization. There were several things on the letter and I could see about providing them with a copy of it." In no way was I asked to, or did I commit myself to providing a copy of 4,000 letters to anyone, in fact, I did not give a firm commitment to provide even one.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has suggested that I misled the House by stating that 4,000 letters were in support of Bill 25 — and this is in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's comment: "First of all, he indicated to the House that he had received 4,000 letters of support for Bill 25." A quote from May 17th, Hansard Page 1218. That, Mr. Speaker, is totally a false allegation; in fact, Mr. Speaker, I never said or implied that those 4,000 letters were written to me in support of Bill 25 which was just introduced last week. What I actually said, and I quote from Hansard, Page 2115: "Mr. Speaker, this is the pile of letters in favour of a Cattle Producers' Association in Manitoba. There are approximately 4,000 and here is a pile, Mr. Speaker, of those which were opposed to it. Mr. Speaker, I think that the evidence we have in the department that our government shows that there is a need for a livestock association in the province. I would like to just proceed a little further to say, with the implementation of enabling legislation, that the producers themselves will, in fact, be the people who organized and run their organization. I think that the Act itself will enable them to go ahead and we think it is time to get back to the beginning times of Manitoba when the government worked with the producers of the province and not in confrontation to them."

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had referred to Hansard before rising on Wednesday, he would have seen that I stated that letters were sent in 1977 supporting alternatives to the then Minister of Agriculture's plan for a beef marketing board. I will read it and I will table it.

This, Mr. Speaker, says, "A petition for an alternative to a beef marketing board. I, the undersigned, am a Manitoba cattle producer registered to vote in the upcoming beef marketing referendum — their name and their signature — I wish to see the following proposals offered as an alternative to a beef marketing board: (1) A beef ombudsman operating under The Ombudsman Act be appointed to investigate and correct producer complaints; (2) that packers be required to daily advise the market information service of the following details of all direct-to-packers sales, live or rail grade, (a) number of cattle, (b) type of cattle — steers, heifers or cows, etc., (c) grade, if rail grade, and expected yield if live, (d) price paid (live or carcass basis). The market reporter will be empowered to fully check this information, the information to be posted not identifying the packer or the shipper and to be accessible to the producer or the news media in all parts of the province.

(3) A cattle producer organization be funded by a voluntary checkoff and run by elected director to do the following things, without government regulation: (a) providing daily market information to producers in all parts of the province, (b) assist starting producers to understand the market and the grading system, (c) fund research into the production problems unique to Manitoba, and (d) represent the industry in dealings with government." There's room for comments and it was mailed to Beef Petition, Box 100, St. Norbert, Manitoba.

The honourable member also suggested that I have no letters of support for the proposed organization, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from many organizations in support of a cattle producers' organization. These come from such groups as the United Grain Growers, the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the Maine Anjou Association, the Diploma Graduates Association, the

Beef Growers Association, the Manitoba Cow-Calf Association and the Manitoba Hereford Association.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I have misled the House in any manner. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lac du Bonnet has deliberately misled the House with his incorrect statements and false accusations of Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I said I had some 4,000 letters, approximately 4,000 letters supporting a Producers' Organization and I do. I said I would see about supplying the opposition with one copy and I have.—(Interjection)— I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is attempting to revive the emotional battles and campaigns which characterized last year's vote in his Beef Marketing Board.

That same issue may, in good part, be responsible for where the Member for Lac du Bonnet sits in this House today, and we intend to keep him there.

I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member check the facts more closely next time before he rises in this House to accuse other members of misleading this Assembly. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet has further embarrassed himself with his totally unfounded and irresponsible comments of Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I will take the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture plus the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, I will peruse the Hansards very carefully and I will render a decision on the matter of privilege raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health tell me whether he is considering removing medical care coverage from those people who are students at the university who do not originate in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: That possibility has certainly been under consideration by the government, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister considered whether there would not be a problem with regard to citizens of Manitoba who are attending universities in Ontario and Quebec and other parts of the country with regard to medical coverage supplied in their provinces?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I don't foresee any difficulty in that respect, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that there are and would be alternatives available in terms of medical coverage for foreign students in Manitoba. The final decision has not been made but I reconfirm to the honourable member that it has been considered because of the actual wording of the Medicare legislation and because of the fact that the way the system currently operates, or has been operated in Manitoba, those students are still eligible for benefits under Medicare, paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, when they are back in their own home countries.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister also consider relieving the students that do not have coverage for their medical expenses and hospital expenses while in this province, would he relieve them from the sales tax, the income tax and the other taxes that they have to pay, which pay for these services?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that approach or that perspective I would just cite the tuition and the cost of education, the cost of educating those students, which is borne by the taxpayers of Manitoba to a substantial degree. I assure the honourable member that whatever decision is made it will be made in the interests of equity.

There is a possibility that some refinements of the approach might be adopted which would simply protect the taxpayer of Manitoba from having to incur expenses when the students were not here in Manitoba, or when their dependents were not here in Manitoba. That is an aspect of it that's being looked at. I assume we'll be discussing it in some detail during the Estimates process.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, one last question. Would the Honourable Minister consider the effect that this could have on young Manitobans who have traditionally had and have made use of, the right to go to their sister provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan or British Columbia and receive

their education at the same rates as people who live in those provinces?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, no, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's a comparison of apples and oranges. There is no evidence that there would be that kind of impact, at least I have none.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the statement by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in regard to the Jarmoc statement, and indicating that the draft agreement was forwarded to the Department of the Attorney-General on October 14, executed on November 14, approved as to form by the Attorney-General's Department, December 21, 1977, can the Attorney-General advise whether or not, prior to November 14, his department verbally okayed the wording of the draft agreement prior to its execution on November 14?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to peruse the file in the department relative to this matter and it appears that Mr. J.D. McCarroll, Director of Administration Services of the Tourism and Recreation Branch, forwarded a draft or proposed agreement to the Director of the Civil Litigation Department on October 14, 1977. On this memorandum there is a hand-written note by one of the solicitors in the department, that on October 26, 1977, a Richard Nuxoll of the Parks Department phoned to indicate this matter was not being proceeded with.

