

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday April 3, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 members of the Department of Agriculture accompanied by Mr. John Neabel. This department is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur, the Minister of Agriculture.

We also have 18 members of the Red River Community College of the Department of Adult Education. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jim McKay. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

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

Presenting Petitions . . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The Petition of The Royal Trust Company, Praying for the passing of an Act respecting The Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Report of the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy, and I have a statement as well to give to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I present this report on behalf of myself, my Co-Chairman, Conrad S. Riley, and Gordon Holland.

At this time, I would like to acknowledge the co-operative effort of the private individuals and public servants who made possible the work of the Task Force. I am confident that the long hours so many have devoted to our work will benefit all Manitobans in the form of a more efficient, effective and responsive government.

The Task Force, Mr. Speaker, is deeply indebted to its secretary, Mr. William R. McCance, who served us with dedication and distinction.

I would like to also express our appreciation to the community-spirited Manitobans who served as members of the various review teams on special studies.

I should like, as well, to make special mention of the contribution made to our work by the Deputy Ministers, the secretaries of the review teams, the Managements Committee Secretariat and its program auditors, the Provincial Auditor, the Civil Service Commissioner, the Department of Finance and the staff of the Task Force itself, as well as the many civil servants and employees of Crown Corporations and other agencies who gave us their full cooperation and assistance.

I would be remiss at this time if I did not thank the members of the public and the Civil Service who wrote the nearly 500 submissions to the Task Force itself. Roughly 60 percent of these submissions came from civil servants and employees of Crown agencies. The Task Force felt that these submissions not only provided valuable information for a study, but also afforded an opportunity for many people to speak their minds, and it was obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the volume of submissions originating from within the Civil Service, that many government employees had long awaited an invitation to give their comments.

The Order-in-Council establishing the Task Force on November 17, 1977, set out our terms of reference. With the terms of reference before us, the Task Force determined the scope of its task and developed its strategy. A target was set to complete the investigations in approximately four months. The Task Force took note of recent studies both inside and outside Canada on organization and government operations.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Task Force are presented in two volumes: those of a general organizational nature are included in Volume One of the report, and those specific recommendations pertaining to the Departments activities and Crown Corporations are included in Volume Two.

In brief, the recommendations fall into two main areas. Our first volume deals with the position of government in relation to the community. It also attempts to deal with the broad managerial questions of accountability and responsiveness. The new organizational structure which we have proposed attempts to address both these issues.

Our second volume deals with the many specific activities of government. We have studied the apparatus of government as closely as our short mandate would allow. In this process we have

Monday April 3, 1978

identified many areas of potential economy and increased efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the honourable members, in case they imagine that this government's Task Force and Organization on Economy is a new idea, or if they feel we have been ungenerous with the departments, that in 1782, Edmund Burke in the British House of Commons expressed a similar intent in, Mr. Speaker, what was the first attempt to reform British government. Mr. Speaker, this was the commencement of line departmental estimates as we now know them.

I should like to read Article Four of the Civil Establishment which said, 1782: "And whereas a new and economical plan is intended to be adopted, be it therefore enacted that the Commissioners of the Treasury shall be authorized and required to direct such person or persons as they shall think most fit and capable to prepare methods accommodated to the several reforms and alterations of all the several articles of expense of His Majesty's civil government, within district departments, which shall after being inspected and approved, be presented to the said Commissioners of the Treasury and which estimates of expense shall not be exceeded above 5,000 pounds in any of those departments in any one year, without sufficient reasons."

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, the legitimacy of governments derive from their service to people. Service to people, the promotion of the public interest and the common good are ultimately the tests by which any government organization, any government policy or program may be judged. The first responsibility of the Task Force, therefore, has been to attempt to apply that test, to see what government activity was serving a public need, and how well or badly that need was being served. The need for restraint, the wrestling with priorities, the question of control and accountability, all these were there, but all were there in the context of recognizing government's primary responsibility, its responsibility to people as a first concern. Given the need for restraint, there was no choice but to streamline operations if commitments, particularly those to the elderly and to the needy and the disadvantaged, were to be kept.

It would be a mistake to view the appointment of the Task Force solely as a response to the serious economic circumstances that we are facing. It is certainly true that the general economic conditions and the particular fiscal position of the province have given a sense of urgency to the work of the Task Force. But I think it's important to recognize the more basic issues which made a review of government organization and operations not only desirable but essential at the present time.

Over the past 25 years, we've seen an enormous expansion in the role of government and in the size of the public sector. That expansion has not been the monopoly of any one party or of any one administration and has, in fact, been common to all jurisdictions. This growth in public sector activity has been partly a function of growing social values and partly a function of the substantial economic growth that we experienced up until the early '70s. In recent years, however, it has become increasingly clear that the growth of the earlier period could not, and would not, continue at its previous levels. It became increasingly clear that there would be a need to reassess the developments of earlier periods in the face of changing circumstances and the realization that to a much greater extent than earlier, future developments would depend on a willingness to develop priorities, accept trade-offs and initiate reforms.

After a generation of rapid and substantial growth, in short the time was more than ripe to examine where we were and to consider whether we were making the most effective use possible of the resources available to us.

A second strong impetus to a review of this kind arrives from the matter of perspective. In political life, there may not be many advantages to being in opposition but one of the advantages that it does give you is an opportunity, very often, to see government more from the standpoint of a private citizen and to see it, moreover, as a politician, or as politicians who are not preoccupied by the inevitable minutia and details of day-to-day administration. I think it's fair to say that many of us, including many of us who had the experience in government but who spent years in opposition, were struck by the evidences of the growing complexities of administration and by evidences of a lack of control by political leadership of government in recent years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, such observations are, of course, the stuff of partisan debate but I respectfully submit that some of the relevant evidence here is documented in the reports of the Provincial Auditor and elsewhere. They are not there for simply partisan attacks but reflect a genuine problem, whether the problem was peculiar to the previous government or endemic to all modern governments. The problem of control and accountability, therefore, was one that cried out for re-examination and that would have been true whatever the particular financial circumstances at the time of our coming into office. However, as I've already said, there can be no question that the need for restraint which was recognized before the election and brought home even more clearly afterwards, the need for restraint certainly added urgency to the Task Force work. There is no question that it has made the job more difficult. We, as the government, were confronted with the need to consider long term proposals to rationalize the organization, caught in the delivery of public services, and the need to reassert public control over them. We have been simultaneously confronted with the need to deal with immediate problems of severe financial exigencies which have, in part, been created by the failure to rationize and control in the past.

Now let me not be misunderstood. I don't want to exaggerate the efficiency of government. Much of what is mistaken for inefficiency in government is actually government's complexity. The idea that government can, and should, be run like a business is only partially true.

In the private sector shareholders speak with a unified voice and have a common demand that their

businesses make money.

Manitobans speak to government with many voices making demands which often conflict. It is the job of government to balance the needs and desires of one group with the aspirations of another.

Consequently the objectives of government are much more complex than the objectives of businesses and the success of government operations are commensurably more difficult to assess. There is nothing like a profit and loss statement in most areas of government. There is no money to be made in Medicare, low income housing, highways or jails.

The task of reform is no easy task and it is certainly all the more difficult when it is remembered that the system must continue to function even as it is being examined and reformed. The machine had to be repaired while they continued to work.

As the Royal Commission on Australian Government administration commented, and I quote: "It is essential that the system should continue to operate while the change occurs. It is not possible for major parts of the government administrations to stop work while they are being rebuilt, nor is it practical to build a parallel organization wholly to replace the original when its construction is complete. Changes proposed must therefore, other than in times of extensive social breakdown, be of a kind which can be incorporated quickly or progressively into the working environment."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our recommendations will be taken in the spirit in which they are offered. If I may once again quote the Australian Commissioner: "Our approach was, rather to seek a prescription for improvement than to deplore existing deficiencies."

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Leader of the Opposition, may I say that statements made when reports or things of this nature are brought in the House, I hope would be of relatively short duration.

In recognizing the Leader of the Opposition, I want to give him equal time that the Minister had, and the Leader of the Opposition has ten minutes.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I shall promise in advance not to have to cause you to be sorry that you made that undertaking.

I would begin, Sir, by saying that the statement just made by the Minister without Portfolio is accepted in the spirit in which it is intended, if by that he means that it is good, from time to time, for governments to re-appraise the existing format of organization and structure and to seek ways and means of bringing about, even if only by a degree, improvements in operating efficiency and improvements in responsiveness of government to society. If that's what he meant, I agree wholeheartedly, that it is only a positive exercise and in no way a negative one.

But of course, Sir, this Task Force has been given a great deal of publicity, probably more than this government bargained for, but I think in the initial circumstances they were bargaining for a lot of publicity surrounding this Task Force exercise.

I believe I can say, Sir, on the basis of my experience, on the basis of what limited conversations I've had with those engaged in this Task Force exercise, that they soon came quickly to realize that what we are contending with here in Manitoba is in no way unique, isolated or out of line with similar phenomena in every other part of our country, and for that matter in any other country of the free industrial western world. It remains to be seen the extent to which this government intends to dramatize or take partisan advantage out of this Task Force Report and its several recommendations.

For the moment, I shall restrain my comments to what I believe to be very very mild but hopefully observations of some insight.

I begin by saying that I concur with the Minister in expressing appreciation to those within the public service and those within the private sector of our province who gave extra of their time in order to try to come to grips with the workings of modern day government. Indeed, those who had no previous direct involvement with the workings of modern day government, I rather suspect — and I'm not being unkind to them — thought that it could be run, oh, so much better, so much more efficiently, that they all they need do was set it up on a basis more or less comparable with the internal workings of the modern corporate entity, or modern company or corporation. I know from personal conversation that they quickly found that indeed the onus on government today, the things that it is expected — and in most cases rightfully expected — to have to contend with, run such a much broader spectrum, such a much wider degree of human difficulty and aspiration that it is in no way comparable, nor could it be made to be comparable with corporations or companies no matter how large.

On the bureaucratic side of things, the subject which is something that almost every citizen — including myself — occasionally find it impossible to avoid venting frustration with and objection to, the size of bureaucracy, but even here it is obvious to those who only care to look, that in the modern large company or corporation, the internal structure and decision-making process is not much more rapid nor efficient than that of modern day government. Even given the fact that the spectrum of problems that they have to contend with is much more limited, at least limited as to the variety of problems involved.

Going on now further to other statements made by the Minister without Portfolio. He, I think, as a matter of interest and perhaps rightly, in order to give the full historical perspective, goes all the way back to Edmund Burke in the British House of Commons in 1782 and, as such, really he has given us a free lesson in civics which we shouldn't resent but welcome. I say to him that I don't fault him for going that far back; I would be content to go back only 10 and 20 years that there have been in our country in relatively very recent times, in the 1960s and 1950s, commissions or task forces on

government organization and structure, federally and in most, if not all, of the provinces. The Glassco Commission, the Carter Commission — the latter on taxation but really not divorced from the organization of government and the Department of Finance in particular — and in Ontario, in 1972, perhaps with less publicity than here today, and in Manitoba in 1972, with less publicity than today, there were certain structural and organizational changes made.

The final analysis, Sir, rather than take up a great deal of time in venting partisan fury about these things, I will be quite satisfied to say that time will tell whether any really significant changes come about as a result of modifications, changes, in the structure and organizational charts of government. There's no harm in it; as to what good it will do, is in my opinion a matter of degree which time itself will only be able to ascertain. We, Sir, never made much about the pros and cons of reorganizing and restructuring; it matters little, in fact, whether there is a Treasury Board composed of four Ministers selected from among 15 Line Department Ministers, or whether there are 11 Line Department Ministers with four Ministers, four to six Ministers, who have no departmental duties, but rather a staff function rather than a field or Line Department function.

