

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order, and I'll recognize the Member for Inkster the courtesies, and then followed possibly by a ruling, but a courtesy to the Member for Inkster, I'll let him finish his remarks.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to speak by sufferance, Mr. Chairman. If I have a right to speak, I have a right to speak.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What do you mean by saying that you will recognize the member as a courtesy. I think it is his right. I don't know what you mean by courtesy, and I'd like to know.  
--(Interjections)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I recognize the right, and I call on the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Okay, Mr. Chairman. I would like to conclude. If there are any problems, Mr. Chairman, with the items - if my friend, the Member for St. Boniface will just pass the Estimates Book, I would indicate that we have proceeded, as I understand it, just so that there is no misunderstanding as to the item that I am speaking on, the last item we dealt with was 1.(a) Minister's Compensation. That was passed. The next item that was introduced was the global item, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty \$1,573,600.00. Actually, I thought that I was on the last item, \$149,160,200.00. But it really doesn't make any difference, Mr. Chairman. If the \$1 million had not been passed globally, that is a motion that goes to Committee on which one can speak. The Minister's salary has been closed, and I am speaking on the global item, \$1,573,600; and I understand that there will still be another global item to discuss, which I thought I was on, but it really doesn't make any difference because both are global items.

Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to come to the defence of the Minister of Highways and Transportation, because I think that the Minister has been abused by the majority members of this committee. I think that it is not unusual for a member to ask for confidence in a Minister. That was done, and the vote was in favour of the Minister by a majority vote in the House. But the members of the majority apparently are of the opinion that the Minister cannot defend his salary; and I understand that the Minister has not spoken on his salary, that there have been no speeches. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, he spoke to introduce his Estimates. He spoke to introduce his Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, there was a motion in the House with regard to the Minister's salary, which was defeated, and there has been no further debate on the Minister's salary and I charge, Mr. Chairman, the members of the Conservative majority, of lacking confidence, not in the Minister receiving his salary, because they voted for it obviously in the House, I charge them with lacking confidence in him being able to defend the receipt of his salary, which is probably worse, Mr. Chairman, than had they voted the other way. Because to vote for a Minister's salary and then to suggest that he cannot defend it, just means that he gets his salary without being able to defend it.

Now I, Mr. Chairman, don't happen to have that low a regard of the Minister. I am not really way up there either, but I do not have as low a regard for the Minister as is obviously been displayed by a majority of the members of the committee who say, and this is the first time in parliamentary history that I am aware of - when I say parliamentary history, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going outside of the confines of this House - but I know that when we used to discuss Estimates between 1966 and 1973 or 1974 when the rules were changed, the Minister's salary was always first.

Therefore, in the days before I came, and when the Member for St. Boniface was a member, it would also be the case that the Minister's salary was always first. And therefore, the Minister always had to defend the receipt of his salary. When the change in rule was made, Mr. Chairman, it was made on the basis that a more

rational analysis of the expenditures would take place if we dealt with the items, item by item, but that the Minister would then be able to deal with his salary only as the last item. And in order to protect the last item, Mr. Chairman, and this is particularly something that the House Leader should be listening to because, you know, the House Leader is a fine gentleman I think, but he has adopted his freshman year as House Leader and has been given the enviable responsibility, Mr. Chairman, of doing some particularly obnoxious thing. And it's true. I mean, he was asked to go to Rules Committee and force through a rule of which there was a considerable amount of accommodation, which was denied, and subsequently had to be reversed.

Now he's been asked, and I will be corrected if I am wrong, to make the first motion, Mr. Chairman, of closure on the Minister's salary based on a five-minute debate and one speech having preceded that debate. The Minister's motion having gone through, the Minister's salary was confined to a speech made by the Member for Ste. Rose and a five-minute speech. . .no, I have to include a motion made by the House Leader, which took of course no time at all, then the Leader of the Opposition's speech for five minutes, and of course, the irresponsible and uncontrollable outcries of the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Public Service, who of course couldn't be gagged, Mr. Chairman; in any way by any closure motion. The Member for Lakeside has said, "You can't impose closure on me. Perhaps you can close it on those weaklings in the opposition, those fine people who will obey the rules after closure has been imposed, but you're not going to impose closure on me, and I'm going to speak to the press from my seat in the Legislative Chamber, telling them that those people are all wrong."

But to become somewhat more serious, Mr. Chairman, not that I'm not serious up until now, but to become somewhat more serious, if the Attorney-General will look at the rules, he will see that there is room for two closure motions, actually three, on any single item, and I'm sure the Minister has cottoned onto this, he can move that the item be moved forthwith, in which case that is dealt with. On all of the items leading up to the Minister's salary, he can move a motion setting out a specific period of time to conclude all of those items. But the Minister's salary was left out, because the people on the Rules Committee said, that no matter how much you move closure up to the Minister's salary, you will have to have a separate debate on the Minister's salary, and if you want to move it, there has to be a separate motion.

Now, what the Attorney-General has done, is that he has been so fearful of the capacity of the Minister of Highways to be able to deal with his Estimates and to be able to justify his salary, so certain that if he let the Minister open his mouth, the entire Conservative administration will fall down like a house of cards, that he said, we can't under any circumstances let this guy talk; we can't. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister had said was, at the cost of having to go to the public and say that, we pulled a new one. We have, for the first time in Manitoba parliamentary history in any event, we have imposed closure on the Minister's salary with a five-minute time limit, after one speech.

Now I ask the Attorney-General, because this is not the last time we're going to be here, I ask him to look at those rules, the three rules that I have suggested, and indicate whether this type of procedure was ever contemplated, whether it was necessary under the circumstances, and whether it will get him anywhere. Because, Mr. Chairman, if we are not able to get this Minister to talk during this particular debate, is the Attorney-General aware that on second reading of the total bill to vote supply, we go into committee, and in committee you are able to again go through this procedure. And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister will look, he will see that on second reading of supply and into committee, in the closing days, that it is very rarely debated. It's not as if the Opposition, particularly when it's nice outside and the moon is shining and it's warm, that they want to prolong debate. But they can be provoked to prolong the date.

I want to tell the Attorney-General - I'm going to come clean and I'm going to make an honest admission - I had no intention of speaking today. He provoked me into a 30-minute speech for nothing, which none of you would have had to endure, and it has been an endurance. It has been an endurance. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I tell the Attorney-General that he is - for his own good - he has proceeded with this rule in such a way as not to accomplish what is a perfectly legitimate result.

Mr. Chairman, there was an argument in the House today. I'll reveal it to my friends of the New Democratic Party because it was something which I - it's not as if I have raised it for the first time. When the bells were ringing for more than 15 minutes, or so, and there was a suggestion that the opposition could keep the bells ringing forever, I said, not on your life they can't. And I said, that in no way is the opposition entitled by the Whips saying that they're not ready to stop the parliamentary procedure from continuing; and that if the Speaker, or the Chairman, came to the conclusion that the Whips were merely delaying a vote and not legitimately trying to get members into the House, that the Chairman could call a vote.

And, Mr. Chairman, I say that - not out of love for the New Democrats or love for the Conservatives - but out of love for the parliamentary system, which I do not want to see anybody interfere with. And, therefore, those people who think that they can prevent a vote by not appearing and saying that the Whips won't let you in. I can tell you that when I was the House Leader, I went to the Speaker and I said, they've had a reasonable length of time; unless they give you an explanation as to why they need more time, I am asking you to take this vote. And I would defend the right of the government to do that today.

So, do not get the impression that these remarks are being made on the basis of being for government or anti-government. They are being made for the purpose of having our parliamentary system operate in a way which is sensible. And I defend the closure motion.

If the members of the opposition had decided that they were going to debate the Minister's Salary in such a way as to obviously convey to the public that they are not engaged in meaningful debate, then the Minister has a right to come in and say, "Look, you've got one hour more, you've got two hours more, you've got the remainder of tonight's sitting, and then we're going to ask you to vote".

There would have been probably some postured outcry, but the government would have been right - and they would have been seen to be right, Mr. Chairman. And I'm not saying this for the first time. The Member for St. Vital, the Member for Kildonan, I don't see any others here on the Rules Committee --(Interjection)-- Well, all right, the Member for Minnedosa has heard me say this before, both from the government side of the House and from the opposition side of the House. That if the Attorney-General is going to cause the members of the opposition to be seeking out time for the purpose of debating, then it will not result in a good process, and what is more, will accrue to the disadvantage of the government in power, which of course I am delighted to have happen. But I don't know why he is delighted to have it happen.

I say further, Mr. Chairman, and I plead with the Attorney-General, there is still one item on which the Minister's salary can be debated, and there is absolutely no doubt about that. Because when we were discussing putting the Minister's salary at the bottom in Rules Committee, all of us agreed that even the Minister's salary is over, there is still one item. And we all said that, it should be no surprise. We said there is still one item, and that is the total amount, and there could be a debate on that item, and that debate of course is subject to the normal rules of parliament.

So, Mr. Chairman, in summing up, and just because I don't wish to take more time than is absolutely necessary to make my remarks, and I trust that every word that I said was necessary to the debate that we are participating in, I charge the government, Mr. Chairman, and condemn the government, for degrading their Minister of Highways, who, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure could do much better than they expect of him, if they will only let him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, since the Member for Inkster's remarks won't be corrected by members of the opposition, I would just like the record to stand clear that in the dying hours of yesterday's session, when the item of the Minister's salary was being debated last evening, the Member for Ste. Rose as critic for the department presented a motion which we voted on this afternoon in the House. And after that motion, I decried him for making such a dastardly motion, such an unjustified motion, such an unwarranted accusation, and

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

such a terrible position to put on the record. That was last night when I defended my salary, Mr. Chairman, and I don't want the Member for Inkster to be putting the wrong impression on the record. So I would just like to correct that, that in fact last night I defended my salary to the utmost degree and there was no reply from any member of the opposition once I had justified my salary, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, if I could just have your ear for a moment. During the dinner hour, I, with the assistance of other people, looked at the Rule and for what it's worth in my judgement of it, it would appear that when Rule 65(15) and (16) was drafted, it was evident that the intention was that passage of the two motions, i.e., the department and then the Minister's salary, was to preclude further debate on the department's Estimates.

MR. GREEN: Speaking to the point of order, there is nothing in the Rules to say that. I have described the rules. And furthermore, the Rules Committee considered this very point, Mr. Chairman, not more than a month ago, and we all agreed that after the Minister's salary was voted on, there was a motion for the global item; there was a motion. You put the motion, Mr. Chairman. You said, "Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,573,600.00." You put that motion. That motion is debatable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we have a lot more people in here tonight than what we had in here last night, and I believe that this is where some of the confusion is originating. Last night, the Member for Ste. Rose, after considerable debate and so on, he made what everybody would have considered was his closing speech of the Estimates. He made that speech, and at the end of that speech, he moved to reduce the salary. Now traditionally, that has always been the last item of debate from the opposition, that the last item of debate was reducing the salary. At that time, Mr. Chairman, we asked the members opposite whether they were through debating the Estimates, and we received that assurance that they were. The Member for St. George gave us his word that they were through. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows on a point of order.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have no recollection of being asked for any assurance that there would be no further debate.

MR. BROWN: The Member for St. George gave us that assurance. Now, I don't know, if he has not been talking to you, that's something that we cannot help. But the Member for St. George gave us his word that they were through debating the Estimates of Highways, and he said, "tomorrow afternoon we'll go into the Legislature. . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: One member at a time. The Member for Rhineland on the same point of order. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. George said that we were going to go into the Legislature this afternoon, we were going to have two votes, we were going to have a vote on reducing the Minister's salary and then we were going to vote on that particular appropriation to complete the Estimates.

Now this is the verbal agreement that we had with the members of the opposition last night. I am certain that the Member for Inkster did not know of this, because we've always respected his word; a word was a word, and we've always been able to respect his word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster on a point of order.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, surely the honourable member is not saying that my word, or that the official opposition is, if I didn't do what they said, it's not breaking my word. I am not. . .

MR. BROWN: What I said, Mr. Chairman, was, I do not believe that the Member for Inkster knew of this agreement or this arrangement, but nevertheless, this arrangement had been made. I am certain that the Leader of the Opposition, when he charged in here this afternoon and starting tilting windmills, was aware that this agreement had been made. We expect agreements to be honoured. If we can not have agreements honoured when they are made with opposition members, then I don't know, then we've come to a real sorry state in this Legislature. We had no intention, and we still have no intention, really, of invoking closure. That never was the intention. You had every opportunity last night to debate these Estimates. But it was your motion that closed debate last night, and it was your assurance that you were through debating the Estimates of Highways.

Now that is why we find ourselves in the position that we're in at the present time. We have debated 20 hours and 25 minutes up to last night, the Estimates. I believe that everybody must realize that that is many more hours than we've ever spent on the Estimates of Highways. It was 14 hours and 50 minutes last year. We are 6 hours above the Estimates of which they usually are. So you had ample opportunity, really, to debate the Estimates, but it was really your decision last night to cease debating these Estimates. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, we really have no alternative but to cease debating the Department of Highways Estimates and to vote on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for Rhineland making a motion?  
--(Interjection)-- Then indicate - do you want to put the question, is . . .  
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Why don't you call the next item. Actually we passed (1)(a); we passed (1)(b); we passed all of them.  
The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland is obviously confused. We have voted on the question of the Minister's Salary, we are now voting on the global motion representing some \$1.5 million of expenditures and that is a debatable motion. So far, Mr. Chairman, we have had only one or two comments on that item, and the Member for Rhineland suggested that is sufficient debate. Now, perhaps it would be sufficient debate if we didn't have the interlude of the last couple of hours, Mr. Chairman. But let not the Member for Rhineland suggest to us that some members should be precluded from making a contribution on this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: On a point of order. My recollection - and I think I am correct that the government members would not allow a Yeas and Nays vote last night. That's because it was after 10 o'clock. Therefore, the committee should have rose or moved on to another item, and there was no other item to - so, therefore, except this motion now that we're on, the global figure. The Member for St. Vital suggested to the Chairman that he take it under advisement. The Committee of Rules was meeting this morning at 10 o'clock and they could be discussed there to find out on what grounds we were standing on that particular question. That's where the argument arose, and there were members on this side of the House - I spoke about, perhaps, 10 minutes or less; and the Minister replied, perhaps, with 5 minutes reply. There were other members on our side of the House that wanted to make their contributions on the Minister's Salary, but we had to dispose of that motion. There was a motion before the House to reduce the Minister's Salary, and that motion had to be dealt with. And there was an attempt made last night to defeat my motion and also to pass the global Estimates. There was an attempt made, and we had to argue for half an hour or more to try and resolve that question last night which was resolved today.

And my understanding is that we would go into the House, and we would deal with that motion to reduce the Minister's Salary, and that we would come back here, and

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

then deal with the main motion, and that was his salary. --(Interjection)-- The \$15,600, the \$15,600, that's what that is. I have no recollection that there were any deals made. I have no recollection of any deals made last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. ADAM: Well, we're on the point of order, and I don't know where we stand at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I was not going to speak on a point of order. I was going to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Are we on a point or are we off that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. ADAM: Okay. I just had a couple of more items that I wanted to ask the Minister, that I asked him a question last night in regard to a question of turn signals on motorcycles, and I wonder if he could elaborate more on that particular question. I know that he doesn't have any assistant here, but when I got home last night at 12 o'clock I did have more information on this particular subject. There was a letter waiting for me in the mail from the Antique Motorcycle Club of Manitoba. I'm not sure whether the Minister is familiar with this group, but I would like to ask the Minister if he could, perhaps, elaborate on the time limit for the antique bikes, and the older model bikes, if he can deal with that. Or, if he can't deal with it tonight, perhaps he could give me that information tomorrow, but I would like to read this letter into the record.

MR. ORCHARD: Don't bother, it's already been solved, Pete.

MR. ADAM: Well, perhaps, if there is a solution . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Absolutely.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if the Minister could give us that information. I think I think I'll put that letter in --(Interjection)-- I'm asking the Minister a question.

MR. ORCHARD: You're debating the motion.

MR. ADAM: I'm debating the motion, the global figure. Mr. Chairman, the letter is addressed to me and it said: "Dear Sir: I am writing you in regard to the legislation to be declared as of April 1, 1980 requiring turn signals on all motorcycles. We, the Antique Motorcycle Club of Manitoba, would like to urge you to support an amendment of this law to include a cut-off date, exempting older motorcycles. We suggest a cut-off date of 1969, and depend our correspondence with Mr. P. De Galla on this subject. As you can see, he seems to see no objections to our request, but has doubts about the possibility of passing an amendment before April 1, 1980 deadline. We have been lead to believe that such an amendment is being prepared, and would urge you to do anything in your power to speed passage of such an amendment.

