

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 12 February, 1981

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

**SUPPLY — FITNESS, RECREATION
AND SPORT**

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We are here to consider the Estimates of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a brief opening statement.

It is my pleasure to present the Estimates of my department following the second year of operations as the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport. We believe it has been a rewarding year with a number of achievements and I am happy to present the Estimates here tonight.

As stated on numerous occasions, the provisions of recreation opportunities depend largely on the interests and efforts of municipalities, community organizations, and the provincial sports and recreation agencies. I am pleased to report that we enjoyed a strong working relationship with the municipalities and the community and provincial groups, with the mutual goal of encouraging Manitobans to be active in their recreation. We have seen benefits to people engaged in informal activities like cross-country skiing, boating and jogging, the more intensive sport competitions, the social activities, and the senior citizen clubs and programs for the disabled.

Major programs conducted by our Recreation and Fitness section have been the awarding of the Sports Facilities '80 Program, which saw something like 343 grants totalling in excess of \$2 million, which were used for the renovation and upgrading of facilities in areas throughout the province. The program, as I announced the other day, will be along very much the same lines with the exception that the funds will now be able to be used for recreation facilities other than the arenas and curling rinks; they will be able to be used for community centres and community halls.

Another program which I wish to bring to your attention is the District Recreation Grant which allows municipalities to combine their efforts and enlist the support of school divisions to hire a full-time recreation director. In 1981-82, we plan to bring the total number of districts to 27, encompassing 49 rural municipalities, 25 towns, 24 villages, 26 school divisions, and two local government districts.

Special projects managed by the Recreation Section this past year were the Frontier Games, the Bird's Hill Day Camp, Northern Water Safety, the Manitoba Marathon, Senior Olympics, Equipment Grants to Remote Communities, the Energy Assistance Program, the Corporate Challenge.

Fitness programs included instructor training, fitness studies and workshops, and a Fit for Fun Program to encourage people to participate. The Sports Injury Centre again offered treatment to

registered athletes and the summer program which we hope to offer this year in co-operation with the Department of Labour and Manpower, we anticipate that some 75 students will assist in projects throughout the province and will receive valuable experience in leadership training.

The department has continued its funding to the sports associations to assist in program development, coach training, competitions and special projects. In addition, the department has assigned funds to all regions for their recreation and sports programs. ManPlan and Athlete Aid Program for our most talented athletes, coaches and officials, allocated about \$100,000 this year to 180 individuals from 38 sports. This program will continue again in 1981.

The Order of Sports Excellence was established in 1980 to pay tribute to the athletes winning provincial, national and international events. A special medal was pressed and eight gold international medals, 127 silver national medals and 866 bronze provincial medals have been presented this year. Young athletes in 18 sports are presently preparing for the '81 Canada Summer Games which will be held in Thunder Bay in August. Funds have been assigned to the sports associations to assist them in the selection and training of these athletes.

My department has also been pleased with the co-operation of the Manitoba Medical Association, the Physiotherapy Association, the Manitoba Chiropractics Association, the Athletes Training Association and the Faculty of Medicine, the MSF and the High School Athletic Association, for the work and assistance they have provided in the establishment of the Sports Medicine Council. We hope to work with them with regards to receiving advice from this particular body on matters of training methods, safety and other matters related to sports medicine.

In closing, I wanted to pay particular tribute to the many agencies, the many volunteers in the Province of Manitoba that really make amateur sport work. I believe it's not a government department or anybody in government that can really make these things happen. It's the thousands and thousands of volunteers and people who donate of their time and energy and resources to make the amateur sport field a field of recreation and fitness work in the province. So to them I would say a heartfelt thank you and I would also at this time like to recognize the contribution that my staff have made with regards to the development and energies and talents they have displayed and exerted throughout the year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for his remarks. I must say, and I think the main thing is that we've got to decide how we're going to deal with this and it's always been very difficult in this department. It's always very interesting, but difficult because of the varied and different groups that are charged with

looking after fitness, recreation and sports in this province, and the Minister has certainly accepted that, because he paid respect to the medical profession, the Sports Federation, the Sports Medicine and so on and the volunteers, and his last words were that the government alone wouldn't go very far, that it is all the volunteers and all the people that are involved in this that makes this go. Now I don't know if he can do that.

I think there is only one way to save time, and I say save time because we could look at this department and it shouldn't take too long. There is no reason to prolong this, like maybe some other departments. But I think there's only one way. We would have to have at least an idea of the overall picture before we start dealing with any specifics. What I mean by that, I would like to have the total dollars that are spent on sports, fitness and recreation and also the different groups. Now what I mean by that, I would like to know first of all, we are looking at the estimates. But if we just look at the department estimates without discussing anything else, we won't have an idea of the complete picture. There will be something left behind and somebody else will be looking after that, so I was hoping, and unfortunately it was decided just a day or so ago that the Minister would go, in fact I think he was supposed to be in the House and I wanted to discuss this with him, but what I would like to see right now is, I have in front of me the estimates, I would like to know what the revenue is from the Manitoba Lottery Commission. Of course, we are going to deal with the lottery, but that could be done in general or the lottery itself the running of the lottery somewhere else, but now I'm talking about just the revenue and then the breakup of this revenue, what went to culture, what went to where, and then the breakups, so therefore the total amount that will be spent by the government because I don't think that's shown in here at all.

There are some programs, the Minister even referred to one of the programs about the capital program which is on lotteries, so I would like to know how much money comes from the lottery; I would like to know if there are any trust funds left or if that money is gone; I would like to know what happens to the revenue of the Boxing and Wrestling Commission, and, if that hasn't been touched? If the Minister did the same as I did when I was there, there must be quite a few bucks there because we were planning and this and I imagine the Minister's planning also, but there might be a certain amount.

Then I would like to know the revenue, the share that goes through sports of the lottery, the Western Canada-Manitoba distributor and the one-fourth share that goes to the Sports Federation. Now, if I add that we'd have an idea of the total picture, the amount spent, and then the Minister could then in some remarks then say, well this is what the government is trying to do, through our Estimates this is the responsibility that we take.

Now through lottery revenue, through the share that goes to the government we know that this goes up and down, so we're not tying ourselves up on things that had to be done. It might be the frills or the excess and so on, we would use the money for that and then the Minister could tell us that the Sports Federation, when it accepted to be a partner

to distribute the lottery, and therefore benefit from that, accepted these responsibilities. Now if that could be done I think that we could proceed very fast, but if the Minister would insist that we start dealing with that, it would have to be very very flexible, we'd have to come back and so on because there is no way that we could get the true picture with that.

For the future maybe we should have a statement like this with maybe . . . the Minister gave me a stack of paper and there are only two of us here and I don't know when I'll be able to read that and still ask questions. While I'm reading that it will be all finished by then before I can ask the questions. I'm not faulting the Minister, I'm just trying to find a way where we can agree and try to do this in the best possible way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that if the Committee would allow me to pass from 1(a) to 1(b) it would still covers the whole waterfront, because the rules do state that the Minister gives his statement and we've always allowed one critic and then go on. So, 1(b) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Okay, well maybe we can start off, I haven't got an all-encompassing sheet exactly, but we'll go down.

First of all, starting with the Boxing and Wrestling Commission and the member will remember that last year we made a change in the Act of the Boxing and Wrestling Commission. It used to be that the funds were held in trust by the Minister of Finance for the Boxing and Wrestling Commission and really there was never very much done with the funds and I think it has built up to the point where it is in excess of \$60,000.00.

Last year in the Legislature, and I believe it was a Statute Law Amendment Bill, we said that those funds could be spent by the Boxing and Wrestling subject to ministerial approval on the development of amateur boxing and amateur wrestling on that sport. (Interjection)— That's right. Plus it also allows them to get the interest on the money that was being held by Finance, which was not — (Interjection)— That's right. And that was a bone of contention because with today's interest rates it amounted to \$60,000, you're looking at maybe \$9,000 interest. With regard to that, there has been I believe, and I'm talking from memory, I haven't seen the final statement now . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Would it be easier to get it over with if I have a few comments on what the Minister said about boxing and wrestling. All right, this is just suggestion now. I know this was suggested to us when I was the Minister responsible and I was waiting for more than that. These are professional sports, and I felt that instead of spending that money just for the development of those two sports — it is related, it is the same sport but that's all — that is money that should accrue to the Commission or the government, as long as we make sure they throw it back into amateur sport, and I would hope that some time in the future when this comes up again, I don't know if this is something that's going to last forever, I would like to see that money earmarked for the development of sports, but not necessarily just those two sports. You know these sports are getting it from the general revenue; they are getting money from the

general revenue, some of it comes from amusement tax at hockey games. You don't say that just the tax at a hockey game will go to develop hockey and so on. So it's just the thought that I would like to mention at this time.

MR. BANMAN: We could deal then next with the amount of lotteries funds which we are projecting spending, and the member will be aware that it varies because most of the stuff is done later on by Order-in-Council as you move through it, would be about \$1.5 million roughly.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that the total or is that the share for your department

MR. BANMAN: That would be the total that would be spent on, oh things like grants to sports associations —(Interjection)— This is what we will be spending in the department.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could the Minister just round figure to me, can the Minister seeing that he's responsible for the Manitoba Lottery Commission, also give us an idea of the share this year, the projected share for what they have on hand of the total thing, and how much will go to Cultural, you know just round it off and give me an idea? What is the portion, the percentage that is kept by the Minister?

MR. BANMAN: We are anticipating for this year, for the year ending March 31st this year, of having revenues from lottery sales of \$3.6 million. That is split up, two-thirds to my department and one-third to the Cultural Affairs, so that would mean that my department in this particular instance would get \$2.4 million and Cultural would get \$1.2 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is there a further split now between Fitness, Recreation and so on now as accepted in the department, or are those just programs that are passed in Cabinet and that you decide? Could it be spent all for fitness, or all on capital projects. I say that because originally there was a split between a certain amount for fitness, a certain amount for recreation, I think.

MR. BANMAN: No, I think the Department of Cultural Affairs still earmarks some for historical resources and that, but the department here — (Interjection)— the figure is roughly about 37 for sport and the rest would be for fitness.

MR. DESJARDINS: There is no policy, just programs as needed.

MR. BANMAN: The policy, I guess, with regard to the split between the two departments, between Cultural and that, was established a number of years ago and the government has just carried on with that split, but we don't earmark X-number of dollars for Fitness, Recreation or Sports.