I am unaware of any verbal conversations that any member of the department may have had with officials in the Department of Tourism and Recreation subsequent to October 26, 1977 and prior to November 14, 1977.

I note that the agreement that was signed on November 14, 1977, indicated that it was subject to the approval of the respective solicitors as to the wording of the agreement.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Attorney-General then, in view of the information that on October 26 communication was forwarded to his department to the effect that the agreement was not being proceeded with, if he can advise the House as to when, after that date, his department was advised that the agreement was being revived?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the agreement indicated that was signed on November 14, 1977, had a hand-written clause inserted in it that the wording was to be reviewed by respective solicitors. I have no knowledge of any discussions by the Deputy Minister of Tourism and Recreation with anyone in the department between that time period October 26 to November 14, and I assume that it was only subsequent to the signing of this agreement by the Deputy Minister that the department was — pursuant to this wording of the clause that was added in — where they then asked to approve the document as to form.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Attorney-General advise as to when, after November 14, the agreement was then forwarded to his department for approval as to form? And what correspondence took place at that point between the Department of Tourism and Recreation and his department?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that would be a question that should be put to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to that question later but at this point, I would ask the Attorney-General since the agreement was approved as to form on December 21, 1977, if there was any accompanying memorandum from lawyers within his department to the Department of Tourism and Recreation in connection with the form, such as he will note that although there was a space for the agreement to be witnessed, it was not witnessed yet his department approved the agreement as to form. Is there an accompanying memorandum explaining deficiencies in form despite the fact that it was being approved in a formal way as to form?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on the technical point, I'm sure I would have thought that the Member

for Selkirk would have been well aware that there's no absolute necessity to have a signature witnessed. The file that the department does have though does not indicate any accompanying memorandum from anyone in the department.

MR. PAWLEY: Could I ask a supplementary then to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation as to what date after October the 26th was communication made from his department to the Attorney-General reviving the agreement which is the subject of our discussion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got any dates on that. The only date I have seen is the date of the approval of the form, on the form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a supplementary.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister of Tourism and Recreation prepared to take my question as notice and advise the House as to what date after October 26th, did his department then proceed to revive this agreement and request the approval as to form from the Department of the Attorney-General?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, a question that I tried to ask yesterday when we ran out of time. Was the Minister fearing any responsibility and does he care that the chief curator of the MultiCultural Studies was also the only senior curator in the Human History Division is seeing his employment terminated after 11 years after being one of the senior men at the museum because of lack of funds coming from his department?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, the Board of Directors of the Museum are elected officials. They've also got a manager and are running that day-to-day operation. I can undertake to check into the matter and see what has happened but the day-to-day operations and the staffing is done by the Board of Directors and I have no direct input into that.

MR. DESJARDINS: That wasn't my question, and I consider this more than day-to-day operation. The Honourable Minister, does he care that the Museum will now be closed in the winter from 4:30 p.m. and not to be opened in the evenings and, therefore, making it quite difficult for students and working people to visit the Museum and also that the entrance fees will be raised? Does the Minister care about that?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker, I care but as I mentioned the operations of that particular Museum are carried out by the Board of Directors and the staff and I'm sure they're trying their best to provide the best access they can for the public.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister hasn't answered my question. Then is it the intention of the Minister whose party was in the government when they encouraged construction of the Museum, the Arts Council, the Centennial Hall, the Planetarium and took credit for it, is it his intention to be an official guest when they nail the last nail on the door closing these institutions to the public of Manitoba — well you were all there for the ribbon cutting though, you were all there for the ribbon cutting, but now it's the Board eh?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs whether he has any documentation and if he does, would he table it in the House to substantiate his assumption that the Jarmoc agreement had my consent?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that in assuming that I am just as accurate in my assumption as the Member for Rupertsland was when he was speaking before and said that I had knowledge of it, so I made the same assumption.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Honourable Minister. In view of the

fact that his assumption is based on the fact that there were discussions between certain individuals unknown, can the Minister assure the House that there is no one today making a proposal for park development of whatever type to some member of his staff, inter-departmentally, amongst members of his staff which proposal the Minister may not approve?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any staff department that has forwarded any proposed agreements to the Attorney-General's Department and let me say further that I have instructed my staff not to undertake any discussions as far as large private developments until the whole Whiteshell matter has been resolved.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a further supplementary but obviously, it's pointless. I wish to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture whether he would name at least one independent self-governing organization in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario or anywhere in the free world that has the same purposes, same method of operation, the same powers as your organization intended to come into being pursuant to Bill 25.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the honourable member opposite that the association is comparable, the Livestock Association. I'd also like to say that the Act that we're introducing is similar to the Ontario Cattlemen's Association Act 1968. I believe, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Tourism did admit to the House that he had instructed his Deputy Minister to sign the proposed agreement with Jarmoc, my question to him is: When did he establish this Task Force which was to be reviewing the development of the Whiteshell and reporting to him on a master plan for the area?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, we were collecting data all through the process and have come up with this particular review at this time.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, he's obviously misinterpreted my question. My question to him is: When did he establish the Task Force to review the Whiteshell Park and report to him on the kind of development that should take place there?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, shortly after we took office.

MR. BOSTROM: If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, why did he then ignore this Task Force that he had established and instruct his Deputy Minister to sign a development agreement which had major implications for that park and the nature of which was strongly recommended against by the very staff which I assume he would have on his Task Force.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the member will look at the memorandum of agreement, it states clearly that everything is subject to the Parklands Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a fourth question.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will look carefully at the development agreement, it clearly gives the developer the right to go ahead and build 200 condominium units and my question in that regard is: Will he table the documents in this House which give the legal opinion in writing that this agreement only refers to a development of a road? Will he table those documents in this House because he referred to a legal opinion in his review today and I demand that he table this information?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite isn't happy with what I have said, I have indicated that I have had opinions from different areas, — from my staff, from Mr. Jarmoc, from the Attorney-General's Department and other areas — that the only thing he had was the right to build a road, and that's what our legal opinion is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on that famous road, in view of recent radio reports that