As a club, we have no objections as a cut-off date later than 1969, but would have serious reservations should an earlier date be proposed. We would appreciate any reply you can give us indicating your intentions in this respect."

Now, I wonder if the Minister could just elaborate on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the honourable member would give us a date of that letter.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. ADAM: March 18, and I just received it last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Member for Ste. Rose, we have been in communication with that organization.

MR. ADAM: Not yet, I never . . .

MR. ORCHARD: We told them last week, Mr. Chairman, that an amendment was coming forth which would exempt all motorcycles from 1974 and back from the requirements of turn signals. That organization had that information by phone, confirmed by letter. That amendment, Mr. Chairman, is going to be made retro-active April 1, 1980. The speedy passage of that amendment is, indeed, in jeopardy when we consider the waffling tactics of the opposition.

MR. ADAM: Oh, come on, come on, now. Mr. Chairman, the letter was sent to Ste. Rose, not to the Legislature, and that's why I didn't get it any sooner. But I only got it when I got home last night. It was brought to me from Ste. Rose.

The other item I wanted to - just a short item - if the Minister could clarify it for me again, in regard to the five-year restricted licence. There is no recourse, is there? We have established that conclusively, there's no recourse for this fellow?

MR. ORCHARD: No, there is no recourse.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Dygala, the Registrar, cannot look at that case, or anyone else?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, all Estimates and expenditures have been approved item by item, they have all been initialled and there is no further moneys to be approved. I move that the question be put on Resolution 80 now.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

#### SUPPLY - FITNESS, RECREATION AND AMATEUR SPORT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Morris): I call the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few brief opening remarks with regard to the operation of the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would allow us a bit of information, so that we don't have the same comedy of errors that we've had this afternoon and tonight. Is it the intention of the Minister to include the Lottery at this time? If so, will we wait for the Minister's Salary or could we get some information before, because I think it is practically impossible, as far as I am concerned anyway, to really look at what is being done in this department. Because there is a lot of revenue from the government that is spent for some of these programs, and I think there has been an agreement with the Sports Federation that they are taking the responsibility previously held by the Minister.

While I'm at it, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there will be a closure motion when we get to his Salary. I would like to know what to expect.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, in light of the exercise that we all got, this being the Department of Fitness, maybe we should go through the same exercise again.

But in reply to the honourable member's question, I think he is quite right, there are a number of items within the Estimates' structure itself, as we go through the different areas, that hinge on Lottery revenues. If it would be acceptable to the members of the committee, in dealing with the agreements and the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, if we could leave that up to the Minister's Salary.

MR. DESJARDINS: The agreements.

MR. BANMAN: The agreements and the operation of the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, which is under me. I don't there is a special line anywhere because it's...

MR. DESJARDINS: But as far as the money, the revenue from the Lotteries and the programs that are run, you will explain it...

MR. BANMAN: I think that's the only fair way of doing it. If we would leave it to the end, you wouldn't get a true picture of what is going on. So. . . as we go along.

Before commenting specifically on our programs, I would like to say that it has been very rewarding to be responsible for this particular new department of government. It provides the opportunity to meet and work with people of all walks of life, from all parts of the province and from all areas of interest. I would particularly like to today commend my staff, both the field personnel as well as the administrative people, along with the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister, who have done a tremendous job in bringing this particular department together and contacting so many people throughout Manitoba.

Over the last year, I had opportunities to be involved with several particular sporting events. One of them, which I attended last summer, was the Western Canada Games, where I saw such things as Grant Towne here of Manitoba win the gold medal in the marathon, Sylvia Burka perform outstanding feats in the speed-skating events, and saw gold medal play on behalf of our basketball, volleyball and handball teams. Needless to say, this brings a special kind of satisfaction and pride in seeing our Manitobans perform in such outstanding fashion.

These are a few of the more spectacular happenings, but it is equally rewarding to see the increasing number of people throughout the province engaged in such activities as cross-country skiing, jogging, cycling and many of the other recreational activities which help keep Manitobans physically fit. Our goal is to bring a certain amount of joy, personal satisfaction and the many other benefits that come to people who are engaged in leisure activities.

One of the main principles of our operation is assisting people to assist themselves. This is best achieved by supporting municipalities, community organizations, recreation agencies and sporting associations. There are a number of programs of support, but as we go through the Estimates, we will see that there are a number of major ones, one of which I announced the other day, the Sports Facilities Aid Program, and the other one which has caught on really well over the last number of years is the District Recreation Program.

Sports Facilities 80 will provide, as I mentioned in the House the other day, \$2 million from Lotteries revenues for the renovation and upgrading of sports' facilities, with a view to increasing community use of such facilities and yet decreasing the operational costs and energy consumption. The District Recreation Program enables small communities to combine their resources to hire a full-time recreation direction to conduct their programs and operate their facilities. In the past year, six new districts were formed, bringing the total now up to 18.

In dealing with fitness, we want to continue our practice of working co-operatively with agencies providing physical fitness opportunities. This includes recreation commissions, community centres, sports groups, "Y"s, summer camps and other groups that are encouraging people to stay active. We are also cooperating with organizations such as the Manitoba Heart Foundation, which is offering a program of fitness which is called Fitness in the Workplace, and we are presently



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

reviewing a program named Cooperate Challenge, which encourages business establishments to become involved in competitive games.

In addition to these projects, support will be given to special programs I have referred to in the past, such as Frontier Games, an athletic program for children throughout the north; Bird's Hill Day Camp, operated for children deprived of their summer vacation opportunities, water safety instruction, the Manitoba marathon, senior olympics, and so on.

These are but a few of the projects offered to encourage Manitobans to become active, to become fit and to experience the benefits of physical well-being as well as the joys of participation.

A major project which we have had a positive effect, I believe, on the sporting community in the last year, is the relationships which we have developed with the Manitoba Sports Federation in the 61 provincial amateur sports body.

The Federation, by means of the revenue earned as a partner of the Western Lotteries Manitoba . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I hesitate in interrupting the Minister, but better now than later in having to repeat it. I turned on Page 51, we're looking at the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport and it's got two lines. We were talking about certain things under the Minister's Salary; there isn't even a Minister's Salary; forgot he's getting his pay later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the member, 52 is Minister's Compensation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I've got it now. I thought there was no Minister. . . I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Only half, Mr. chairman. The other half comes from Co-Op Developments.

While the Federation is carrying out its function in assisting sports bodies, our department with its regional services will link up with the efforts of the communities and its organizations, and give assistance to development of activities at the local level.

My department will continue to provide direct assistance to provincial sport associations for sports development programs; grants will be available for clinics, coaching certification, athletic aid, travel to and hosting major championships, and a regional development program to involve more rural people.

And I'm pleased to report that the Gimli Training Centre has been in full operation to serve as a residential training site for sports and cultural groups.

In co-operation with the Gimli Development Corporation, the centre has been operating on a break-even basis with an annual saving of about \$50,000, and has seen increased use.

Also the Sports Injury Centre is being successfully operated at the Refit Centre. This program is unique in Canada and is receiving national recognition for its treatment of athletic injuries. The program has treated over 5,000 athletes in the seven-and-a-half month period and has received many glowing compliments for its service.

My department, in conjunction with the Advisory Council, is reviewing a plan to expand the service and to include a Predit Program which will offer a physical appraisal to check the capability of athletes in their different performing skills.

In conclusion, I would like to state that we have enjoyed a very successful year, I believe. The major program thrusts have seen a good effort on behalf of all the groups, the community groups, regional groups and the provincial agencies.

I would also like to pay tribute, as I mentioned before, to my staff, and we look forward to the '80s with great expectation and are confident that we can encourage the provisions of fitness, recreation and sport opportunities for people in all segments of our population.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)--pass. The Member for St. Boniface.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, does this cover the salary for a staff of how many?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: And I intend to ask the Minister the number of the staff on every item, so I wonder if he could advise us, compared with last year.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, this provides total staff man years of five. It's the same level as last year. If the member would like, I could probably just send him a summary of the total staff man years.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, that would be better. Is last year on that also?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, it's a comparison.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to find out now what is happening, what has happened to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport. There was a committee. There is an Act that allows this. The committee has been sent. I never heard that the committee was disbanded. The former Minister chose to name another committee - why I'll never know - another committee to study the whole question of sport when they had a Fitness and Amateur Sport Committee, which was duly named by Order-in-Council - and never rescinded - and it was felt also that if the Minister certainly had every right to name extra members, other members, or to replace some - but this was never done - now I'd like to know. I'm not talking about this Minister's committee, which is not governed by any Act, just the committee they put together chaired by Mr. Daly and I have all the respect, I'm not knocking that committee at all - but I'd like to know if the Advisory Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport that was there three years ago, if it still exists, and in fact what are the names of these members?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the committee, as I understand it from my experience with regard to this when I took over, that the committee had expired. There were two members who were serving on that committee; as part of that committee were serving on the WLMD Board of Directors; in other words, were representing that particular association. And the funds for that third were accruing to the department.

What has happened is, with the advent of the Manitoba Sports Federation joining, those two members were resigned from WLMD, and at present there is no Advisory Council such as the member points out that is reporting to the Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that, and I'm not opposing this, that the Sports Federation replaced that committee as one of the partners that was intended from Day One. But the Sports Federation chose not to accept that in those years, and then they've had a change of heart when they couldn't make a success of their own lottery.

But that is something apart from that. That is an Advisory Committee for the Minister on Fitness and Amateur Sport. That was a name. That Committee was a name to represent this group on the lottery thing. It was only until the Sports Federation made up their mind. We didn't want to see sports lose anything. So that Advisory Committee was asked to make recommendations. It was quite active. But this committee was there before this committee, it's been there for years. In fact, I think this Act was brought in by the former Conservative government and I would like to know why, if the Minister said that committee doesn't exist, was that Order-in-Council rescinded? If not, that committee does exist, in fact. And if my memory serves me right, they were not named for any period of time. I would advise the Minister if he is not - and it seems obvious that he is not discussing with that committee - that he is not getting the benefit of their recommendations. I recommend, and maybe I should wait till he gets his information.

MR. BANMAN: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, and I have worked under the impression that the terms of the particular appointments were expired and there has not been another body appointed.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

I should point out to the member that there are regional councils right now that are in place dealing with some of the rural problems. We do have a sports' medicine group that is advising the Minister with regard to the sports medicine aspect of the thing, and we do not at present have an advisory council of the nature that the member refers to in place.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not too sure about that. I don't want to argue with the Minister, and I don't fault the Minister for that. This was done by a previous Minister. But I would ask that he check, because if he did have to go back to the original Order-in-Council when these members were appointed, and if there is no period stated, they are a member until the Order-in-Council is rescinded, and I doubt if that was done. Now, apart from that, I would suggest to the Minister that he should name a committee. He named other committees in the community recreation which existed before, but I don't think that they would replace that committee. I'm not saying that he should stay with these people. If he wants to change the committee, he certainly has the right; they have a mandate to govern and they can do what they want. But I think that that committee is provided by the Act; that committee could be very helpful and I think that the Minister should see first of all if that committee was rescinded. If not, I think that he should resurrect this committee and name some of the members, because I think that they could be very valuable. It's an overall committee that would still help. I know that there is another committee on sports medicine, but that's only one phase of it. I know there are committees for different communities, for community recreation, but I am speaking mostly now for fitness and amateur sports. And I think that the Minister should have a look at that - I don't fault him at all, this was done before - first of all, to check and see if actually that committee does not exist; maybe they're not meeting, but I think they exist, and if this committee doesn't exist, I would suggest to the Minister that he look very seriously at naming a committee. It's provided by the Act; there's no Act, nothing changed. I could - in fact, if the Minister is not familiar with this Act - well, I can find it after anyway. He knows - it's The Fitness and Amateur Sports Act. So I think that there is a real value for these people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to check. It was my understanding that the terms had expired; if that is not the case, I agree with the member that the proper steps should be taken to rectify that. I take his advice with regard to the forming of such a group as possibly a good one. I guess one of the things we've managed to do in the last little while because of the two departments coming together, is to coordinate some of the efforts before you had the department scattered in two different areas, which did cause some problems dealing with recreation. I think that the member will agree with me that there is, in many instances, very little difference between recreation, fitness, and sport. If somebody is doing some physical activity for their own pleasure in their spare time, it's recreation, it can help them in their fitness and also be part of a sport. And so I will check whether that term has expired and exactly where we stand with that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to bring up this point, but the Minister did, and I would like to say a few words on that. Again, I can accept that the department is together, but I can see nothing wrong with the way it was before. You have community recreation. It talks about all the recreation. It could be reading, it could be painting, it could be anything else. It is mostly recreation. And Fitness and Amateur Sports is something else. If it was the Department of Health. . . I think that we were making an effort to provide more programs on fitness. There was very little done, if anything, in the province before that. This was being done, and then with amateur sport. So I can't say that it's wrong to have it all together, especially now that the Minister is not. . . previously there was the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and it didn't fit there any better than it did in Health. I think part of it fit in Health. Now that there is a Minister of Fitness and Recreation, there is no problem. But I don't like the term "scattered" as if it wasn't

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

important, because I think we set up a department, a directorate of Fitness and Amateur Sports, and I think in many ways, the Minister - and that doesn't prevent him from cooperating with the Minister of Health, but I think a lot of it can be done, some of the things that are being done now. Because when you talk about fitness, let's not just think of fun and games. That is certainly part of it, but fitness is also a proper diet, and it's many things that are now done - preventive medicine, if you may, and that also, there is no reason in the world why different departments of the same government can't cooperate. And I hope that this is being done. I hope that the Minister - because there was a committee named; we were working in the direction of having cooperation from different departments, including the Department of Education. You have the Department of Education, where you should move more in the field of athletic sports than we're doing now.

So I would hope that the Minister. . .and this I think would even prove my point or add weight to my point, where the Minister should have an advisory committee on fitness and amateur sports, and maybe some of the Ministers, such as the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health, should participate in.

I wonder if. . .there is no reason to delay the first few items, but where are all the programs that the Minister referred to in his opening remarks? I would like to get into that now. The first, General Administration, is mostly just administration. Am I right, Mr. Minister?

MR. BANMAN: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: There's no programs or anything there.

MR. BANMAN: It's the second main appropriation really that. . .Resolution 69.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)--pass; 1.(b)(2)--pass; 1.(c)(1)--pass; 1.(c)(2)--pass; 1.(d)(1)--pass. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on just - an explanation of Research and Planning. Is that strictly the planners within the department? What is their role? What are they doing?

MR. BANMAN: They serve the two departments, both co-op development, as well as this particular department, and have been working on such things as the RehFit Centre, things dealing with the Gimli Training Centre, things along that line.

MR. DESJARDINS: What do they do at the RehFit Centre?

MR. BANMAN: The Sports Injury Centre; I'm sorry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. They are mostly the staff of the Minister, and assist him in his responsibility in both departments then.

MR. BANMAN: That's right, and also look after questions about different research projects dealing with things that will arise within the department.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister then would be well advised to do the same thing as has been done in his salary, and maybe to have the true picture here, pay part of the salary under his other department. I don't think that Fitness and Amateur Sport should have to pay for research that are doing any part-time work. I think that maybe that should be noted, or has that been done?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, last year we had more or less the same thing come up, because of the two departments. I guess there is no magical way, you either leave it in co-op or put it in here. We did transfer 4 clerical staff that were in the Department of Fitness last year, to the Co-op Development, to sort of level it off a little more, and we feel it's a pretty good blend. The other thing that I should point out in the next item - no, it's the item before that.- is the administration and personnel, because both departments are relatively small, they

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

each don't have their own unit and the administration and personnel unit is housed within the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Minister explained, but then that doesn't present what is being done in this department. If this department, and a number of places, are paying for work being done for the Minister, but in his dual capacity; that is not a true picture of what is done in Fitness and Amateur Sports. It is difficult, but maybe it should be paid 50 per cent by each department, not all loaded in one department. It's not presenting the true picture, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BANMAN: Well, I guess. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not going to insist on it too long, but I wish that the. . .