And the same goes with respect to the organization of the military, for that matter. How much time you can spend on organizational structures. In the final analysis, it's the results that count. What is important here is not whether there are 11 Ministers of a departmental kind and five or six of a Treasury Board without line responsibility kind — as I have already pointed out, Ontario made reorganizational efforts about five years ago, which they set up three or four ministries without Line Departments functions, under cluster groups, you can start drawing the charts this way and that — in the final analysis it doesn't seem to have made much difference, for better or for worse. What can make a difference for better or for worse, and that depends upon again, social and economic thought and values, is whether as a result of this Task Force, and flowing from it, as a consequence there will be changes with respect to support for local government, municipalities, towns, villages, cities, school boards, universities, colleges, Manpower training institutions, health care facilities, hospitals, and the like. That is what counts, and that is something which we will be able to ascertain only in the course of the next months and few years.

I say in conclusion that I am happy that the Minister has made what is, I would say in all candour, a relatively statesmanlike statement with respect to Task Force and modern-day government. He has acknowledged, he has taken the initiative in acknowledging that comparative objectives and responsibilities as between government and business is not all that simple.

Then, too, I also appreciate the fact that they have looked back 200 years or more. I also appreciate the fact that he has looked as far away as Australia. Now I ask them simply to look as far away as their sister provinces in Canada, which isn't asking for too much, if they're willing to look as far away as Australia, because in looking to our sister provinces he will find, if he hasn't already had it pointed out to him, and which he will not admit in candour, that in that respect, taking a full perspective view of our province in the context of our country, that our public service is not too large — it is in fact one of the smallest — that our public government spending is not out of line, in fact it is one of the smallest on a per capita basis in our own country, etc. On that basis, Sir, if there is indeed a perspective within our own country alone, they needn't look as far away as Australia, or look to the 18th century. If they do that I will rest content, because on that basis, if we are in difficulty, Sir, we are at least in no greater but indeed lesser difficulties than many other parts of our country and the industrial world.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following reports:
Report of The Cooperative Loans and Loans Guarantee Board for the year ending March 31st, 1977;

Report of the Cooperative Promotion Board for the year ending March 31st, 1977;

A Preliminary Report on the Impact of Rent Controls in the Province of Manitoba, July 1975 — December 1977, prepared by the Rent Stabilization Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief statement to make at this particular time, for which I have some copies to pass to the Leader of the Opposition and to yourself, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, today Manitoba motorists begin operating on Manitoba highways under the metric speed regulations. While an education program informing Manitobans of this change has been in effect during the last period of time, I am prompted to take this opportunity to remind all Manitobans that the conversion from miles-per-hour to metric kilometers also means a somewhat reduced speed limit, and I take this somewhat unusual opportunity to appeal to our law enforcement people to exercise some degree of understanding and discretion during the next few days as people get used to the new reduced speed limits. This of course does not in any way apply to any serious or flagrant abuse of these speed restrictions, but rather that some common sense understanding of the fact that it is a major change for Manitoba motorists, and that perhaps the greater use of warnings rather than ticketing could be considered in this initial introduction period. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Monday April 3, 1978

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively non-controversial matter and perhaps I should — well, it is non-controversial in the sense of this Chamber, I would think — it may well be controversial in terms of the reception which it receives by a good many, by no means all, of the general public. My only point in rising, Sir, is to express the point that it has been known for some time now, some few years, that we were undergoing slow transition towards a metric system of weights and measures. There were some aspects of our economic life that were left to somewhat longer postponement; it was done on the basis of common sense in an attempt to minimize costs of conversion, and I certainly join with any appeal by the Minister of the Crown who has just spoken, or any other Minister that is involved directly or indirectly with metric conversion, to follow a policy of common sense in the administration of his department and certainly he is justified and should be joined in urging common sense upon law enforcement officers insofar as allowing people some margin or tolerance at a time when they are getting used to the new system.

Of course, it is not a burden on common sense to be able to ascertain, it's a matter of judgment, the difference between flagrant abuse and the understandable margin of error or miscalculation, so in that respect and in every other respect I join in this public statement to help encourage fellow citizens to be patient with and themselves tolerant of the new metric system which will become an all-pervasive part of life in our country in the years ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the following reports: The Manitoba Water Services Board, year ending March 31st, 1977; The Milk Control Board of Manitoba, year ending September 30th, 1977; and the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation Annual Report, March 19th, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for the Department of Renewable Resources for 1977, ending March 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): I would like to table the following reports, Mr. Speaker: The Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending December 31st, 1976; the Civil Service Commission for December 31st, 1977 and The Workers Compensation Board for December 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. The Honourable Member for Portage.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 8, 8n Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter!.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and flows from a statement which he himself made to the media last Friday. Can the Minister indicate whether he was correctly reported when he presumably stated that with respect to the dental nurses now in training in Regina, that there is, in his opinion, no legal commitment as well as moral commitment to those approximately 60 young nurses?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would say that I was probably quoted by the media correctly. I don't feel that I am very often misquoted by the media.

I would say, however, that this is a decision that would have to be looked at by my colleagues, in particular my colleague, the Honourable the Attorney-General. I am not a lawyer. In my view I am not persuaded, I do not know for certain that there is a legal commitment. I do feel a moral commitment. If

Monday April 3, 1978

my colleague, the Honourable the Attorney-General, tells me there's a legal commitment, well then obviously there is a legal commitment. But that is being looked at, Sir. I'm not familiar enough with the terms surrounding the conditions of employment related to those nurses.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I do not pursue the matter of legal opinion since the Minister has repudiated any suggestion that he was giving one the other day. So it is then presumably an open question still as to whether a legal commitment exists.

My question to the Minister is, having just said as he did, that he does not draw a distinction between a moral commitment and a legal commitment, which is probably both wise and human of him, will he then therefore give an assurance that even if there is no legal commitment that he will proceed to honour the moral commitment, namely, that these young people in training, in nursing education, will be provided work tending to the dental needs of young children in this province?

MR. SHERMAN: I cannot give that commitment, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that I'm a member of an Executive Council. I am one of 15 members of that council. I have certain strong feelings on this subject. If it's necessary that they be made known because of the way conditions are developing, they will certainly be made known. But I can't give a commitment of that kind until the Cabinet has had a chance to study the whole program.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the Honourable Minister that he is a member of a collective responsibility of some 14 or 15 people. My question to him then is, since he understands so well the nature of Cabinet Government, does he feel it will make any difference whether he is one of the eleven line department Ministers or one of the four non-departmental Ministers?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my ambitions were always to serve the people of Manitoba and my constituency through my party, behind my Leader who is the Premier, and it makes no difference to me what position I hold, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a fourth question?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, it's related certainly, Sir. It's a supplementary. Flowing from the Honourable Minister's answer, I take it then is he confirming that he is not drawing any distinction in terms of efficacy or any other measurement in terms of eleven Ministers with portfolio and four without?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition can draw that conclusion necessarily. The proposals that are in front of us today are proposals that are new to a good many members of this House. I suspect, in fact, that they're not very new to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. But I can assure him that there are substantial contents in front of us today that are relatively new to me. I would advise the Honourable Leader of the Opposition not to draw that conclusion quite yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question to the Minister without Portfolio, responsible for the Task Force. In view of his opening statement and the source being Mr. Burke and the lack of any other sources in the book, I suppose the obvious question is whether he consulted in anything somewhat newer than the 18th Century sources in the preparation of this document?

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of answering the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The reference to Mr. Burke and the particular statement that was made to the House of Commons at the time the Bill was introduced, was simply to indicate that that was the first, Mr. Speaker, the first occasion in which the question of departmental Estimates and accountability were in fact entered into the record of the British Parliament, and I think that's fairly important.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made to other studies that were undertaken, and reference was made to the study in Australia, and the Leader of the Opposition referred to it in his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that the Task Force took note of the most recent studies and the important ones. The Australian study, without question, is probably the most massive work on Government organization administration, taking two years, consisting of four volumes. That along with the work that has been undertaken in the United States and in Canada were reviewed particularly with reference to the work of the Special Program Review taken by the Government of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to hear that we were able to find sources that were beyond the eighteenth century. But I would like to know if the Minister is prepared to

deposit the working papers, background reports and the variety of sources and submissions that the Task Force received either by tabling in this House or making them available through the Provincial Library so that such information would be available on a broader basis to the other members of this House and to the public itself, which obviously has an interest in this matter?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has before him the Report of the Task Force. The submissions from the public were given on the basis of confidentiality and the working papers are internal documents.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have several supplementaries but I will confine my final supplementary then to the question of how does the Minister or the government now propose to proceed with these particular reports? Are we to have these examined by a Special Committee of the Legislature? Are they to be presented in the way of a reorganization bill on the part of government, and can we expect to have such dispatch of this report this year? Can you give us some indication what the scheduling or program based upon this report will be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I could indicate to him that the government intends to govern; the matter is now before the Premier and Cabinet and we will all, in this House, await that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable the Minister to clarify. He was quite clear, Sir, in his response insofar as presentations by individuals and the general public is concerned, that this will not be forthcoming. I put that aside, Sir, and ask the Minister if however the reports of the sub-committees will be made available at least to the extent of being tabled with the Clerk or with the Legislative Library?

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

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, because they are internal documents, and if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will refer to the statements that have been made in the past, they indicated the internal documents would not be presented, but a final report would be in fact tabled.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very hard for me to answer the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who continually interrupts. If he wants to ask a question, I'll deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, again, they are internal documents, or working documents. They were one of the several sources of information that the Task Force dealt with in the preparation of its report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Task Force Report. Given that the Task Force Report, or at least its statement, refers back to the eighteenth century and to places far away in this world and given that the Task Force Report refers to spending in the last 10 years as having increased by 319 percent, can the Minister indicate if the Task Force was prepared to look back not only 200 years but prepared to look back 10 to 20 years to ascertain what the increase in Manitoba's government spending was between 1960 and 1970?

Would the Minister deny that the increase in that period of time was 319 percent, or more?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the particular percentages in front of me, but I should say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition I do have figures which I think contradict very much the figures that have been presented by him with respect to per capita debt. And I'm quite prepared and will debate with him the relevance of the information that has been furnished and I think indicate pretty conclusively that the information that has been given to the House has been based on false assumptions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I asked the Minister not about the public debt, although I am quite prepared to debate that with him as well in the context of the rest of Canada, I asked him a very specific question. Since the Task Force press release refers to government spending as having increased 319 percent in the last ten years, can the Minister indicate whether in addition to looking back 200 years to Edmund Burke, that they look back 10 to 20 years to ascertain what the increase in Manitoba government spending was between 1959 and 1969?

To put it directly, was it not 319 percent as well and then some?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I can't give the Leader of the Opposition the exact figure because that

Monday April 3, 1978

information has in fact been examined. Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker, but the relevancy of course — from our point of view — was the urgency of the situation, Mr. Speaker. Realistically — (Interjection)— Well, the honourable members opposite can laugh all they want but, Mr. Speaker, I will make the one point that's very important and the information that is necessary.

When we entered as government we faced a \$225 million deficit and it was rising. We faced the projection of a \$400 million deficit for the fiscal year 1978-79.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, of the alleged \$225 million deficit, can the Minister indicate how much of that was on capital account, which projects were not yet contractually committed and therefore cancelable?

Can my honourable friend the Minister indicate to what extent the \$100 million capital budget allows discretion for cancellation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to all members that the Question Period and the line of questioning that is developing at the present time is very close to being questions that could be more properly debated during Estimates. However, the Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt they were cancelable. They were cancelable during the period of the administration of the honourable members opposite. But the only problem is that they did not know at the time the extent of how bad the expenditures were running and the extent of their own deficit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with another question.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I am trying to heed your advice, Sir. The Honourable Minister makes it difficult with a provocative statement. But I am not asking him, Sir, about the extent to which we were aware of shortfalls in revenue or excesses in expenditure, I am asking him simply if he acknowledges that \$100 million of the \$225 million had to do with capital account construction projects at least a major part of which had not yet been let contractually and therefore was cancelable? Does he acknowledge that?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there were, of course, some that would be categorized — (Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, that information will be provided.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: That information will be provided, Mr. Speaker, but I should suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was as easy — if the honourable members opposite when they were in government had understood the problem — to have corrected and taken corrective action had they had the will.