MR. DESJARDINS: When we did decide on the split between culture and recreation, and fitness and amateur sports in those days, there was a further split because community recreation wasn't with fitness and amateur sports so they got part of that and then the fitness and amateur sports, so much for fitness, but I got the answer.

MR. BANMAN: The member would probably appreciate since — and I think something like that was going on before the two departments were brought together. In other words, the fitness and amateur sport was with the Department of Health, the other part, and I think that necessitated, because it was two different Departments might have necessitated a split.

MR. DESJARDINS: We didn't decide by first of all which department wants the money, we decided where we want to spend the money. Some of it was in the Arts some of it was Culture, but anyway you have a mandate, we don't have to do it forever the same way.

I've got my answer, Mr Chairman. I have no criticism of that.

MR. BANMAN: Further the Manitoba Sports Federation which became a partner of WL&D two years ago is a quarter partner in that particular operation. Last year I believe the funds received were in the neighborhood of \$720,000.00. They have assumed the operation of the Sports Admin Centre and several other programs that the department was involved with before. The salary grants . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That's for the Administration Centre.

MR. BANMAN: That's right. The salary grants, they've picked up the cost of leasing the building. They also picked up the cost of postage and things like that.

MR. DESJARDINS: In other words, all the sports . . . but no other programs. That's the only one that they accepted, they took away from the department plus any other programs that they might have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just wonder if I could bring it to the Committee's attention, the gentleman behind is having trouble identifying who's who, so give the Chair enough time to recognize the member and also the Minister. We got into this problem the other day, one word answers back and forth. Unless there is some voice detective downstairs, how are they ever really going to know, so just give the Chair time enough to recognize and make it clear to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(b)(1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, that's the information that I was seeking. Now before we leave that then we can go with the department. Can we talk about the money spent by the Sports Federation? The Administration Centre, what is the latest on that, is there a budget, does the Minister have a budget for the Sports Federation? The Minister has to approve that program, not necessarily decide or dictate but approve so there is no duplication to my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: At the time when we signed the original agreement with the Manitoba Sports Federation it was agreed that the Minister would okay and have the authority to look at the program

before they went ahead with it. We are in the process right now, and also there was a two-year renewal clause; sort of a two-year review if you want to call it, we are in the process now of going through that to see what they have in mind, what has happened to their cost as the member will appreciate there are several more sports governing bodies that have moved in there in the last little while, which means that there has been some additional space. They have also moved out of what was the Ellice Avenue property, and moved into new facilities which have cost them an additional amount of money; I believe the rent in that new place is about, what is it \$146,000 a year - in the neighbourhood of \$140,000 a year, for something like about 15,000 square feet of space.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us an idea of the total amount spent on the Sports Administration Centre, that is total, for salary, for stamps, for rental and so on, out of that 700?

MR. BANMAN: About \$700,000.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you telling me, I want to make sure now, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that out of approximately \$720,000, which is the amount of money that the Sports Federation had to spend, that \$700,000 was spent on the Administration Centre, that left them \$20,000 for their administration, for paying their staff, and for any other programs that they had?

MR. BANMAN: Then I guess without sort of having the exact details before me here right now, but what happened when the agreement was signed, they took over the responsibility for all the people that were on contract or whatever, working at the Sports Admin Centre. In other words, they are paying those people now. Before, the department was paying them.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have no problem with that, I understand that.

MR. BANMAN: From the rough figures I have here, their operating costs, the salaries for the sports administrators, for the different sports governing bodies and related things — there is something like 35 people involved on part-time or full-time — is something like \$400,000 and the balance of \$300,000 is for rental, supplies, security and all the other things. When we signed the agreement with them, we did not leave them very much room for general administration. In other words, they took almost the whole amount that they were receiving from the lotteries in programming we were doing at present.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I am well aware, I know what the Administration Centre is all about. I am not questioning that, and I know that when they became partners, they accepted the responsibility to run that Administration Centre. The question, and I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding, the Minister told us that the revenue, the money, and I don't think the Sports Federation has any other revenue than that, or very little, if any, and I stand to be corrected, but they received approximately \$720,000, their share of one-fourth partnership, and

the Minister claims in round figures that the whole thing — the Administration Centre - all the cost of running the Administration Centre, salaries and so on is approximately \$700,000.00. That means there would be \$20,000 to run the administration of the Sports Federation, their salary, whatever they have, plus any other programs they have, and that to me doesn't seem right.

MR. BANMAN: If I left that impression, that is wrong. That includes the MSF Executive Director and some of the things they do. That's within that figure. Because it's all in one complex, and I guess they've got some space in that particular complex like a lot of the client organizations do, so it's part of the whole operation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I can understand that, but my question was really, you see they had a Sports Federation before. They were conducting their own revenue. The government of the time was running the Sports Administration Centre. There was an agreement, and the Sports Federation became replaced by the Sports Advisory Committee, which worked with the government to spend more money, that amount of money on sports, but they took that over, but they also accepted the responsibility of running the Sports Administration Centre. That's exactly what I want to know. I want to know what the Sports Federation is doing besides that Administration Centre? I would even accept that you say, well all right, so much money for the Sports Administration Centre and renting, that includes premises or space for the Sports Administration Centre, but I want to know then what the Manitoba Sports Federation is spending on their own staff, on administration, their own affairs, and also what other programs they have, because I want to see the overall programs in this department, or in fitness and amateur sport, and that was the reason for my question.

MR. BANMAN: Just before the final agreement was signed, the Manitoba Sports Federation was down to I think — one of the breweries was giving them some space, they were down to one secretary and one Executive Director who were being paid, and I think their operational costs at that time were in the neighbourhood of \$4,000 a month. (Interjection)— That was sold. When we were discussing with them, they had a secretary and an Executive Director, and basically they were living from hand to mouth on the thing. —(Interjection)— That's right, that's right. They didn't have a big machine set up. Right now — I could find out exactly — I think they're down to one Executive Director and two secretaries, and I think that's all that they themselves have with the group, and they're working on things like the Hall of Fame and some other things which the department isn't involved in. Basically, I know what the member is asking — is there \$300,000 of programming that they've taken over and are doing? I can assure him that that is not what's happening.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, then I would like to have some comment on that. I'm quite surprised and a bit disappointed. I think it was a hell of a deal for the government to get rid of the Sports Administration Centre, but it's the Sports Federation who were

jumping up and down, so happy when this deal was done. I think they got the short end of the stick. I think that what happened on that was that they took the responsibility from the government, they are running it, it's putting somebody else instead of just the administrator of the Centre, and then Sports Federation itself is doing very little. I thought they would be doing more, because their dream was to run certain programs. They started programs, they were bailed out by your government, and they were bailed out by our government. For instance, the Sports Injury Centre and those kinds of things we had to take over, and then ManPlan and all these things. So now then, actually the Sports Federation is looking after organizing certain receptions or things like this for athletes, recognizing athletes, having a Hall of Fame, and has the responsibility of the Sports Administration Centre.

Has there been a meeting with the Minister and the sports group themselves? Are they pleased with the way things are going now? Do they feel that this is the best thing, the Sports Federation running that, and what are their views on the Sports Administration Centre? I know that it will probably be very difficult to give me a consensus. I think that all in all the larger groups would sooner have the money because they can stand on their own two feet, and the smaller groups would be in favour of the Administration Centre. I would imagine that this is still the case. But in a few words, could the Minister give us a progressive report on how the Administration Centre is working and are the sports groups themselves fairly satisfied?

MR. BANMAN: I would have to say that I have had, in consultation with the smaller sporting groups and the larger ones, a fairly good report with how the whole system is functioning. The member will appreciate that when he was Minister, things don't change that much. Everybody always wants a little more money to operate, but given the constraints that we have all been working under as well as they are working under, I think that we have pretty good rapport, and I think they're getting a pretty good deal out there. The member will appreciate that I am of the belief that if we're going to provide too many funds for any of the projects, what's going to happen is that we are going to lose some of our volunteer people who are involved in it, and I think that there have to be certain constraints that way. But the system so far, in the last year and a half, has worked out fairly well. I'm not saying that there might not be some pitfalls along the way, but so far I haven't had any formal complaints or written complaints from anybody that is housed in the Administration Centre at present.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, that was a concern of the people of the Centre working itself, but I'm talking about the sports organizations themselves, the sports bodies, do they feel that this is a priority? Are they in favour of keeping the Administration Centre the way it is? Are they satisfied that there is not too much money spent on that, or do they feel that there should be different programs; for instance, more money directly to help pay for either equipment or rental of a rink, or travel, or that kind of thing? The Minister said they always want more. I know that's a fact, and I'm not suggesting

necessarily at this time that more money should be spent. You can't satisfy everybody, but in general do they feel that the people are satisfied, that the money available is being spent wisely - are they satisfied?

MR. BANMAN: I would say yes. One of the changes that has been made, and I guess it's in the evolution of the whole Sports Admin Centre and the whole field of amateur sport, one of the things that they had been traditionally complaining about and complained to me for a number of years when I was Minister is the way the grants were handed out. We would earmark so and so much for coach development, so and so much for travel when we would give them a grant. What we have indicated to them is that we are now if you want to call it, block funding, and we are asking them to tell us how they spend their money. What was happening before was that they were using some funds over here, and not using up another allocation over there, and running short and running back and forth between the appropriations that we were giving them. What we do now, is we are giving them a block grant, to, for instance, the Manitoba Ski Association or the Manitoba Yachting Association, and they then determine whether they want to spend it on coaching or other things. That was one of the biggest problems.

With regards to the Admin Centre, I think they've all got used to it, they all use it fairly well. There are some board rooms in there. I think it would be very difficult for anybody to try to turn the clock back and saying, we would rather give you the money and you do with it what you want. The concept has sort of jelled all the sports groups together and I think they'd really miss the Centre if there was something happened. Even the larger groups are now sort of saying it's a pretty good place to be and it's a pretty good deal.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is something that I just learned today about this block funding, and I know what the Minister means by that. This might be the time then to ask the Minister whether the objective of the government and the department, and I imagine there are some strings attached. In other words, I don't imagine that you would look too favourably if the executive of the CAHA took the money for hockey and had a meeting in Hawaii, for instance. I would imagine that certain things have to be done. There is a list of things that they can spend the money on, but you don't tell them how much to spend on that because the needs are different. For some people it might be coaches, other people might be the rentals of ice or swimming pools and so on, and other people might feel that travel is the important thing. Now is the Minister suggesting then, that is pretty well then, most of the programs are left to these groups? In other words, you are working on other things, like we will see when we go through your Estimates, but as far as the amateur sports, you are saying there is so much money here, this will be divided this way, and you take care of everything, or does the department or the Minister accept certain responsibility, for instance, of training athletes for games and so on, there is funds for that is there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: That's right We have our leadership development programs or coach certificate programs and things like that But what was happening before is that . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You're talking about for travelling and such . . .