MR. BANMAN: As I mentioned, there is no magical formula to the thing. It's there, it's worked fairly well, and we've achieved a certain scale of economy by using the personnel for both of them. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, I am not suggesting that you change that at all; so much the better, if you can get that kind of work with the staff. My suggestion is that the cost, the dollars, represent the work that is being done in this department. The same as if you look at the first line, the salary of the Minister, they don't say, well all right, it's working well, there's two departments, and all the Minister's pay is shown in there. There's part of it shown in the other side, on consumer, and I am suggesting that the same thing should be done on the staff of the Minister's that are working for both sides. I am not suggesting that he should change the working of the department at all. It's just for the Estimates, for the budget.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, it would be breaking down some SMYs maybe to half staff many years and that type of thing, so. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: So, you're breaking the Minister in half, I am sure you can break other people in half.

MR. BANMAN: It could be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d). . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, just back on this Research and Planning. I think the previous government was moving towards doing more in Fitness, and we had a man that was brought in as the director of fitness for the province. I understand that the position is no longer there, and I think this is a step backwards. I wonder, is there a full-time man that is provided just with the fitness of working with free enterprise? Has that been done, they would move in towards the free enterprise, to try to get these programs through. . .offer these programs maybe to large firms that might cooperate, maybe give 15 minutes a day to their staff to work out, to get in shape. It seems to me that there is nobody doing that work, certainly not on a full-time basis.

MR. BANMAN: Within the Estimates, there are two staff man years dedicated to that, and the one position is filled right now by Syd Glenesk. The other one is being bulletined right now, and I understand there is a lot of interest being shown in that particular job. I think we've got something close to 60 applications for that particular job.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is only for Fitness and Amateur Sport?

MR. BANMAN: It's strictly dealing with fitness to go work with people like the Manitoba Heart Foundation who put on clinics. There is a movement now to try and get the larger corporations involved in having their own in-house programs

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

dealing with things such as the Manitoba Marathon and all the other fitness programs, to try and coordinate and give them a hand.

MR. DESJARDINS: I am very happy that that has not been discontinued. Then my information is probably not correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for St. Boniface finished? The Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, just to follow up on what the Member for St. Boniface was raising, do these people who are trying to encourage, basically the private sector, to promote physical fitness amongst their employees, is this also being extended to municipal employees? Is it being extended to getting school boards to try and promote physical fitness amongst their staff? Specifically, what is the government, as an employer of a great number of people, doing to promote physical fitness amongst provincial government civil servants, as a preventative measure more than anything else?

MR. BANMAN: Dealing with the group such as the Manitoba Heart Foundation, as well as the larger companies that are getting interested in promoting fitness, we are working with them to get people interested in pursuing their own leisure activity which is of benefit in a fitness nature to them. We've seen things like the Manitoba Marathon, which has really caught on, they expect over 8,000 runners this year, and many of the people, as the member will probably have noticed around the building and everywhere, are starting to run now, and corporations are encouraging their people to get involved and get actively fit.

As I mentioned before, the one position has been place now for a short while. We are advertising for another one, and we hope to become more involved in a number of these areas as time rolls along.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, again, I would like to ask specifically, what is the government doing as an employer in this respect, and is the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, pursuing this particular dimension with government? The Minister mentioned that you can see an increasing number of people conceivably civil servants, around the building, say, jogging. Is the government providing any facilities whereby civil servants who may want to go out and jog in the morning, or particularly jog at noon, have a place where they can shower, and have a place where they might be able to have a gym suit hung up, you know, a small locker room area in the basement, either of this building or the Woodsworth Building or the Norquay Building. For example, if you just take the complex right around the Legislative Building, I would hazard a guess that we might have something in the order of 5,000 civil servants working in this particular area, and I think it would be quite easy for the government to set an example as an employer, possibly working in conjunction with the Department of Public Works, for example, to set aside a bit of space in a basement somewhere for locker facilities and for shower facilities.

For example, a credit union, the Transcona Credit Union, just opened a facility recently, about a year ago, in Transcona, and I was quite impressed with their efforts in this respect in that in the basement of their new building, they had a little exercise room, and they had a little shower room where people could in fact indulge this, because unless you start providing facilities like that, a lot of this will just be empty rhetoric, especially for people who are working in offices. I think you need some other facilities like showers, like lockers, unless of course we are going to just rely on, say, the YMCA nearly, or the YMHA. But both of those require the payment of yearly fees of some significance, and I think if you are wanting to induce fitness among people, primarily as a preventative measure in terms of health, then I think the government has to go a bit further and set greater examples than it has to date in this area.

I'm wondering if this particular department is doing anything specifically in this respect with the government, as an employer.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, we are in the process right now of recruiting another person. This is possibly an area that can be

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

explored and possibly will be explored by this additional person. The account to date is simply that there have not been any facilities installed, whether it be for the Members of the Legislature here or for anyone else. A lot of the members here, as well as some of the other areas, have been running at places like the RehFit Centre and have been going to the "Y", like the member mentioned. Others, on the other hand, do have the problem, if you go out for a jog on a hot day, it makes it pretty hard to come back to work after that without having a shower.

So, all I can say right now is that I take the member's suggestions and see what we can come up with once we have this full-time person hired on staff to co-ordinate and work together with the corporations as well as one of the largest corporations in Manitoba, namely the government.

MR. PARASIUK: I think there have been a couple of private companies that have taken the lead in this respect. I think that in the Richardson Building, there is a facility there for people to undertake exercise and I think that the government can go a bit further than it has to date in this respect, and I will be asking you questions as we progress on this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(2) - the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of fitness - and the Member for St. Boniface touched on it - I am quite concerned with the procedures that are now taking place in the confines of the College of Physicians and Surgeons with respect to Dr. Schwartz. I intend, Mr. Chairman, to relate it to this department in a meaningful way, if I can. The pretense or the suggestion is that the doctor is being considered solely on his professional merits, and I certainly hope that that is the case and I'm not going to condemn without any evidence, but I do know it to be a fact that there has been and will continue to be a debate in the medical profession with respect to that kind of medicine, which is designed to keep people well, as opposed to that type of medicine which is there for the purpose of curing the ill. Certainly, that is a necessary thing, but the medicine that is designed to treat people who have fallen to some type of sickness has - and I don't think that I will be criticized by the profession for saying this - has resulted in some doing the easy type of thing, the prescription of antibiotics, the pushing of drugs, on the basis that there is an easy solution; and there has been less emphasis on living in such a way that your body does not subject itself to illness.

I think that it is a difficult fight that this man has against him, and I note that there are other doctors throughout the country who do not regard it as a simple issue, and feel that the man is being unjustly dealt with. Now, I don't know whether he is being unjustly dealt with or not, but I do know that there is a debate within the profession on this issue. And I look at the department that we are engaged in, and the Member for St. Boniface touched on it, it is one that is designed for the purpose of encouraging people to stay well. I just wonder, Mr. Chairman, I know that some of the practitioners will have a very difficult problem engaged in the field of orthodox medicine - I am just wondering whether there is anything that doctors with this particular philosophy, which I think is admirable, can be a feature of this department.

Now, I don't think it should be dismissed as something as belonging to the Health Department because we are talking about fitness, and the program that the Member for Transcona is talking about, the program that the Member for St. Boniface referred to, deals with the area of fitness. If fee-for-service medicine is going to be difficult - I'm not saying that people shouldn't usurp their right to engage...and suffer sometimes, and again I don't wish to accuse the College of doing anything because, despite what has been criticism in the paper, I'm not aware. What I am worried about is that there is no suitable avenue, or that avenues are not closed to people who think this way, and there are respected medical authorities who will say that the orthodox medicine is not helping people, it is not designed to do so.

If the area of fitness is one which the Minister has within his jurisdiction, is the use of such practitioners somewhere in his program, either in the research area or in the practical ends that my friend, the Member for Transcona, is referring to, are there avenues to deal with doctors of this kind? By the way, I really believe that it's not new, that the Christian Scientists believed much the same

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

thing, and I'm not certain that they were not right, or are not right. Because I think that much of our illnesses cure themselves if we treat ourselves properly, and this is what the doctors are saying. Well, it's a question of how you live and what you eat, you know, early to bed, early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise.

Mr. Chairman, I am very very concerned that these people get caught in the establishment system and are unable to operate with it, and I want to know whether there is avenue for the operation of such skilled people within this area?

MR. BANMAN: By way of background, I can maybe relate to the member - and the Member for St. Boniface is knowledgeable on this because he had quite a bit to do with setting up that particular, and providing some of the funds for the Sports Injury Centre. The Sports Injury Centre was moved roughly a year ago to the Reh-Fit Centre, to a new home, there at a site where there is a certain doctor by the name of Wayne Hildahl who is very interested in sports medicine. One of the things that this particular group that the Research and Planning people are looking at right now, and are pretty excited about, is an injury prevention program which would check out an athlete to try to predetermine whether an injury would be sustained in a certain endeavour, whether it be jogging or running or whatever. The group involved in this is dealing, together with a group of individuals who are on a Sports Medicine Board and the makeup - I believe there is somebody from the Department of Health, and a number of people involved. This would be more or less our first sort of step, if this materializes into sort of an injury prevention type of program - we call it PreFit, if you want a short word for it - but it would basically deal, in the beginning, to check it out, to see how it affects the athletes. And this would be carded athletes, in other words, people who would be treated at the Sports Injury Centre normally for injuries that they sustained during an athletic event.

We are looking at that, and the department as well as the group involved are pretty excited with that, because it would be one of the first thrusts in that way, I understand, in Canada.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Minister sees the relationship I'm talking about, and I say that with regard to the Injury Prevention Program, what he describes. I'm glad that the public is doing something in that area.

I want to try to relate it to the general fitness program. Mr. Chairman, I believe our medical bills are going up at very quick rates, and I believe that one of the greatest avenues or possibilities in reducing our traditional medical costs would be in the area of keeping people well. If this department has got a fitness program - and I'm not even suggesting that there be something massive - could they include as part of the fitness program, some pilot projects or other thrusts - could they include it in their research - as to even taking, Mr. Chairman, a sample group of people and have them subject themselves to a program designed to prevent their illness and compare them with a sample that doesn't, and see what happens to their medical costs and to their physical being. Because there is a great need for cancer research - I'm not certainly going to minimize the kind of things that are sought for in this area - but I suppose that if we could have half the people who now smoke, not smoke, that would do much more for the elimination of cancer than all the cancer research. --(Interjection)-- Pipes apparently are not that bad.

So that's only a small example about how illness could be prevented. I wonder whether the Minister would not consider some of the medical authorities who are oriented in this direction being part of a fitness program to deal with keeping people well. You know, there was a friend of mine who argued that our medical insurance scheme was a bad scheme, because it paid a doctor when he cured an illness, and there should be a scheme whereby a doctor has a certain number of people and he gets paid for every one of them that doesn't come to see him - that if you get paid for those who don't come to see you, you will find a way of keeping them well. And there are --(Interjection)-- yes, my friend, the Member for St. Boniface, says it's not that farfetched. The Kaiser Clinic Program is a presentative, medical care program. It's much more sophisticated than than and can't be dealt with that simply but, nevertheless, there are avenues for looking around. I think the area of fitness, you know, the word "fitness" is one which involves everything



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

that I'm talking about, and I wonder whether the Minister wouldn't see whether some research shouldn't be gone into this, not only from the physical point of view - I note that Mr. Glenesk knew him when he was with the YMCA. I know a lot of physical fitness buffs, and they are all certainly going to provide valuable service; but also I'm talking about from the professional medical standpoint, are there people in this area who could be of service to the department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I think that in answer to the Member for Inkster, that the Minister wouldn't have too much trouble finding this information. He could start by looking at the RehFit Centre, which has been in operation for less than a year, approximately a year, and you've had some people that were very bad, bad cases of heart problems - and there's no greater killer, I think, than heart disease. There are two programs there. There's a program as the Minister knows, a program of rehFit and a program of prefit. And some of these people that could hardly walk around the track are now running 5, 10, 15 miles; and it is because of these type of programs. I would hope that the Minister is co-operating, is working - I don't see any sign of that, but the Minister I'm sure that he welcomes the RehFit Centre. I'm pleased that weren't gone too far down the pipe that the previous Minister could not cancel the grant that had been committed to them of \$250,000, that made it possible for them to build this RehFit Centre. And I think it is a very good centre and I would like to see the government work with these people, Research, the Department of Health, and the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Now, I am also concerned - the Minister spoke and it's clear the Minister wants the same thing that we want, and he wants the same thing that the previous administration wanted. But what is the Minister doing, what kind of money is there for those programs. We've have talked now about a full-time, maybe two, people working in Fitness, but that is vague. What is done? We had announced in 1977 all kinds of programs for fitness, and those were frozen. I'd like to know what is being done. If the Minister tells me that this has come later, fine. If the Minister tells me that this is money from the Lottery, that's fine also; and this is why we said that we would ask you to be flexible, Mr. Chairman, that we be allowed to discuss money from the Lottery if they deal with the programs that the Member for Transcona and the Member for Inkster have talked about.

On the Sport and Injury Centre, the Minister said that I had something to do with the setting up of that. Well, I wish it was right, but I can't take any credit for that. The only thing is the Sports Federation - we're doing it. You ran out of funds, and the program is going to go belly-up and we accept it, to take it over. The intention was and it is now, it has to be transferred to the RehFit Centre. And I would hope that the research that they're doing - there is something else, the Minister is certainly on the right track when he says that they're looking to prevent, to see what can be done, either in the exercise, or warming up, or for the kind of condition to be to play different sports, for instance. And I would hope, I hope that the Minister just forgot to mention it, and I hope that they're looking at equipment also. That is a very important - and, for instance, a doctor told me years ago that the equipment for a hockey player was no good, the pads were bad. Because the pads for the defenceman were just prepared or made in order to stop a puck, a shot. The worst accident, the worst thing that happened to a defenceman, was when a defenceman fell to his knees, the hard pads were hurting the knees and the knees were being hurt because of the design in the pads. I'm giving an example. There's different helmets that could be of more of a menace than anything else if they're not designed properly. I know that this is being done by other people, but I would hope that this would be one phase that this Research Committee will be looking at. I think it is a very important phase. I would like the Minister to tell me if it's shown somewhere else and then I will wait, but I would like to know the concrete programs that the Minister has on Fitness and Amateur Sport, such as the ones that were announced and they were frozen by the former Minister.

I would like to know if any of these programs that were through lottery money, and I wonder what is being done. If it's somewhere else, fine; and if it's

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

further down, all right, I accept the Minister on that. There is nothing from the Lottery coming on this, for those programs?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the item is dealt with in 2.(e), which is Fitness Development, on the next page, just on the other page. That's the figure out of the Estimates, and when we get to it, there are some funds committed out of lotteries with regard to that.

MR. DESJARDINS: So, all fitness, we can get back to Fitness Programs on 2.(e) then.

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay, fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(2)--pass; 1.(e)(1)--pass. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, what is the situation there? I believe that this has been transferred - this responsibility has been transferred to the Sports Administration. Is my information correct?

MR. BANMAN: That's right, Mr. Chairman. There was \$287,400 which was allocated last year with regard to this item. This will be taken over by the Manitoba Sports Federation as they take over their responsibilities. What happened was that we set up a joint committee right now. The department was responsible for the moneys until the end of this calendar year and after that, they take over and we'll fund that particular program from their share in the Western Lotteries Manitoba Distributors.

MR. DESJARDINS: So, this is more or less a trade-off with the Sports Federation, and they are responsible to run the program and also to finance the program. So this is a saving to the government, then?

MR. BANMAN: Well, yes and no. Before the \$800,000 was coming to the government via Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport and . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: There was a line in the . . . The programs that came from Lottery were programs that could change if the lottery revenue ever dried up and certain responsibilities were accepted by the department. If my memory serves me right, this was definitely the department that paid and through the Estimates. It wasn't through lottery money at all.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, I agree.

MR. DESJARDINS: So, it is a saving, in effect, to the government. So when you say that you're giving a partnership to the Sports Federation, they, in fact, they were getting that Sports, not Sports Federation as such, but Sports through the Advisory Committee, we're getting programs, but they didn't have to pay it - so this is a saving of the government that hasn't been replaced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)--pass; 1.(e)(2)--pass. Resolution 69, 2.(a)(1)--pass; 2 . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Is there a program on this one? Are there any programs, or is that strictly administration?

MR. BANMAN: Administration.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2)--pass; 2.(b)(1)--pass; 2.(b)(2)--pass; 2.(c)(1)--pass.  
The Member for Transcona.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, could the Minister describe what this particular program is?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, with regards to recreation and, I guess, this goes back to when - a number of years - we have two offices in northern Manitoba, The Pas and Thompson, at which we have a recreational consultant. Any programming that is carried in the north, including the running of these two offices, is done through the Northlands Agreement. In other words, it's cost-shared on a 60-40 basis. It's been that way for, I understand, a number of years. Any programming with regards to that secretarial staff and all that is covered under the Northlands Agreement and is cost-shared.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)--pass; 2.(c)(2)--pass; 2.(c)(3)--pass; 2.(4)--pass. Oh, pardon me, yes, 2.(c)(4)--pass.