the road — the famous road to nowhere — is blown in the wind, is it completed? Is it still under construction, or has it blown away?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the permit that permitted the construction of that particular road stated very clearly that the gentlemen building the road would have to pay all royalties, and different things that are involved with the Department of Mines. I also understand that there are certain staff officials that were supervising that road. But since several months ago, we have stopped any work on that particular road while the review was being done.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time or in the future, assuming the road is completed, will the public be allowed to travel that road?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the member will check the agreement that was tabled by the Member for Inkster, he will see on there that if it is to become a public road we will have to reimburse the developer for the costs of building that road.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister this question. Let us assume the road is completed and it is not taken over by the government. Is the developer required to meet minimum government standards of highway construction in relation to public usage? When that road is completed, do they have to meet minimum government standards of construction?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Parks Branch has certain guidelines for the development of roads and I would assume that the Parks Department officials would make sure that those guidelines are adhered to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is in a position today, then, to confirm whether he would be prepared to give the opposition one copy and I use the same words again, one complete copy of that stack of documents that he referred to as letters in support of Bill 25?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if the member is referring to a copy, a signed copy, I believe that if that is the case that I could consider providing one more copy.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the copy — a stack of copies, 4,000 in number, according to the Minister. Unless I am in a position to see them, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minister that they could all be blank paper. So I ask him whether he is prepared to assure the House that we have access to the complete copy, or one copy of that stack of documents, that he displayed in the Legislature on introduction of Bill 25. And if I am not able to get that, Mr. Speaker, I have to assume that those are blank pieces of paper.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe, as you stated earlier, this matter is being dealt with and you will be making a decision on it. However, if it is a concern of the member opposite that he would like the names, as it stated in the beginning of that petition that I, the undersigned, am a Manitoba cattle producer registered to vote in the upcoming Marketing Board referendum, which the honourable member opposite compiled the list of registered voters, I would think that that complete list of registered voters could possibly be made available.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is now attempting to confuse the issue. I am merely asking for a copy of those documents that he referred to as letters in support for Bill 25. He carried them in and displayed them, Mr. Speaker, and the media took notice of them in the report of the proceedings of that day indicating that the Minister walked in with a fairly substantial stack of material backing him on the introduction of that legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I expect the Minister, at this stage, should be honest with the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Since the Attorney-General indicated that there was a decision not to proceed with the particular agreement that had been forwarded to that department on October 26th, can he discuss or advise the House as to the circumstances under which the agreement was revived after October 26th? And could

he advise the House as to the date of his own memorandum to his Deputy Minister instructing his Deputy Minister to proceed with the execution of the agreement of November 14, 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my remarks, there seems to have been a difference of professional opinion between the departmental people of the staff.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not really interested in the differences of opinion among the staff. Could the Minister answer my questions? If he is unable to answer this morning, would he take those questions as notice?

In fairness to the Minister, I could see that he was attempting to rise to his feet to answer and
I . . .

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the member would repeat the question.

MR. PAWLEY: Since there was an acknowledgement from the Attorney-General that his file indicated that the Department of Tourism and Recreation had advised the Department of the Attorney-General that they were not proceeding with the agreement, which had been forwarded to the Department of the Attorney-General on October 14th, can the Minister advise the House (a), as to the circumstances after October 26th in which it was decided to proceed, regardless, with the agreement executed on November 14th, and (b), if the Minister could advise the House as to the date of the instruction which he forwarded to his Deputy instructing his Deputy to execute the agreement of November 14, 1977?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will try and get the dates for the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can assure the House that those 4,000 letters referred to are indeed authentic and that the people that have sent those letters to this private organization, that those people are cattle producers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member and the House that those letters are authentic.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to ask the Minister of Agriculture to tell the House how he has been able to ascertain whether the names on those letters are names of people in the production of livestock in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour by way of clarification of a statement that the Honourable Minister made yesterday respecting strikes and the problem of security of the province, and the question of maintenance of essential services.

By way of clarification, was the Minister of Labour stating that it is the policy of the government to bring in legislation requiring people back to work, that is, in effect, taking away their right or their ability to withdraw services. Is it the government policy to legislate people to work if it is deemed advisable by the government? Is that now the policy, to legislate people back to work if it is deemed advisable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of the government to protect the people of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: I can assure the Honourable Minister that we are all concerned about the welfare of the people of Manitoba, and the security and maintenance of essential services. But I would also submit, Mr. Speaker, that this security can be maintained without taking away the fundamental freedom of not having to work if you do not wish to work, or to withdraw services if you do wish

to withdraw services.

So my question is: Does the policy of the government to legislate people back to work apply to such groups such as nurses in the province, who are now in the process of taking a province-wide strike vote?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question yesterday for the Member for Kildonan. In my speech to the Rotary Club, I highly stressed the policy of this government was to have a minimum of government interference but if it affected the health and the security of the people of the Province of Manitoba, that we were prepared to protect the people. I also added that I would hope that the former government would have had the same sense of responsibility.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I assure the Minister again that we have the same concern about the welfare of the people. Does the Minister not believe that the welfare of the people of Manitoba and the maintenance of essential services cannot be provided for without taking a fundamental right and freedom away from the people of this province — the freedom to withdraw services? Are you suggesting that there is no other way? Is there no other way, Mr. Speaker? Is the Minister suggesting there is no other way to ensure essential services are maintained, without taking away the freedom of people?

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ORDERS FOR RETURN

ORDER NO. 56: On Motion of Mr. Walding.

THAT an Order of the House do issue for return of the following information:

1. All bids or proposals submitted to the Government of Manitoba for purchase or lease of the Lord Selkirk II pursuant to the public advertisement regarding its sale.

2. All bids or proposals for purchase or lease of the Lady Selkirk.

3. All bids or proposals for purchase or lease of other assets of Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism will undertake to get that information.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call second readings of Bills No. 19 and 21.

BILL NO. 19 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Section 67 of The Mental Health Act presently states that the powers conferred under that Act, as to the management and administration of an estate of a mentally disordered person, are exercisable in the discretion of the court for his maintenance and benefit and that of any person dependent upon him where it appears to be expedient in the due course of management of the estate.