MR. BANMAN: That's right and we would earmark X number of dollars for this and X number of dollars for that and based on the size of the organization that would vary. They felt that certain times their priorities might be a little different from one year to another and we would go through a fairly lengthy process trying to straighten it all out so we have indicated to them now that given certain parameters, you know, we don't want to get into hosting all kinds of receptions for people and have the Executives fly to Hawaii but given certain parameters they now decide whether they want to maybe send a coach out to Dauphin to teach gymnastics for a week to start up a new club there or something like that. That is left up to their discretion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, will these grants, will I find that anywhere in the estimates or is the money coming from somewhere else? What is the total amount for that? —(Interjection)— Well, first of all, is it the Estimates we are approving tonight or is it money from the lottery, where do you get the money for the grants?

MR. BANMAN: The funds to the sports governing bodies comes from the fiscal budget, from our budget.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is this in the package I have?

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: The amount then is under Sports Development, there is the \$291,000.00. That's the money that is going directly to the sports bodies?

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: For a certain number of things to go within . . .

MR. BANMAN: That is 63 sports governing bodies.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I heard the member of his staff say both when I asked where that money comes from and I found this \$291,000 now is their money. Is it for the same thing? Is it just to make up a larger amount that comes from the Lottery, and what is that amount?

MR. BANMAN: There are specific projects like ManPlan, which flows through the organizations and then there are, for instance, there is another grant to provincial sports associations for travel to assist in championships, that's \$90,000.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's not part of the lottery funding?

MR. BANMAN: No.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is strictly to help travel Is that world class athletes or is that between provinces or within the province?

MR. BANMAN: It could be interprovincial or it could be international but most of it would be spent on interprovincial travel assistance.

MR. DESJARDINS: What are the guidelines for that? You must have something because I'm positive that the Minister would have the same request practically daily, because there is a pee wee hockey team or midget hockey team or a figure skating team that wants to travel somewhere and it'll be a real good thing for the town or the city and the province; those kinds of requests. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the rules are, I think we can make our own rules. I have no objections at all in the case in here. We're doing it in a friendly manner, in a way to get the information. If the Minister would want somebody to answer, I think that's permissible, if we agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was questioned yesterday in the rules, so . . .
The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: What I was asking for is sort of a guideline here. What is happening is that when a team goes to represent the province in a national event, the sports governing body will submit to us a budget, if you want to call it, of what it's going to cost.

MR. DESJARDINS: A national event.

MR. BANMAN: A national championship.

MR. DESJARDINS: For instance, the figure skating championship in Halifax.

MR. BANMAN: Yes. With the one caveat if they don't get full federal funding from the Federal Government. Then we look at it.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's national, I can understand that, representing Manitoba. What if it's international representing Canada? Do you expect the Federal Government to pick that up?

MR. BANMAN: I think it's been the understanding from the provinces for many years and we're trying to get that hammered out with the present Minister and I just returned from a meeting not too long ago, where he wrote, we will be issuing a statement saying what responsibility rests with who, but I think it's been the traditional viewpoint of the provinces that the training of the national calibre athlete, the elite athlete on the national level, as well as the costs that are associated with the travel is the responsibility of the Federal Government. And that was agreed by all the provinces and there is a statement out with regards to that being worked out right now.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is a new policy then. This has been accepted in principle? It's not announced yet, so therefore, if you have one of the gymnasts, they won't need to worry that they can't go because they can't find the money, you'll have to scrounge the money. This will be the policy, ironed out between, decided between the provinces and the Federal Government and they will accept that responsibility.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, that's the understanding we have right now and they do I might add, if there is an

international calibre athlete that is doing travelling, they do look after, if they are representing Canada, the Federal Government does look after it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Now what about just a friendly team of hockey team or something and I'm sure that you get these requests. What is the policy for that? Do you refer them back to their sports-governing body and say that's up to them, if they have any money, we can't start paying for every team, right? There's no exception, you don't help them in any way?

MR. BANMAN: That's the policy I think that's been carried on for many years now. There's just too many championships whether they be in the field of baton twirling or Pee Wee Hockey, there would be just, the member is quite right and I guess when he was Minister he was bombarded by, especially towards the end of any particular season, whether it be a soccer season or hockey season or whatever, there are many people calling and asking for some form of assistance, travel assistance. There are just too many that we've never got into it and I don't anticipate that we will. There's just no way you could deal with all the requests. There are just too many groups.

MR. DESJARDINS: This might be the time to talk about the games, you still participate in the Canada Games but it seems, and I'm very disappointed in this, that you've done away with the Manitoba Games and the Manitoba Games served many purposes as far as I'm concerned and the committee that look at the situation recommend that these be kept. Now for some reason or other the present government it seems have discontinued that. The value of this was, there was a certain amount of money and what reminded me of that is the travelling. You had people working in their region. You had a lot of people volunteer, those that organized that, the volunteers, the coach, the trainers, and all these people were working. They were encouraged. You brought in different people from different regions and they received a little bit of help. Every region received a little bit of help and then if there was a site chosen as the place for the Manitoba Games, of course the winning teams of all these regions were helped in participating.

What have you done to replace that? It's good to talk about the class athletes, but unless you have changed, and the Minister can tell us that, if you have changed the objective of the department, I think, and whose time was trying to create better fitness, a better life and if at all possible, offer every Manitoban a chance to play — participate in a winter and a summer sport and there was a bit of travelling. What, first of all, was the reason why these games are not going on and what if anything has replaced that? Maybe there is something that is filling the need as well, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: A number of things have happened and I know some of them go back before I was there. The Canada Summer and Winter Games have become a fairly costly item for the provinces, team preparation and other things; that's one thing. The

other thing is that last year it was determined that the provinces would continue with the Western Canada Games which will be continued on a every four-year cycle basis. The next one will be in 1983 in Calgary.

The other thing we have done to try and recognize the ambitions of the Manitoba Games is to encourage regional games and what's happening, this year we will be having regional games throughout Manitoba. We have not gone the one step further and brought that into the Manitoba Games concept, but we are developing the regional sports associations who are developing a regional games set-up and I guess I would have to say that I haven't ruled out the other thing, but it is not in the cards this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: With some funding from the Minister's department?

MR. BANMAN: That's right. The grants to provincial sports associations which will include the Manitoba Games will be \$175,000, projected.

MR. DESJARDINS: I thought that was to help you with the what you are now . . . with the recreational directors and so on, to help — that is not the . . . Mr. Chairman, I wonder, we saw what the Sports Federation was doing. Can we go back to the lottery and then we'll, by elimination, we'll finally reach this and it will be easier.

The Minister, from the lottery, the total revenue, which is two-thirds of the amount was about 2.4. Now out of that your number one program is your capital program — right, that you announced and this is a continuation of last year's program?

MR. BANMAN: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Recreation, that program is somewhat less generous than last year, the one announced last year. Is that because there is less money to go in its . . . ? It's pretty well the same program but less generous . . . working with the money you have.

MR. BANMAN: That's right. We reduced the maximum amount, for instance, on municipalities that have over a 5,000 population. It was brought down from \$25,000 to \$20,000 to reflect the available funds and the lottery revenues.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is there any change in the — what should I call it — the rules? When this program was started we insisted that first of all if there was any . . . the sponsor would make an application but he would have to have it endorsed by the municipality. The reason for that — we're saying well, if you build a white elephant municipality, you accept the responsibility because we're not tying ourselves into any maintenance and so on which could be pretty costly. This is something to help you with what you have or build something else but we are not accepting the maintenance. Is that still going on? Is it pretty well the same principle that we had when we started that program?

MR. BANMAN: That's right. I think everybody is concerned with regards to ongoing costs. It's one of

the reasons that the municipalities are tied in, as well as the accountability aspects of it. We wouldn't want to have groups coming into us and us evaluating. I think the local people, as the member pointed out, probably know best through their elected representatives where the money should go.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is the total cost, the estimated cost of that program for the coming year?

MR. BANMAN: Approximately \$2 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: So there is roughly \$400,000 left from the lottery fund and what are those other programs? You mentioned one with the sports. From that money, the revenue derived from the lottery, your department's share will be approximately \$2.4 million; \$2 million spent on that capital project and then you have another \$400,000, roughly. You have mentioned something of a sports group there, I don't know, the last one, when we were dealing with this 291 for grants.

MR. BANMAN: Provincial Sports Association.

MR. DESJARDINS: How much is that?

MR. BANMAN: That was \$175, but maybe if I could just clarify something here what happens in these programs. For instance, we are still paying out some funds on projects that have now been completed and applications processed from three years ago, in other words, from the old capital facilities grants, because sometimes municipalities will ask for extensions to projects, and what happens is that the funds for instance on the program that was announced this year will not start flowing until about a year from now. We are just now in the process of starting to pay, or paying out grants which were — (Interjection)— That's right, when you announce the program, what happens is that people start sending their applications in. The Department of Labour has to go through them first to make sure that they meet all the fire, safety, so you are looking . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: The Minister indicates \$175,000 being spent on sports and here in his figures at the back he has \$180,000 for clinics, and \$86,000 for hosting. Is that coming from a separate area or is that the same thing?

MR. BANMAN: That's a current appropriation that we're talking about over there and we were talking lotteries over here.

MR. FOX: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know that you approve certain things but you don't pay all the money immediately, some of it is only when it's pretty well finished; when you are satisfied it's finished. But I thought that my question was how much money — what has the estimate been this year, and I thought the answer was \$2 million. Is the Minister saying that you are approving \$2 million but you won't spend \$2 million this year, or are you saying that you are trying to

catch up from what you owe from previous years and what will be spent on the approved project this year will be approximately \$2 million? What I am trying to do and maybe there is nothing really drastic here or no catch, I am trying to find out where that money is spent. We have identified \$2.4 million coming from the revenue of the lottery and I was trying to find out what other programs you had. I thought you had about \$2 million of that for your capital program, \$175,000 for the sports group. Am I right?