MR. DESJARDINS: 60 percent from Canada, the rest from the provincial department.

MR. BANMAN: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: But it's administered by your department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)--pass.  
The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is going to be quite difficult. I think the committee could not be accused of stalling on this. We've passed a page already. It would be real helpful if some kind of document was prepared by the Minister, giving us the different programs under Sport Development, Recreation Resources Development and Fitness Development, either of that is financed through his Estimates here or through the lottery. It's going to be very difficult if we have to write everything down. I wonder if the Minister has prepared anything as was done in . . .

MR. BANMAN: I've got a schedule here, Mr. Chairman. The member will appreciate that a few of the items are projected from lotteries, have not received Order-in-Council approval, and are feelings of some expenditures that the department might want to make, and I'll give him that. But this is not a . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, may I make a suggestion? Can I make a suggestion and I make this in all sincerity, and in the spirit of co-operation. Could copies be made, because I'm not the only member of this committee? Could copies be made and I wonder if we could suggest that the committee rise at this time to expedite matters, and whether we could look at this and maybe finish that tomorrow afternoon. I'd like to have the information, the information of all the programs in these different fields and, also, the finance here or finance by lottery, with the proviso, of course, that the Minister is saying everything has not received the final approval. We'll accept that, but that's where the Minister is recommending to Cabinet that these expenses meet these programs. I wonder if the Minister, in a spirit of co-operation, if I could move that the committee rise, and if copies could be immediately, though, so we can have it to look at tomorrow, before we come back to committee.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we don't have any trouble, we can give the - what lottery ones, we'll have some copies run off. Again, I just reiterate the problem that I do have. There are certain things on here that we are projecting, and certain organizations that have been requesting certain funds from us.

MR. DESJARDINS: We can have that, and when will we get the copy on Lotteries?

MR. BANMAN: This is Lotteries.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, well, when will we have copies, I thought you said you have . . .

MR. BANMAN: No, they're making some right now.

MR. DESJARDINS: And what about your other programs on the departments?

MR. BANMAN: The other programs, we can get that for you tomorrow, too.

MR. DESJARDINS: Tomorrow morning, could there be - and then we could go in different caucus rooms?

MR. BANMAN: I think so.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, with that understanding, I move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion on the floor that committee rise. All in favour? (Agreed)

MR. BANMAN: We'll deliver it all tomorrow morning.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

#### SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson).

MR. CHAIRMAN: This committee will come to order. We are in the Department of Natural Resources. I would direct the honourable members to Page 78. Resolution No. 104, Item 5. Parks (a)(1) Salaries--pass; (2).

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. While we're on this section I would like to get some more clarification from the Minister regarding the plans he has for the development and maintenance of the resources within our provincial park system.

I note he has a brief note heading this up, says, for the healthful enjoyment, cultural, educational and social benefit of the people of Manitoba. I would ask him what policies, if any, he can tell us that he has adopted or is in the process of adopting, the processing of developing for the achievement of that objective, that is to manage the resources of the parks for all the people of Manitoba and above all to protect and conserve those resources for the future Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me distribute a bit of information I have here on the policy guidelines covering Indian Land Entitlement and a list of courses attended by staff. One question was raised under the personnel section of Administration and the other under consideration of the secretary to the Indian Land Claims sub-committee.

With respect to the policy matter question that the honourable member raises, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to take a few minutes to outline the general directive under which the department is operating. And the general statement of policy is, of course, that the provinces provide outdoor recreational opportunities for Manitobans and to preserve unique or representative natural and cultural resources. And then we have listed a number of general guidelines or steps that should be taken in order to achieve those general objectives.

One of those is to establish a parkland classification system which identifies the principal purposes of each park and a system which can be readily identified by the public. At the moment we have a number of classifications of parks that

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

the classification of which does not readily inform the public about the general intention, the purpose of those parks.

Secondly, we want a parkland system that will be developed by designating lands as parklands ensuring that future generations receive them under use patterns that are sustainable without causing irreparable damage to the natural or cultural resources, and one that addresses parkland recreation in a systematic way within the context of the total spectrum of outdoor recreational opportunities available to Manitobans. The term "outdoor recreational opportunities" here includes natural and cultural interpretational opportunities.

And also, by preparation every five years for Cabinet or Provincial Land Use Committee, approval of a master plan for each park land explicitly describing the overall objectives of the park, and the opportunities and the facilities which it is to provide.

5. The system should ensure that the public has an opportunity to participate in the planning process and that master plans will reflect government policy direction.

Then more specifically, parklands will respond firstly, to provincial interests for rare, scarce or special forms of recreation; and secondly, to regional demands and priorities.

It will provide high quality recreational opportunities. It will provide opportunities for outdoor recreation in terms of consumptive uses, such as hunting and fishing, and non-consumptive uses, both of which are considered to be equally legitimate.

The system will provide interpretive facilities and programs, and it will accommodate commercial utilization of resources where it does not lessen future recreational use-potential or unduly compromise the primary purpose of the parkland.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are fairly explicit policy statements. Before the Committee rose at 4:30 this afternoon, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland was alleging that we did not have any policy direction in place, and furthermore, that we had delegated that responsibility to an outside consultant.

I would like to point out to the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, and to the committee, that that allegation is totally without foundation. That in fact what was consulted and was contracted out to consultants, was the task of developing a planning strategy for the parks, essentially a recipe to be followed in achieving the policy direction of government. That was something which was required in order to allow us to proceed with the development of these lands which have not previously been developed.

To interpret that report as being a policy document, is simply inaccurate. I have a copy of the report here, Mr. Chairman, which I would be happy to provide to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has admitted in recent public statements that he still does not have a policy with respect to the development of the provincial parks as they relate to the individual provincial parks.

His colleague, the present Minister of Fitness, gave us a commitment more than a year ago, I believe it was in his first term as Minister responsible for that department, that he would have a policy planning process in place that would provide us with a master plan for the Whiteshell Provincial Park, to use one example. As I understand it, as we are sitting here in the year 1980, two and a half years after the Progressive Conservative Government has been elected, we still have not received such a plan, so that people who are interested in that park, people who have cottages in that park, people who may have existing businesses in the park, and the majority of people who use the park for day use or general recreational use, still do not know what this government's intentions are regarding the future development of that park, and it raises concerns in many people's minds.

I don't have to remind the Minister that the Jarmoc fiasco, which his colleague dragged us through in the House here regarding the proposal to set up a massive condominium unit in that park, is something which is still not dead as far as

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

people are concerned, because it has come to our attention that this gentleman is going around to talk to the various local government groups in eastern Manitoba. I know for a fact that he has been to talk to a number of municipal councils, a number of reeves and councils, and also local government district councils, and at each of those he has made a presentation, making it appear as though his particular condominium proposal would be something that would be of great economic advantage to the area, without of course explaining that there are serious environmental considerations and very serious environmental concerns with respect to that project.

So, Mr. Chairman, he is, by not providing full information, eliciting resolutions from these local governments in support of his proposal. I would wonder, Mr. Chairman, why this gentleman would be still doing that two and a half, well, at least two years after we wrestled a commitment out of this government to postpone that particular development, and forced them after much debate in this House to back down on that commitment which they made to that individual to allow him to proceed to develop a massive condominium development in that park.

Mr. Chairman, the very fact that this individual is still proceeding, certainly makes us on this side believe that this government is still holding out some hope to that individual, that he will be some day allowed to proceed with his development. That, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion is contrary to any kind of proper environmental considerations regarding the development of the Whiteshell Park. I don't need to remind the Minister that it is very unpopular with the general public and the general users of that park - his particular proposal is a very unpopular one and one which very few people support.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says that he has policies, I'm wondering why we are not aware of those policies and why the community and local government groups in the east side of this province are not aware of those policies, why he has not made it clear to Mr. Jarmoc in no uncertain terms that his development is unacceptable and will be unacceptable under any future policy which his government adopts with respect to the development of the Whiteshell Park.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that it has taken this long for the government to even get to the point where they have what he calls a development planning strategy in place, which is supposed to provide the guideline for a policy development for Manitoba's provincial parks.

I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, why the Minister, in establishing this policy planning framework and the master planning strategy which he had hired environmental and socioeconomic consultants to do, by the name of Interdisciplinary Systems Limited...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Yes. Have we moved to Park Planning, to Item (b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're still on Salaries.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'm asking questions under Administration, because in this case I think it is of some consideration that we should look at the reasons why the Minister found it necessary to contract this kind of work out to outside consultants when he has a group within his own department that he was describing to us yesterday called the Resource Allocation Group, where he has, as he mentioned to us, a senior resource planner; he has the former director of parks; he has a staff in there that are capable of putting together plans and strategies for his department to look at. So I would like the Minister to answer that question specifically as to why he chose to contract this work out and not do it within the department with the resources which he has in the department.

MR. RANSOM: In order to get the job done, Mr. Chairman. I don't seem to be able to communicate to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland what policy means. I just gave a statement of policy which, when I discussed it with the Naturalist Society or with the Wildlife Federation, and with other people who are interested in this sort of thing, they seemed to understand that as a statement of policy. I'm sorry if I don't seem to be able to get it across in a fashion that

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

the Honourable Member for Rupertsland could understand. He seems to be interpreting policy as what I would refer to as a master plan for a park, and that is a procedure which we, some two months ago, in releasing some background information and the report which I just gave to the honourable member, in which we gave a commitment to begin to develop those plans. I'm not happy that we don't have such plans in place, but I can tell you that we have made more progress in two and a half years getting those plans in place than the previous administration made in eight years, because there was not a single park plan that was approved by the elected people of government and put in place. I think that is what is necessary, Mr. Chairman, and that the statement of general policy which I outlined to the committee, provides the general direction within which individual master plans will be developed, and the public will have an opportunity then to have an input into the development of those plans, the preliminary ones, which will have been prepared according to those general guidelines.

With respect to his specifics concerning Mr. Jarmoc, I do not control Mr. Jarmoc's activities. If he chooses to go and promote a project with the local municipal councils, that is his business. I don't plan to interfere with proposals or statements which he may wish to promote with municipal councils. But I have said that there will not be such developments take place within the Whiteshell, or within any other park, until such time as there is an approved master plan developed for those parks.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is certainly confused when he claims that there were no plans in place when his government took office, because there certainly was a plan for the specific park that we're discussing, and that is the Whiteshell Provincial Park. And that plan I know of personally because the department I was responsible for had a hand in assessing it, in discussing it with the park planners of the day, and the resource people, the resources personnel in our department, had the opportunity to put in certain amendments to it in terms of. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, Park Planning is under section (b). I have allowed debate on it under Administration, but if you would care to get to administration rather than just park planning, and we can discuss it under item (b). Unless you discuss it now, then it won't be allowed under (b). It would be repetitive.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is such overlapping matters here. I certainly don't intend to repeat under Park Planning what I say here under Administration, but certainly the administration of this section is concerned with park planning, it's concerned with program management, it's concerned with park maintenance, and so on, so there's aspects of those things which I would consider dealing with here, although there may be some more specific questions as we come to each one of those. In this case, we're talking about developing master plans; and in this case, I'm not sure what the title was used at that time, but there was a plan put together by the department responsible for parks. It was, as I said, one which had input from the various other departments that were concerned, and it did have the concurrence, I believe, of the groups that were interested in that particular park. And in fact that plan, to my recollection, came to Cabinet and was approved by Cabinet. And in any case, The Parks Land Act states that it is not necessary for such a plan to come to Cabinet, because the Minister of the department can approve a park plan under The Provincial Parks Act. So that I know for a fact that the Minister of that department at that time had approved that plan, and I believe he also brought it to Cabinet for approval as a matter of courtesy to his Cabinet colleagues.

The question I was asking the Minister, I think he answered partly in that why he had to contract the work out for the developing of the planning strategy to outside planners. His very short answer was to get the job done. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest he could have got that job done at a much less cost if he had used the existing staff within his department; a staff, I might add, that were involved in developing plans like this under our administration, and in fact had a

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

plan for the Whiteshell Park, which could have been simply updated through bringing it to public attention and having public hearings, public input, into that plan in order for it to probably be more in tune with the feelings of people at this time, that it could have been done by existing staff within his department, and he would have had that entire portion of work done by now. Instead, all we have in front of us is a planning strategy. We still do not have a plan for that park.

And I would like to ask the Minister further, to why he chose outside planners; how did he come to choose this particular group of planners, which he contracted the work to? Was there a competition for the selection of this planning group? And further to that, what was the cost to the government of doing this study?

MR. RANSOM: There were proposals called for, Mr. Chairman, and this group was selected. I believe that the cost figure was approximately \$22,000, plus or minus a bit. I would be quite grateful to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland if he could table a copy of the master plan that had received approval from previous Minister or from Cabinet. I would be most interested in seeing such a document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, I assure the Minister there is such a document and it's in the files of his department, if he would simply ask his officials. I brought it to the attention of this government two years ago when we were discussing this item in the Estimates at that time. And I received approximately the same kind of stonewalling from the former Minister as we received from this Minister, on that issue.

I would like to know, further, if the Minister intends to use outside consultants for the follow-up work that is required in developing individual master plans for the Whiteshell Park and/or other parks within the system. I think this is a question of administration, Mr. Chairman. Does he intend, through the Parks Branch of his department, to hire outside consultants for this work? Or will he use existing staff within his department for that purpose?

MR. RANSOM: It is my intention to primarily use in-House staff, Mr. Chairman, but if there is a necessity to get some input in an area of expertise that is not available within the department, and is not required on an ongoing basis, then it would make sense to go out to get it.

If I might just return for a moment to the question of the master plan, I have to advise you, Mr. Chairman, that I don't seem to be able to find such a plan. But I would assume that, had one been passed and approved, that it would have been a public document and would have been fairly widely distributed to make the public aware of what the government's policy is. Unfortunately I haven't been able to find one, and no one has come forward with one yet. I certainly would appreciate it if the Member for Rupertsland could provide one.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I attended a meeting at the time that the Jarmoc issue was being discussed in the Legislature, a meeting that was held at the Health Sciences Centre and which was attended by some 500 people, all of whom were concerned about that proposed development in the Whiteshell. At that meeting, representatives from the Naturalist Society and other groups in fact referred to the plan that I am referring to, and recommended it to the government in a resolution that was passed unanimously with the exception of one individual at that meeting that night. A resolution was passed unanimously suggesting to the government that they use that particular plan as the basis for a future plan for the park. In other words, take that plan, update it and make it into a proper plan for the park, with public input into the process.

I was aware of the document. A wide number of people who were present at that meeting were aware of that document. So, Mr. Chairman, why is the Minister not aware of the document? I believe the former Minister of the department admitted such a document existed, and in fact if we go through Hansard, we will see that he



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

did admit such a document existed. His argument was different than this Minister's. His argument was simply that the document had not been passed by Cabinet; the plan had not been approved by Cabinet. I pointed out to him at the time, as I point out to this Minister, it's not necessary for that kind of a plan to be approved by Cabinet. The Minister has that authority under the Act. But I'm quite sure that even that part of it was completed as well, and it was also passed by Cabinet.

In any case, that documents certainly exists, and I recommend it to the Minister, which hopefully would save him time and money in developing a new master plan for the Whiteshell Park. If I can find it in any of my files, I certainly will make it available to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I take some issue with the Minister's using of outside planners for developing park plans, particularly when he has people within his own department. I believe the Minister is indicating a certain policy change in terms of the direction his government is going, an implicit policy change, since the takeover of the Progressive Conservative administration. One reason I have for thinking that, Mr. Chairman, is that he has replaced the Director of Parks with a new Director of Parks. He has taken the old director and transferred that person into the resource allocation unit which we were discussing in his Estimates.- I believe that's the name of it, Resource Allocation - and hired a new Director of Parks. I would ask the Minister if it is simply a coincidence that the new Director of Parks in Manitoba was recently a partner in the firm of Interdisciplinary Systems Limited, which is the same firm that completed the study for his department for the master planning strategy which we are discussing here today. I would ask the Minister further, in the selection of this individual for the position, was there a competition involved and if not, why not?