Section 79 of The Mental Health Act sets out a number of instances in which the public trustee shall become committee of the estate of any person who has no other committee. The public trustee has been supplying maintenance to the spouse or children of mentally disordered persons for many years without obtaining an Order of the Court. A judgment of the Alberta Supreme Court recently interpreted a section similar to Section 67 of The Manitoba Mental Health Act to mean that the public trustee as committee has no authority or jurisdiction to financially support the dependents of his wards without a court order. The proposed amendment to The Public Trustee Act will clarify the authority of the Public Trustee to supply maintenance to the spouse or children of mentally incompetent persons.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General would submit to a couple of questions for clarification? Firstly, is it then the intent of this legislation to take away from the courts, what are the present responsibilities of the court to approve of payments to be made by the Public Trustee?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker, the Public Trustee has not been applying to the court. It has been the practice to supply maintenance without any application to the court in these circumstances; it's been going on for a number of years and it's only in the light of the interpretation of the Alberta Supreme Court on a similar section that the proposed amendment is being made.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to comment on this statement. I appreciate the fact that apparently the Public Trustee has been taking the responsibility of deciding who is a dependent and making payments on behalf of the dependent. The fact that it has been that way for many years does not necessarily mean that it is a correct way in which to do it, because it seems to me that there has to be some kind of review mechanism for any trustee, Public Trustee or otherwise, who takes the responsibility for making payments on behalf of another person, in this case a person who is not mentally competent to make his own decision. And it seems to me that it might not be a bad idea to make sure that there is some additional review mechanism when such a payment is made. It's not as if it's being used to support the person himself, but a dependent, and the first question that occurred to me was, on whom was the onus of proof as to the dependency of the person on whose behalf payments are being made? I'm just wondering — I've never had occasion to consider this before — whether there shouldn't be some review mechanism, and whether there shouldn't be a review mechanism as to the payment and as to the judgment on the onus of proof of dependency.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't oppose the bill, I just would like that at committee stage we have further clarification on the feasibility. You know, it occurs to me that this might be a matter for the Law Reform Commission, or for the Bar Association to make some helpful comments to the Legislature on what is very much of a legal interpretive matter and one that has administrative aspects to it. And I hope that the Honourable Minister will have possibly the Public Trustee at Committee, or someone who could give us some advice on experience as to whether or not there is adequate protection under the present system and the newly-suggested law, which is apparently to approve and to make valid previous procedures as to whether there isn't some danger of bad judgment without review.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I would like to just say a few words in connection with this bill as well at this point. I want to certainly confirm the expression of views by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns. I am wondering, however, when we do reach Committee, if we could pursue another area. As I understand the present provisions of the law application can be made for the trusteeship, either through a Public Trustee or, alternatively, through a Committee. Now if the procedure is to move by way of a Committee then it is my understanding that court approval is required. The court approval usually follows letters and documentation from the medical fraternity in order to establish the committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be that the only way that a mentally disturbed person can be protected is if in fact the application is to be made for a committee, is to make the application by way to the court. But I must say that I would like to feel, Mr. Speaker, that there could be some other alternative than obtaining court approval, and I don't know exactly at this point what procedure; I believe that we could develop some procedure; I believe the Law Reform Commission could develop some procedure.

I have for instance in mind an example now of a farm family in which the father, due to surgery, has suffered some brain damage, and for a period of time will be confined to an institution. It is not known for how long. In the meantime, the farmer in question has always operated his dairy farm closely with his wife who has participated more or less jointly in the participation of the farm operations. She would, of course, prefer to be appointed as a committee. In order to appoint her as a committee rather than to proceed through the trustee, an application must be made to the court with all the attendant costs that might be encountered in that respect. And yet it seems to be a natural situation because of the family unit, because of the type of economic operation, the dairy farm, the partnership type of arrangement that has existed, husband and wife, that surely there must be some method by which we can eliminate some of the unnecessary rigmarole and red tape,

minimize expense, delay and concern as an alternative to appeals to the court.

So, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see this particular bill proceed on its way to Committee so we can have a better clause by clause discussion, but I would like the Attorney-General to consider the points raised and to refer the points raised to the Law Reform Commission, because I do believe that there is need for substantial updating in the provisions pertaining to the legislation that is before us, not just in a piecemeal fashion but in other methods and approaches as well.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to see the bill proceed to Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to give further and serious consideration to the matters as raised by the Member for St. Johns and the Member for Selkirk, at the Law Amendments Committee, and I will attempt to have as much information available on the points they have raised when the matter is before the Law Amendments Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 21 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 21, An Act to Amend The Real Property Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if I first of all could point out a typographical error in Section 30, Subsection 5, of the Amendment, the word "given" in the fifth line should be "give" rather than "given." Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for St. Johns for proofreading the bill a few days ago and bringing this matter to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Section 30 of the Act will provide a procedure by which claims, reservations and interest which have been brought forward on a real property application from the registry system can be vacated. The procedure is similar to that now used for vacating caveats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Attorney-General that on second reading we're dealing with the principle and clause by clause examination of the bill should take place in Committee.

The Honourable Attorney-General.\$

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly why I just referred to the fact that it will bring forward this kind of procedure without going into the detailed description of every subsection of that proposed Section 30. Mr. Speaker with respect to Section 57, this will simply allow for making a Certificate of Title deemed to be subject to a sale of land for tax arrears for which no return has yet been made. Once a return has been made it is noted on the Certificate of Title; in that interim period purchasers are protected by the normal issuance of a tax certificate and the Section 88 simply deals with improvement in the procedure for showing on the Certificate of Title a memorial where leasehold term has been extended or renewed.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I did have difficulty with the section that requires this typographical error correction. I will admit freely that I didn't quite see the sense of the intent and it wasn't obvious to me that it was typographical because the wording was a little bit confusing to me. It appears to me that I would still want to hear comments in committee about whether the District Registrar would have absolute discretion on that but I think probably it is acceptable and I would want to hear more about it.