MR. BANMAN: Maybe to make it simpler, and I think the question the member would like to know is what is our anticipated uncommitted balance after we have committed \$2 million for this project, and the figure that we are using right now is \$1,552,000 would be uncommitted funds in lotteries right now, at the end of March 31st, considering that we have said that we have put away \$2 million for this other program.

MR. DESJARDINS: You are saying that there is \$1.5 million that is not committed before you start this program. After taking care of that program there is still \$1.5 million. Where are you getting that money to spend \$2 million on that?

MR. BANMAN: What has happened in the previous years is, I guess under the other administration in here too, there are funds committed for different projects. Sometimes the draw down isn't as heavy as is anticipated, but the balance is committed. In other words, if we want to announce a program we estimate roughly on what it's going to cost.

MR. DESJARDINS: You had money from last year?

MR. BANMAN: That's right, and if the draw down isn't as heavy, it's a carry forward, so what I'm saying right now is that we anticipate all things being equal with the lottery sales and the member knows that's a little "iffy". It looks like we will have about \$1.5 million which is not committed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

A MEMBER: You left us a bundle, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know I did, and you froze everything, and then you looked good when you spent it, the same bloody programs, too. Don't get me started we're doing well. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, okay on what do you anticipate spending that \$1.5 million then of that money? If you say it's in here, that's fine.

MR. BANMAN: One of the things that has happened with lotteries and I think the member, when he was setting up WL&D, the 3 partners at that time. One of the rationales for not paying out funds to those groups for the first six months, in other words, there was always a six-month lag time, was the fact that we never knew exactly how much money we were going to get in. In other words, the organizations from WL&D, which run the distributorship always have six-month reserves sitting with WL&D, so they get the funds six months later. The intention, I believe, and I've never been able to, or never really sat down and talked to anybody

about it, the rationale for that is that it would allow these groups a six month lead time in case the lottery revenues started getting a little soft and they could then adjust their programming accordingly.

What I'm saying to the member here is that there has always been traditionally, I think, since I've been involved in lotteries, a certain amount of uncommitted capital which could then be used should something happen to the revenues that are coming in. So I have not got . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I am not criticizing. The Minister is saying that there is \$1.5 million, but it's not committed at this time, or part of it is not committed at this time. I accept that. In other words, it's an estimate. You're not going to spend it before you get it. So you're saying that it's not all committed. What part then of that \$1.5 million is committed and on what portion? I'm trying to identify the programs. I am not complaining or criticizing.

MR. BANMAN: I gave the member the figure of \$1.5 million that would be spent, anticipated, on different programs from lotteries with regard to the department in the coming year. I mentioned that before. I mentioned the figure \$1.5 million. That would represent . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister says that what we will have left is \$1.5 million once we're finished with the capital program. That's what the Minister said.

MR. BANMAN: That's right but the year end is March 31st, we would expect to have \$1.5 million left. The projected expenditures for the year '81-'82, starting April 1st, on all kinds of lottery funded programs is \$1.5 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: Which you have already.

MR. BANMAN: Which is in the books, so we could, I guess, if we didn't go with the capital facilities program next year, let's say nothing happened and lotteries wouldn't make any money, we could still go ahead with the programming for the coming year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in other words, the Minister is saying that the money on hand now is committed and nothing else. That you have on hand \$1.5 million and you have committed on your capital program \$1.5 million, so the anticipated revenue is not being committed as yet. Any new revenue is started after March 31st?

MR. BANMAN: I say when I have committed for that \$1.5 million, that will go on through the year and we'll be reviewing it and has to be passed by Cabinet by Order-In-Council, like its always been done. But he's absolutely right, we have enough money to do the program for the coming year; whatever comes in the next year will go on a surplus.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if I agree to leave this, providing other people are satisfied, then we could start with the estimates proper and all the other programs I'll find them here. The Minister won't say, well that is from a program from the revenue. That is what I'm trying to identify, where the programs are, and I've been able to determine that

the Sports Federation are running the Sports Administration Centre and running their own administration and maybe the Hall of Fame and things like that, and from the share of the department from the lottery revenue is mostly for capital and there's \$175,000, I think, for grants, for sports and the rest has not being determined yet. As the money comes in the Minister will submit programs or added money to different groups to the Cabinet, but that hasn't been approved yet. Right?

MR. BANMAN: There are programs for instance like the Sports Injury Centre.

MR. DESJARDINS: Who's paying for that?

MR. BANMAN: Which is funded from this \$1.5 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that's what I want to know. I want to know besides your capital program construction, I want to know what other programs you fund through lottery, that's exactly what I'm trying to find out?

MR. BANMAN: Well we'll have that in our Annual R1port. Should I go through a few of them? The Frontier School Division for the Frontier Games gets \$22,000; the grants to remote communities for recreation equipment gets \$35,000, that is under The Northlands Agreement. So it's 60-40, we get some money back on that; we've got the grants to the regional recreational organizations in the province, which is Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, Red Cross Water Safety Programs, a whole bunch of them, that totals \$70,000; grants for the Northern Manitoba Recreation Association for travel and administration \$5,000; I'll pick up some of the bigger ones. The grant to the energy assistance for the Demand Billing Program

MR. DESJARDINS: For the community centres?

MR. BANMAN: That's right. That's \$100,000; Sports Injury Centre \$75,000; Northern Water Safety Program \$11,000; Summer Activities Program \$33,000, that includes the 75 students that I was talking about, the STEP students, when they were involved in different projects; Birds Hill Day Camp \$18,000; Recreation for the Disabled Program \$20,000; Gimli Training Centre \$15,000; Manitoba Marathon \$12,800; ManPlan, which I mentioned; the travel for Sports Associations — the one we were talking about the Assistance to Championships; the grant to The Manitoba High School Athletic Association \$20,000; Manitoba Games, which we discussed was \$175,000; Coach Certification Program . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that for regional, because there's no more . . .

MR. BANMAN: Yes that's the regional. The Sports Injury — we got that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Sports Injury Centre, let's talk about that one. Is that at the RehFit? How does that work? The people who are getting care there are charged; they are not even covered. Are they covered by Medicare, to start with? I am talking

about the medical, the doctor. Why wouldn't that be covered by Medicare?

MR. BANMAN: The doctor, if he sees a patient there, is covered by medical. If the patient requires physiotherapy treatment and is a carded athlete, he has a card then the province will pick up the cost.

MR. DESJARDINS: If they are referred there, private practice for the doctor, they pay for their own?

MR. BANMAN: They have to pay.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay.

MR. BANMAN: Another program is the Coach Certification Program, which is roughly about \$80,000.00. These are a number of the programs. There are some smaller ones involved in here, but that makes a total of about one and a half.

MR. DESJARDINS: Have you got anything for awards in that at all, or do you have a policy? Maybe in a few words you can tell us what your policy is on awards.

MR. BANMAN: The Sports Award Program, we have \$10,000 in there. We have the Order of Sports Excellence, which we have given, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, a Gold Medal to an international athlete, a silver to a national athlete, and a bronze to a Manitoba champion.

MR. DESJARDINS: In that award, does that cover — I know it's small but it adds up — all these clubs that don't get any help from the government at all but would like to have some pins to exchange? That part of the award program, where does that come from, from the department or what? What if I have a request for that, who do I see?

MR. BANMAN: You would see an official in my department on the sports side of things. We have pins. As the member will appreciate, we get requests from people — I'd like a thousand pins, I'm going here. We have a fairly tight policy. If people want that amount of pins they have got to start paying for them because there is no way that we can start giving away pins that cost us 75 or 76 cents and start giving away a thousand pins.

MR. DESJARDINS: Do you allow so many and then they start paying, or do they start paying from the first pin? What's the score?

MR. BANMAN: The policy that is followed is, for instance, if you have a hockey team going to New Brunswick, usually what happens is, if it is a tournament, they exchange pins on the ice. They would receive some pins so that they could use them there.

MR. DESJARDINS: They would have maybe 25 or something like that?

MR. BANMAN: But they would not receive pins for handing out to spectators and that type of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can I make a suggestion at this time, all I can do is suggest, that if the Minister is sitting in that position, in that spot next year, I wonder, if we are going to have a true picture — and I thank the Minister for his co-operation tonight but it is very difficult, you know, I was handed this today and I have no idea what it is all about — I think that we should have it a week or so before. I think that, especially this department, we should have an idea, for instance, of the revenue that comes in, a couple of pages, maybe what comes in from the Lotteries and what has been earmarked for what program, and the amounts, so we know what the programs are. And maybe another page on the Sports Federation and what their budget is, not every cent but at least the details in administration and so on, and the revenue from the Lotteries before we discuss other business. It is very very difficult to determine and to try to look at that with any kind of intelligence. As I say, I appreciate the Minister's co-operation, but it would be easier.

If you are not sitting there, if I am sitting there, I will do the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) pass; 1.(b)(2) pass; 1.(c)(1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could we have at this time the staff. What is the total of the department? Is it the same; is it more; is it less; what's the score?

MR. BANMAN: We have 60.4 SMYs last year and it is exactly the same this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: You had 44.30 that I have for the department last year.

MR. BANMAN: If you will look at the top one that I gave you, it's very simple if you look right at the bottom there, the total department, it shows the adjusted vote at the end of 1981-82 was \$1.892 million with a total SMY of 60.04; this year it is \$2.173 million with the same total. It shows an increase in spending of \$281,000.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: So it's the same staff in all the different departments, or have you adjusted it?

MR. BANMAN: There could be some adjustments.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will have to check. What I have here is a total of 44.30, I must have forgotten something from last year.

MR. BANMAN: If you have got the 44.30, you would be looking only at the Fitness, Recreation and Sport side and not at the General Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Where are we now, Administrative Services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is all general administration, that's all the Minister's staff and the people working in the department?

MR. BANMAN: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(2) pass; 1.(d)(1) pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I wanted to ask the Minister an opinion here on an issue that is quite relevant and this may be as good a place as any, in terms of his position of girls playing on boys' amateur hockey teams and so on. I wonder if he could enlighten us on his position in this matter.