MR. SCHREYER: With respect to my honourable friend's suggesting that there wasn't the will, may I ask the Honourable Minister if he is suggesting that any of the deficits incurred in the seven previous Budgets were excessive? Is that what he is suggesting? That's my question. Because I make it clear that we regret none of those deficits, Sir, from 1969 to fiscal 1976-77 inclusive. They were all necessary in the public interest.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): The Leader of the Opposition is flagrantly violating the rules of the House in engaging in the kind of debate that he is now engaging in. He simply does not recognize the fact that this is the Question Period.

I recall not so long ago when the Question Period was severely limited to asking questions only and was not an opportunity for making statements as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is attempting to do now. And they now feel that they have a perfect right to do that. When they were on this side of the House, they certainly took advantage of every opportunity to remind us that we were not permitted to do the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise, Sir, on the point of order to serve notice to you that I do not intend to pursue that line of questioning in order to expedite the working of the Chair. However, I do not concede the point raised by the Honourable the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize anyone else, may I point out to all members that this is a period for members of the Chamber to elicit information from the treasury bench. So far we have used up 20 minutes of the Question Period and only two members have been asking questions. There are many others that do want to ask questions and I will now recognize the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force. I refer the Minister to Page 23 of Volume II of the Task Force and ask him to verify the statement: "Thus Legal Aid lawyers have appeared before Law Amendments Committee to make submissions on pending legislation on behalf of groups."

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and furnish the information to the honourable member. I think, rather appropriately, Mr. Speaker, there will be opportunities to debate the Task Force recommendations and its findings, particularly with reference to the Estimates. — (Interjection)— Well, there will be a Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, and to that extent, I think there will be an opportunity to be able to deal with those matters.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister to assure this House in bringing back an answer to my question which he's taken as notice, that the reference was not intended to include Messrs. Savino and Peltz who made representations before Law Amendments Committee December, 1977, opposing the Family Law legislation being introduced by this government — two individuals who now have had their contracts not renewed.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Selkirk has in fact answered his own question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question was: (1) requesting assurance from the Minister without Portfolio. The Minister without Portfolio has not seen fit to provide that assurance yet. I would assume that he would take the question as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me whether there were any members of the Legal Aid who in fact appeared before Committees of the Legislature. He then, Mr. Speaker, said that there were certain members who were of Legal Aid who in fact did appear. He answered his own question, Mr. Speaker. On that basis, I should suggest to the honourable member there was no need. He cannot ask me for any particular assurances about anything. If there is a particular issue that the honourable member wants raised, he may ask the appropriate minister. The Task Force recommendations are just that, Mr. Speaker. They are recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a point of privilege.

MR. PAWLEY: It was very clearly indicated to the honourable member that the reference were to two individuals who appeared on their own behalf, not on behalf of groups before the Law Amendments Committee, just as lawyers in private practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. . Johns with a point of order.?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like clarification on Orders of the House. The Honourable the Minister responsible for the Task Force stated that there would be an opportunity to review the entire Task Force Report under Estimates. On that basis, may I ask, through you to the House Leader, whether he can assure the House that there will be that opportunity to review the entire Task Force Reports and, if so, under what item in the Estimates would it come?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, the salary of the Minister without Portfolio comes under the Estimates of the Department of the Executive Council and that will be the opportunity to debate that particular item.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable the House Leader give us the assurance that the salary of the person referred to, that he will still be a member of the Cabinet at the time we deal with those Estimates so that we are sure that we can deal with the Task Force Report.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Health. In order to expedite matters during the Estimates of the Department, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could provide us with the list broken down in different parts of the department of the 1976 and 1977 — I think that was discussed last year — and the proposed 1977-78 as well as the 1978-79 list of all staff, that is the civil servants on contract in his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I don't see any difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member would allow me to take that back to my office as a recommendation and I'll certainly confirm it to him.

I prefer not to confirm it this afternoon but I don't see any difficulty with it.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's fair enough, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if my honourable friend could remember also that he was going to issue a statement on the financing, the new federal financing of the social programs and the commitment, if any, of the Manitoba Government for those programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I would like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister whether he is prepared to have the co-chairman and the chairman of the various sub-committees of the Task Force appear before a special committee of the Legislature to answer questions and to discuss the various recommendations of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think that that question would be more properly presented to the First Minister when he's here. Certainly if he would ask my recommendations, I would say, "No."

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, in his reply, I'm wondering whether the Minister is now suggesting that the import of this particular Task Force is not sufficiently great that it should obtain the attention of a Committee of the Legislature where we can go into a great deal of detail in our questioning of the members who gave their time, as we've been told, in providing the various recommendations to the government. In view of the importance of this matter, is the Minister now suggesting that after all, it isn't that important and that we need not take this time to review the report and to question the various Task Force chairmen?

MR. SPIVAK Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a Member of the Treasury Bench and am prepared to answer questions with respect to the Task Force. I also would like to indicate to the honourable member that I'm quite prepared to put on the table of the House all of the reports of the last eight years and indicate that very few, if any, of the people that were involved came before any Committee of the Legislature.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Does he have an answer to the question that he took as notice last Wednesday?

MR. SPEAKER: Can the Honourable Member for St. Vital clarify that?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK, Minister of Finance, (Riel): Seeing as how I've taken a number of questions as notice, I wonder if he could indicate which question he is referring to.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I raised a question concerning the bids for government building insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll table that as soon as I have it returned from the Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Task Force. Since the Minister is responsible for all but one member of the Task Force, namely the Co-Chairman, Mr. Conrad Riley, could he assure the House that in the interests of full accountability in the Legislature, Mr. Riley, who is not responsible to the Minister responsible for the Task Force, will be called before a Legislative Committee to answer questions?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Riley was appointed by Order-in-Council. The Order-in-Council was signed by the Premier and the members of the Treasury Branch, the Cabinet. He is accountable, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister and the First Minister as well as the Minister without Portfolio is accountable to the Legislature.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary. Can the Minister responsible for the Task Force, in going back to Edmund Burke, provide any precedent in the British Parliamentary tradition whereby a member outside of Executive Council was not responsible to the Minister so designated in parliament as being responsible for a particular area?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of spending time trying to be able to satisfy a strange twist of mind that the Honourable Member for Transcona has and the constant questioning that has

Monday April 3, 1978

occurred with respect to a particular item. But I should point out to him that Mr. Riley and myself are both accountable to the First Minister who is accountable to the Legislature and I am accountable as well in presenting the Report. I think that should satisfy everyone but probably not the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary. Since the Minister, in introducing the Report, indicated that he was doing so to further clarify accountability in the Legislature, could he then clarify accountability to the Legislature for someone outside of Executive Council who is not responsible to him as the Minister responsible for the area.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member, on the opportunities that will arise in the Legislature, to philosophize and to debate this point at length and to be able to frankly get rid of it from himself so that we may be able to get on with the job. But I should indicate to him that I think it's far more important that the accountability of why the deficit rose in the way it did and why we faced the deficit we did when we came into government, becomes far more important and relevant with respect to the taxpayers and the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister of Education could now tell the House what the reduced program of the Inter-Universities North Program will be for this fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact percentage or the fraction thereof at this time but I know that it's somewhat modified.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could take as notice and bring to the House a detail of how many dollars will be available for this program.

MR. COSENS: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that can be handled in the Estimates. **MR. McBRYDE:** I don't know if I should address the question to the Minister of Education or somebody in the Treasury Benches opposite. But is it his wish then that members of the opposition call directly to the Universities Grants Commission, a Mr. Condo, to get the information because the information is in the newspaper today and the Minister is not able to provide it to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Minister responsible for the Task Force whether he would not agree that the information he provides in these two volumes is virtually useless to the members of the Legislature, the media and the public because they are in such scant form that all we're getting are statements that this board should be disbanded or that board should be disbanded. Would he not agree that unless we have the background papers, this information in the blue documents is virtually useless?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, because in many respects it reflects on the administration of the previous government and the ministries involved, including the Member for Elmwood, I think for him it would be useless but I think it's important for the present government in being able to arrive at the decisions that they have to arrive at to be able to carry on the government.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I regret the Minister didn't answer my question. I would ask him, since the background papers are apparently available to members of the Cabinet, whether he would not agree that in addition to questioning of himself as Minister responsible that the members of the Legislature who are in the opposition should have the right to question his colleagues department by department as to the impact of these recommendations in relation to the background papers provided.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary then. Is the Minister prepared to table all costs associated with the Task Force?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can indicate to the honourable member that not including the salary costs — and this is the information as I have it to date — that the salary costs of those who were within the government and working on the Task Force, it would appear to be about \$8,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Education. Last week, he had indicated that there will be a Manpower Training Agreement with Canada in effect as of the date of commencement of this fiscal year. Would he please indicate to the people of Manitoba what agreement is in effect, whether it's an extension of the one signed by the New Democratic Party government or a new one? And if there is a new one, could he outline some of its highlights and significant changes, if any.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the new agreement has been met in principle. There are still some minor clauses that are being ironed out and that agreement will be signed as of probably the next two weeks and dated April 1st and we're continuing under the former agreement until that time.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to address a question to the Minister of Finance since we will be dealing on Interim Supply very soon. Will he have with him the information which I requested dealing with the assessed value of the succession duty case that he gave us in some detail? Will he have the information as to the extent of the estate involved in the case he described to us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, I have asked the department to prepare that particular one and another couple of examples but I won't have it ready for this afternoon and I thought perhaps it might be more appropriate to deal with it in the Budget which I would supply to him at that time which I expect will be before the House fairly shortly.

MR. CHERNIACK: A question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister consider that since he gave us specifics dealing with \$2,300 a month and a fully paid house, that in that case he could give us that information. Probably it's available now but if not he should be prepared to give it to us as soon as he could make it available which could be this afternoon in time for the debate. If not today, then unfortunately, we would have to wait until tomorrow.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can make it available to the member as a matter of return during the Question Period or during tabling of Ministerial information but I doubt whether I'll have it ready this afternoon. I probably will have it ready some time this week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder if the Minister would take as notice the question, would he consider asking his staff to monitor closely the marketing of no-brand-name products that they're doing in the East so that we can encourage some of the people involved in marketing to try and save some of my constituency some money on food?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestion of the Member for Winnipeg Centre. I don't know the area that he refers to other than to have read some general reports in the newspapers, but we'll certainly take that under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the exercise. I'd like to ask the Minister without Portfolio some questions pertaining — he's piqued my curiosity about this Task Force — would he now indicate that with the Tabling of this report whether members of the Task Force have now been relieved of their duties and that the volunteers and so on have been thanked graciously and are now back in their private occupations?

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, almost all of the members, or all those who are volunteers have, in fact, been relieved of their responsibilities and have been thanked. There are some who are still continuing and will be continuing along with the staff of the Task Force with respect to specific studies that were undertaken to be completed for additional information to be provided to the Premier and the Cabinet, dealing with those matters that are basic to the improvement of the total

financial accountability and information system for control and management of the government.

MR. AXWORTHY: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister's remarks therefore indicate that there will be an ongoing staff arrangement for which he will be responsible to this House, that will continue to provide supervision, regulation, assessments of the departments, and is he now indicating that that will be the basis for this new treasury corps that he is talking about, or in fact can he give us some point in time when the Task Force will be disbanded and when the Minister without Portfolio will no longer be a Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all ask the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge to read the report. I think that's very necessary before the questions can be asked. When he reads it he would then understand that some of the answers are within the report.

The Task Force Report is now before the Premier and before the Cabinet. The House will have to wait their decision with respect to it but there are continuing studies that were undertaken, or studies that were undertaken that still are in a stage where they require a certain stage of completion for assistance to the government with respect to the matters that they will deal with. We are in Session. It will be up to the First Minister to make whatever determinations will occur. So far as I am concerned I will be continuing on with the work that we've commenced in the hope of being able to complete it so that the information will be available for the First Minister and for Cabinet.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can he indicate because he has signed this report with his recommendations, which is now going to Cabinet, that under the principles of Cabinet solidarity, if the Cabinet does not fully accept those recommendations he will then performe be asked to resign because they can no longer agree with those recommendations or the Cabinet doesn't agree with him?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me for the honourable member who is supposed to be affiliated with the university and an academic, that question is a rather ridiculous question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Renewable Resources. I wonder if he has a reply to a question which was taken on notice by his Leader on his behalf last week regarding the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association and whether or not the present government will be giving them support in principle for their application to DREE for funding, to buy out the existing fur auction sale in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering, to the Member for Rupertsland, was it not the Member for The Pas that asked that particular question? It was yourself, okay. Well, I think there's a difference. You know if the gentleman hadn't been here then I wasn't prepared to answer, I was going to wait until he was here, if that's all right with the Meer for St. Johns.