I also hope to receive a little bit more information in committee on the question of adding an

exception from the title itself in regard to the sale for tax arrears. I don't remember the procedure that well that I could speak with too much authority on the procedure in the past and the problems that may have arisen that make this necessary, but I'm hoping that there will be a more extensive description probably by somebody from the Land Titles office on what problems they have met up with in the past. Generally one likes to think that when one receives a Torrens Title it really means what it says and, of course, it does because one has to read a long list, I forget how long the list is — but maybe 15 to 20 exceptions from the title being clear — when we refer to a title clear of all incumbrances the general public thinks that it really is clear but then there are all the exceptions of another one is being added. I think one has to be somewhat cautious, to make sure that we don't have too many, or too many that are not necessary but still confuse the issue. One would like to think that we can do without lawyers in our day-to-day lives, and yet the more exceptions that are put into this kind of a title the more likely it is that a person would be unsafe in dealing with land without making use of lawyers. I say that because I would like to think that lawyers would have more time to spend protecting the rights of individuals and not being involved in technical details of conveyancing. But other than that, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the proposals, and I think every year we have amendments to The Real Property Act, that the proposals this year are certainly worthy of consideration.

QUESTION put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Seven Oaks is prepared to go on Bill No. 14.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (Manitoba)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 14 — The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There were many speeches made on this particular bill, as well there might, because it probably is the key bill in this session. To date the bills put before the House have been at best, I could be kind to them, are straight administrative, not very contentious except, of course, for the cattle one, but that is contentious for another reason.

Bill 14 is important because it does something that the Member for Pembina indicated it does. In his comments he said that the New Democrats on the one hand say that the Conservatives don't have a game plan and he's critical that we say that because in fact they do have a game plan. And he said that Bill 14 reflects that game plan and I believe him. I think that Bill 14 certainly is reflective of the Conservative philosophy. It's reflective of what they said last fall, reflective of what they said immediately after taking office and it now reflects how they perceive Manitoba and Manitobans, so I feel that they're being consistent, and I have to agree with him. I disagree with that consistency. I think what they're doing is terrible, but that of course is a difference of opinion.

You know, when the Minister introduced his bill, I think he said this bill provided badly needed relief, I think that's one of the phrases he used. I can't give him the page number but it's his speech so he would know where it is. It gives badly needed relief, is the term he used, implying that Manitobans were in a bind, they were sort of oppressed, they needed this badly needed relief. And who did they give relief to? The relief was given to those in upper incomes — I'm not saying just the rich versus the poor, it's not that simple at all. I'm saying that anyone over \$20,000 gets a bit of a benefit; below that, forget it, they are much worse off, even up to \$20,000, \$25,000 level. If you smoke, as I do, it goes up. Now we know if you want to have some liquor it's going to cost you more money. Your gasoline costs you more. They're going to say, no no it doesn't cost more, it's exactly the same, but it isn't. In the final analysis it isn't because they are now taking two cents a gallon and putting it into revenue, and since the MPIC, the automobile insurance is going to be lacking \$7 to \$8 million; they're going to have to make it up somewhere. They're going to have to raise the premiums unless they declare a moratorium on car accidents. I don't have quite that much power yet think they they're working towards it, but they haven't got that yet, so in fact they're taxing more for gasoline as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here is something that the members opposite have tended to accuse us of on this side of the House. They've always said that we on this side are the party who believes in redistributing income. That's a terrible thing, we have no business redistributing,

and I see the member there agrees with that statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, what we're seeing is even a greater redistribution of income, but it's redistributing from those with least ability to pay to those with best ability to pay. That's the redistribution that's taking place in Manitoba today, has been taking place pretty regularly since October 14th, and certainly since the first session in the fall and now this session, in continuation. You know, they've given up revenue, about \$30 million, so how are they going to get it back? They pay the gasoline, as I've indicated to you, then they use another technique, they use the technique of user fees, so they give up tax revenue — not based on the ability to pay because the more you make the more you benefit — but they raise park fees, provincial park fees. I think in today's statement by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, he indicated that somehow these provincial parks were for people who didn't have the funds, the people that cannot afford to travel to exotic destinations on their holidays.

They needed something close by because they can't afford to go on trips either within the country or out of the country or even off-shore, so instead what do they do? They say, "We're going to lower income tax, we're going to lower corporate tax, we're going to give up revenues." But they've got to make up those revenues so they sock it to those people that the Minister of Tourism is so concerned about, who can't afford to go to exotic places and they raise the permit fees for vehicles by 20 percent and 33 percent on an annual permit and 33 percent on camp ground fees and 42 percent on sites they've serviced with electricity — if you have a candle it will cost you less, if you use a candle, but if you have electricity, it's going to cost you 42 percent more, not for the hydro rate, just the fact that it's —(Interjection)— Oh, no, not the hydro rate, oh, no. It's just that it's got lights, it's a posh campsite. And 20 percent if it's on an annual basis, if you can afford to buy an annual one, then it's 20 percent up. Fully serviced sites up 33 percent, green fees up 25 percent, cabin rentals up 50 percent, log cabins up 16 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of maneuvering that this government has been doing and I'm not surprised because I maintained, and have maintained for some time, since last fall, that Manitobans are witnessing a beautifully written and prepared scenario, a script. I don't know who wrote that script but let me tell you, he's quite a script writer. And the script was something along these lines: Manitoba's in terrible financial shape, the government was a terrible government, mismanaged, there was fat all over the place; we have a huge deficit, we must cut back, we cannot afford to do things. Costs first, needs second — that was an excellent . . .

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. MILLER: Oh, that was an interpretation of the Minister of Health. I shouldn't say he said that, I don't think he used those exact words but the news media covering his comments summarized it in those four words. —(Interjection)— A beautiful summary because it caught the essence of what he said: costs first, needs second.

So as they cry crocodile tears about all the things that they can't give people any longer, the cutback of services, the removing of services, the pushing off and sloughing off to someone else their responsibilities as in the case of municipalities, hospitals, the universities, telling them, "Well, you're going to have your autonomy; we're not going to get in your way, you do as you please. The only thing is we're not giving you much money, say 2.9 percent."