MR. BANMAN: I have taken the position, Mr. Chairman, that the sports governing bodies who look after their particular sport, they are elected representatives, elected by people involved in that sport at annual meetings. They establish the rules and regulations with regard to their particular sport. If, in the establishment of those rules and regulations, there are any problems dealing with any of the statutes that we have on the books, that then becomes a matter for the Attorney-General's department to look at.

With regard to the human rights issue that is involved in this particular matter, the Human Rights Commission is looking at that, but I have not made any direct representation to them on this matter.

It becomes a matter where, I guess, all of us would hope that common sense was being used. We have many sports which are either played almost solely by women, others that are played almost solely by men. Hopefully, as I mentioned, a certain amount of common sense can prevail and we won't get into the problem that we have right now.

MR. DOERN: I would just ask the Minister whether I am reading that he has a personal position, the common sense position, being that there should be teams for girls and teams for boys and that when you start mixing them then you start having problems. For example, if you allow girls to play on boys' teams then presumably you have to allow boys to play on girls' teams. So then you have girls' hockey teams and there's a few guys playing on it. Then you have ringette teams. Is that exclusively played by girls? Then you obviously would have to have boys playing there and you'd smash up that league and the same would go for all the sports that are not traditionally played by girls but also played by girls, like baseball and basketball and volleyball and so on. I just think that people are getting carried away here. They are looking at one side of the issue. They are saying that girls have the right. Some say that girls have the right or should have the right to play on boys teams, but if that's true then it also works the other way, and then I suppose you have no teams that are exclusively reserved for one sex, so that everything becomes co-educational or whatever it's called. I think that it's ridiculous because you wind up of course in some cases, I guess, with women attempting to play football, and I am sure some could, but we've had, I think, women trying to play pro-football and pro-basketball and it hasn't seemed to work out too well.

My own view is that it is not a good idea to allow a mixture for a whole variety of reasons, one of them being just the discrepancy in size. I am sort of telling

the Minister my position. I am asking him whether he concurs with that position.

MR. BANMAN: I guess the unfortunate thing about this particular event that has happened here is that one of the girls in question has played for the team for three years, and that compounds the problem. I think if, at the outset, they had been informed that these were the rules and she hadn't started to play, but now that the team is winning there's problems and I believe that's the unfortunate situation that's happened here.

But it should be pointed out, I think, that no matter what sport you're endeavouring, if you are at the Olympic games they go to great length for hormone testing to make sure that you are competing in the men's side or the women's side where you belong. There is no question — we have ladies' bonspiels, we have men's bonspiels and I don't think it's a matter of discrimination, it's just a matter of exercising some common sense in this program. Again, I say, what compounds the problem here is the fact that they were allowed to play in the first place and that's unfortunate.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then I would deduce that if the Minister is pressured by whatever groups or individuals to intervene in this so-called dispute or whatever it is, temporary aberration, that he's not going to intervene; he's not going to take a side; he's not going to support certain women's groups or individuals who want some sort of punishment meted out to the CAHA or whoever it is or deny them provincial funding or provincial facilities; that he's not going to take a side in that sense.

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, there are some sports like figure skating, where 95 percent of the people there are girls. The provincial funding goes to them. It's not spent equally, half between the boys and half between the girls. Synchronized swimming for instance is totally girls. There are not any men involved and yet we fund them also; gymnastic program — same thing, the member mentioned that. I think there's about 95 percent girls in that one too. I have taken the attitude and will take the attitude that the sports governing bodies are the ones that are going to determine how they work it. Hopefully the Manitoba Amateur Hockey Association can form a girls league and these girls can play there then, but they will make the decisions and if there are some contraventions to any of the legislation that we have before us or any human rights things somebody else will have to deal with it. But I think, as far as I am concerned, it's not something that I am going to make a determination on.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I also wanted to ask the Minister, just to clarify here. He talked a short while ago about the fact that he felt, as I understood it, that Manitobans of international calibre, like Olympic athletes, etc., were a federal responsibility, but I also ask him whether it hasn't been the case that the Provincial Government has supported individual athletes like Bruce Pirnie etc. My impression is that we have in fact either supplemented federal programs or picked up the slack, or where there's a vacuum, filled it to support certain local people. First of all, is that true? And

secondly, has federal funding become so extensive that it's now covering everybody?

MR. BANMAN: If the Federal Government is supporting we don't provide any support. If they are a good potential national calibre and are rated fairly high, we have a program called ManPlan which we were discussing before which is \$100,000 out of Lottery which is given to athletes if their particular sports governing body recommends that they should get it. The maximum you can get from that, I believe — what is it? 1,250.00.

Just as an example, Ogiowski, the figure skater, received roughly about \$1,200 from the province.

MR. DOERN: Was anything done by the province to attempt to compensate — I don't mean with cash payments, but given that the Federal Government got involved in an olympic boycott, which I did not support and thought was not a good policy, and thought was not a policy that produced any results of any kind other than to deny athletes an attempt to participate in an international competition — was anything done to compensate or make up for the denial of some of our top Manitoba athletes who may have been Olympic participants? For example, were they sent to other track meets, or were they allowed special training opportunities because of what was really a very serious blow to track and field?

MR. BANMAN: I understand without quoting too many examples, but I understand that they were sent to several international events. I think Bonnie Wittmeier went to New Zealand and many of the athletes took part in other international events in their particular sport. But that was a federal responsibility and the province did not get involved in any of those programs. The training of the Olympic team and the sending of the Olympic team is the responsibility of the Federal Government and, to my knowledge, Manitoba has never been involved in that and didn't get involved this time.

MR. DOERN: Our ace figure skater, is that Petra Burka — no, Sylvia Burka. She's now into cycling, a speedskater now a cyclist. Is she being supported in her endeavours by the province or by the Federal Government or some combination?

MR. BANMAN: We apparently helped her out in cycling through ManPlan. I don't know, is she still speedskating? Yes, retired.

MR. DOERN: Are you saying she is now retired from cycling?

MR. BANMAN: Speedskating.

MR. DOERN: What about in cycling? Is she being supported by the province?

MR. BANMAN: She did receive some funds from us. She is now apparently on the national team and will now be looked after by the Federal Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Just some clarification to see if I am correct. Is there any research done in the way

the grants are allocated in respect to the clinics? The reason I am asking is because I find that there is very little difference in the amounts, yet I know that some sports are much more participated in than others. I just wonder whether there has been any kind of research done into the allocation, or is it just the past practice that is being followed? Archery is not as well attended as, we'll say, soccer or something of that kind. How come they have just about the same amount for clinics? Have you looked into and researched it to see whether they need the same amount or whether they need a greater amount in one area or the other?

MR. BANMAN: The staff every year sits down with the sports governing body and looks at what they are projecting to do and this is something that is arrived at. I guess there is a little tradition involved, but it is something arrived at together with the staff of the sports governing body.

MR. FOX: That's fine to sit down and co-operate and discuss, but possibly if Manitoba is lagging in an area, we'll say archery or even amputees, which has nothing for hosting, just 800 for clinics. Should we not maybe promote some of these things, give them a better opportunity to develop. Maybe the sports federations don't look at it in the same light; they may only look at it in the light of promoting those which are popular to the public and yet maybe the participants would like to have more help but can't get enough voice because they are a small group in the Sports Federation, so they don't get sufficient support from the body. This is where research should maybe be done by the government in order to allocate it more fairly, equitably. It may be fair now but I am just questioning how much research has gone into developing some of these areas, in spite of what the Federation asks, because the Federation may not be fair always.

MR. BANMAN: I understand that the associations submit what they feel they will be using that year and it has worked out fairly well in the past number of years in resolving the different amounts that they are looking at.

MR. FOX: I had some representation from people I know, so I will have to tell them that they have to make a little more noise is they want more because apparently that is the way it is going to work. If the Federation is going to represent them, then they have to make a louder noise at the Federation level.

MR. BANMAN: I would tell the member then that they should get in touch with me because it is my department that administers and the Sports Federation, with regard to this particular program, is not involved so they should contact me. If they are not happy with what has happened, they should give me a call directly.

MR. FOX: Okay.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I want to make this clear. You are just talking about a specific

program now; you are not talking about grants? There is a formula for grants to the sports bodies, the one that you refer to as the block funding, that is by membership, isn't it mostly? The general grant that comes under, the 291, what you refer to as block funding, there is a formula for that, isn't there? It is by membership, or according to membership, or what?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, there is a formula that is involved with regard to that.

MR. DESJARDINS: The program that you were mentioning, then, is only for clinics then?

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister how many people are presently employed in the Research and Planning Branch?

MR. BANMAN: Three, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I notice the amount is to go up from \$79,000 to \$96,000.00. Does this indicate that there will be an additional person employed in this branch?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Is the Minister indicating then that the increase of some \$16,000 is to be for salaries only?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, there is a reclassification involved and the member will appreciate that this year, because there is a two-year agreement that has been signed, the actual increase, or the GSI has been added on, so this is the actual figure, whereas previously you would have looked at the Estimates and you wouldn't have included the total GSI

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of what research and what planning was done by this branch over the last year.

MR. BANMAN: This particular group, since I am the Minister responsible for both Fitness and Amateur Sport, as well as Co-op Development, works for both departments, and they would work on a number of areas within both departments, on special projects assessing things such as the sports agreement between the Manitoba Sports Federation, and look at any policy changes, any programming changes that we have got going.

MR. WALDING: Does the Minister have further information? I take it that's the research part of it, is it, or is this now planning, or is he not differentiating between the two?

MR. BANMAN: We don't differentiate between the two. There are three people involved in it. They would deal with other things such as the Sports Medicine Council, who are now looking at a few

changes, we did a few things there. They would evaluate what is happening at the Sports Injury Centre, looking at the Gimli Training Centre, and we accepted responsibility for NASA, which was handled before by the Department of Natural Resources. It is a group of individuals, three people, who look at the agreements that were involved in things like that.

MR. WALDING: I would like to ask the Minister whether he has given any instructions to these three people for the coming year of any research that he wants done or any particular planning area that he wants carried out?

MR. BANMAN: I can't specify anything here right now but they will be dealing with ongoing programs and other things.

MR. WALDING: The Minister mentioned something interesting earlier on, that this same group is involved with Co-op Development. I wonder if he might indicate to the committee approximately how much time is involved between these two departments and why the salaries and other expenditures are charged to this department only and not broken down with an appropriate amount charged to the other department?