We have been requested by the Manitoba Trappers' Association for support in principle, I have as the Minister, and they are presently receiving telegrams and letters from other provinces which are generally in support in principle. I, personally as a Minister, support it in principle with some conditions to it; the very same conditions that are fairly identical in the other letters of support, that we have a look at the purchase arrangements; we have a look at the type of proposed ongoing management arrangements; we have a look at the real or imagined — and I don't say that sarcastically — the real or imagined benefits that would be forthcoming to the trappers in Manitoba.

There are four or five jurisdictions I think that you are aware are involved, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and the Territories. At the moment the trappers are looking comparatively at the Ontario situation. I believe, personally, it's a little difficult because of the five jurisdictions versus the one major big one in Ontario that they can really rightfully compare themselves to that particular situation.

For example, the last convention I believe that the Ontario Trappers' Association had — I think they had in the neighbourhood of 1,100 to 1,200 delegates at that one convention — so that gives you an idea the size of the Ontario situation. But we're reviewing right now and I'm preparing a letter as one Minister in support in principle subject to attaining some of the other information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a last supplementary.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm then, given the lengthy answer he gave me, which I appreciate, that if the trappers are able to produce a reasonable feasibility analysis which will demonstrate the economic viability of this operation, that this approval in principle will indeed be a solid one backed by the entire government in Manitoba right now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: It's just about an impossible question to answer. There's — and I'm guessing — I think it's a million dollar DREE grant that they're looking for. They're going to the banks in Manitoba for a huge sum of money. All the other provinces are looking at the workings of how their organization is going to work.

I understand one jurisdiction in particular, it does not have a total jurisdiction set-up type of Trappers' Association and I certainly haven't gone to the Cabinet with it yet. So it's very hypothetical at this particular moment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ORDER FOR RETURN

ORDER NO. 5: On Motion of Mr. Doern, Order for Return.

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. The amount of office or other space purchased, rented, or leased by the Province of Manitoba or its agencies since October 24, 1977.
2. The date of each particular purchase, lease, or rental transaction.
3. The persons or companies with which each transaction occurred.
4. The amount of building space involved in each transaction.
5. The amount of money paid out in respect to each transaction.
6. The department or agency on whose behalf each transaction was made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty in accepting this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Proceed to the Orders of the Day. Pursuant to the rule that provides for the adjournment of the House to proceed into Private Members' Hour, I want to advise the House that there is only one measure on the Order Paper and the Honourable Member for Emerson is not prepared to proceed with that measure today, so we'll be carrying straight through until 5:30 on government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you now prepared to proceed with the Order Paper? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Social Development, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the following Bill, Bill No. 7, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter before the House is Bill No. 7. Are you ready to proceed? (Agreed) Section 2—pass. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now on Friday when the Honourable Minister of Finance was speaking, he referred to statistics in respect to the Civil Service. Would he clarify whether the Civil Service of Manitoba are not comparable to the rest of Canada, one; and secondly, in referring to the Civil Service, was he suggesting that some of them had to be let go because they were indolent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the second question, the answer is obviously "no", I made no such reference. I trust the honourable member would not want to leave the inference that there has been a suggestion of that, either on this side of the House or on the other side of the House.

With regard to the first question, the actual numbers, I will have to refer him to the Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission. I notice in today's statement for the Superannuation Board that the number of people retiring has totalled some 379, plus people, I presume, who have transferred to other jobs; and what the total will be, Mr. Chairman, I expect that I will be able again to present up-to-date figures on that in the presentation of the Budget; and that those figures would be more meaningful to the Member for Kildonan than any statement that would be made on the current figures of the presentation of the current annual reports.

Monday April 3, 1978

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the statement, I wasn't referring that the Honourable Minister had said they were indolent, but we do have the fact that some 370-odd were laid off. Is this a suggestion that they weren't working hard enough or that some of them were indolent, or what is the suggestion in this particular instance by the Ministry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable member is aware that there have been statements a number of times that the reason for the reduction in the size of the government service is primarily the financial restraints under which the government is operating. Of the 373 referred to by the member, I would mention to him that somewhere in the order of one-half of those were employees who were on either term or contract or short-term, and approximately somewhere in the order of half were permanent employees, and every opportunity is being made to provide them with first opportunities to bid back in on other job openings coming up.

From the practical point of view, Mr. Chairman, I would think that within the next year or so, if you look at the number of retirements alone, which I have mentioned, in the last year there have been, I think in the report listed 379, just retirements, you can see that it doesn't probably take too long a period for opportunities to come up. Whether they come up in their own specific areas of professional pursuit is another question, but there certainly will be other opportunities for them to re-enroll in the government service, and consideration is being given, and has been given, Mr. Chairman. I should remind the members opposite that consideration has been given wherever possible for people to re-enter the Civil Service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I can well understand that those people who were on contractual employment, and when their contract terminated, they would be let go, but I would imagine there were some people on term and contract employment whose jobs are still ongoing, and nevertheless were they terminated as well, and were the programs stopped in order to let these people go? In other words, let me ask it another way: I asked the other day whether the re-deployment chairman had called a meeting of his committee; I understand it hasn't been called yet. How can those people who have been let off to date go and get re-deployment if there are no committee meetings, no hearings where they can apply?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman there's always the positions available in the Civil Service that are bulletined, and the re-deployment committee can give some added impetus to the opportunities for the people to come back into the Service. But with regard to his initial blanket question, with regard to the different reasons and so on, and why the layoffs, they vary from department to department. In some cases, in the Department of Finance, for instance, there were I think about 14 people affected by the elimination of the Succession Duty Act, and there was no need for that staff technically to be continued to be employed, and they would be primarily full-time civil servants. Now, by natural attrition in the Civil Service, we have been able to provide opportunity for quite a large number of those people, and I would hope that over a period of time we would be able to relocate more, but it will take some time.

Now, in other departments, in Northern Affairs there were significant shrinkages of the total staff operation, and there were some significant shrinkages in other departments as well, but it varies and depends, in that particular case, whether a particular operation has become, say, redundant, as in the case of the Succession Duty branch operation, or whether the positions themselves have become redundant simply because of a contraction of the amount of activity in a particular area.

Mr. Chairman, the member will have to go at each department one by one to find out the various different reasons for the reductions in the size of the public service to get at the answer, because he is going to find differences in every department.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Chairman, redundancies can be accepted, but what about those departments where there is a backlog of work? I understand that there is a backlog in respect to Critical Home Repair, yet in that area too there were layoffs, and the same thing in the MHRC, The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the Rent Review Board; the layoffs have been excessive in some of those areas yet those things are still ongoing. I have not heard the government announce a policy that they are not going to carry on with the Rent Review, yet the papers indicate there were layoffs up to 50 percent in that particular department. Can the Minister explain why?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would again remind the member that he will have to get the specific information in the specific departments when the estimates come up for review; that is the standard procedure. In general, the shrinkage, just to repeat again, has been as a result of the financial constraints on the total government operation, and that apart from where there is an obvious redundancy, such as the one I mentioned, the primary reason has been the financial restraints, or also the assessment by the particular Ministers that the operation required could be done by lesser staff.

MR. FOX: That's fine, Mr. Chairman. But why then are people being told that their applications cannot be processed at the present time, in respect to Critical Home Repair, when there's a backlog? I mean, the two are not synonymous, the two statements.

MR. CRAIK: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, the member is going to have to direct that sort of information at the specific departments when they are up for review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is incumbent upon me, as a result of discussion on Friday, to deal to some extent with the matter pertaining to comments which were made before the Law Amendments Committee of the Legislature last December, and which remarks were, I believe, to some extent made reference to by the Member for Riel in his opening remarks, and also by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that credibility in any government is important and is a basic fundamental if in fact we are to enjoy the confidence of the electorate at large, and therefore it is with great concern, and concern, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that was felt by all members of the Law Amendments Committee last December, that a representation that was well-presented to the Committee indicated a lack of credibility on the part of the government opposite. I believe it is very important, therefore, that we deal with this today.

On December 9, 1977, Mrs. Goodwin, who represented the Provincial Council of Women, on Page 55 — and if the Honourable Member for Riel has the Hansard in question I would suggest that he might wish to follow the comments in that Hansard as to what was said during the discussions involved — but on Page 55, Mrs. Goodwin indicated, "I would suggest that prior to the election the members of the provincial government or the provincial council were of the understanding that a Conservative government would allow this legislation — referring to the Family Law legislation — to stand, and would not hold it up for implementation."

Then on Page 56 of Hansard, I posed the question to Mrs. Goodwin: "Mrs. Goodwin, I was rather interested in your remark that during the election campaign the Provincial Council of Women had received an impression from the Conservative party that this legislation would be permitted to continue through. I wonder if you would expand as to why you had felt, as an organization, assured by the Conservative party?" To which Mrs. Goodwin answered, "I did address the different parties, and of course they all had policy; however, when I contacted the Conservative headquarters they did not have a policy, and so therefore I had to work through my own member, who in turn went directly to the Premier, then the candidate, Mr. Sterling Lyon, and then he passed the information on to me, that the legislation would not be held back."

There was further discussion on Page 57 of that Hansard. The Member for Fort Rouge asked a question of Mrs. Goodwin as follows: "I presume then that if you had determined during the last election campaign that one of the political parties, or two or three of them, were in fact against the legislation, or had intentions to withdraw it, or to change it, that you would have so advised your members that in fact, one of the parties was going to take a step that would be contrary to the interests of the Provincial Council of Women. Is that correct?"

Mrs. Goodwin answered, "We advised our members that none of the parties were going to repeal the legislation."

The Member for Fort Rouge: "So you did advise your membership that all the parties were in favour of the legislation based upon statements that were issued by party headquarters, or by leaders of the respective parties?"

Mrs. Goodwin: "Yes, we did." Mrs. Goodwin then further indicated that if the Conservatives were elected — she indicated that through her own member she was advised and given the message — that if the Conservatives were elected the Family Law legislation would stand, would not be held up in its implementation, that the government would monitor the success of the legislation, after which amendments would be made where necessary, and that the legislation would not be nullified, and that both of these gentlemen would advise against the repeal of the bill.

Mrs. Goodwin then further went on to say, "It was a verbal, over-the-phone conversation, and after this controversy arose over the direction of the legislation I contacted my member and wrote this letter setting out what I had understood our conversation to have meant. He, in turn, contacted me and made it clear that he was speaking to me as my member and was relaying the information to me."

On Page 58, the Member for Fort Rouge: "Could I take it that the Council of Women would feel somewhat that what they were told was really labouring under false pretenses, because they were really not being told exactly, only things were in the election campaign."

Mrs. Goodwin, and these are the operative words, Mr. Chairman, "Did we feel misled, you mean?" Member for Fort Rouge: "Do you feel misled now?" Mrs. Goodwin: "Misled? I think we feel somewhat deceived."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter of grave concern to us, as Members in the House. Election campaign was fought, it was felt, by the Provincial Council of Women — representing well over 30,000 members, if not more, in this province, representing different groups within the province — that all three major political parties were committed to this legislation. Mrs. Goodwin who, Mr.

Chairman, I know not what her politics are — I don't believe she is a member of the New Democratic Party by a long shot — indicated that she had made a special effort to contact her member. And I want to say that Mrs. Goodwin indicated in private discussion that she liked her member, she refused to identify her Member of the Legislature because she liked him as an individual, and she did not want to refer to her member by name before the Committee. But, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that Mrs. Goodwin is a constituent, by address checked out, of the Minister of Finance. I know that the Minister of Finance did support the original Family Law legislation last June for the Legislature, and it appears from the information that was presented to this Committee that a representative of a substantial body — in fact, the representative of the women of the Province of Manitoba, the representative group of women in the Province of Manitoba — felt deceived; deceived by information that they had received directly from the Minister of Finance. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this House must have an answer, deserves an answer, and must receive an answer during this debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps first of all that the Member for Selkirk wasn't here during the fairly lengthy discussion we had on Friday on this very topic, and I don't mind repeating it because I think that there is probably an effort being made, on this side of the opposition here, to make more of this than what is actually justified.