So this is part of, as I say, the scenario that's gone on. So on the one hand they cry crocodile tears saying, "We'd love to do more but we really can't because of the terrible financial conditions." At the same time, of course, they give up revenue and they gave up about \$23 million to \$30 million revenue so that they're . . . And trying to play both ends towards the middle in doing so, they're trying to indicate a consistency in their position and I say it is consistent, it is consistent with what they want to achieve because the Conservatives do believe that less government is better government. The Conservatives do believe that people should do for themselves. They do believe that it's up to people to provide for themselves. They do believe — and they've said it many times — that people should achieve for themselves. They do believe that only when it's desperate — and you define the word desperate — should the state, should the government, society at large, give a helping hand. You know, that definition of desperate is one that's very subjective. I maintain that some people can maintain that until you're really dying of thirst, find your own water. Others may feel that that's a little extreme so it's really a question of measurement, of a subjective measurement of what is desperation, at what point should compassion, which the Conservatives claim they also possess, at what point that should come into effect.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we have always maintained and always felt that a society that pools its resources, that jointly pays out for a common purpose is a much healthier society. It's respect for the individual; it's a recognition that not everyone has the same capacity, that 100

children for example, starting off on a foot race, there will be one who comes out first and the other will run hundredth, simply because the physical ability is different in each one. The same applies with mental ability, the same applies in ability to achieve. So I am one of those who believe very very frankly and have always believed that when society as a whole pools its resources they can make for better services to all and sundry and make for a healthy society. Conservatives don't feel that; they feel that what makes things happen is a person's motivation to accumulate and his desire to accumulate will make him a very productive individual and that is the only, the only, thing that makes people productive. Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never believed that. Societies that have pursued that policy have not really benefited in the long run and I don't think it made for a better society.

We're told that Manitoba must compete and that's another reason for Bill 14. You've got to build up the right kind of economic climate and that is just so much hogwash because I don't care what the Minister of Finance does, he can bring in another five Bill 14s, he will not, in the foreseeable future, be able to compete with Alberta to make Manitoba more economically — by his definition — make Manitoba more economically attractive than Alberta, he can't do it, he can't match their wealth. There's no way he can do it.

Mr. Speaker, the idea that one can entice, that one can attract, that one can put out bait whereby people with money or firms with money are going to come in and invest is just so much daydreaming. As I say, on the basis of a straight competition between Alberta and Manitoba you've had it, you can't touch them. You can't touch B. C. for that matter, even Saskatchewan is now going to outdo you because of the huge oil revenues that they've been acquiring in the last 36 months, and they're huge.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis I don't believe — and I think it's short-sightedness on the part of the Conservatives — to think that somehow, some place, they're going to entice somebody to come to Manitoba — I'm not sure what it is they expect — to build an automobile factory, produce automobiles in Manitoba. Now isn't that stupid? They know it's not going to happen, they know it's not going to happen, it's impossible. Not in the society where industrialization and automation is so perfected that the most efficient way of doing it is in one building, under one roof, one central location with a highly automated production line.

Mr. Speaker, bicycles — let me tell you, if somebody really wanted to take over the bicycle industry in Canada one plant in Ontario can out-produce more economically 55 different companies across Canada and if he doesn't believe me speak to any manufacturer. Mr. Speaker, there was a day when, in Manitoba, there was a firm like General Steel Wares, CCM, there were a number of firms. They've all gone. Did they go because they didn't like the Campbell government, because they didn't like the Roblin government? No. They went because business dictates they go. You know, I was involved in business myself and I recall that when Reynolds Aluminum, the giant multinational in the United States wanted to come into Canada, they were gentlemen. I happened to purchase my materials from two firms that they were taking over. They came to see me and they said, "Mr. Miller, we want to introduce ourselves. You're a large purchaser from the two firms we've just bought and we want to tell you the product you're making we're going into as well. So we're going to both be involved in the protection of the raw material, the secondary processing of it and the producing of the end product. And we want to tell you that within 24 months we intend to take over one-third of the Canadian market." Very blunt, and I said, thank you for telling me, you're very honest. Do you know something? They did it in 22 months. They just took over.

So when I hear this talk that something is going to happen, they're going to change the economic climate, they're going to change the psychology in this country, they are going to somehow attract and entice and induce investment in Manitoba, it is naive, it's childish.

Any business magazine that you look at, any business consultants you talk to will tell you that it's not the tax rate in the province, it's the availability to market. It's the availability, accessibility to raw materials. It's the availability of your labour force. These are the factors that determine whether you come in or you don't come in; unless of course the Federal Government or perhaps the Provincial Government gives away money through DREE and other things, in order to attract or make it possible for somebody to build a plant free of charge or give him 20 percent of the cost of building. That hasn't worked either because you know in the Maritimes it hasn't been done. And after 20 years, just when it should start paying off, they've simply picked up stakes and left because it doesn't pay them any longer.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis in my opinion Manitobans have to look to themselves. They cannot look to somebody to come riding in in the sunset, or the sunrise, on a white horse, throwing his money around and hoping that somehow it will dribble down to people.

We have resources, we have people which are probably the finest resource of all. We can, on

our own' through investing in ourselves, achieve far more than if we stand around, we advertise, we plead with people to come here and say, "Aren't we nice? Aren't we nice? Won't you come into Manitoba? If you're not satisfied with a 54 percent rate in income tax because your income may be high, well, we'll consider 50. Is 50 too high? You're paying only 30 in Alberta. Well, how about 35?" And you start dickering, you start sort of bargaining, competing, it's like an auction sale. What am I bid?

I recall the days and members opposite will, where certain firms wanting to locate in rural Manitoba, in small towns, used that very technique. They'd go to Town "A" and say, "If we come in and build our little warehouse here, what will you do for us?" Well, they'd say, "Well, maybe we should give them 20 years of no municipal tax." They'd go back to Town "B" and say, "This is what we've got here, what are you offering?" Well, maybe it should be 25 or maybe a fixed assessment. —(Interjection)— Well then you end up eventually with a CFI. Did Tupperware in Morden do the same thing?

MR. CHERNIACK: Inexcusable.

MR. MILLER: If they did it, it's inexcusable. Because in the final analysis you can't win. You can't win because you're playing into the hands of those who are simply going to take advantage, and I don't blame them. They're in business to make money. If I'm going to put up \$150,000 in something, I'll take every break I can. I'll take every break I can and if I can get a better break from the Attorney-General than I can from the Minister of Finance, I'll do business with him, not with the Minister of Finance. —(Interjection)— Then I'll go the other way.