MR. BANMAN: We went through this last year, I guess, and instead of splitting them up, they are a good group and they work well together, and instead of splitting them up — there isn't any magic to this, it could be split up between Co-op. I understand they do a little more work for the Fitness side than they do for the Co-op side and I guess you could appropriate one and a half staff man years there and one and a half there. It seemed this was the simplest approach to do it since it all comes under one Minister, and that's the way we have done it.

MR. WALDING: It is probably simple and indeed it does come under one Minister, but it comes under different appropriations, or it would appear that it should do since it is for two different functions.

Perhaps I can ask the Minister whether the Provincial Auditor or his staff is aware of this practice and whether it meets with his approval. I have found in the past that the Provincial Auditor and auditors generally are very fussy about the right things being slotted into the right numbers.

MR. BANMAN: Finance is aware of it and he's never commented on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1) pass; 1.(d)(1) — the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, at one time the department had pretty good statistics, pretty good information. For instance, they had a chart and they knew how many arenas they had, how many of them had artificial ice, how many baseball fields and so on. Is that being kept up? I know that at times you get behind, but is that being kept up? I think it is quite important when you are looking at these facilities, if the departments have the same aims of trying to serve as many people in Manitoba as possible. Is that available? What is the state of this information?

MR. BANMAN: It is a computer program and we could get a printout if we want. We keep it up-to-date. As a matter of fact, we have one individual now who came on staff a year-and-a-half or two years ago who deals exclusively now with facilities. He consults with the different rural recreation facilities as well as in the city. But there is a computer program that is carrying it on.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would if I could request a copy of that for our party, to give us an idea of where we are at. That, Mr. Chairman, is pretty well all the recreational facilities — maybe not every single one, but at least the arenas, the baseball stadiums or swimming pools?

MR. BANMAN: We will try to get the member a printout.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, last year I think the Minister hadn't been in that position too long and he wasn't aware that he had an Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport until a statement came in. Now, is that operating? Are there members on that; how often do they meet; is the Minister taking advantage of their knowledge and their expertise on that? Is that being done?

MR. BANMAN: We did have, and if the member will remember, last year there was a change made to the Act where it said, "the Minister shall" it was changed to "the Minister may". To date what we have done is we have used groups like the Sports Medicine Council to deal with things like that. I have not set up a particular advisory group. We have specified some other groups. I guess we have dealt with the Manitoba Parks and Recreation Association, with the Sports Medicine Group, with the Manitoba Sports Federation and things like that so I do not have a group as the member mentioned.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think the Minister is missing a bet there. He could receive help from these people, and that would not curtail or prevent him from meeting with these other groups. In fact, he can representation on this advisory council from these people.

While we are at that, has the Minister had any meetings with the handicapped people? For too long, I think, these people have been neglected. For instance, in his capital project, are there any qualifications or any obligation for these people to make sure that if there are any new buildings, that these people would have access to it? Is there an effort being made to show the example in this field and make sure that our handicapped people — it's bad enough that they have these handicaps — that they can go ahead and participate and live as normal a life as possible, is that being done at this time?

MR. BANMAN: About a year and-a-half ago, we recognized the growing need for some assistance for the handicapped, things like wheelchair basketball. These sports are really catching on. What we did at that time is we hired an individual who is working strictly with that particular program, as close to the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped. That person is now working very closely with the committee that's been set up to deal with the year of

the disabled and his sole job is to deal with the type of thing that the member mentions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay, in other words, there's discussion going on, but are there any policies that come out of that. For instance, you have a capital project that you're giving grants to people; now, do you insist that, for instance, if it's a type of building that handicapped could use, do you insist if there are ramps needed and so on, that that be done before you make this grant?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: We have undertaken two things. We have facility workshops which are carried on all over the province, indicating what the requirements are, but the other thing we've done is to get the Department of Labour, when we talk about these Capital Facilities Grants and that, the Department of Labour will advise the people when they're building, in other words making some changes to their structures or anything, that they should include the proper washroom facilities for wheelchairs, proper rampage and other things so that if there is provincial money now that goes in on one of these projects, these changes are part and parcel of the whole thing.

MR. DESJARDINS: It is one of the conditions before the grant is made?

MR. BANMAN: This new building code which now includes all these things is then applied to the facility where this happens and I think one of the examples even is the Winnipeg Arena where they put in elevators now on the side and that to accommodate the handicapped.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the person that is working in the department on that, is he handicapped himself, or he or she?

MR. BANMAN: There was established in Manitoba an advisory council for the handicapped funded partially from private agencies, I think we gave them a grant, and the Federal Government. It was sort of a co-operative effort. The Federal Government pulled out of that program and what happened at that time the individual that was employed applied for the job that we then bulletined and received that job. That particular person is not handicapped.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, that person might be very qualified, but I think in the future if any jobs like that come up, the Minister would be well advised to at least consider the possibility of getting a handicap. I'm told that at times they hear from architects and so on and they say it's going to cost you \$700,000.00. Apparently that was one of the things that was said at the — the Minister mentioned the Winnipeg Arena. Some of the handicaps were saying that they could have something for \$700 at one time but they're always brought in too late and then people try, are well intentioned, but I think unfortunately we have the tendency of talking to them as the last resort and I think that all the community in general up to now has been lax.

I'm not blaming the Minister of this department more than anything else but I think it would be well to make sure, from now on at least, to make a start; if there's any construction or any sports like that to make sure that these people can participate as much as possible. Especially if this new constitution goes through and the Bill of Rights comes through it could cost an awful lot of money because I think that the rights of the handicap is recognized.

Mr. Chairman, again before we leave I think I could stretch a bit and put this in research and planning. We had discussed last year the possibility of having an interdepartmental committee of governments, the Ministers of the different departments involved to see if we could change some of the things that we've all condemned that have been going on for years under different administration. I'm thinking, for instance of, maybe have some radical changes, some real changes in the question of community centres and school facilities and so on. Now the School Board will say you can't use this gym. I think that they've opened up. It's much better than it was, but I'm giving that as an example.

It seems to me that the Minister of Education and this Minister could work very closely on things like that to make sure . . . you know we're talking about restraint, we're talking about the cost of everything, we're talking about the people of Manitoba having to pay for all these things, instead of having duplication that we spend wisely the money that we have. Any new schools could be combined with the community centres for instance. You have the community centres, it has to service certain area, it is pretty well the same as an elementary school, pretty well the same thing, it has the same need and it would be fairly easy to use these facilities, the yards for instance, for recreation. For two, two and one-half months a year they're not being occupied. They could be used by a community thing and then during weekends when the school is not used, you could have part of the school as a place to change to go skate and so on. I'm giving that as examples where we could co-operate in that a little more.

And certainly in the fitness — when the Minister starts dealing with fitness, certainly he should be talking to the Minister of Health because I think a lot of prevention on health is also important. You should be working together on that, and I think also with a nutritionist and so on, I think that you have to have some kind of a diet, eat proper foods, I think that is as important as the fitness and the training and so on. Has the Minister done anything on that suggestion that I made last year. I don't want the Minister to tell me we meet in caucus and in Cabinet. That's not what I mean. I'm talking about staff and Minister getting together.

MR. BANMAN: There isn't any high powered committee that's been formed. I guess one of the interesting things I think, if we'd look back in Hansard, one of the first years I got here, I think I made exactly that same observation and it's always bothered me, the lack of use of some of the facilities in the summer months or some of the evenings, some of the beautiful gyms.

I think if we go back to '73 and '74 the member, when he was Minister in charge will read that I said the same thing that we should do that. Unfortunately, I guess I have to say that I haven't been able to turn

that around the way I would like to. For some reason, Manitoba, I don't know if it's an isolated case or whether we're a little different than the states is, we just have never been able to tie the school into the community usage system as much as the United States has. I've been talking to people about it, asking questions. A lot of people say well I'm finished with school, I don't want to back to school and have a little hangup on that side of the coin.

It is one of the problems that I have not been able to come to grips with and it does bother me because there are a lot of facilities that are not being used fully. I have seen some progress, for instance, in my particular town, there's a lot of fitness courses that have started up and are using school facilities. There are some basement tracks where the school is now unlocking certain doors and allowing people to come in after evening. I have mentioned to the Minister of Education that one of the real problems we have is that when the school is designed itself, it's not designed in a manner which allows only for public access maybe at one particular door or one particular avenue. What happens is very often you have to open up the whole school if you want to use the gym and that's when the School Board start balking because they're scared of vandalism and things like that. Hopefully with different programs that are coming in, fitness programs for adults and that, people will start using it a little more, but I'm not happy with the progress I've made.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is absolutely right. I certainly wasn't the first one or the only one that talked about this problem this year nor was I last year. My suggestion was that we quit talking about it and in 1977 there was a committee that was in the process of being . . . finally talked the Minister, well I was responsible for health, so it brings my people and I had convinced the Minister of Education that this was a good thing and he was setting up staff — you probably have memos in your files somewhere on that. I'm suggesting something that was just accepted in principle; if we could go a little further to have these committees to discuss these things. Because this Minister alone will not be able to do it. He has to enlist the help of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education for these things and then you could make it work, because you represent the public and the public is paying for this and you know if it's worth doing it, it's going to take a little hard work, but I think you can do it. I guess that's all on that.

MR. BANMAN: The points well taken and I'll work a little further on it and hope we can accomplish a little more than we have to date.

MR. DESJARDINS: Before we leave this, can the Minister give us a report on the field house. You know the university has been asking for a field house, the Minister said a Task Force had come in with the recommendation and the danger is that we're going to wait forever now while they're fighting for the site and fighting to see if it should be a university or a community oriented thing. I am not challenging the necessity of that for the school. My thought is that the university should have one, they could occupy it all this time, that we need some of

these facilities, especially in the climate that we have. You know we have different hockey rinks and different things like that, for instance, track and field, they're not much and that can occupy a lot of youngsters. It would be better then sniffing glue somewhere or these drugstore cowboys. I wonder if the Minister has anything to report on that; the whole situation, not just the University of Winnipeg.

MR. BANMAN: I guess it is sort of an opportune time to discuss because we're just discussing joint use and one of the things that really intrigued me when I was at the Western Canada Summer Games last summer in Saskatoon, was the fact that the city of Saskatoon along with the University of Saskatoon had built a field house together and were going to joint utilize the facility. Realizing the needs and wishes of the University of Winnipeg, realizing that we need an indoor track as the member mentioned because of the climate and it doesn't give us a good chance for the athletes to perform, we commissioned that particular, well we didn't commission it we asked a couple of people, Sammy Fabro and a few people to look at it. There was a member from Crescentwood, Nick Daikiw, City Commissioner and Sam Fabro.