Now, I said at the time that I had a call on this and was asked by the party in question, and in fact I've since had discussions with her in which this particular didn't come up and I realize it had come up in the Committee but not until after the session had adjourned last year did I realize it had come up, because there were references being made across the way and I thought I had better look it up. And I did and I read the same remarks. But I wasn't aware of them until somewhat later and I welcomed the opportunity to clarify it in the House.

Now the question, as I recall, was not whether the Conservatives would repeal the legislation, although that may have been the question, I think the question, as I recall it, was what was our stand with regard to the legislation. But it may well have been. As I mentioned on Friday, you get not an infrequent number of calls on many issues — some of them which were on this particular issue. I recall this one because I did feel it was an important one. I knew that Mrs. Goodwin had a particular interest in it. And I replied to her and, as the record will show on Friday, I said that the member used the words "would not"; I think the operative word — if he wants to use operative words — was "could not" . . . they repeal the legislation.

The legislation had been proclaimed and was headed for implementation as of January 1 this year — 1978. And the understanding that I had at the time — and I think it's still the correct interpretation of the law — was that once the law was proclaimed it couldn't by Order-in-Council be deproclaimed. But what nobody foresaw at that time, nor had in the back of their minds, was that there in fact was going to be a special session of the Legislature.

Now, in addition to that, I said to Mrs. Goodwin in view of these conditions that the Act has been proclaimed and will go into force on January 1, if the Conservative Party were to form the government, that they would monitor the legislation and if changes had to be made that they would be made at a subsequent session. And she asked me, "Does that mean that you might change it next spring?" I said, "It could be changed at any session."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that I don't know that anybody in this House knew at that time there was going to be a special session of the Legislature. It wasn't in fact known. I suppose that one could have speculated after the Supreme Court ruling came out on the AIB that there may have to be. And I think that probably occurred some time in the early part of the election campaign.

At any rate, nobody was thinking at that time nor do I recall us seriously considering that there had to be a special session of the Legislature until well on into November until it became clear that there was going to have to be — thanks, Mr. Chairman, as I said on Friday, to the former government passing the AIB provisions by Order-in-Council rather than bringing the bill into the House that they already had printed, and which we finally brought in.

So, on technical grounds — if you want to do that — we have fulfilled what we said; there was no case of misleading. Now, Mrs. Goodwin said that she felt somewhat deceived. Quite frankly, if I were her I would have too — and I said that — because she felt that it was going to go into operation. I felt it was going to go into operation because the legislation had already been proclaimed.

I know the opposition will try desperately to make a mountain out of a molehill in this particular case, and that's to be expected. But I want to state for the record that what Mrs. Goodwin was advised I in fact have no problem living by and I can certainly understand her feelings and her statements to the Committee — no problem there either. But had I known at the time that she called me that there was going to be a special session of the Legislature in December, or November or whenever it was going to be — before the end of the year — it would have been a different condition. I don't think I could have said that to her. But at that time I was told the Act is proclaimed. Technically it will come into force. It will take an Act. . . Well, it will be monitored until the special session. There is no other alternative.

It wasn't a case of having an option. There was no option. And that was my understanding. If the lawyers opposite want to interpret and indicate differently, then that's up to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Monday April 3, 1978

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the problem is . . . I think the Minister of Finance would have to acknowledge that what he is doing really now is depending upon a technicality, which wasn't fair either to Mrs. Goodwin or to himself.

What Mrs. Goodwin was interested in, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not this legislation would be nullified. She wasn't thinking in terms of whether there would be a special session of the Legislature but whether or not the Conservatives — if elected to government — would at some point nullify the effects of the legislation which at that time had already been proclaimed by the prior government.

That was a simple enough question, and I find that the Minister of Finance is trying to hide behind some technicality, some legalities. And Mrs. Goodwin was asking questions to her member that she expected a correct answer from, an answer which was straight to the point and not an answer that she would require the services of lawyers to assure her that what she was receiving was in fact a commitment or not. And I'm very disappointed that the Minister should, in fact, appear to be hiding behind that type of technicality.

I notice on Page 57 of Hansard that Mrs. Goodwin indicated that she had contacted her member and wrote a letter setting out what she had understood to be the conversation.

I think what the Minister could do if he wants to assure this House that in fact he did not deceive — as was suggested at the Committee — that it would be only fitting and proper that the Minister refer to his letter to Mrs. Goodwin. And Mrs. Goodwin being the type of woman she was — a very decent woman — did not want to refer directly to her member, before that Committee.

But it was obvious from the address of Mrs. Goodwin that her member is the Member for Riel, the present Minister of Finance. And I do think that the Minister of Finance should present his documentation to the House so we know what really went on between the representative of the Provincial Council of Women and himself, pertaining to this very critical issue of last year and what has happened pertaining to that issue since.

I wonder if the Minister would provide the House with the substance of that letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I would have absolutely no intention to provide the Member for Selkirk with any particular correspondence I have with one of my constituents, as a member of the Legislature, any more than he would and he knows that very well.

I don't deny that the lawyers opposite will take every opportunity to try and drive their wedge in, using anybody they possibly can, and they certainly will, Mr. Chairman.

I've dealt with this matter. I put it on the record adequately. I stated that if the government of the day had told the people of Manitoba that the legislation which should have been put through was going to require some action before the end of the year, and that there was going to be a legislative session and that a matter such as this — whoever the government was — the answer could not have been given.

The answer that was given, Mr. Chairman — and the member still hasn't said I was wrong on that case — is that the legislation had been proclaimed and could not be deproclaimed short of an act of the Legislature.

At that point in time it was a *fait accompli* and the answer was: The legislation is coming into force; the performance of the Act in that case would be reviewed and if there were changes to be made they would be made at some subsequent session of the Legislature.

There was no undertaking that the Conservative Party, if elected, would not make changes to the Act. And that was the only thing that was open to question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member really still hasn't dealt with the meat of the issue. He makes reference to lawyers across the way as though some way or other by that type of statement he is prejudicing the outcome of this particular discussion and I suppose he is trying to appeal to prejudice of the electorate in general, and I know that many of the electorate in general have pretty strong feelings about lawyers, and I suppose that's what the Honourable Minister is attempting to do.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, what is pertinent to our discussion is that it was understood the legislation would not be nullified. I'm sure Mrs. Goodwin would agree that, and as we had always indicated, that there might be need through the regular session to propose amendments to the family law legislation, amendments that would improve the wording and remove technical and legal ambiguity, and improve the operation of that legislation.

But not, Mr. Chairman, not at any time, would we agree — nor would the Provincial Council of Women have agreed — that when they posed that question to the Conservative Party and the answer that they received that in fact the Conservative Party was proposing to nullify the legislation. Because if the Minister of Finance had been quite loyal to the facts and had reported to the Provincial Council of Women, "Yes, if the Progressive Conservative Party is elected as the government to the province of Manitoba on October 11, 1977, that we will proceed at the first available opportunity — whether it is during a special session or whether it is in the regular session of 1978 — to totally and completely nullify the principles of the family law legislation," if they had so responded to the Provincial Council of Women, Mr. Chairman, you can be bound and you can be certain that the Provincial Council of Women would have related that information to all their members and to all the organizations that

consist of the Provincial Council of Women in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the results of October 11th might have been quite different, quite different, if the Conservative Party had told the Provincial Council of Women exactly what they intended, and which has been demonstrated by the events since October 11th. The results might have been quite different and I regret very much that the member is not coming forward here, and trying to hide behind technicalities and legalities, and trying to impose a burden upon Mrs. Goodwin. And I think it's very unfair to Mrs. Goodwin to impose upon her the thought that she should have some way or other seen through the answers that were presented to her on behalf of the Provincial Council of Women.

She wasn't thinking in terms of whether or not a regular session would be called, or whether it would be a special session. She wasn't concerned about whether or not you could undo the legislation after proclamation. She wanted to know whether the Conservative Party in due course, at the first available opportunity, would nullify the principles of the legislation. She would expect amendments and improvements to the legislation, but not as she indicated before the Committee did she expect that the decent fundamentals of that legislation would be nullified at the first available opportunity that the newly-elected Conservative government in the province of Manitoba could seize upon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that this isn't the end of the debate on this issue because we will be looking at this further on in the session and we will also be having meetings with the various interest groups between now and the time that we do deal with it again as a matter of legislation.

I do want to mention to the Member for Selkirk — he says that it would have made a substantive difference to the outcome of the election — I want to point out that the public of Manitoba generally knew that on the third reading of the debate last year that the Conservative Opposition voted in majority at third reading against the bill so that there wasn't any attempt to disguise the general feelings of the opposition at that time. Had it been a major issue, certainly it would have stemmed from the recognition that that was the majority position of the Conservative Opposition to the bill as it was drafted. I had a few inquiries about this during the election campaign but I have to think that, in my own constituency, this was not a major issue despite the very very vast airing that it had during the session just prior to the election and during, the clear knowledge of the positions of the various parties on the bill that went through. So I don't agree with the member that it would have made a significant difference to the outcome of the election.

With regard to the specific issue that he's dealing with now as to whether or not there was anything untoward in the exchange, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite willing to live with what I've set on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I hadn't intended to intervene in the debate at this particular moment but the last comments put on the record by the Member for Selkirk do move me to make it abundantly — what the Minister of Finance has just finished saying, that quite aside from whatever the position the Minister of Finance has taken on this issue with his constituency and in this House, that he demonstrated that position in this House in the manner and way in which he voted, but for the Member for Selkirk to leave on the record that the Conservative Party as such and their leader in the last election deliberately attempted to mislead a group of people or segment of our society simply is not wrong because I can assure you — (Interjections) — simply is not right. Well, Mr. Speaker, let them play their little games on the other side but the majority of members, as the Minister of Finance has indicated, that expressed their feelings on this particular bill, have no hesitation about expressing them across the length and breadth of this province and including our leader. On any occasion that I was with my leader in my constituency addressing large numbers of people, obviously many more numbers of people than the Honourable Member for Selkirk had an opportunity of addressing during the last election, there was no effort made to conceal or to shy away from the position, the unhappiness that the majority of the members of the then opposition, the majority of the members of the Conservative Party had a great deal of difficulty in accepting that messy piece of garbage that that government had forced on the people of Manitoba. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, nobody in rural Manitoba misunderstood the kind of impossible situations that that kind of legislation, had it been allowed to stand, and what the implications of that legislation would have been.

So I don't want to prolong the debate. The Honourable Minister of Finance has replied in response to the subject matter but I am upset, Mr. Chairman, by the kind of insidious suggestion made by our learned friends opposite who say they don't want to see anybody, you know, dealing in technicalities, but through that technicality that the Honourable Member for Selkirk just used, he attempted to leave on the public record a situation that the Conservative Party and the Conservative members were anything but straightforward in the comments and the positions taken during the last election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: I don't have to leave anything on the record. The record is clearly expressed for the honourable member's benefit on December 9th, 1977 hearings of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments as to who deceived who and if the honourable member would read that, then he would

know from the record who deceived who in the Province of Manitoba.

Secondly, I find it rather strange, the Honourable Member for Lakeside's comments. He made reference about this legislation, sloppy and messy and the vast implications of this legislation that rural Manitoba fully understood what the legal implications of this legislation were and then went on to say, "But we never attempted to make any secret of our intentions in respect to that." He said, "My leader has made no attempt to suppress information as to the Conservative Party's position on this legislation."