MR. RANSOM: Yes, indeed there was a competition, Mr. Chairman. I believe we advertised nationally, seeking a new Director of Parks. The individual in question did not come from the group of applicants that applied for that job as a result of the national advertising campaign, but it subsequently came to our attention that he was interested in the position and employment with the government, and our interviews, etc., he satisfied us that kind of person that we were looking for and had the management experience that we thought was necessary for this job. The report that we had provided was, of course - that contract was let considerably in advance of that event taking place, in terms of hiring a director.

I must go back once again to the plan, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member refers to because first of all, I believe he said to us that it was a plan that consisted of government policy direction, and that it had been approved by the Minister, at least, if not by Cabinet. Subsequently, and I think the record will show, he said that it should have been upgraded into a proper plan, which I can only assume means that it was an improper plan at the time that it was prepared. If, in fact there was policy, was a plan approved by the Minister, I would assume that that would be a public document and that we would have no difficulty in finding it.

Now, what is available for many of the parks is background work that has been carried out by the planners. They have made recommendations concerning zoning and possible uses that they saw as being appropriate or inappropriate within parks, but not a statement of government policy as such to guide the planners in the work that they were doing, let alone one final plan being approved and having a Minister's signature on it as saying this is the government-approved plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was simply being kind to the government in saying that they could have used the existing plan that was in place and, in quotation marks, I think I should have said they could have turned it into a proper plan since they seem to not even want to recognize or admit its existence, never mind the fact that it was indeed a proper plan, and one that was developed through consultation with the various departments that were concerned with resource development, and had very carefully mapped out the areas within the park that were suitable for their various uses. It was a very detailed document. I'm surprised that the Minister has, to date, not been able to find it. It probably

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

went the same place that most of the information regarding the Jarmoc incident went. When we asked for an Order for Return, there didn't seem to be very much information available. The Minister's department has been practising file burning, or book burning, or whatever they do to destroy such files - shredding maybe. It possibly could be no surprise that there are certain files that are missing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Is the honourable member saying that we did not provide complete information to the House on the Order for Return?

MR. BOSTROM: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that there was very little information provided, and we believe that there was significant additional correspondence which passed back and forth between the individuals concerned and the government, which was not provided, yes, I believe that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I heard reference to burning of documents. Is the honourable member suggesting that there were documents burned, destroyed, by this government?

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am only suggesting that there is certain information that is missing, and this park planned for this Whiteshell is one that the Minister apparently can not locate. So somehow that document has disappeared.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the point of order had nothing to do with the plan. The point of order had to do with what seemed to me to be an allegation that we had not filed complete Orders for Return, that we had in fact burned or destroyed documents. I would like the honourable gentleman to either make that challenge and to make it stand up, or withdraw it.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a difference of opinion as to what information was supplied. I simply stated that I do not believe all of the information was supplied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have been listening very carefully to the debate, and I don't think that I can rule it as a difference of opinion. It appeared to be stating facts that were known, and I would hope that the honourable member could produce some documentation as to those statement of facts, or withdraw his remarks.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, there is one definite fact that I can state, and that is the plan for the Whiteshell Park did exist. It was a plan developed by the department and it did exist. And if it's missing now, then something happened to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: The point of order was with reference to materials to do with the Jarmoc case, was what the honourable gentleman was referring to. He has alleged that we filed incomplete Orders of Return and that we burned or destroyed papers. That is a very serious allegation, and I think that the honourable gentleman should either be prepared to substantiate it or withdraw it.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome. To the honourable member, I would agreed with the Honourable Minister in regard to the statement of facts that were attributed to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the same point of order. I do not believe that I said the government burned files or shredded documents. I simply said that there were certain information that does not seem to be available, and I did not know what happened to it. That is what I believe I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I make a complete ruling on it, I would have to have another review of Hansard to make sure whether, in fact, the remarks were made, and in what manner.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we review the record, and if the record in fact says that, then I trust the honourable member will withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A ruling on the point of order after I have had a chance to look at Hansard on those remarks.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (BUD) BOYCE: To the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that you are going to review what was said, because in listening to the debate, I heard the member say, "I believe" in his remarks. And it would be a sorry state of affairs if a member in this House couldn't stand and say I believe. He may be in error, but I think the records will show that he said, "I believe that it was incomplete" and then went on to suggest why it may have been incomplete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, if that was the remarks made by the honourable member, I would be inclined to agree with you, but I will not be able to make a ruling; my memory isn't that good and I would have to have a look at Hansard before I was able to make a complete ruling on that.

(1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was, before being distracted, commenting on the Minister's handling of the department with respect to parks and I believe that, at the risk of being accused again of saying the wrong thing, I believe the Minister stated that there was a competition for this position, and that after looking through the interviews, or not interviews but the applications of people who applied for the position of director of provincial parks, all of those applications were thrown out, and the Minister made an appointment of the incumbent, who coincidentally was a partner in the firm of Interdisciplinary Systems, which is the same firm that did the study for the Minister's department. And I would ask the Minister why he did not re-open the competition, since the incumbent did not apply in the first instance when the position was advertised. Why did the Minister not re-open the competition and allow other people to apply, as well as the incumbent, who was appointed without further interviews?

MR. RANSOM: The competition was on a national basis. It was advertised nationally, and it did draw some applications, and it was fairly widely known that the position was open because there was a parks conference held in Winnipeg at the time that the competition was open. And as he, I am sure will acknowledge, that the appointment of senior officers such as a director, are by Order-in-Council, and are not the regular type of Civil Service appointment, and that in fact, no competition. . .

MR. BOYCE: I wonder if we could have order. I can't hear the remarks the Minister is. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on a point of order.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, could we have some order in the House? I can't hear a remark that the Minister has made.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got to agree with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Could we have some order please? We have people. . . I'm trying to control this committee, but the recording apparatus is not picking up. I see that the gentleman who is in charge of the recording apparatus is having great difficulty trying to differentiate between who is speaking, and I would ask the honourable members to please give a little bit of consideration to the honourable member who is standing at his place and speaking, and we will be able to carry on if we will be given that consideration.

The Honourable Minister. Excuse me; the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, it was moved that the question be put on Resolution 80, the Ayes and Nays were called for, and a count-out asked for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Resolution 80?

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the motion. All those in favour, please stand. Ayes and Nays only? Excuse me, I'll retract that last statement. Call in the members.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The motion before the House is that the question be put on Resolution No. 80.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:  
Yeas 24; Nays 20.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.  
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, since the resolutions in the Estimates of the Minister of Highways have all individually been passed, would that conclude the Estimates of the Minister of Highways?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There has been a motion passed that the question be put. There's been no question put. There's been no resolution passed. --(Interjection)-- No, not in here. You've got to go back. You go back to the other room.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, on the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this on the point of order?

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, I believe so. As I understand it, this afternoon that Resolution was read into the book, at 4:15 this afternoon. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: Possibly I can help you, Mr. Chairman. There was a motion made - we were on Resolution 80 - that the previous question be put. That motion asked to have a Standing Vote. We have now taken that Standing Vote in respect to the previous question. The motion is still before us and we can have the vote on it here, if you like, to expedite matters for you. But it has to have a vote of this Supply Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I guess that completes the Department of Highways and Transportation and I will make an announcement if somebody will advise me what the next department is that's going to start in the other Committee room. --(Interjection)-- Okay, so the announcement is that the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sports will commence in Room 254 immediately.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES (cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This Committee is back in order. Item under discussion is (a)(1) Salaries--pass; (2). - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, when the committee broke up, or was interrupted I should say, we were discussing the appointment of a Director of Parks and the way in which it was handled by the Minister. I believe he said, and I stand to be corrected, that there was a competition for the position. And then I heard him say that there was an advertisement for the position and that subsequent to that all of the applications were disregarded and the Minister and Cabinet decided to appoint the incumbent to the position, as the new Director of Parks.

I wonder if the Minister could confirm that that is the way in which the events took place and if he could confirm or in fact if he could tell us why he did not have another competition, which would allow a degree of fairness into the process and allow perhaps other qualified people to apply for the position. I would also ask him if the former incumbent of the position, the former Director of Parks, if he was allowed the opportunity of applying for the position.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the honourable member didn't hear earlier when I outlined what had happened in terms of the position being advertised nationally and there being a Parks Conference held here in the city at the time that the competition was open. It was widely known that the position was in fact open.

I believe that some interviews were held. It was decided that we did not have a suitable applicant for the job and through what could be termed as a direct search the Cabinet chose to appoint Mr. Derek Doyle as Director of Parks, and that as an Order-in-Council appointment. And of course it would not have been necessary or required to hold any type of competition to fill those positions which are made by Order-in-Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, at least it's on the record that the government is operating in this fashion in filling positions. I would point out to the Minister and to the House that this is an approach which the First Minister continues to derate and criticize every opportunity that he has, and that is the appointment directly of people who may, as a result of their association with members of the government, or whoever in the government, be accused of having been appointed for other reasons than merit. I don't the incumbent here, but certainly the fact that an appointment was made without competition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: The honourable member is alleging that the appointment was made because of some connection with people in government. I suggest that he should withdraw that remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was listening to the debate. The inference might have been there, but I don't think the actual accusation was there.  
The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is, that when appointments are made in this way, the suspicion can be raised and the suspicion can be there

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

in the minds of the public, in the minds of opposition members, as to why a particular person was chosen when there is no obvious open competition for the position. I remember the press, I believe, commenting on this, and questioning the Minister on this at the time of the appointment, and I think the Minister had some difficulty at that time explaining, as he's having difficulty explaining now, how they came about to select a particular individual who hadn't even applied for the position. So, Mr. Chairman, there have been some recruitment process that certainly is not following the Civil Service Commission route in terms of a recruitment selection and appointment method that takes into account a merit principle, and looks at various individuals before making an appointment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just throw that out as being something worth noting, when one considers the public attitude and much-proclaimed attitude of the First Minister towards this kind of process. I hope the Honourable Minister will remind the First Minister of his statements in the House regarding the hiring of individuals, because the same kind of appointment process used by the New Democratic government was berated by the First Minister; and individuals appointed in a similar fashion - which I don't say is a wrong way of doing it because the Cabinet and the Minister has the authority to appoint individuals to positions like this. But you can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. You can't accuse one government of doing something wrong in following that process, and then follow that process yourself and hope to be above suspicion.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just remind this Minister and this government of what may be considered a very hypocritical attitude on their part, a very hypocritical public attitude on the part of their First Minister, when he gets up in this House and, as the Honourable Member for Inkster just said, talks about rat-infested nests, etc., etc., the fact that people are - anybody who is hired in this fashion by the New Democratic Party government, Mr. Chairman, was accused of being a New Democrat and a New Democratic Party supporter.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has admitted that the individual involved has been almost handpicked, hand-selected by some reference to himself and certainly, Mr. Chairman, we would be naive to think that there was not some recommendation by people that are close to the Minister, who would say that this particular individual is qualified for the position and he has the right attitude towards the policies that we want to pursue. So, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that if these people and this government, Progressive Conservative government, are going to follow that policy of selection, and recruitment, and appointment, let not the kettle be calling the pot black or whatever it's called.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would want to elaborate on the abilities or whatever of the person appointed, to satisfy members in this House that the appointment was based on some very rational reasoning on his part. You know, I note that the man is an engineer. I don't know what that has to do with parks development in Manitoba or parks administration. So, perhaps the Minister has information that he might want to provide for the benefit of members on this side.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to provide the honourable members with a detailed background of the person involved. He is an extremely well qualified person in the field of multi-disciplinary resource studies and environmental studies, management of personnel and management of studies. I'd be happy to provide most of the background.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (a)--pass. (b) Park Planning, (1) Salaries.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have been following a routine - to the Honourable Member for St. George - where the Minister will introduce each item as it comes up.

The Honourable Minister.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: . . .to say, Mr. Chairman, that there are 31.05 staff man years in the Estimates before us, and that's the same number as were approved in 1979-80, and I believe that we have in fact been discussing the Park Planning for the last while.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I regret I didn't catch your eye as you were finishing the work on the Administration section and going into the Planning. I wanted to understand the process that the department went through in the selection of the Director of Parks, when they advertised the position nationally, as the Minister had indicated. I presume that there was, in the advertising of the position that interested applicants apply, that there was in fact a bulletin with a competition number and the like. Was that competition ever held, Mr. Chairman? Could the Minister indicate whether a competition was actually held, or were the applicants that did apply, were they notified that no longer was the government continuing this application, or what procedure was followed?

MR. RANSOM: With respect to the first part of the question, Mr. Chairman, yes, individual people were brought to Winnipeg and were interviewed. With respect to the second part of the question concerning notification following selection, I would have to determine from my department what procedure was followed.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how many applicants were there for the job description, if the Minister can recall. Were the interviews conducted here in Winnipeg on the particular job?

MR. RANSOM: If I recall correctly, there were perhaps 10 to 15, Mr. Chairman, and interviews were conducted in Winnipeg. I find this a little unusual, Mr. Chairman, if I might say so, that under Administration we discussed planning and now under Planning, we are going to discuss administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It does give me some problems, also, if I could just make a remark on it. I have been trying to follow under Administration and Park Planning, and it does give me some difficulty. I know that there is an overlapping, and I would recommend to the honourable members that if we can stick to the subject under discussion without as much overlapping as has been in the past, I think that we could carry on.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that in the entire resolution of No. 5 that we are dealing with, although we are dealing with separate components of it, that there will be considerable going back and forth on the issues, and considerable latitude, I think, in most committees has been given by the Chairman, the wide-ranging discussion, although it may go back and forth by different members, once all the issues that members have are raised, then the items are generally passed in sequence. So I can sympathize with your position, Mr. Chairman, and I will try and deal with the Park Planning process, although I did rise, or begin to rise, on the Administration because I had a couple of those questions with respect to the process, but you had already moved on, and as a result I am in the next section. I hope that you will allow the latitude that has been going on in this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, I wasn't ruling him out of order, I was just trying to give a little direction so that it would move along smoothly.  
The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, could the Minister. . .when the interviews that were conducted in the City of Winnipeg, when the selection was made with respect to the director that is now in place versus the interviews and the competition that was held earlier, what kind of an overlap was there in between the advertising of the job and the appointment of the director?

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: A period of a few months.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says a few months, what is a few, in the Minister's mind?

MR. RANSOM: Well, the present director began work about the end of January, I believe, and I think that the interviews were probably conducted in July, perhaps, during the summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would want to know from the Minister whether or not he has resolved the problem of taxation with respect to cottage sites. I believe the Minister has been attempting to deal with a problem where some people in the Whiteshell, as an example, were levied for support of school services and municipal services, or one or the other, some municipalities, and others within the parks system, being next door to those people, were of course not levied. I know that the department has attempted to grapple with that problem, and I wonder if the Minister has any information as to what the intent of the government is in an effort to resolve it.

MR. RANSOM: I can't say, Mr. Chairman, that the problem in general has been resolved. It is a difficult one of long-standing, as the member is probably aware, but we have attempted to resolve two or three situations on an individual basis, and the one that the honourable member refers to in the Whiteshell, I believe, was a situation where it was discovered that there were some cottages that were in the municipality as well as within the park and they had not been assessed previously, and that an assessment was carried out and they were to be taxed. That portion of the municipality was subsequently removed from the park.

We have done similarly with the Bird's Hill Park and with Grand Beach, to try and resolve some long-standing problems there the municipalities had in relation to collecting taxes and having to pay taxes to the school divisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Just so that there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that sections of the park were removed and therefore the people that were not assessed will now be assessed in order to provide uniformity within a given area of the park region, to remove the discriminatory actions that were taking place? Or is he saying that sections that were taxed were removed from taxation in order to comply with some degree of uniformity in the park system?

MR. RANSOM: It means that the park was removed from the municipality, by agreement with the municipality, if I might say so, that those people are not paying taxes to the municipality.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would now then ask the Minister what it is that he intends to do with respect to the larger discriminatory situation that we find ourselves in, and that is that there are parks in Manitoba where there is a municipal taxation applied. I'm thinking in terms of the Grand Beach area, as an example. Are we now in a situation where in the Whiteshell, the cottage owners will not pay taxes but in the Grand Beach area, they will pay taxes. If we are not in that position, how has the Minister rectified that in Grand Beach?

MR. RANSOM: Well, the Grand Beach one is one I just referred to, Mr. Chairman, that area of the park that was in the municipality has in effect been withdrawn from the municipality, so those people will not be paying taxes to the municipality. But the problem is much broader than that, there are inequitable situations that exist in other areas of the province, and I think it is impossible to solve them with the application of one policy. We must attempt to deal with them one by one, just as we face an increasing problem with the question of permanent residences in parks, and all the implications that lie with that. I



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

don't think any other jurisdiction has been able to solve that one yet, and we don't have the resolution of it either.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he has agreement from those RMs in the Whiteshell, and in particular the RM of St. Clements, as to the recent decision that was made to take people out of the tax rolls of those municipalities. There have been agreements from all of the municipalities involved, I gather.