I know amongst those people there, I tell you I'll get good offers from every town that they represent. They'll fall all over themselves. But in the long run you will lose and they will lose. I'll bet that they'll lose because my goal, and the goal of business, is to maximize its profits. To say that they have to have a social conscience and they are good corporate citizens — sure they'll have their top executives sit on various boards and agencies and do their thing, and I'm not belittling it; This one goes on the Health Sciences Centre Board, another one goes on the University Board and the third one goes on the United Way, they're fine people, but I don't want to depend on their goodwill or charity.

The future of Manitoba depends on its people. The future of Manitoba depends on what we do for ourselves. I say that Manitobans have confidence in themselves providing they get leadership. And that's why, the other day when we heard about the decision of the Cabinet not to take up the option on the shares at Tantalum Mines, I was angry. This isn't a question of nationalizing something that somebody had worked on and invested in, no, not at all.

We had 25 percent of something that obviously even the Conservatives of their bias, were uneasy about divesting themselves of, because they know what's in there. They know that there are minerals there of such a unique value that it would be absolutely crazy for them to give it up and so they realized they couldn't go all the way, although I think they would have liked to.

But the 50 percent that was available, that they could have that they had first option on, they backed away from. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is such shortsightedness — and that shows the difference between us and it has nothing to do with nationalization — it just makes good business sense.

When Alberta wanted to secure Pacific Western Airlines — by secure I don't mean acquire, but I mean wanted to secure, to make sure — that it was retained as an asset for Alberta; they stepped in without any hesitation and they purchased it. That was the smartest thing they ever did. They had no hang-ups, that government has no place in business and all that sort of hogwash. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHERNIACK: That's how come we own the Telephone System.

MR. MILLER: And my colleague reminds me, the Telephone System, that's why we own that. That goes back many years.

But in more recent years, Alberta didn't spend five minutes stewing about it. They just went out and did it because they knew it made economic sense to them, it made economic sense for Alberta. And I say that Manitobans have to start thinking along the same lines.

Our future lies within ourselves. You're not going to buy prosperity. And you're not going to achieve prosperity by scimping, saving and riding out a recession on the backs of the poor, of the indigent, of the middle income; you're not going to ride out a recession on that. You may try, but you know history has shown that when that has occurred the reaction against that is so intense that sometimes

it becomes a threat to the democratic system itself, and that's a danger.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at Bill 14, we see many things in it, not just a simple so much on gasoline, so much on cigarettes, it's not a dry document. Within Bill 14 are contained many philosophies, many approaches. We think they are shortsighted approaches. We think those approaches are selling out the people of Manitoba. They're selling them out for a short-term gain. They're appealing to certain people's individual position in saying, "We are going to protect your position. We are going to protect the status quo because you benefit from that status quo." And they're doing it. And as a short-term policy they may be successful. But I think in the final analysis it's got to boomerang on them because in Manitoba, what makes things move in Manitoba for the average businessman — and I'm not talking about Dominion Bridge and I'm not talking about Canada Packers and I'm not talking about the railways — but the bulk of business in Manitoba depends upon the mass of people buying, the acquisition, the purchase of goods and services. Because Manitoba hasn't got these huge major industrial businesses that eastern Canada has, that Central Canada has.

I say that you are not going to have this flow of funds, the purchasing power by giving your 2 percent cut in sales tax across-the-board, not based on ability to pay, so that it works out that way, but rather that you get 2 percent — if your income is \$50,000 you get 2 percent; if your income is \$10,000 — so one benefits by \$13.00, the other one benefits by close to \$300.00. You are not getting money into the hands of people who have — and the term I think is — the greatest propensity to spend. It's a term I believe used by economists which says that people with lesser incomes have a greater propensity to spend because they have to spend on basic needs. They have to spend on basic needs. And if you're going to make funds available, if you feel that more money has to go back into the economy, don't cut by a flat amount so that, as I say, the person with \$50,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 gets a 2 percent cut advantage and the person at \$5,000 gets nothing because he doesn't pay income tax.

No, what you have to do if you want to get funds flowing is get the money in the hands of people with the greatest propensity to spend, the ones who have to spend because they have to buy basics, they have to keep going. You need your clothes, basic. You need shelter, basic. You need food, basic.

You know, a friend of mine was saying to me that he's going to be benefitting quite a bit and he was wondering what to do about it. I know, he's going to put it in an RRSP. He puts it in an RRSP and then he's going to have to pay even less tax because he's going to save on the value of his RRSP, so he gets it coming both ways.

That does not add to your economy. It adds to that person's wealth but it doesn't add to your economy. It does not increase retail sales. It does not —(Interjection)— Yes, it could even be invested in other provinces by the trustee, as my friend for St. Johns points out.

So, Mr. Speaker, Bill 14 to me is a manifesto of where the Conservatives are going, and I have to agree with the Member for Pembina when he said, "Bill 14 reflects the Conservative philosophy." You're darned right it does. You're darned right it does reflect it in every way. And the philosophy is being consistently carried out. They've given up revenue. So they can then say, "We haven't got the funds." And first, cost; second, needs; we are forced into that position.

So you charge user fees. We don't want to be the dirty guys of the province, so we charge user fees. But you know I found it interesting — the Minister of Health was deploring and wringing his hands and saying how he regrets that the Federal Government is so intransigent, and from now on with regard to social services the Federal Government is going to pay a lump sum, bulk payments to Manitoba as to other provinces based on a per capita tied block funding, tied to the Gross National Product with a levelling feature. All right, then he said, "That's terrible. Manitoba is going to lose," and he says, "All it gives, it assures a flexibility." But flexibility to do what? Flexibility to spend less dollars. I had to laugh because he and all that bunch there have been telling this to the municipalities, "You got autonomy, you do, you got autonomy. We don't interfere. If you feel you have to raise your fare, raise your fare. If you feel that you have to cut out services, cut out services." —(Interjection)— I will get to that.\$

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— I'll get to that. Mr. Speaker, he said to the universities, "This is how much money you're getting, but you have economy. We don't want to interfere in your affairs — global budget, you do what you want with your funds." But the pie was shrunk, and just as the Minister of Health is crying that his pie is shrunk and therefore his flexibility is just a facade, it's a flexibility to spend dollars he hasn't got —(Interjection)— that's what he's saying, that's right. But when he's talking about his hospitals he doesn't say that, he says, "We give them global

it's their decision."