Mr. Chairman, all I say to the honourable member is that I have gone over as much election material, published and distributed by the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba that I could lay my hands upon. I have examined advertisements in variously weeklies and dailies authorized by the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba; I have gone through press clippings of speeches made during the election campaign, September-October, by spokesmen, including the present First Minister; and nowhere, nowhere, Mr. Chairman, do I find reference to Family Law. And yet the Member for Lakeside said, "We never tried to make any secret of what our intentions were." Well, I wish the Honourable Member for Lakeside would tell us, would tell us, because, Mr. Chairman, there certainly were no roars to their intentions. I don't even ascertain a purr as to their intentions during that campaign.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm, at the moment, looking for some statement that was distributed only recently by members of the Conservative Party wherein . . . it was a blue document which I saw being distributed by the Member for River Heights, but I also understood there was one by the Minister of Education . . .

A MEMBER: They were all the same.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . They were all the same documents. I see this one is the Minister of Labour's document. I would like to tell the Honourable Minister of Highways that this is an excerpt dealing with Family Law: "The previous government had passed a law that they said would protect the rights of both husbands and wives when marriages break up, but there's only one thing wrong with that law, it wouldn't have worked. Passing an Act for the sake of creating a new law isn't practical if it won't work and has to be amended almost as soon as it is passed. Your new government has put the implementation of that law off until later this year to give us time," — I repeat that for the Minister of Highways — "to give us time to make sure that the law we finally pass really will provide practical protection for everyone's rights when marriages break up.

"Some people have opposed this saying this delay shows the government opposes women's rights. That's just not true. To protect anyone's rights, we need sound and workable laws. That's the kind of family law your new government will introduce in 1978."

MR. ENNS: We will.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I point out to you that there's nothing here to indicate that there would be any changing or switching or varying from the principles in the present laws as that stands on the record books — the Family Property Law . . .

MR. ENNS: Read it again.

MR. CHERNIACK . . . and I point that out in order to be able to remind honourable members opposite who just applauded this statement that I predict that their actions will be such as to deny the protestations, the indignant protestations, the righteous protestations, which I believe this document presents.

Mr. Chairman, although it would appear to me that the Minister of Highways wanted to provoke a debate relating back to the election campaign in order to extend this debate indefinitely, I would like to remind him that we're dealing with interim supply. He probably has civil servants who are becoming apprehensive about the mismanagement of the government's affairs that endangers payment of wages and salaries to the civil servants . . .

MR. ENNS: About the obstruction of the opposition, of the callous, heartless opposition that will obstruct them.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . I will therefore do my best to avoid prolonging the debate even longer and to avoid provocation from members opposite to prolong debate even longer because I am concerned about the affairs of this province and its financial viability, and I'm very much concerned that the persons opposite who have no regard for a proper, efficient operation of government shouldn't mess things up by their mismanagement of the financial affairs of the province. Therefore, I am anxious that we make sure that this bill does indeed go through all stages and receive Royal Assent before it is too late to at least pay the civil servants who are still on the payroll of this province, bearing in mind

the large number that have already been fired, Mr. Chairman, for whatever excuses are being offered by members opposite, but which must relate to one of two things: Either civil servants have not been working as well as they might have and therefore they've cut down the numbers of them, or the government by cutting off civil servants has eliminated programs which they don't want to carry on and, therefore, by elimination of civil servants, they have eliminated programs.

I want to express regret that the Honourable Minister of Finance did not take the trouble to produce the information which I am sure was readily available to him after we spoke on Friday, because he described a case on Friday, and I have the Hansard here, which indicates that he knew that there were some \$40,000 of life insurance payable to a widow, he knew that she was getting half of a \$48,000 home clear of all encumbrances, and he knew . . . —(Interjection)— oh, he's just corrected me, so now I don't know what he knew. But he also indicated a \$23,000 monthly annuity payable to her. The only other information — \$2,300 a month — if I said \$23,000 obviously I underestimated on the basis of annual and I overestimated on the basis of monthly — \$2,300 a month which is about \$27,000 a year in annuity payments which would be free and . . . clear of anything that she might have been able to earn on her own.

So that with all that information that was before us, I am very much disappointed that the Minister didn't bring the information this afternoon. He knew full well, Mr. Chairman, that I'd asked if he would produce it and I am certain he could have gotten it. The important feature to this is whether a discount rate of 5 percent is realistic. And I have to tell him I don't think it is and I have to tell him that we were in the process of looking at that figure just to see whether it shouldn't be increased and thus reduce the assessed value of a pension. But the fact that it hasn't been done does not take away my question which was: What was the total assessed value of the estate? It's important to know if a person is being called upon to pay \$23,000 — I quote the words "Up front" — then I have to know whether she needed the money over a longer period of time because she did get, I see from the Hansard, Page 339, that she had a \$44,000 life insurance policy and half the house. So that it may be that it would be no hardship for her to pay the \$23,000 out of the \$44,000 cash that she received as a beneficiary on the death of her husband. But if the honourable member uses the words "up front", I must remind him that under the legislation as it sits today, he has the right to postpone payment over a period of time and as I recall it, the interest rate is 5 percent. It may have been changed; it may have been changed; it was 5 percent. As a matter of fact, as I recall — he says 9 percent and I believe it was changed to 9.

Mr. Chairman, I also have to mention that I believe that the person liable for payment of tax has the unilateral right to select payments over a period of five and one-half years and one would wonder whether this person was not advised by the Honourable Minister and/or his department, that if she found it difficult to pay the \$23,000 up front, using his expression again, that she could elect to pay it over a period of time and I believe it is five and one-half or six and one-half years. I'd have to check the Act.

Well, now while the Minister is replying, he's just said, "It's not," so while . . . NT66

MR. CRAIK: The charge back, the carrying charge back is nine percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the honourable member says that the interest rate is nine percent per annum. I'll check that but if it is, it is somewhat less than one can get for a guaranteed investment certificate today at a number of trust companies. So that it might have paid her to get nine and one-quarter percent on an annual basis on a guaranteed investment certificate and pay the government over a five year period. I don't know if the Honourable Minister knew enough to advise her to that effect if she had difficulty paying it up front.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am really interested in knowing more about this case as an instance of what the honourable member feels was so unfair to the person involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I recognize and appreciate the member's willingness and anxiousness to have the Interim Supply Bill dealt with. I will just mention that the question was on Friday and I spoke to him briefly, privately and said, obviously for personal reasons that this should be presented as an atypical case or a model case for him. I have asked the staff as of Saturday to do it, but what they are also attempting to do and will present is the case where she may not have been in the position to actually pay the charge but took advantage of the time payments.

Now I want to tell the member that I am advised that the discount rate was five percent to determine the present value, but if she had made time payments we would in turn have charged nine percent interest on the time payments. So we are saying on the one hand that we are going to discount it five but charge nine if she wants to space out. Now there is something incongruous about that type of an arrangement. I think even the member opposite would recognize that.

The other important feature here is, who is in a position to determine what is hardship or not. It may not be hardship. Who knows in that particular case whether there is hardship or not? But what we are doing is pitting the wisdom or otherwise of a government against the wisdom of a man who is trying to plan a pension for his widow, and trying to crystal-ball what inflation was going to do, and what other things were going to do into the future. I don't think that there is any minister that would want the job particularly of trying to assess what was and what is not hardship, because I suspect in most cases, if you looked at it as of today, it may not be hardship but who knows what is down the line. Furthermore, what business has the government got in interfering with the rights of a citizen to plan a pension for

Monday April 3, 1978

the remaining spouse. —(Interjection)— But they are interfering, Mr. Chairman. They are interfering very very clearly. You could not . . . —(Interjection)— Well, you know, the member says you could always move in and consider hardship. He also told me that only once in the former previous government had a concession been made on those grounds. If he told me correctly, only once during the tenure of the former government was a concession made to a person on the grounds of hardship.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that it is very very difficult to recognize and try and say what hardship is, because I am sure that hardship might not look like hardship if you are looking at today's income of that size we are talking about. But who knows what it is five years down the line? Who knows what it is ten years down the line? And what would this case have been like had the widow been 35 years old with a couple of dependent children. So those are the problems you run into and which we would want to look at if we are going to look at this further.

I indicate to the member that it is only as a matter of lack of time that I haven't been able to table this sample case to him, but I will, in due course, do that. I am not avoiding it in any way, shape or form.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Honourable Minister is not avoiding the question. I am sure he will produce the information. I will drop this matter by saying that this case that he brought as a hardship case could hardly be called that in my estimation, because we know that this lady had a \$44,000 insurance policy, cash I assume — I have a right to assume that — was being asked to pay \$23,000.00. I know she had a right to extend payments over six and one-half years. I see from section — I think it is 51 — she would have a right to postpone it. The Honourable Minister points out that we changed the interest rate to nine percent. I point out it would still be to her advantage, that she could do it by electing to pay nine percent when she could invest her money at nine percent or better over the period of time. I bear in mind the fact that she had to have an estate in excess of her exemptions which, if the death occurred since the Act has been amended last, would be an estate of over \$300,000.00.

I find it very difficult to consider that a hardship. —(Interjection)— Well, then it was \$250,000.00. I still find it difficult to say that an estate valued at \$250,000, even over-valued by the use of a five percent factor, is one which would bring about hardship. So I drop it there because obviously we have a vast difference of opinion as to what is hardship and what is fair and unfair. I still think the Succession Duty law that we had was a fair one, but that could be debated at length and will be debated probably in the future. It is a matter of interest.

So I will leave it at this. I am looking forward to getting the information which the Honourable Minister undertook to give us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was not intending to resume debate, however I have just received information which I believe to be of a urgent nature and although I was reluctant to sit through the voting of Estimates which would assist this government in mismanaging the fiscal affairs of this province, I am doubly concerned now.

I have just been informed by the media that Messrs. Cholakis and Einarson have held a press conference this afternoon in which they pronounced their intentions, and I hope we can obtain some response from the Minister of Tourism, because it is his actions that have placed us in this position today in Manitoba, and he is in the Chamber, and I am sure that he is aware of the nature of their press conference.

They have indicated their intentions to convert the ship, from the information that I have received, into 80 staterooms, which will be sold from \$20,000 to \$30,000 each for some sort of floating condominium in the Province of Manitoba.

The Minister of Highways is laughing because he obviously feels that I am joking. He obviously feels that I am joking and this is not so and I am trying to provoke some humour in the House, and I do wish, Mr. Chairman, that I was only being humorous. I would be much happier this afternoon if I was relating some humour rather than a tragic account of what has happened to this once-proud project in the Province of Manitoba.

To the Minister of Tourism, he had made it very clear to groups, and I know that he communicated to the Selkirk Chamber of Commerce his desire that this vessel would continue to operate within the Province of Manitoba, would continue to provide jobs and some opportunity for the purchase of supplies by local business people in the Interlake.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it sounded good and I am sure that again people were encouraged to rest upon the type of representations they had received from the Minister of Tourism. But now we have this great farfetched project announced this afternoon — going to convert the ship into a floating condominium, a floating condominium, and some certain selected Manitobans will have the opportunity to purchase these condominiums. My colleagues properly correct me, not necessarily Manitobans, they could be from anywhere, at a price of from \$20,000 to \$30,000.00.

Now Mr. Cholakis and Mr. Einarson apparently have indicated also at the press conference that they are not too sure whether this is going to work out. Well, I am not too sure either, Mr. Chairman, whether this is all going to work out. And they have indicated that if it doesn't work out then they are going to slice it into sections and it is going to be moved right out of the Province of Manitoba for

some more lucrative enterprise elsewhere than the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is impertinent that we note several points at this stage, that what is happening to the Lord Selkirk is the direct outcome of the policy of this government in selling that vessel at fire-sale price early this year. It was a giveaway, it was a giveaway, a ship that was operating to the benefit of all Manitobans, was drawing tourists from all over the North American continent into this province, and the Minister of Tourism, if he denies it, let him speak to anyone that travelled on that boat and let those that were passengers on that boat tell them about the people they would meet from New York State, from Florida, from California, from all over the United States, drawn to this province only because of the operation of that vessel. Let him speak to that and let him advise this House whether or not when the question was directed to him last week, when he professed in this House that he was not aware of the intentions of the new purchasers of that boat, that in fact he did not have advance notice of the contents of this press release this afternoon by the new purchasers. Only a few days ago, I believe it was last Thursday, the Minister of Tourism didn't know anything about the intentions of the new purchasers.