MR. RANSOM: Yes.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the department has in plans in terms of either planning or dealing with areas where there are small wayside and camping areas. And some areas that I have in mind are, like the Lake St. George camping area in the northern Interlake, or some of the wayside parks where there is some camping or very limited camping, like Nassau, along Lake Winnipeg - what kind of a long term plan or at least thrust has the government got, or is its intention with respect to parks of that size, like Moosehorn Beach? I am giving you Interlake specifics, but there is no doubt that there are many such parks throughout the province - here in the Whiteshell area I think it's Otter Falls - and many of them that are very small that have maybe 10 or 20 campsites, are very well used, but require an ongoing maintenance and upgrading to make them very usable and very attractive to the people, not only in the local areas, but passers-by. And I am wondering what kind of thrust the government has in this area.

I know historically we have kind of looked at grandiose plans with large provincial parks, and those being our major thrust in the Whiteshell, in Spruce Woods, and Hecla, and several other areas within the province. But it's these little parks throughout the province which really give a lot of enjoyment, not only to the motoring public, but to a lot of the local people living in the area; and it's these areas that really, from time-to-time, become a bit neglected and uncared for, that require just that little bit of extra to make them the shining spot of a small community or local area. I am wondering what direction the province is taking, and what plans they have in those areas.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think that a fairly simple answer is that we are trying to orient the system to the demands that the public has. And there is no question that there is significant demand for the type of facility to which the honourable member refers. But we have a great many competing demands, I guess, from those areas that don't have any facilities by way of parks. The Lynn Lake area, for instance, that doesn't have an adequate facility at all for sort of an in-point of the travelling public. They'd press for some minimal facilities, and then go to a place that already has what they would consider to be a rather elaborate facility, but they're pressing for electrification of that type, and hot and cold showers. Clearly, there is a limit to the amount of funds that we have available. We'll simply try and bring some balance to the system by identifying as closely as we can what the needs are, what the demands are, and then we'll attempt to apportion our funds accordingly.

But the facilities that we do have, I believe that they will be maintained at a satisfactory level. It is certainly our intention to have our parks maintained in a clean and attractive state, and we usually hear from the public if that is not the case. And I think, in general, that we get quite favourable comments on balance on the job that our staff does in maintaining our parks.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while I can sympathize with the Minister's comments that they are gearing their policy to demand, I hope that's not the sole criteria, because when you look at the issue of demand, it's almost like the novice looking for his first job. Everywhere he goes, everybody wants him to have some experience, and they won't hire him unless he's got experience, and how does that individual gain the experience unless he's given the chance to be hired? It's in the same vein that I speak about the small wayside parks. If there were

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

some sort of standardization of facilities in those areas, I can - and I am sure the Minister will agree - indicate that there will be the demand, whether it be local demand, what could be called through-put demand of people travelling along the highway, or a kind of a regional demand. The facilities in many of these wayside parks are not standard, by any stretch of imagination. Some of the parks have toilet facilities, some have a few better-prepared campsites, some not quite as elaborate. Is there a standard system that the province has in terms of what shall go into one of the wayside camping areas, and is there a general upgrading program that the province has that it will carry on on a year-by-year basis so that throughout, say, a four or five-year period, the parks that are now in existence will be upgraded to a standard where they will be fairly comparable throughout the province.

MR. RANSMON: As a general statement, Mr. Chairman, we are attempting to upgrade rather than make significant expansions; I think as a generality, that's, I think, a fair statement. We have, for instance, 102 wayside parks in the province, and there are certainly differences in the facilities that are available there. There are 85 provincial campgrounds as well, and 44 provincial recreation parks, and 12 provincial natural parks. I think when we distribute the capital program, which I hope we'll have ready tomorrow, you'll see, the honourable member will see, Mr. Chairman, the kind of activities of upgrading that we're undertaking in the upcoming year.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that very point, anyone who drives through Canada from one end of the country to another, could not help but notice, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba has some way to go with respect to providing those off-road facilities. If you compare Manitoba with Saskatchewan, I think that the comparison is such that we have a glaring disadvantage for the motorist in Manitoba who wishes to stop along the way, anywhere along the main highways.

You travel through Saskatchewan on almost any highway, you see huge signs posted notifying the public just where the parks are, what facilities are available at each one, and there are numerous of those kinds of facilities on all highways in Saskatchewan. It seems to me that if the department hasn't looked at that, perhaps it might be worthwhile to examine what has taken place there, just to determine whether or not it's an area that we should be expanding into.

The other question that I have in my mind, Mr. Chairman, has to do with Hecla Island and what is happening on Hecla Island. Just where are we with respect to the development of that island park? Are we doing any more? Are we making any more improvements? What is the financial position? And what is being done to improve it, if it still has not achieved a positive cash-flow position? I'm talking about the hotel accommodation on Hecla, Mr. Chairman.

Just how are we doing with that facility? In terms of the golf course, I gather from golfers that it's about the best golf course in western Canada. --(Interjection)-- Well, the Minister in charge of Housing says it is not. Then if it is not, I suggest to him that he should make it so, or help his colleague make it so. You know, we should have one that stands out as being one of the best in Canada, if not "the" best. I don't think that we would want to shrink from that objective, Mr. Chairman.

Perhaps it might bother the Minister that it's a public venture and therefore he doesn't like to emphasize that aspect of it. If that's his problem, I suppose that's his privilege, Mr. Chairman. I don't share his philosophy in that regard; that is quite obvious.

I believe that parks are built for the benefit of all the people of the province and that whether or not they are looked upon as being financially remunerative is here nor there. The important thing is that all the people of this province have access to some outdoor activity and to some reasonable facilities wherein they might want to participate and partake in the few months of sunshine activity that we have in this province.

But in particular, Mr. Chairman, I would want the Minister to indicate to us what he is planning to do or is doing on Hecla Island and whether or not the hotel operation in itself is viable, non-viable, yet, or are we making money on it, are we losing money on that operation, and so on?

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member will have to raise that issue with the Minister of Finance during his review. The management of the hotel is being handled within the Minister of Finance's department.

In terms of the other activities that will be undertaken at Hecla, some of those of course will be listed in the capital works, which I say I hope to provide tomorrow.

I believe there is one item that we're looking at, at soliciting a private development proposal for the marina. Where is that item? So it makes it a little difficult for me to . . . Oh, yes. We are at present undertaking a preparation of a prospectus calling for proposals from private sector for the construction and operation of a full service marina and it remains to be seen just how that might be negotiated, but that's one of the things that we're working towards, and then in addition we'll be listing some expenditure items with the capital program.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat intrigued with that latest suggestion, observation, or revelation of the Minister.

The Minister is suggesting that they are looking at some private options with respect to the operation of a marina at Hecla Island. The question that arises from that is whether or not there is going to be any kind of subsidization of that kind of operation and, if there is, what the degree of subsidization that is proposed to take place there? I am not talking about the fact that the province has obviously, along with the government of Canada, spent millions of dollars in that particular park development and it seems to me that if we are going to now involve some private entrepreneurs on site, then we must have some sort of a rental arrangement that reflects some reasonable return to the province, as opposed to being a direct subsidy to a private operation. Otherwise it seems to me it would make sense to consider a marina as being part of the park operation.

I wonder if the Minister can clarify just what he has in mind in that regard.

MR. RANSOM: We, of course, have not received any proposals yet and so we can't say at this time what kind of a package that might come forward. But I think in general terms, again, that the concept is that if the private sector, through investment of private capital, is able to provide service of the standard that we want in the area, then we should consider that.

But, generally, I think we have a record or history in our parks of the private sector having great difficulty in existing, partly because of the short season that we have and partly, I think, because of the kind of arrangements that we have for the percentage of the gross. It just has been very difficult for businesses to operate. And of course if they can't operate, then we either don't have the services provided or it's necessary for the taxpayers to provide the services.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, what really concerns me is that the department breaks down the operations of a major provincial park operation into components that, by themselves, become unviable, as opposed to having a complete parks package in the area that might be viable. And I make reference now to the fact that I've always considered the Lord Selkirk, the ship, Mr. Chairman, as being part of the park's operation, that it was an important component of the park's operation.

Now, if you sell the ship, which the government has, to private investors, what are the water rentals that they are charging the private investor for the use of the lakeshore facilities in the area? Or what are the charges back to the investor for the use of the Gull Harbour facilities? Because what Gull Harbour is, it's a destination point for that particular ship, Mr. Chairman, on many occasions, in fact, if not always.

Therefore, what we have here is a situation where the province is putting in the infrastructure, providing a destination point of interest for someone else to profit from, if you like. Now, there's nothing wrong with that providing there are proper charge backs and recognition that everyone must share part of the cost. But if we burden the province with all of the cost items and provide free services to the people that wish to involve themselves in the other activities of

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

transportation, whether it be scenic transportation or just straight transportation, Mr. Chairman, then one has to raise the question of wherein is the overall public interest.

It seems to me that the more you destroy the package concept of a major park operation such as Hecla Island, the more you're falling into the trap of subsidizing different components, directly or indirectly, through the fact that the people of Manitoba must keep up the main component and that is the park itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass.  
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the public is maintaining the park in any case, and then either is faced with the choice of either providing further capital investment to provide a service and involving a further subsidy to the users of that service, they're faced with either that or having the private sector provide that service, even though they may well be using the basic facilities of the park. It strikes me that it's in the public interest to go with the least-cost method and if by soliciting proposals from the private sector to provide services that we would regard as an adequate standard, if we can come up with a better deal for the public, then I'm certainly prepared to look at that.

Perhaps the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet would not be. Perhaps he wishes to have the government control all of the facilities. It would be the owners of it. I don't think that that necessarily is in the public interest.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Minister, I have no particular hang-up on one or the other or the combination of the two. All I am suggesting is, that one has to be cautious in the way that parks package on that particular island is put together as between the private interests and the public interests. And that it seems to me the logic of my argument is that the public interest has to come first. That's what parks are all about to begin with, Mr. Chairman, is to provide a service to the general public and that is a proper area for government involvement.

I would hate to see the day, Mr. Chairman, where our resources have been given up in favour of private entrepreneurship, which then turned around and abused the, what I call, basic human rights of the people of Manitoba to use those resources, and that's really the point that I'm trying to make.

I believe that we have an overabundance of natural resource and beauty in this province that all Manitobans should be able to participate in and with, and utilize to the highest degree. But I wouldn't want to see the government embark on a policy which slowly but surely denies more and more people access to those natural facilities, Mr. Chairman, that we do have.

I know it's always a temptation because there are pressures as there were pressures in the Whiteshell, Mr. Chairman, where private interests were, well in fact through this government, entered into an agreement to, what I believe, was going to result in destroying an environment that up till that point in time was considered to be a good environment.

Surely I hope the logic is there; that what we really want to preserve for the people of Manitoba is the best in leisureland and parkland facility and that we wouldn't compromise that for the sake of some particular interest on the part of any person or group.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister mentioned that where marinas were operated privately, that it wasn't very viable. How many marinas are now being operated in the province in provincial parks that are operated by private entrepreneurs?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I didn't refer to marinas being operated privately. I referred generally to commercial facilities being operated privately.

MR. ADAM: Yes. In the matter of - I don't know if that comes under the next item but I guess it would, that is, the concessionaires would come under the next item, I believe, Mr. Chairman?

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Program Management.

MR. ADAM: I want to ask the Minister if he could give us some information on the program of new vacation home lots. What is happening in this area; are the lots being sold, are they being rented, is it a standard rate? How many are available? I am thinking of one at Bannock's Point. If there are any lots available there, are they being sold or are they on a rental basis and what are the rents? Perhaps he could give us some information on what's happening at Waterhen, Waterhen River, which is in my constituency. It would be interesting to know what is happening there.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, we have the information here that the vacation home lots that will be available this coming season, lots for lease by public draw will be in Nopiming Park at Long Lake it will be 36 and at Booster Lake it will be 60; in Grindstone Provincial Recreation Park, Little Grindstone Point, 190; in Duck Mountain Provincial Park at Singoosh Lake, 30, at Child Lake, 50; at Wellman Lake, 40.

Now, these are within parks and available on a lease basis. Lots outside of parks, which would be available on a sale basis at appraised market value would be in the eastern region, Lonson Point in the Lac du Bonnet area, 53; Lake of the Prairies, in the western region, 62; 11 at the Waterhen; and 21 at Wekusko, for a total of 147 available for sale.

MR. ADAM: A further question on that same topic. I believe there is a subdivision at Bannock's Point which is not in a park, it's outside of a park. There was a subdivision there undertaken under the previous administration. It's north of Manipogo Park, about roughly two miles, three miles perhaps.

MR. RANSOM: Could the honourable member be specific with the question. What is it about this Bannock's point development that the honourable member would like to know?

MR. ADAM: It appeared that the Minister didn't have any information on that particular area and I was just wondering if there are any lots still available there that haven't been allocated. There's 11 lots, I believe, at Waterhen. How is the price established for these lots at Waterhen?

MR. RANSOM: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that there are some lots available that are essentially available on a selection basis, you just go and pick one. Initially as the areas are opened, then they are done on a draw basis and if the demand isn't sufficient to take up the number of lots that are available, then the remainder just simply are made available then on a first come, first serve basis. So there are some lots available there. That area, I believe, is outside of the park and therefore we would give consideration to sale of lots in that area, outside of a park.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister advise the pricing of the lots - what is the criteria for establishing a price, for instance, at Waterhen or Bannock Point, which are both in my constituency?

MR. RANSOM: The price will be determined on an appraised basis of what a lot should be worth on the market.

MR. ADAM: What are the guidelines for establishing the value of a lot in a particular area? That's what I am trying to find out. There are private lots being developed in proximity to this provincial subdivision and I'm just wondering, how do you establish a price for the lots at Waterhen? I'd like to buy one, for instance; how do I find out how much a lot would be worth at Waterhen?

MR. RANSOM: Well, if you contact the Parks Branch we'll let you know. But the appraisals are carried out by appraisers, by people who are qualified to make appraisals of what a lot is worth and if the honourable member would like me to

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

get some details as to how the appraisers go about determining that, I suppose I could do it. Not being an appraiser myself, I'm not familiar with all the techniques that they would...

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the appraisals are made by an outside appraiser or is this by our own Land Acquisition Branch?

MR. RANSOM: These are appraisers in the Crown Lands Branch.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister just where we are at with respect to cottage lot development relative to the demand factor for such cottage lots? Do we have a surplus; are we in short supply; is there a waiting list? What is the current program that the Minister is proposing for this year? Are we building new facilities or are we simply filling the existing ones, or where are we at in that program?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I just outlined to the committee the lots that are available this summer. That's a total of 553 lots and I guess in some places we have more lots available than there is demand. At Lake of the Prairies, for instance, we have quite a number of lots in excess of what the demand is. In other areas, that would not be true. I'm sure if we were to make any lots available in the Whiteshell, for instance, that they would be snapped up immediately. So it has a great deal to do with the distance, obviously, that people have to drive to get to them. There are some who are interested and prepared to drive fairly long distances to Long Lake, for instance, in Nopiming Park. There are a great many others that regard that as being too far, similarly even to go to Grindstone Point. Again, it is something that we will be attempting to appraise the demand more carefully and not devote too much of our capital to the development of lots that aren't going to be required, especially if it seems that the private sector is able to provide enough lots of the type and standard that people are looking for.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the Minister's criteria is with respect to new cottage development and new lot development. Does he have a formula that would suggest that for X number of thousands of people that there ought to be X number of cottage lots available in a given region, or how does he approach the question of demand for these kinds of facilities on the part of the public? There must be some systematic way that the Parks Branch determines that, Mr. Chairman. Do we have an overabundance of lots now, generally speaking? I mean, have there been, in the area where we have high density population, have we had quite a large number of unused cottages and unused lots, or have we always consistently used them up to capacity without adding to the supply? What is the philosophy of the government with respect to meeting the demand?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think as long as we have applications running at two and a half, three, three and a half applications for each lot that is available, then we have a pretty good indication that there is demand there and that's what we have encountered. In Grindstone, for instance, it was running as high as three and a half per lot, and at Beresford Lake it was running in the neighbourhood of two and a half. On the other hand, I would say that the development at Lake of the Prairies, there were only quite a small number of the lots that were taken up there. But nevertheless there was some demand in that area and there was the opportunity to provide that sort of recreational opportunity and so we developed some. Perhaps we developed too many in that case and should have gone with some smaller individual developments.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister uses the term "lot" and I have been using the term "lots" and "lots with cottages." Does the Minister imply by that that we are no longer building cottages as we were for several years, or is it just lots that are being developed? What is the current policy of the government?