They were given some pretty strict guidelines, in other words, to see if it couldn't be a joint-use facility between the city and the U., whether it could be developed in the downtown core area and what finally happened is that they came up with a report and I guess the University isn't particularly intrigued with the proposal. I have asked the Mayor for a meeting. He's indicated to me that as soon as he gets back from Japan, he's gone to Japan, that we will sit down and discuss this particular proposal.

As the member knows, the province doesn't build any recreation facilities, or operate any of them so our rule in this particular field would be one of capital funding for the facility. But I don't want to go ahead and make announcements of capital funding or any assistance until we really discussed it thoroughly with the city, because as we discussed before, it's one thing to provide the capital, another to operate the thing so it would have to be to that extent, we would have to sit down and really hammer it out. We will be doing that, hopefully, when the Mayor gets back and I'll be able to report more on it after that.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I suggest then, and I'm sure the Minister is as interested as I am, when he has this meeting with the Mayor that he should maybe establish a deadline, because there is a danger here of fighting what site and then should it be a joint effort with the community at large and the university. It might be if the Minister is ready to go that he force these people to make a decision fairly soon because it is needed and that might be a way to get these people to decide what they want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d) — The Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: I have a question for the Minister. I don't understand completely what you've just said. (Interjection)— Pardon me? That's a preamble to a question. Thank you for the help. I don't quite understand that position the Provincial

Government is taking. Have we come to the conclusion that there is need for a field house?. Is that an accepted given?. Have we accepted the recommendations of the report and have we made a commitment to build something, somewhere, sometime?.

MR. BANMAN: As I mentioned before we are not in the position of building buildings and we are not in the position of operating. We recognize, and I think everybody in the sports community dealing with track and field, recognize the need for an indoor facility and that was even highlighted, if you recall, when we allowed the Track and Field Association here to set up the indoor track at the central provincial garage. I guess we gave them a bit of the taste of what it's like to have an indoor facility to run and train in and that even heightened the sort of public pressure that has been brought on with regard to that, so I don't think that anybody disputes the need for the facility. We have all the other facilities. I think that Winnipeg is one of the, and the report points that out when it comes to swimming pools, indoor hockey rinks, and that we've really got a lot of good facilities, but one of the glaring sort of gaps in the whole system is an indoor running facility.

I should point out that the University of Manitoba is in the process, they've raised all these funds now and will be rebuilding their hockey and stadium complex but that they intend also to build an indoor running track. So there is one coming up there but that I don't think alleviates the necessity for having something, I would say that everybody realizes the need is there and that is why we commissioned the report.

MR. DOMINO: If we can assume we are going to build something then could I take it from your answers to Mr. Desjardins' questions, that you're going to consult with the City, if we can again assume that the City is going to agree, that a facility should be built, will you be consulting with the city concerning the location of the potential field house?

MR. BANMAN: In discussions, and it is all very preliminary right now but I would anticipate that if the facility is to be run by Parks and Recreation from the City of Winnipeg the site locations and that would have to be determined by the City so that it will come in with their whole master plan. I wouldn't want to get involved in the position of telling the City now you're going to have to build it there or that. I think that decision would have to be made by the City to see how it fits in with their whole recreation plan.

MR. DOMINO: To the Minister, so then the City will be involved in the selection. Are there any other groups that you anticipate will be directly involved in the selection process for a site? The Sports Federation, are they going to be involved in the process of selection?

MR. BANMAN: I would imagine the City would be interested in trying to accommodate as many of the groups as possible. Again, it's premature and I really can't answer until I've had some more negotiations with the City to see exactly what their thoughts are, what their plans are for the future?

MR. DOMINO: Obviously, as the Minister is aware, one of the potential sites that was highlighted in the Steen report and one of the sites that's being discussed by the Sports Federation for some time, happens to be right in the very centre of my constituency, so I'm expressing these concerns. It has been discussed in the neighborhood and for some time about the pros and cons of a facility of this type because we do have a large piece of open land between Polo Park and Strathcona Street, in which a creek runs, Omand's Creek and the creek is in disrepair and the citizens have found it difficult to obtain the support of the City or the Province for rehabilitation of the creek.

MR. BANMAN: Well one of the sites in the report that is mentioned is particularly that site, what I guess a lot of us refer to as the Veledrome site and that's one of the sites I think that's been mentioned. Now, whether or not that actually becomes a site is just premature, I would have no answer to that.

MR. DOMINO: Because it's been discussed by various people that that is a potential site, some of the citizens are concerned that if we were to build a field house and if that site should be selected they might not be fully consulted as to what traffic difficulties would be created or parking difficulties or noise, or simply aesthetic problems for people who live close to the building. I know it is a rather hypothetical question but what I'm looking for, I think, is an assurance from the Provincial Government that if we fund a project like that we will ensure that the local citizens have a direct and a real say in the design of the building and in effects to alleviate potential problems.

MR. BANMAN: The City Planners of course are going to be involved but I think that particular problem which the member refers to is, I think there were some plans at one time many years ago, with regard to developing that site for something and the same question was raised at that time by the local people in that area. I would imagine, well I'm sure the City would take all those things into consideration before they went ahead. I should point out I don't think that a facility like this, we're not talking about a 5,000 seat stadium, we're talking about a running track with some facilities inside maybe for team handball, inside the track, some tennis courts and maybe 1,000 or 1,500 seats. But were not looking at something that would be like the traffic coming from a Jets game or anything like that. We're looking at a much smaller complex that would not house that many spectators, would basically be built for the training for the amateur athlete that wants to practice track and field.

MR. DOMINO: I agree completely with you in that I certainly think we have to have a field house and I believe that one of the potential sites, and it may be an excellent site, would be Omand's Creek. And I don't want to leave the impression with you, Mr. Minister, that the people are all opposed to it. To be exact we have held two public meetings on the subject, well attended, and I've distributed a survey to all the people in the immediate area, 3,000 or 4,000 houses that would be immediately affected and the responses were very good. People were very

interested in the project; there were reservations obviously but many of them said it's a potentially good thing for the neighborhood and welcomed it. Some people have suggested that everyone is against it but that's certainly not the case. They just want some assurances and I'm sure those are easy to give.

It should also be mentioned right now that, to be exact, the local citizens are organizing a Citizen's Committee — I just came from the meeting myself tonight, that's why I'm a little late at the committee — to take up matters like this and discuss them with the Government because the people are hoping that if the site should be selected the surrounding land, approximately 20 acres could be purchased and the field house could be placed in the middle of a park because they are very concerned obviously about that creek and the condition it's in and the possibility of turning the creek from an open sewer into a creek park. So this is the major concern of the people. I thought I would take this opportunity to bring it to your attention and I thank you for your answers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(d)1 pass — the Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Just before we leave Research, I sympathize with the Minister and the Member for St. Boniface in respect to using community facilities in schools especially and I believe some of the problems arising from getting this cooperation is because some of the gymnasias are not built to have spectators. And I would wonder whether the research department couldn't look into creating some portable ones or finding out some way of improving those facilities without engendering too great a cost which would then facilitate the use of those gymnasias with spectators at present. Because that's what I find when you go to some of the larger schools that they don't all have facilities for spectators and that could be something that would, maybe if it was created, then people would say, well we have spectator room why can't we get them, why can't we have more involvement and more participation. That's one aspect.

The other question I'd like to raise, and it really doesn't come under Research but which would facilitate the Committee's procedure is in respect to funding. The Minister mentioned block funding earlier and I wondered whether we could get a breakdown on paper so we could just compare and have a look at what it looks like. I know the Minister read off some areas but I think it would be easier if we could see it in black and white.

MR. FOX: We did get the stuff for the clinics and for the hosting but the other, there is nothing before us here and it is not in the estimates either as to how the money is broken down and allocated to whom in respect to the sports.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think we're just talking about breakdown of the last one, the Grants.

MR. BANMAN: We've been pushing to try and get the annual report done. It's in there and I was hoping to get one. I was just going to photocopy it for tonight but it's at the printers already and it's in there. The total breakdown is right in the annual

report. I tried to get that through, it's not here but as soon as it's out I'll get it to the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member in St. Boniface

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr Chairman I think maybe you should pass that before I make my comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(d)1 pass; 1(d)2 pass.

Resolution 68. 2(a)(1)— the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the Committee and to the Minister that this would be a good time to rise. I think that we have accomplished quite a bit, not just half a page. We have looked at many things and it would give us a chance to look at this and we can go on the other one and I doubt if we're going to take that much time, as far as I'm concerned I don't want to speak for others, in the Minister's salary except that is the time we usually discuss lottery, but I mean to rehash the whole thing again there wouldn't be any need. Of course, we said that last year and the Member from Fort Garry came in and she was perfectly in order, so I wonder if we could have the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee Rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 12 of the Main Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Resolution No. 13, Clause 7, item (d)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just prior to the supper hour adjournment I was picking up the debate from where the Member for Lac du Bonnet had left it with respect to the sale of Crown lands and the fact that it required a considerable amount of consideration and a considerable amount of recognition that there are a number of demands on the land base of this province. And I wanted to, just for the record, indicate to the honourable members that the policy that this government has embarked on with respect to the sale of Crown lands is not a simple knee-jerk reaction to some of the actions of the previous administration or not one that was conceived in the heat of an election campaign, but one that in fact was a very understandable and appropriate course of action that followed several decades, I might say, of consideration of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I do have to, without going back into history, and without worrying about that, about how land development took place in this province. I do have to remind honourable members and indeed remind my own members from time to time that it was a Conservative administration that chose, in the early 1960s, to freeze all land sales in this province. And for many of the same reasons that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet talked about earlier on this afternoon, that there needed to be an opportunity to take stock of our land base, to take inventory if you like. Indeed we co-operated with a

very substantial, a very costly, I might say, federal shared program called the Canada Land Inventory Program which really enabled us to take inventory of the land base that we have in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, that was undertaken, and not only was that taken stock or that inventory of land taken, but action followed that stock taking; no more perhaps than in that area that the Member for St. George is familiar with and myself am familiar with than in the Interlake under the ARDA FRED Program that honourable members are well familiar with, and indeed the incoming administration in 1969 carried out and carried on with.