To me it is incredible that the purchasers who should have, for next to nothing, at a fire-sale, at a rip-off to the public in Manitoba, a rip-off which I don't blame the purchasers for, but I blame the Minister of Tourism and Recreation for, should have been ignorant of their intentions and what they are professing to announce this afternoon in the Province of Manitoba.

Does he feel that we are that naive that we would not be aware that the Minister would not be aware of what the purchasers' intentions were? And a threat now hovers over our heads that this boat may end up outside the Province of Manitoba altogether. It may end up in the Caribbean or somewhere else — a boat that I feel most Manitobans were proud to feel was part of this province, part of the attraction presented by this province to business activity and the drawing of tourists to this province, that because of fiscal mismanagement by this government. And Mr. Chairman, this is one of the first concrete examples of chickens coming home to roost by the fiscal mismanagement of those across the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Memuer for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Chairman, I am shocked. I am shocked. We have an example of a government which really doesn't give a tinker's damn about the people of this province.

Number one, they have given away, as the former Attorney General pointed out, an asset of some \$4 million replacement cost for one-quarter of a million dollars. And the Member from Wolseley, I want it on the record, says from his seat, "We've got the money in the bank", because that is where he places all of his values.

But, Mr. Chairman, if you will recall, last year, the attention that was given by the media in this country, including the national media, including the RCMP and others, of Winnipeg being the centre for laundering money in North America, I would suggest that I am apprehensive at this point in time. Because if that thing is sold as a condominium it becomes a private residence and all of those people will be entitled to gamble on that ship just as if it was in their own home.

At this point in time I for one intend to stand on my feet until the end of this day until I get some assurance from the Attorney-General of this province and this will not be the case. And don't come at me at blocking, blocking your Interim Supply after sitting for two weeks, one time for nothing else than political expediency, to try and embarrass the government. You could have had this Interim Supply through a long time ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, another thing which prompts me to form this opinion is their attitude towards land in the Province of Manitoba. I, for one, would support anything which is reasonable to ensure that the agricultural land in the Province of Manitoba is under the control of those people in Manitoba who want to farm. We had evidence before we formed the government in 1969 that that was not the intent or the wishes of the present administration. They would have sold farms all over the province to anybody, including Ogilvie Oats, who wanted to purchase land, so all they are interested in, as I pointed out to the Member for Wolseley, is bucks in the bank. But this is, as I started to say — I wish the Minister of Finance was in this House — the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, of course, has absolutely no intention, albeit he is in the House, to inform the House of what's going on in his department because he doesn't know.

I had a question, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister of Finance. He has finally admitted that this government is restricting programs. In response to the Member for Kildonan he said they are cutting staff when they are restricting activities. If you want to get into semantics, the government has finally admitted they are cutting programs. One, of course, is obvious, and he alluded to that; you remove the Estate Tax and you don't need the people to administer that tax, that is true, that's one program that they admit they cut. But he also went on and said that they are restricting activities.

But there was one other thing that was of note to me while he was making his remarks. I recall sitting in this House and the Member for Riel, the present Minister of Finance, stood up in the House and said, "It was a black day in the history of Manitoba that Gordie Howe of the civil servants and . . . " and went on and on and on. He is talking now, about transferring with jiggery or pokery, a whole Civil Service, a whole Civil Service, and I need some assurance that seniority still counts within the Civil Service, what attention is being given to seniority? What attention is being given to the ability of people to transfer from one job to another?

The present administration, Mr. Chairman, one of the first things that they did was to call somebody back, a retired commissioner, and ask him to step into the commission. I have yet to hear

of a meeting of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission is responsible to this Legislature, not to that government. I understand Mr. Duncan, the former commissioner, is dangling out there somewhere; I don't know where that particular case sits.

The Minister of Finance when he stands up in response to the Member for Selkirk mentioned, "Oh, it's a technicality," as if that refutes an argument. He mentions the lawyers on the other side, as if that refutes an argument. I kind of empathize with my colleague because their usual rebuttal to my argument is that I'm talking philosophy. But nevertheless, technicalities — and this legislative process is all technicalities — we were given a bunch of reports today, Mr. Chairman, this illustrious Task Force Report, and in it is a Letter of Transmittal — front page — this thing is dated March 31. Just a very simple thing, but nevertheless they typed three names down here on March 31 as if anything in here could be attributed to Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson resigned, as was pointed out, in February. It has nothing to do with this report, it's a technicality.

We have another report that was given to us. We have a whole bunch of them; I haven't had a chance to read all of them, and I certainly haven't had a chance to read all of the Task Force Report. But here is another simple one, it's the Milk Control Board of Manitoba Annual Report, Letter of Transmittal, second page. This thing is on the stationery of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba — Your obedient servant, The Milk Control Board of Manitoba, Chairman. No signature on that — that's no technicality. You know, I'd like for you to take a contract into court some day with no signature, and say, "That's a contract." They would throw you out.

But go over to the next page — (Interjection) — Well. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside is chirping again this session. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your Honour's obedient servant, Minister of Agriculture. He didn't sign it — they didn't even type his name here — who is the Minister of Agriculture? I assume it's the present Minister of Agriculture. These technicalities. These minor technicalities.

I am standing on my feet, Mr. Chairman, because I was given some assurance that the Minister of Finance would be back. I have asked the Minister of Industry and Commerce — (Interjection) — Well, you know, we can be technical. I can stand here in silence until the Minister of Finance comes back, but I am certainly not going to yield the floor, that this measure goes to a vote, until I get some answers from the Minister of Finance. Anybody else want to ask any questions of the non-existent front bench over here? It will be on the record. Do you want to ask some questions?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to take a moment, I'm sorry to note that the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Tourism left the Chamber just a few minutes ago. I did want to direct a couple of questions — (Interjection) — I'm sure he will be back, the House Leader indicates that. So let me put on record a couple of questions. Firstly, I would like to know, and I would like to know from him, in both capacities, whether any public monies have been applied for or will be advanced in connection with any change, or any part of the development of the Lord Selkirk project, and I would like to hear him answer that because as Minister of Industry and Tourism he would know, I would think, if anybody would.

Secondly, I would want to get clarification, and the sooner the better, as to what are the provisions in whatever legislation he is involved in, or maybe as a Minister of the Environment, regarding condominiums that are floating rather than the ones that will be permanently established on land as proposed by Mr. Jarmoc. Can Mr. Jarmoc now build a boat on whatever lake his land fronts onto, then build himself a condominium structure, and then go ahead without any restraint? And if there are restraints, then I think it's up to this government to tell us, and very quickly, because there's been an announcement made to the effect that the Lord Selkirk is going to be converted into condominiums. If that's the case, then I think we ought to know, what is the government's attitude to permitting, or advancing, or assisting, or denying, or in any way reviewing the rights of people to convert a floating mansion into a large number of units of houseboats. I think it's very important to know whether there is any legislation to cover it, or whether the government is prepared to deal with it. The government should have an attitude, even though it's private enterprise that may be involved in it; it is the use of our rivers and streams that are being affected, and one would have to know. It may well be that the answer we'll get is that it's under federal jurisdiction; frankly, I don't know. Maybe Lake Winnipeg and the Red River are federal jurisdiction, but the government has an interest in it, and I think it's very important to know. What is the government prepared to do to at least investigate and then have an opportunity to deny or to permit the proposed development of this condominium structure of a floating nature on Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if as well we could place on the record some further questions to the Minister of Finance, because I do believe we should have the answers to this this afternoon. Further to the questions posed by the Member for St. Johns, is there provincial legislation that would permit the holding of a casino or gambling-like activity on the boat, in view of the intention to convert it to a condominium? Maybe the Minister of Tourism would be able to enlighten us, because he had indicated last December that there was no intention to convert it to a casino type

operation, but I am just wondering, in view of the announced intention to convert it to a private condominium, whether or not it is also intended that the boat would be used casino-wise in connection with a private club type of arrangement? I can see that as a possibility in view of the announcement.

Secondly, I am wondering just whether or not applications have been made to this point to the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, and whether it is intended to operate a cabaret or cocktail type lounge on the boat, or whether it will be a private club liquor license; just what other type of activities? I think the Minister should try to enlighten us as to what information he has as to the type of activities proposed for the boat, because I don't see it being restricted only to living accommodation, Mr. Chairman. I foresee the boat being converted to other types of uses, and I just wish that the Minister of Tourism would share with this House the knowledge which he must have at this stage as to the intentions of the owners of the vessel. There must be considerable activity proposed for the boat which would ensure the price that apparently is being set on the suites, from \$20,000 to \$30,000; a boat which sold for what? A quarter of a million dollars, and which would bring, if all the condominium suites are sold as proposed, in the neighbourhood of some \$2 million. There must be some added attractions there that would render such a large markup, such a fantastic markup on the price which the purchasers paid for the boat. This is a markup — what does this come to in percentage terms? — 500 percent markup. So there must be some added factors in there that would make it very attractive to prospective purchasers, that they would want to participate in this type of venture.

I would like the Minister of Tourism to contribute to the debate in this House because we are kind of — it's like Oscars tonight, the Oscar awards, the Academy Awards, we are in suspense, we don't know yet just what is really proposed by way of awards. The suspense is building up, we haven't been able to obtain much information to date, but I just feel the suspense in the air all around me. We don't know what the next announcement is going to be, we just don't know. There were envelopes there that were sealed, and certainly we weren't privy to those envelopes, and like watching the Academy Awards, you are kept in suspense until the envelope is unsealed and you can ascertain the contents there. Well, I'm sure that the Minister of Tourism has many sealed envelopes in front of him with information therein, and I'm sure that he would like to unseal those envelopes and announce those envelopes, probably with some pride as to just what sort of additional activity this was going to promote in the Province of Manitoba. Now is his opportunity to do so. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, just to very briefly answer some of the questions the member has offered. Number one, Mr. Chairman, I heard of the impending press release of Mr. Cholakis this morning when I was driving in with my car; that's my knowledge, and I've had some of the details of a statement that he made.

Number two, the boat was sold to a bunch of private individuals, what they would do with that boat is their business.

Number three is, the Manitoba taxpayer will not be subsidizing that boat to the tune of \$300,000, \$400,000 a year any more. And may I point out to the member opposite that that amount of money just about covers the total advertising budget for the Department of Tourism when we're trying to promote all the tourism in the province. What you're asking us to do is spend that kind of money on one particular enterprise in this province. This government felt it did not have the funds to do that, and therefore has decided to sell the boat, so if the honourable member doesn't like it, I appreciate his point, and he has the perfect privilege of getting up and say that. . But we did not have the money to spend, \$300,000 to \$400,000, on propping up that one industry in this province. We said it before and we did what we said we were going to do.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister said that this boat was sold to a private enterprise — I think he said to a "bunch of people" — and what they do with it is no concern of Manitobans. I think he said that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell him that I'm one Manitoban who's very very much concerned about the use of that boat and how it will be developed. It may well be that if they want to sink the boat that we wouldn't have much concern, but even then we would because that boat is a large boat, we can't just let it go to the bottom of Lake Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no way, no way that Manitobans are not concerned with the manner in which that boat is used. Unfortunately the Minister was absent when I put some questions on the record. I'll repeat them to him. Is he concerned on behalf of the people of Manitoba as to whether or not this boat will have to obtain any permits from the province in any respect; whether in doing so, is he concerned about the nature of use that that boat will be put to? Is he concerned about whether or not there will be an opportunity for that boat to float up and down the shores of Lake Winnipeg, both sides, polluting it?

Is he concerned about whether or not this boat will be able to dock right at government pier, or whatever the pier is in Winnipeg Beach, and prevent people from making full recreational use of it? Is he concerned if whether or not there will be, as has been already suggested, a possibility of a private boat being used for gambling purposes for members of a club which may be on it? Or for drinking

Monday April 3, 1978

purposes or for whatever other useful purposes? Is he not concerned about the people of Manitoba, because what it says on the record today is that it is no concern of the people of Manitoba as to how that boat is being used by the private entrepreneurs who have purchased it?