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: We are providing land, we are providing lots.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister tell me how many cottages were built in the last year, if any, and where?

MR. RANSOM: I don't believe the government built any cottages in the last year, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable member is asking about lots being built by private individuals, I don't have that information with me.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the fact that we have a good percentage of our population who probably will never afford a cottage and therefore if the public is not involved in some way in the building of these kinds of facilities and in the leasing of them on a weekly, bi-monthly, or monthly basis or whatever, that a good percentage of our population just wouldn't enjoy that part of Manitoba that everyone wants to enjoy, and that is the outdoor wilderness type of environment, for at least a short period of time during our best months of the year. I know that during several years of our government that we recognized that fact and that cottages were being built at public cost and subsequently leased to individuals on whatever term, whether it was by the week, by the day, by the month or whatever. I'm sure the department has the information. It would seem to me that if the Minister is suggesting that that part of the department's thrust has been terminated and is not to continue any more, then that would give rise to quite a lot of debate as to the merits of that decision, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RANSOM: Well, it may well give rise to debate, Mr. Chairman, because we have not undertaken any expansion of the program that the previous administration had undertaken.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister then tell us how many government-owned cottages that his department now operates in Manitoba?

MR. RANSOM: I'm advised that the number would be about 30.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister advise as to how many cottages were sold by the Province of Manitoba in the last two years?

MR. RANSOM: I'm advised it would be 12, 12 log cabins at Grindstone.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I would like to know from the Minister what the logic was in the sale of any cottages since the Province does not have that many, what would be the logic in disposing of 12 cottages?

MR. RANSOM: I would have to check back into the records of the department to determine why that was done. As I recall, it probably had to do with the excessive costs that were involved in those cottages, but I have to confirm that.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to determine why costs had something to do with that decision because, obviously, costs can be passed on to the lessee on a rental basis and in recognition of the fact that so many Manitobans are not, and probably never will be in a position to own cottages of their own, it seems to me that this is a reasonable compromise in order that those people might have some access to these kinds of facilities. So, I would pursue that, Mr. Chairman, more strongly. There must be a reason why the government wanted to dispose of some of their cottages.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I gather from what the honourable member said, that he was suggesting that there could be an actual return on the investment involved in these cottages. As I recall, the cost figures that were involved in developing them, one would certainly not be able to recover those costs and still be able to provide the sort of service that the honourable member refers to. As Minister, the department has not been involved in those sale decisions at all; and so I'm not familiar with all the information that formed part of the decision, and

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

I would have to make some inquiries before I could provide him with any more detailed information.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister indicate whether or not it is his policy to dispose of the remaining cottages that he still has within his department? Is the Minister intending to offer for sale the remaining cottages that are owned by the province?

MR. RANSOM: We have would have no intention of disposing of those that are being used. Now, I think there was some question about the Camp Morton ones; certainly the ones within Hecla are being used at quite a good level of occupancy. I'm advised that the Camp Morton ones are not being used by the public to what might be considered an optimum capacity and, therefore, we might well be looking at either moving them to a site where they could be used, perhaps at Hecla or else in selling them.

MR. USKIW: Well, yes, would the Minister then illustrate for us just what his policies are with respect to that large group of people in this province who do not find themselves in a position of building cottages on his lots that he is prepared to provide them? What is the policy for that group of people, Mr. Chairman? Is there a policy, or is there a vacuum, or what are the options that he is suggesting to those people?

MR. RANSOM: There are many types of recreational opportunities, potention recreational opportunities, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think that it is necessarily the responsibility of government to provide all those opportunities, all those potential opportunities to people. And cottaging, that happens to be one recreational opportunity, fine. Most people, if they desire that kind of opportunity then they pursue it, others are interested in camping, and tenting, and whatever. To single out cottages as being a type of opportunity that the government should make available at a substantially greater subsidy that we might do with our more conventional type of park facilities, I don't think that is a direction we should be going at this moment. I don't think that we can get the best use out of public money to invest it in those type of facilities.

I think that it's probably more appropriate to deal with the kinds of things that the Honourable Member for St. George was talking about, where we can touch a great many more people with other types of facilities than you can with cabins that are developed directly by government.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that the department embark on a massive building program of cottages for people that might want to lease them, but I am suggesting to the government that it seems to me that it does make sense to have a fair mix of programs within the department. But that does involve and include all sectors in society. You know, the Minister probably feels quite comfortable and he doesn't see a great urge or a need for that kind of environmental change for a period of time in a given year, the part of the human species, but maybe, Mr. Chairman, that's because he generally lives in a cottage year round, coming from the area of the province that he comes from. And I look upon my own home in the countryside, Mr. Chairman, very much in the same way. I have no real craving for a cottage out in the sticks somewhere or along a stream somewhere, because I believe that I have that environment on a daily basis, and my craving and desire is to get into the urban scene more often. That's sort of the way it goes. But, Mr. Chairman, there are tens of thousands of people in Winnipeg that do have a desire to make use of Manitoba's outdoor environment, and it seems logical that ought to be a priority project or program of the government to make it happen and to make it possible. So that during that two or three month period that we do enjoy some fair weather in this province that as many people as possible find their way out to the countryside and are able to enjoy with some degree of comfort and some degree a facility provided by the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass. The Honourable Member for Inkster.



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we should just let the item pass without further discussion on it, because I believe that the Member for Lac du Bonnet has raised some significant points which the Minister is not very excited about it. First of all, Mr. Chairman, certainly if in developed areas of our province, where the natural resources are particularly suited for it, we could provide at modest cost facilities that people could rent, people of modest incomes could rent for some of the summer period, then, I would think that would be a worthwhile program which should not involve a cost to the province but should, in the final analysis, increase our wealth. That there would be activities taking place for the purpose of creating a facility which didn't exist before and which, as I understand it, would increase the wealth of the province.

If the Minister says that the facilities are not being used then that, of course, would be another question. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the major thrusts and one of the most progressive programs of the Roblin administration was to develop Manitoba lakes so that Manitobans could use them. And the philosophy at the time, Mr. Chairman, which relates very much to what's happening in Riding Mountain, was that the province would develop the lake, that the ground rent would be rather modest, almost negligible at the beginning. I would think that \$35 a year was the ground rent for some of the cottages, and I don't think I'm far out in that connection. But the low ground rent was an inducement to people who knew or would be given to understand that they could go out, do some work, build themselves a little summer home, and that they would be able to use it because the summer home would be facilitated by a low ground rent.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that if you will go to the Whiteshell area and even the Falcon Lake area, although I think it's less so at Falcon Lake than it is at the Whiteshell, if you will go to those lakes you will find that many of the summer homes have been built by the people who live in them, that they are lived in by people of modest income. It is true, there are very well-to-do people out there, too, but I would not want to penalize the well-to-do by throwing out the baby with the bath water, by saying that if you're going to charge the rent to what they're doing in Riding Mountain, to go over \$1,000, what have you achieved? The person who can afford the \$1,000 still stays there or comes there, but the person who can't afford that kind of thing is forced to get rid of what he, himself, may have built with his own hands to somebody who can afford the ground rent. So, I endorse what the Minister is doing and I say to him, that if you want to tax rich people, tax them on the income tax, tax them on the sales tax, but don't tax them in such a way as to make it impossible for the average Manitoba citizen to participate.

If they started with this so-called percentage of the value of the cottage rent, what are you taxing? You're not taxing income? You're not taxing wealth? What you're taxing, in many cases, could be industry; that a man, who works at the packing house and I know one who spends his entire summer working on his cottage. So his cottage will be very well-to-do but he's a packinghouse employer. You start taxing him a percentage of his cottage value, he stops working on his cottage so he can stay there. What is the logic of it? The value of the cottage is not necessarily and maybe even incidentally a function of wealth. If you are taxing a man on his income tax, if you are taxing him on his sales tax, if you are taxing him on other taxes which affect ability-to-pay, then the provision of the service to provide a cottage lot should be done in such a way that it doesn't penalize people on low incomes. In many respects, Mr. Chairman, and I will declare an interest, I have a cottage at the Whiteshell and I bought it when I was a person who I can properly describe as of modest means. That's right, that is a fact, less means than the packinghouse worker who is there at the same time. But the fact is that I would never have been able to do it if they charged a fee on the basis that here are the wealthy cottage owners. And I would not be there, which I am sure it's not going to cause any tears to drip from the eyes of my honourable friends, but the fact is then it will be an exclusive proposition.

So the Member for Lac du Bonnet raises some significant questions. How do we facilitate? Let's, for the moment, forget the situation as at present and look to an objective. Manitoba is a province with marvelous natural outdoor resources which can be enjoyed in the summertime and in the wintertime. In the wintertime through the winter sports that we provide and in the summertime through,

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

generally, through use of our non-urban areas, except for the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who lives in the sticks, he said - I won't say it - but he gets his kicks out of going up and down the elevators of the Richardson Building, to be coming into the urban world.

But the fact is that the objective should be - and I don't think that the Minister will not concur with this objective, leaving aside whether you're going to subsidize cottages - that the objective should be that the citizens of Manitoba, and particularly the young people, should have an opportunity to enjoy and live in that environment. And what the previous Conservative administration did in the early 1950's is, they did, they did start opening cottage lots with a very low ground rent and one of the stipulations, you could not get a cottage lot unless you built on it; I mean, that's my recollection. The gentlemen at the table are nodding their heads. You could not get a cottage lot like you want to get fishing licences, to sell to somebody else. Here is a piece of Manitoba; we'll give it to you, that's your quota, now you can sell it to your next door neighbour. You couldn't do that with the cottage lot. You could then sell your cottage and it is also true that there have been significant appreciations of some of those cottages beyond the rate of inflation, which then become a windfall to somebody who really hasn't done anything to earn it except have it.

Now how do you keep that windfall down, Mr. Chairman? Very easy. Well, I shouldn't say that. Not very easy but there is a way. If a person can get another cottage lot, he's not going to pay somebody who has a present cottage at appreciated value. He's going to go and do the same thing as the first guy did. So the more cottage lots that are opened up - and I see no problem - the more cottage lots that are opened up the less are you going to give unearned wealth to the people who happen to be sitting on of your lots at the present time. Because they can go and build a lot for approximately the same cost, today's cost, as what you would be dealing with and they would probably find that preferable than paying a great appreciated price.

So if the Minister could keep the ground rents down and not try to collect on income tax on the ground rent - and I am not suggesting you don't; I'd prefer the Minister increase the rates of income tax for everybody for the money - and not use the ground rent as a means of driving people out of cottage lots. He hasn't done that; I won't accuse him of doing that. But the federal government has done it, is doing it, and it doesn't make sense.

I am not trying to protect people in higher income groups from paying taxes. I have always advocated higher income taxes, higher than premium. I was in favour of an income tax as against a premium. I would be in favour of an income tax as against as a higher ground rent. There has to be a ground rent because there has to be some charge for services to those lots, and that's the original basis upon which these charges were sought, but it shouldn't be based on a percentage of the value of the cottage. That's going to discourage a poor man from coming out and increasing the value of his cottage. It's not going to tax people on the basis of their wealth, looking at the cottage as a function of wealth.

So the first thing, Mr. Chairman, and I concur with what the Member for Lac du Bonnet said, the first thing is that there should be a very very aggressive program of making available, right through Manitoba, on a continuing basis, never stopping, cottage lots, so you do not have three-and-a-half people demanding every lot that's in existence, that you have continuing demand, and that you have as close as you can, as lots for demand, provided that they build a cottage on those lots. Not selling them a piece of the Province of Manitoba to sell to somebody else when it becomes occupied but that they build a cottage on that lot.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, if there is a demand for rentals - and the Minister will be able probably to answer that better than anybody on this side, - then there should be available lots for people who want to rent them. And I do not think that they should all be on the same lake and on the same site, because if they are they will be become known as some type of inverse or snobbism with regard to that particular area, unfortunately.

You know, I have no reason to think that leasing from the public is a wrong thing to do but, unfortunately, it will immediately obtain that stigma and therefore it should be something that is available throughout. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, and because I do agree with the Minister that you can not subsidize that kind of activity to any great extent, that the rentals should be on the basis of

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

trying to realize the capital costs and operating costs. I am not sure that that will happen and I am not suggesting it happened with the ones that we built.

But, Mr. Chairman, there should be an aggressive program by the province on the part of all of us, so that a growing number of children are able to take advantage of our summer lake environment. And that, Mr. Chairman, we do have experience with. The province has been involved in the operation of summer camps. We were involved in the operation of the wilderness core. I don't know whether the Minister still is. Is it in the program? Then he knows what I'm talking about. We were involved in the operation of the wilderness core and I recall, Mr. Chairman, that we were involved in the operation of a summer camp up somewhere near Cranberry Portage. None of the members on my side can remember that, that we were involved in the operation of a summer camp for children in the area of Cranberry Portage. At least that's my recollection.

Mr. Chairman, I want to adopt the words of Marie Antoinette, chairman of the Winnipeg School Board, who closed down the Winnipeg core program day camping by saying, "What are they doing here? Let them go to camp where they will eat cake." Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to adopt that. Let the children of Manitoba go to camp. Let them experience two weeks or three weeks in our summer environment in continually growing numbers. Let's not talk of a summer cottage for a family. Let's talk of a cabin in which a group of eight to ten children, under proper supervision and in one of the finest outdoor environments that one can go to anywhere at all. You can take people from anywhere in the world, take them out to our Whiteshell and they will find it a beautiful place. And I'm not talking about only the Whiteshell. But let the Minister build places in our wilderness area on the basis that a growing number of Manitoba children will have that kind of outdoor experience which the more fortunate of us are able to provide through owning a summer cottage. Now what's wrong with that? Maurice Leveque is right. Let them go to camp.

But you have to have a program, Mr. Chairman, and the program will not be a program which will see a net loss financially to the people of the Province of Manitoba, because I would envisage, Mr. Chairman, that we would have a growing and an ever-growing use of the wilderness areas in the Province of Manitoba during the summertime, and that there will be tremendous wealth created by all of the trades that are involved in the building of these areas and in the jobs that would be supplied to educators, to social workers, and to students who would be hired to engage in a summer experience for children in the Province of Manitoba.

And that will not find us being accused, and there are people, Mr. Chairman, who do this. In 1954, in 1955, I was the director of the B'Nai B'Rith Camp on Lake of the Woods, not in the Province of Manitoba, where a hundred children spent three two-week sessions - it would be 300 children altogether except some repeated - in Ontario, at a camp. They still do it; they still go to near Camp Stephens, on the Lake of the Woods, and the YMCA Camp Stephens is still there.

This activity was made available to everybody and I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, that a broad section of the community, of a particular community, the Jewish community, used that camp. But I will have to admit that it was not made available and is not now available to the general community. There are some fresh air camps, there are some sort of underprivileged children camps but there is not a general summer vacation experience, recreational and co-educational, for the general population.

And I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the Member for Lac du Bonnet has said about developing our cottage areas, why this cannot be a long-term objective. I'm not talking about it happening in a year, but you have to start and say that in ten years this is where you are going to be. It will not break the province, Mr. Chairman; it will make us more wealthy because it will involve more people in the Province of Manitoba applying their labours to the physical resources whereby wealth is created. The only way that wealth is created. And it's something, Mr. Chairman, that we have the resources to do and which would be of long-term benefit to the citizens of our province.

I ask the Minister to consider the words of the Member for Lac du Bonnet with regard to an increasing use of our non-urban areas and what are now wilderness areas, specifically from the point of view that he will make it available to more people and as long as the demand is there it should be pursued. And secondly, it will reduce the enhanced value that is now being made available to any cottage

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

owner who happened to buy his cottage a long time ago. Because if cottages are scarce, the price goes up, and they do go up. And it's not an earned increment that is being achieved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Just to reinforce what has been suggested from this side by the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the Member for Inkster, when the Minister suggested that the reason that they got rid of the twelve units was because of cost and difficulty of amortizing the capital cost, I always find it passing strange that this attitude persists. And it's kind of like the engineers mental set, I suppose, when you're talking about such things as moments of force or stress or tension or torque, or something of that nature, they see that as real. But when somebody talks about doing a cost benefit analysis in depth, that they take in any social costs, you know, that's philosophy, that's aery-faery stuff. It doesn't come down to dollars.