I received a call this morning from a woman very — well, I won't go into that — that's time for another debate; I'll get you at the Estimates on that one.

The hospitals are being squeezed. I find it interesting that the hospitals are being pretty quiet, they're being pretty silent. They're really bending over backwards to play along with these governments. And, whether it's because many of the board members, many administrators at top level are sympathetic to the government here, I don't know. Or, they simply say, "It's a new government, you can't fight them at this time; we'll have to go along." So they're being very kind. But I can tell you that the squeeze you put on the hospitals is being reflected in services right down the line. In the case of autonomy the Minister of Tourism got up and said, "Well, you let some staff go at the Museum of Man and Nature. Don't blame me — we gave them the money." The fact they gave them less money than last year, and therefore they had no choice; they've got to do something. And he says they're a responsible board. And there's no question.

You say to people, this is how much money you have this year and there is no more, and they'll say, "Well, we have to give something up; we'll have to cut." And so they cut here and they cut there, and they fire here, they fire there, and whether they fire people or they just let them go by attrition it doesn't matter, there's a diminution, there's a withdrawal, there's a drop.

And the same, as I say, applied at the universities, the same applied at the hospitals, and at the universities the Minister of Education really was cute, he said "The universities aren't suffering," he says, "You know, they're getting about 5 percent." And he figured it out this way, he figured out the province gave them about 2.9 and he says "In tuition fees they're going to get the equivalent . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. "In tuition fees they're going to get about another two, that gives them five." So the student tuition fees are being raised, the user fees are being raised on parks, as I said, and other things. The transit fares have gone up, and this is just the beginning of a long line of cutbacks that are going to keep occurring regularly from here on in.

And I think this government's going to be consistent, because they do believe that people should do for themselves, that the less government the best government, that if you spend money to build something you're not acquiring an asset, you're acquiring a debt. If you build a hospital, that's debt. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources got up and said, "Tell us, you tell us," he said, "I'd like to hear from members opposite how you can explain to a future generation this terrible, terrible debt that they are inheriting?" You know, Mr. Speaker, that kind of thinking, my kids wouldn't have had a school to go to — they shouldn't have had because there was no cash to pay it out with. I would still have gravel in front of my road. It's absolute nonsense to say that a hospital is a debt, it's an asset; that a university building is a debt, it's an asset; that a personal care home is a debt, it's an asset — it's an asset that benefits this generation and the next generation.

And you know, for all the talk I think the public debt this year represents what? 3.3 percent of your budget? Mr. Minister of Finance? —(Interjection) — 3.3 percent, public debt. All right it's 3.3 percent. And I'll tell you, 3.3 percent is not a horrendous amount, as a matter of fact it's a very small amount. 3.3 percent of your total expenditures to pay off your debt and acquire assets in the meantime is really an advantage.

Housing: You know, we hear about all the money that's gone into housing. Mr. Chairman, if all the housing of MHRC was put on the market today the government could get double back for what it invested. I predict that; double. —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, no question in my mind. Just as they could get three times the book debt of Hydro and five times the book debt of Telephones if they wanted to sell those corporations.

And you know, the best example is when the Minister of Tourism got up and said, "We didn't make any money on Tantalum, none at all. No dividends, no royalties, no nothing." Of course there's no royalties because in the mining business they have more write-offs than you can shake a stick at. But he did finally end up saying, we paid 1.5 five years ago and now we're being offered 3.2. Isn't that an amazing thing, for something that isn't worth anything, supposedly, because it's not yielding any revenues, somebody's willing to double the money. Somebody's willing to pay you double what you paid for it. And let me tell you they're not crazy. Hudson Bay Mining knows, if it's prepared to pay you double what you paid, there must be some value in there.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing — I think I only have two or three minutes left — I want to indicate that the members opposite have brought in Bill 14, a bill which is reflective of their philosophy,

which they have a right, certainly, to bring to this Assembly, because they do have a majority of seats and it is their responsibility and right to interpret their mandate as they see it, and I don't question them. What I do object to with them, however, is the fact that having achieved this mandate they aren't honest and above-board and simply say, "We don't believe that government should do; we don't believe that the government should play as active a role as it did before. We, the Conservatives, believe that the least government is the best government. We believe that unless you are deathly ill, unless you're in real trouble, that you somehow do for yourself." Say that; I'd have more respect for you. Don't give me the sort of sorrowful scene that I keep witnessing, "Gee, we'd like to but we haven't got the money because there's the deficit and because of this and of that," — Nonsense. You know, I sometimes think that they really believe their own rhetoric. They believed they were going to come into this government and find so much funds lying around

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. MILLER: Thirty seconds? Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, five minutes ago you told me five minutes, we haven't reached five minutes. —(Interjection)— Okay — leave? Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, if members opposite have the courage of their convictions and admit they did not find these terrible expenditures which they could control and which therefore gave them the moneys to perform what they promised to perform, to give the services to the people without any diminution — they couldn't find it. And now they're stuck with it, now they're in a jam. They couldn't find the moneys; it isn't there. The mismanagement isn't there — we've heard it night after night from the Ministers in their Estimates — we know that it isn't there, you know it isn't there. Now, instead of trying to hide behind some story, come right out and say, "We are doing what we're doing because we're Conservatives; we've always done it that way. R.B. Bennett is our hero, and R.B. Bennett shall rise again."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would just like permission to change the name on The Public Utilities Committee, that of Mr. Schreyer for that of Mr. Hanuschak, the Member for Rossmere taken off and the Member for Burrows put on.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I want to bring to the honourable members' attention a matter that I may have erred in this morning. One of the fundamental rules of a Speaker in any Chamber is to make sure that the business of the House is conducted in a very expeditious manner. One of the other rules, and probably a more important one, is that the Speaker of the House must always protect the rights of members in this Chamber to make their views known and to, where necessary, correct an improper impression that has been left of some of their actions. I refer in particular to Section 127 (3) of Beauchesne; I believe this morning I did inadvertently refuse the Member for Burrows an opportunity to explain, and to the Member for Burrows I sincerely apologize for the error that I made this morning.

The honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement that I believe was welcomed by all members of the House, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.