So I think that we have to know just what is the concern of this province in relation to that boat, and whether or not this province is going to step in and investigate what is being done in order to make sure that it is not in contravention of any of the present laws of Manitoba; indeed if it is not in contravention it is still important to know whether the use will be such as will be not contemplated by the legislators in the past and therefore should be examined. Is he not concerned about the use to which the boat will be put?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're finally getting a debate going in this House. What is coming out now is the position of the government and we're not getting this position in the prepared speech of the First Minister, which was, you know, a very good speech, and he delivered it well. You know, where he gives credit for this, that and the other thing. But what we're getting now, Mr. Chairman, is the attitude of the Conservative Party, out of the mouth of the Minister of Tourism. What he meant to imply is, it's not even any of our business, as legislators in this House, what happens to the assets of the province.

A MEMBER: He doesn't care.

MR. BOYCE: What he is telling us is the attitude of this government, as said earlier by the Minister of Finance when he finally agreed that they were cutting programs, the deficit to which he referred to relative to the Lord Selkirk; the Lord Selkirk was considered as an adjunct to the park system, that they want us to vote them moneys that is going to once again benefit the rich — and when I say the rich I'm talking about the top 10 to 15 percent of the whole population, or maybe even 2 percent relative to the estate tax, the withdrawal of that was only 2 percent of the population, they were so anxious to ram that through to save \$5 million.

But nevertheless this statement of the Minister of Tourism right at this moment, that the saving of the \$300,000 by this arithmetic — he's used it with the City of Winnipeg relative to the operation of our City Park. We don't call it a City Park, it's a provincial park because it's a benefit to all the citizens of the Province of Manitoba — but out of the mouth of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, it's none of the Manitobans' business what these individuals do with the assets that he gives away. I'm shocked, Mr. Chairman. I'm shocked.

A MEMBER: Just like CFI.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister of Finance, I understand, had important business to be out of the House and sometimes Ministers of Finance have to run away; they float bond issues and it boggles your mind, Mr. Chairman

I had asked the Minister of Finance — and doubtless he has been briefed by his colleagues the questions that were asked relative to the jiggery-pokery they're carrying around in the Civil Service, totally ignoring the Civil Service Commission. But, Mr. Chairman, I imagine now that the Minister of Tourism, once again, will withdraw and not say anything or even elaborate on his statement that the selling of a \$4 million asset to somebody for a quarter of a million dollars, just because it, as a part of the parks system, cost us \$300,000 a year so people of Manitoba could have some recreational facilities in the province — and they don't even bother to tell us, I don't know — maybe some of the people who are familiar with finances, in net cost what it cost us, \$300,000 in an operating sense, perhaps this is a valid figure, I don't know. But in the jobs that it created, the taxes that were paid, the incomes that flowed as a result of it, I don't know what the final line would be on \$300,000, the budget of that particular operation, but I doubt very much if it's \$300,000.00.

But even if it was, Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that the people of the Province of Manitoba listen to what the members of this government are saying — not in their prepared texts and not in these press releases that were circulated around here earlier relative to Family Law but what they say in response to questions posed in this House. It was interesting to note in alluding to the First Minister's comments on the Throne Speech Debate, that he chose to quote from something President Carter had said, because it, too speaks loudly of what this government thinks governments are about.

I think, to paraphrase what the First Minister quoted from Mr. Carter, that the government has to work out a rapprochement with the people, because this, Mr. Chairman, epitomizes and is a manifestation of their attitude towards people. They see a difference between the people and their government. They say the people in this province are stupid, that from all of our million people we can't pick and choose people with the competency to operate the Lord Selkirk, the Saunders Aircraft or whatever other company, the Flyer Coach, or Domtar, or whatever the name of this particular company was.

But their whole attitude comes out of their mouths, not in their prepared statements but in the things that they say such as the present time when the Minister of Tourism says, "They're saving money by getting rid of this boat. Never mind what these people are going to do with it." Even if it is to attract people who we think shouldn't be in this particular province.

Monday April 3, 1978

It's interesting to note when I had referred earlier to the fact that Winnipeg was considered a place to launder money . . . The CBC did a documentary on the drug traffic in Vancouver about a year ago, and at that time they alluded to five ex-constables of the Hong Kong police who were in Canada — I don't know if you people know where they are now — they're in Formosa; they're in Formosa because we have no extradition treaty with Formosa. But nevertheless if the Minister of Tourism and Recreation would sell me the boat for a million and the Attorney-General would agree with me that these people would not be subject to prosecution — like the Minister of Labour did for two people who were breaking the law out here, Hooker Chemical and somebody else — you give me that kind of an insurance and I'll sell that boat for \$10 million.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my concern is mostly on this very incomplete and unsatisfactory report that we had from the Minister that introduced the Task Force report today, and unfortunately he's not here.

I think that it is certainly not acceptable that this is going to be the final document, this Task Force report that we have with certain recommendations, so I think that there is not going to be any credibility at all if we do not get the reports of the sub-committees. After all the reports of the sub-committees were the documents that the government and the Task Force based themselves on getting this report. I think that the public should be allowed to look at this credibility, and if these people, free enterprise, were willing to come and do this work, certainly they should accept that their recommendations should be scrutinized.

How can anybody bring in a decent worthwhile debate on the recommendation of the Task Force if you don't know why they are making certain recommendations, and what kind of people? There might be a very worthwhile recommendation that maybe this government would not — I say "maybe" — as a possibility would not have the internal fortitude to act on, so therefore that will be crossed out. And I want to see because this government has been flying kites, that's exactly what they've been doing. You know, you can see it now. Everything was going to be the worst. The Minister of Health has been on every single issue, he's been on all sides. He's covered the — he's maybe yes, no, and sometimes in the same day. They're flying kites and you know, I'd have been crucified if I had brought the program on Day Care that he announced, not too long ago, and it was one of the greatest things ever. You know, they're freezing the program but they didn't cut it, so the people were so happy and that's exactly what they're going to do.

They are announcing the worst. They leaked some of the things from the Task Force, then all of a sudden they're going to say, "No, it's not going to be that bad." That is their style and that's not responsibility. They've told that Task Force. They didn't say, "Go and look at the programs because we have a mandate to cut the fat to see what's going to happen with all this mismanagement that we have, and tell us the programs where there has been too much of that" — I want to see that.

The Minister has said that I would be embarrassed, I want to be embarrassed, I want to see where I went wrong in that department. I know it wasn't perfect but I want to be able to defend myself and there are certain things; and then I want to see what kind of people, what kind of humanity they had. Well, if it's true that they recommended that they do away with the supplement for the elderly, I want the public of Manitoba to know that these are the kind of people that were making recommendation. I think that's got to come out. To say that this is an internal policy, it's nuts, it's crazy. They are people that are in the private sector in a democracy where people are elected to govern. If these people are ready to make recommendations, I want to know what these recommendations are.

I want to know what they think of national unity. If it's true that they said, "Let's get rid of the ADM in charge of French curriculum," I want to know if that's the case. I want to know where they put that almighty dollar sign. I want to see if that's their first priority, that is what I want to know.

I want to know why they say they want to divide the department. A lot of the things I agree with. I don't think that you needed a Task Force to decide that the Department of Health and Social Development was too large and that it should be cut. I don't you needed a Task Force for that.

I don't think that you needed a Task Force to say that maybe they should close some of the hospitals in the rural area. But you know, is that going to be that easy? And how fast do you do it and how do you do it, and do you do it in a way that you're going to improve matters, and I want to know, though, what they based themselves on. This is what I want to know and so far it has been a sham. I can see it now. You know, a Minister who probably won't be here, certainly won't be here for the next election, who has been a political enemy of his leader. Well, he's going to be the joe-boy and he's going to be the one that's going to be blamed.

And then, you know, what names have we got? We've got him, we've got somebody from the Great-West Life and then we've got a civil servant, a chairman of a commission. And they're the ones that are going to decide what they should tell us. And the same people, and especially the same Minister for four years, for eight years, sitting in that seat has been saying, "We want these documents." They wanted to even know the memos between Deputy Ministers and Ministers of the former administration, but now they're not going to give us these documents. Are they ashamed of these documents? We want to know where we went wrong if we went wrong. We want to know. You've announced the names of these people who have these sub-committees and so on. We want to know their reports and how you based yourselves with the Task Force, how they arrived at the

Monday April 3, 1978

recommendations that they made because this document is incomplete. It doesn't mean a damn thing. It doesn't mean anything if we don't get the working documents. That is the important thing because you can change that to suit yourself.

When you're making recommendations I think that certainly we're entitled to know why, why a certain program should be dismissed. You know, I've heard from one of the members of this sub-committee on Health who said, "Well, what the hell. You know, we thought we were supposed to look at the administration." I have no objection to the part that talks about administration, you can have different departments and different levels of government. You know, that's not new. That's been looked at in all provinces by all governments, in some form or other.

But I want to know when it comes to the recommendation of doing away with certain departments, and I want them to tell the public of Manitoba that they were told in Health, "We want you to reduce Health by \$10 million." Those are the terms of reference that we didn't hear, that the people of Manitoba never heard anything about.

You don't get a decent task force or somebody that is going to look after the affairs of Manitoba if the first recommendation, if the first directive is: You are going to cut so many million dollars. Is that how you're going to cut the fat? Is that when you're going to get better administration? And are they the people that have the mandate to decide on priorities? I thought that was our job. I thought that was the job of the members of this House and the members of the Government, especially in the Cabinet, to decide where the priorities were.

Now we set up a sham, a dummy task force. Apparently we're not even going to have a chance to look at the recommendations. It could be the best paper of whitewash, of putting words together and saying this is what we're going to do; this is what has been recommended. I don't think that's good enough, with all the noise that they've been making.

Now, another thing. I want to know if the civil servants in certain departments, in my former department for instance, can say, "Yes, we can operate better, more efficiently with less people." Because then I'm going to ask, if that's true and if this has been recommended by the Deputy Minister of Health, I'm going to ask, I'm going to stand here and ask that he be fired because he's been snowing me for a few years that I was the head of the department. If these are the kind of people that if all of a sudden they can say, if Dr. . . . in Portage la Prairie, Dr. Lowther, — I'm not worried about the former deputy minister because they never said that, but if that doctor can say, "No, we were lying when we said we needed 200 people. We can do a better job with this staff," I want the public to know. Because these people should resign. If they are honest now, they were lying and they were conning the people of Manitoba before and they shouldn't be there.

If the hospitals and people who have been on boards can say, "We can go with a 2.9 increase," they should all be fired because they've been lying and they've been stealing from the people of Manitoba for years. —(Interjection)— Definitely. If they say today that they can go with 2.9, — well, I know they're not. I know they're not, and this is why I say, "Come clean, come clean and don't play games, and have the guts to say what you want." —(Interjection)— I'm responsible for what? For what? I can't hear the —(Interjection)— For what statement? Well, it should be obvious what I think of you if nothing else.

I'm saying that if you've got the guts, if you're going to come in and hide behind a task force, give us all the information, not a whitewash, as was mentioned, with somebody that wasn't even there when that task force was written and apparently who has stated that this is what they've recommended. You know, you've got an Estimate all set and the Minister has announced something on a program and apparently nobody saw this task force. But then you've already made decisions and before the Task Force came out, you'd lowered taxes.

You know, you talk about free enterprise. If free enterprise did that, if Great-West Life decided all of a sudden they would change, that they would lower their income because there's such a great deficit, they're stuck with bad administration, so the first thing they're going to do, they're going to lower income? Before knowing what it's all about? You weren't even sitting at your desks as ministers; you had no idea what your department was all about. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Succession duty? How many people were paying; how many people were paid? How many people were paid? —(Interjection)— That's a possibility, that's a possibility. But what has that got to do with the way you handle this thing now.

You're talking about the one tax. That's a possibility and it's also a possibility that a lot of people are leaving the province. Now you don't give a damn about that because they're not the millionaires that are leaving but people that can't get a job and that are afraid of the way you're acting. People who are in fear of this government, they're leaving the country but you don't give a damn about them. —(Interjection)— You want to what? I don't know but where are the millionaires going? Where are the millionaires going? You know, this is what we based ourself on. If it's good, the people have to be here. Now, if you had your way — be consistent. Bring back slavery. You're going to make a hell of a lot of money. Bring back slavery.

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