I haven't done any comparative analysis in depth of the present government's budget, but over the past few years, I have noticed that they are quite willing to increase the costs of hiring policemen, and I think the annual cost two years ago was \$40,000 a year per staff man year for the RCMP. At that time, I think we were paying - it was sliding up from 40 percent. I don't know what it comes down to the province at the moment. They pay \$25,000 a year to keep a man in jail. Now, just as sure, Mr. Chairman, and I wish people who are - lawyers, included, they suffer from the mental, you know, legal mind syndrome - lawyers and engineers would pay some attention to the evidence presented by the social sciences which are just as irrefutable as the laws of gravity - if I drop that it's going to fall, unless the building blows up. Just as sure as you build a dome, with this kind of construction, much bigger than this, it's going to fall down, unless you go to a type of trihedron construction. People have tried for years to build domes bigger than this and they fell down. I'm sure the Minister knows what I am talking about. Until Buckminster came up with trihedron construction. If he doesn't, it's regrettable if he doesn't know what I am talking about, because you have to take other things into analysis.

I speak representing people that the Member for Inkster was talking about - let them eat cake. And if it wasn't for the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Sargent Park Swimming Pool would never have been built because of the type of attitude which is epitomized by the present Minister that we are examining his Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, the whole attitude, this is somewhat related, in that they give block funding to the City of Winnipeg, which is controlled by the suburbanites, and year after year we make grants to the City of Winnipeg with no strings attached to it and if I wasn't supported in Cabinet by my colleague from Lac du Bonnet, that Sargent Park complex would never have been built, I'm sure.

But you have to take into consideration other things than just straight capital amortization when it comes to this kind of thing. We have to be in a position to look at these factors which are screaming for attention. I don't know how many times a person has dropped, let go of a package of cigarettes or anything else, or dropped an apple on his head - I think it was Newton got an apple on his head once and he come up with laws of gravity and people believe it and accept it, it's a reality, it is. But it's just as irrefutable . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM; The honourable member has been referring to police costs and to evidence and to the Sargent Park Pool and to block funding and to domes and now he is onto the laws of gravity. Could you advise me which item we are on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister, I was able to follow the discussion. I felt that the honourable member was leading up to a point and I was allowing the honourable member to continue.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that very much. It is regrettable that this Minister can't see causal relationships outside of those that he has in his own head. I will make my argument, sir, any way I so choose and if it goes over your head, that's regrettable. When the Member for Inkster referred to the Progressive Conservative, Duff Roblin, it is regrettable that I have had to sit in my seat on this side of the House and listen to the regressive conservatives for the past two years who can't see what is going on in the world. They can't see what is going on in my constituency and with the relationship between this item in your budget, sir, is into some of the direct problems in my constituency and I doubt very much if you are even interested.

Mr. Chairman, we speak in this House in the hope that people will change, but the Minister has shown his inability to even comprehend so that he will change, then we have to keep striving to see that he doesn't sit on that side of the House again when the next election comes up. That is the only alternative. It is regrettable because 10 years I have hoped, I still hope that in a debate that takes place in this House, that the government can see reason for changing some of their attitudes, and in this one particular case, I had hoped the Minister would listen to the argument of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, listen to the argument of the Member for Inkster and perhaps I could even underline a couple of points from my perspective for the constituency that I represent.

Mr. Chairman, from the attitude of the Minister, I'm wasting my time and the time of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat disappointed that the Minister has not seen fit to respond, at least to some degree, to some of the lengthy remarks made by my colleague the Member for Inkster. I simply want to take a moment to point out to him that during the years of New Democratic Party Government, that there was a great interest on the part of members of the government and members of the Cabinet in the idea of making facilities, albeit low-cost facilities, available to as many Manitobans as one could deem practical to make available at a given point in time. I recall many discussions, Mr. Chairman, involving the whole Cabinet, involving the enthusiasm of the Premier, the former Premier, in the idea of trying to restore a fair degree of opportunity for a lot of the urban people who had sort of lost something in the denuding of our countryside in and around urban centres over the years; and that maybe it was time we started to look at reversing that and trying to bring back some of those amenities that might be enjoyed by people living in Winnipeg or Brandon or, well, I think Thompson is well looked after. They've got it all around them. But certainly places like Winnipeg and Portage and Brandon, there is a need, but certainly more of a need in Winnipeg than anywhere else.

I believe that the Roblin government recognized that, Mr. Chairman, because they did undertake a major development not too far away from Winnipeg up at Bird's Hill. I think that was a very good and wise decision. It meant a lot for a lot of people who couldn't afford expensive cottages, very sophisticated environments built out in the Whiteshell or in Bannock Point or whatever.

But, Mr. Chairman, the job has to carry on. The demand factors continue. People in the urban environment do have a desire and they don't always have the means and therefore it would seem logical to me that the Minister would be able to say, well, we have taken an aerial survey or we have looked at our aerial maps and we have spotted 10 acres of bush over here and a little waterway over there and we're going to do something with those resources to make them accessible to the populace of the City of Winnipeg. They might be modest ventures but at least that would demonstrate some effort and some desire on the part of the government to sort of try to restore the environment, to make the opportunity available for many more people to participate in outdoor activity during the summer months.

So far we have heard nothing, Mr. Chairman. There is a totally blank position on the part of the Minister. You know, he looks across the way with a blank stare in his eyes and I don't know why, Mr. Chairman, other than that he doesn't have a policy. It seems to me that this is developing into a Parks Department that doesn't know where it is going, other than to maintain what is already there, and I think that's regrettable.

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: It is evident, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet talks a better line than his government produced because for all the talk that we have heard, for all the concern that we have heard expressed, they constructed 50-some cabins in their eight years of administration.

To respond to a couple of specific points that the Member for Inkster raised, I gather that he had some understanding that perhaps there was a tax or rental to be based on the value of a cottage and such certainly is not the case with this government. We have based and are basing the leases for lots within parks, the leases that are now developed are based on a percentage of the raw land value. But if someone wants to build an elaborate cottage on it or something that meets the minimum standards, the land rental remains the same. I think it should be pointed out though that the system that was put into effect some years ago, with low rental fees, has in fact led to the type of thing that the honourable member says he would like to avoid. And it is in fact very similar to what might happen with a right that is transferrable because in fact what is happening, rental fees are being paid at maybe \$115, \$125 a year and when an individual sells their cottage they, in fact, are selling the right to that \$115 lease. So that the value, the sale price that those individuals are recognizing is in some cases, I'm sure, \$15,000 to \$20,000 more than the buildings on the site are worth. So that results in the same type of thing that the honourable member was referring to. I think it is more appropriate that the public be getting a reasonable return on the land value and therefore that type of return would not accrue to the individual who happened to hold that lease with a fairly low fee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order or a question?

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the Minister would let me just pose a question to him on that point because I don't deny that what he says is true. The problem that I posed to him is that if he increases the ground rent he will drive out people who could only own a cottage with a small ground rent. And I pose to him that the way out of his dilemma is to have many many more ground cottage lots available so somebody will not pay for a cottage in order to get a low ground rent. He would be able to go and build his own cottage and therefore not pay an enhanced value to somebody who is getting money solely for the lot. It's the lot that is being paid for and if more are available, then instead of going to an existing cottage holder, the person seeking a cottage will go to where he is going to get the low ground rent.

That's the dilemma that I posed to him, that if you raise the rent you will drive out the modest owner.

MR. RANSOM: I'm not sure whether that was a question to me, Mr. Chairman, or an observation. That's a theory, of course, that if you do have the lots available, then you're not going to have so much demand. But the problem in much of our province is that it's really difficult to make additional lots available in the areas where people want them. It's not good enough just to have lots available; of course they have to be available where people want them and I expect that in the more desirable locations that people will continue to pay the types of prices that we've seen in the past few years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass.  
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I was checking the Minister at the end of his remarks anyway, so I didn't interrupt him because I didn't intend that he was going to sit down.

What he has just said, Mr. Chairman, he says it's a theory. It's not a theory. If a person wants a lot and he has to pay three times the value to somebody who was on the only lot available, then the chances are if another lot is made available he will buy the lot rather than he bought the cottage. That's what Mr. Roblin did.

How do you think the cottages got built on the Big Whiteshell Lake and on Falcon? Because lots were made available and people, instead of buying cottages

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

at Betula and Red Rock and Brereton, opened up new cottage lots. And the Big Whiteshell was not a good location. You could say exactly the same thing: That it was not the most desirable location. It's now the most desirable location. The location that is not desirable then becomes desirable because it is a developed location. And what I am suggesting is not theory, it happened. It happened under a Progressive-Conservative administration.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps the honourable member would permit a question then.

Does he believe that there should be more cottage lots than developed in the Whiteshell now?

MR. INKSTER: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman, but don't get carried away. I'm not talking about on a particular lake, I conclude in the Whiteshell.

I don't see the benefit of - and my honourable friends talked about making every . . . that the socialists believed in levelling everything down to mediocrity. I don't see the benefit of destroying a recreational experience on the basis that more are going to get it. So I believe in planning. I believe that a lake is desirable on the basis of a certain number of users and I would not just saturate existing places. When the Big Whiteshell was developed it was a completely non-inhabited lake. There are other lakes in that area. You can get there by land and you can develop in that area new cottage sites, just as you did on the Big Whiteshell and on the other ones; we shouldn't stick only to the Big Whiteshell because I happen to have a cottage there. The same thing is true at Falcon; the same thing is true of West Hawk; the same thing is true of Brereton; the same thing is true of all of those lakes.

The kind of thing that happened in the past, I think should be accelerated in the future. I think it's one of the best features of Manitoba that a modest incomer, Mr. Chairman, if you will go there you will see that I am correct that many people of modest income, because the ground rent was low, went and built; with their own hands, they built their little summer home. And they will be driven out in favour of wealthier owners if the ground rent goes up. So instead of having the ground rent go up . . . And I'm not saying it should stay the same, and I'm glad that the Minister tells me that there is no notion because I'll tell you when I was in government there was a notion, so I'm glad somebody has dispelled it, to charge rent based on a percentage of the value of the cottage, like an assessment. There was a notion but I'm glad it no longer exists. Maybe the Progressive Conservatives got rid of that notion out of the bureaucrats. So, good, congratulations. But I am suggesting that there be more and more areas opened up; that that should be a long-range program, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister be prepared to indicate to us just what the development is for the extension of the Whiteshell area north? Is there any development planned by the department this year? Or is this not the area in which we debate that aspect of it?

MR. RANSOM: Is the honourable member referring to cottage lots?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what kind of development project is planned for that area. There is a whole host of opportunity on a number of lakes to develop lots, to develop cottages, to do a number of things. And my question is, what is the department planning to do in order to provide more facilities for more Manitobans, in particular Manitobans from Winnipeg? And the reason I raise that is because it is within driving distance, a short driving distance, and there's an opportunity there to do quite a bit of developmental work yet.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps the honourable member wasn't here when we were into the discussion of planning and the development of the master plans, and so forth, earlier. And that is the type of question that will be addressed and is being addressed in the preparation of that plan at this point. There won't be any, what

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

I would call, major developments, major expansions take place prior to that. I think you'll see that the capital program that I hope to make available tomorrow will show you the kinds of upgrading that's going on rather than expansions into new areas.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister has mentioned it earlier; is there a date by which time he expects this plan to be ready and available for consideration or has he given that information to the House?

MR. RANSOM: I have indicated to my staff and publicly that we want to complete that before the end of 1980, which means that we have to have the draft available in early summer in order for the public to have something to react to and comment on.

MR. USKIW: Does that particular plan envisage a new policy with respect to population density per lake or per square mile or of lake and shoreline or what is the criteria? Or is that one of the criteria of that particular study, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RANSOM: I can't really anticipate what kind of proposals will come forward from the people developing the plan. I earlier outlined some policy guidelines that we, as a government, have set down, within which the development of the master plan should take place. And there will be certain end uses that will be accommodated within the development of the plan for any given park and it's up to the planners, who have expertise in those areas, to tell us what they see as the best way to achieve the ends that we identify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass; (b)--pass. (c) Program Management (1) Salaries--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe you have allowed a considerable amount of latitude in the discussion of these items in that really the only two items that we haven't been dealing with are the A.R.C. Secretariat and the grant to the International Peace Garden. I believe that there was some feeling that we might be able to finish the Parks section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll carry on then.  
The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: On this item, perhaps, although we have discussed many of the issues that would ordinarily fall under Program Management within other sections, the Minister could at least briefly describe the staff that are in this section and what their function is within the department.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are eight staff in this area and they are responsible for developing the park programs that we want to have delivered and in monitoring to see that the programs are delivered to their standards, to their satisfaction by the regional services people. In addition of course they would deal with responding to the many complaints and enquiries and such that we get from the public. But basically they develop the programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (c)--pass. (d) Park Maintenance (1) Salaries--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: There are 448.06 staff man years in this area, Mr. Chairman, 448.06. These are the casual employees that are used in the maintenance programs and this is where there's a significant amount of money is budgeted in this area as well. So we make money and we make staff man years available to have those maintenance programs carried out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.



Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions here that are related directly to this section. At least I believe they're related to this section. One is the people associated with this section, I believe, would be the part of the group that work on the beaches and the parks and I would ask the Minister specifically if he has any intentions to reduce the beach patrols, as was suggested by his former colleague or his colleague who was the former Minister.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman, we have the same number of staff man years available in the Estimates before us as we had in 1979-80. Now within that complement the managers may use them according to the areas that they regard that requires the effort and there may be some shifting. But that service will be maintained.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a specific concern that has been raised with the Opposition and it relates to the numbers of people that are available on a regular scheduled basis to patrol the beach areas, particularly the ones that are heavily used in the summer by children and I would ask the Minister if he could confirm, definitely, that there will be no reduction in the beach patrols in his department.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: The next issue I have in this section which relates directly to park maintenance is based on reports that the Opposition has been receiving from people that indicate that the funding for park maintenance is inadequate to cover the essential costs of park maintenance, and one area that apparently is becoming quite serious is that of equipment repairs within the department.

I'm informed by one or more sources that the funding is not adequate for the park staff to be able to do the necessary equipment repairs, that in fact the department has been starving this section of the department over the last several years. It's getting to the point now where there's, I'm told, a real crunch on in terms of equipment not being replaced and/or repaired and it could cause serious deterioration in the maintenance of our park system. I would ask the Minister if he could respond to that.

MR. RANSOM: Well, without some specific situation to respond to, it's difficult. I believe that last year in our Regional Services that we budgeted for quite a substantial increase for equipment repair and replacement, which was regarded as a necessary catch-up, and that was built into the base then for this year and that we have some further expansion for replacement this year, as well. So, there may well be situations where the individuals managers involved feel that they can use more money and have better equipment in place. But I believe that the level of maintenance that's carried out is the important thing, and I believe that we have a satisfactory level of maintenance.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could break out the \$1.8 million, 1.821, in Other Expenditures, and how they are broken up into the various categories and what these expenditures are going for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I pass (1) Salaries, before we get to Item (2)? (1) Salaries --pass; (2).  
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I don't have those details with me, but I'd be happy to get them and provide them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass; (d)--pass; (e) ARC Secretariat (1), (1) Salaries--pass.  
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: This, as the members will be aware is the agreement for recreation and conservation which was signed in October, I believe, of 1978. We have last summer appointed a secretary to the management board and our government

Tuesday, 25 March, 1980

has appointed our three people to the citizens' advisory group. They are Professor Morton from the University; and Rolly Painchaud from St. Boniface; and Tom Denton from Selkirk. A consultant was engaged last fall to develop the master, the draft master plan. I believe that report is supposed to be completed about the end of this month and should be available within a few days, and it's my understanding that the public participation, public input, should be getting under way in the next month or two. I think that is just a brief update on where that program stands right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (e)--pass. (f) Grant to the International Peace Gardens--pass.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, this is an operating grant, an annual operating grant, made to the Peace Gardens, Mr. Chairman, obviously at the same level as it was last year.

MR. BOSTROM: Just for interest, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what percentage of the total cost of operating the International Peace Gardens is reflected by this grant which the Province of Manitoba makes?

MR. RANSOM: I don't have that information with me but, again, I think I can get that quite readily and provide it. There, also, is another item that you'll see in capital program that deals with the waterworks for the Peace Gardens as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)--pass. 5.--pass. Resolution 104--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,633,900 for Natural Resources, Parks, \$8,633,900--pass.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)