Mr. Chairman, that resulted in officials within the Department of Agriculture, officials within the Department of Natural Resources, to set aside very substantial acreages of land for the kind of multiple uses that any responsible government would have seen fit to undertake.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that we remind ourselves what really we are talking about, and if we start from the total land base that we have in Manitoba, some 135 million acres, we have today 99.4 of those million acres in the public hands in the right of the Crown; 99.4 million of the 135 million acres that we have in the Province of Manitoba are currently under Crown management.

Mr. Chairman, that's not going to change a great deal. I point that out simply because we are in that position. Of that 99 million acres we have set aside some 2 million acres, indeed transferred it to the jurisdiction of the federal government to enable them to manage such national parks that we have in this province and including Indian reserve lands.

We have set aside an additional 2.5 million acres for provincial parks. In addition to that we have set aside 10 million acres for forest reserves; some 34 million acres of that total land base is held in private hands. Mr. Chairman, as a result of knowing our land base a little better, a result of knowing its uses a little better, we have also set aside in the last two decades some 6.8 million acres in wildlife management acres. A lot of that was as a result of the knowledge that we had gained of the land. Some of it I must acknowledge was also a result of deliberate programs to resolve some of the social problems that we had in parts of the province. Some of it was a result of the chronic problems that we had with respect to lands being flooded or subject to flooding, and a fairly ambitious program was inaugurated to purchase, by government, formally private lands to for once get away from the problems of chronic flooded lands. I am referring specifically to such areas as around the southern basin of Lake Winnipeg; referring to other areas where the combination of helping out or resolving an issue happened to work very well with the concerns that the managers of wildlife, the development of wetlands, the two worked together. Private land was purchased under these programs and set aside in perpetuity for that kind of land use.

Mr. Chairman, the point that I am simply trying to make at this time in the estimates, certainly not to prolong the estimates in any way, and not to raise unnecessary arguments with honourable members opposite — I appreciate that in the heat of an election debate rhetoric sometimes overtakes all of

us and that on this particular subject there has been a lot of rhetoric.

What I am trying to indicate, Mr. Chairman, is that the land policy of this government is a very natural progression of having done these several things. It was a progressive administration which I was fortunate to be a part of in the early Sixties that said, hold it, let's not sell any more land; we will freeze all Crown land sales. It was not an ideological position that said that we would not ever allow these lands to be sold but, as being responsible at that time, we said let's take stock, let's take inventory, let's set aside those lands that ought to be used for the broader public use, that ought to be used for wetland habitat, that ought to be used for wildlife management areas, and that, in essence, was done. The question, I suppose, that we have to ask ourselves is have we done that job reasonably well? Is, out of our land base, the kind of acreages that I have just read into the record a reasonable amount? We will have different arguments about that. Some people will say that too much land has been set aside into wildlife management areas, 6.8 million acres; that is a lot of land. Some will say — you know, the question could be asked, have we set aside enough lands for parks of various descriptions in our province? Are those 2.5 million acres, as set aside for provincial parks, an additional two million acres set aside for federal parks, are they reasonable amounts of land set aside for our children and their children to enjoy? Are they reasonable amounts that a province of a million people can support?

I must tell the honourable members that my challenge and my direction to the department will be to manage those acres, those wildlife management areas, to their maximum capability before I see it as a particular responsibility to acquire more.

What we didn't see from the previous administration, any acknowledgement of that continued acquisition of lands, particularly those lands that were formerly in the private sector, into the public sector. I am simply saying to you that I look forward to working with the Minister of Agriculture in this respect. I believe that in Natural Resources, we have our hands full; we have to manage and decide how we are going to manage those lands that are now our responsibilities, those lands that have been set aside for these specific uses.

So the policy of Crown land sales is not, as I said in my first remarks, a simple knee-jerk reaction, ideological, political reaction, as opposed to the position taken by my friends opposite with the question of putting up Crown lands for public sale. We see this policy as a very natural, appropriate progression of different governments having done the right things at the right time. We stopped land sales in the 1960s, the early 1960s, because, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet said, there were serious mistakes being made. Lands were sold that created serious problems that weren't of any help to the people who were the recipients of those land sales. We took the time and we spent the money to take inventory and we took the time to then proceed with action on that inventory. I certainly acknowledge the efforts on the part of the previous administration in that same regard, some of us say too aggressively.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the policy of Crown land sales that this government is committed to, follows

that natural progression of events that tells us that now is the time that in a province such as ours, where there will always be, by a substantial majority, acres of land will continue to be held in the name of the Crown, in the name of the public. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. George says it is productive. It is productive in many different ways, you know, a wetland marsh happens to be very productive for a particular use. We believe that we have set aside — in fact, I haven't had the opportunity of measuring this record, if you like, against some of my neighbouring provinces, but I would suspect that the amount of moneys set aside for the purchasing of Crown lands for a specific use measures up as well as any other jurisdiction. I don't think that we can say that we are poorly served or that we have done badly by our children in setting aside sufficient land for provincial parks. I don't think we have done badly to the naturalists or to the wildlife interests in setting aside sufficient lands to ensure that reasonable amounts, acceptable amounts of wildlife habitat is available for the production of wildlife. I believe that we have done it and when I say we, I certainly include the previous administration in this portion.

What the previous administration did not show or did not indicate and, Mr. Chairman, that's an acceptable different of politics, if you like, and philosophy, if you like, they are hung up on the question of returning or opening up to the privatization of certain lands and we endorse it and we praise it and we are acceptable to it. We have made that promise to the farmers and to the people of Manitoba and we will pursue it. We will pursue it not necessarily, simply in the agricultural field. I believe that there are lands that will be available to the general public for uses that may not be agricultural, that could be used for other uses as well. We do that with the knowledge that we have, in the stats that I have just read to you, set aside — (Interjection)— No, but we have dedicated the lands. When I say "we," I must always include the honourable members opposite during their tenure of office. But these lands have been set aside and they have been dedicated to the greater public use in this area.

Mr. Chairman, we do not take issue, we simply say that of some of the remaining lands, particularly those that have been identified for capability of assisting in agricultural production in the Province of Manitoba that these lands under restrictions, under conditions, can and ought to be and should be and will be made available to Manitoba citizens, and Mr. Chairman, that's what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of members that have indicated that they are less than happy with the program as it's being administered today. Mr. Chairman, I can share some of that concern. I believe that efforts can be made to expedite the matter but, Mr. Chairman, I do not really apologize nor do I take issue with the Minister of Agriculture. I think again it had to be done in a reasonable conservative and cautious manner. It is a gentle program. It's not a question of poor sales. If a farmer that has enjoyed and continues to believe that a lease is by far his preference or to his economic well being, then there will be and should be and ought not to be any pressure put on him to sell that land,

nor should there be unfairness in having land sold out from somebody's tenure or part of his operation simply because somebody comes along with a few more dollars. All these considerations have worked within the program. They have held up the sale to some extent, to the extent that some of my colleagues are pretty impatient.

I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to working with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and now myself in my responsibility as Minister of Natural Resources to see whether or not we cannot re-look, re-think, some of the original guidelines, some of the original proposals that are in effect with respect to the sale of Crown lands to see whether or not they cannot be streamlined, to see whether or not some of the restrictions are in fact necessary because, Mr. Chairman, if you listen to some of the concerns today, there would be very little precious land in agricultural production in this province. If for instance the concern for the fact that land may be subject to flooding from time to time, I would have to suggest there would be no agricultural production between here and Portage la Prairie or indeed in the entire Red River Valley. All of that land is subject to flooding and we intend to make some very fundamental changes to ease up and to change some of . . . to put into the column of accepted, those lands that are currently being rejected.

Mr. Chairman, those were the comments that I wanted to add to the Estimates at this time. I simply feel that it's important, however, that the policy of selling Crown lands is not one that was simply borne in the heat of an election campaign but one of simply carrying out the kind of long-thinking policies that were in the minds of the government at that time, in the early 1960's when it was a Conservative administration that froze all Crown land sales in order to do those very things that the Member for Lac du Bonnet suggested that governments ought to do. I think we have done that, Mr. Chairman. I think our job is now to get on with selling some Crown lands.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Lac du Bonnet asked a number of questions with respect to statistics. I don't believe the Minister provided those and we would like to have that information if he wouldn't mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet asked the question how many parcels of land included more than a quarter section. Basically, the 145 parcels of land are all quarters or parts of quarters. On the other question of were they LGD lands, no, they were not LGD lands; they were all Crown property.

The other comments that were made was the fact that there were decisions made prior to our getting into office about turning LGD vested lands back to those LGDs and in fact, the decision had been made prior to 1977 but the actual transfer started to take place following.

The amount of acreage is approximately 18,000 acres to this date. I am sure there are more in the

mill, in the ongoing process. (Interjection)— I think I put that on the record the other day, of \$1,169,570.00.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, one more question. Does the Minister have a regional breakdown of those 18,000 acres; where have the bulk of the transactions been made?

MR. DOWNEY: I don't have a specific breakdown but when we talk of agricultural regional districts, the majority of the land, of course, is in the southeast and Interlake, so it would be in the northwest region, Interlake and eastern region, basically.

MR. URUSKI: You don't have a breakdown, or a general breakdown on a regional basis?

MR. DOWNEY: I haven't, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is fairly well evenly distributed across that area. The department has been endeavouring to try and cover off the broader area and not work in one region specifically and then go to another. It is evenly distributed, as far as my knowledge is concerned.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We thank the Minister for the information that he has provided, and also the Minister of Natural Resources for how he foresees things developing in the future. We want to point out that we feel and of course the Member for Emerson is obviously not tuned in to the policy that the government is trying to follow. That is quite obvious because you know if he had his way it would all go one way and there would be no respect or consideration given to other interest groups whatever they may be. And so I don't think we can accept that position because it goes far. I agree with the Minister of Natural Resources that, for instance, around Lake Manitoba, there are a number of interest groups who have access to that resource and the lands around that resource. There are trappers, there are hunters, there are farmers, there are ranchers, there are fisherman, there's a whole host of resources. And we have to be on the side of all those groups because they are all Manitoba citizens. They are all Manitoba citizens. And the resources, the resources and the lakes and the Crown lands belong to a million people. They don't belong to any one group or any one person, they belong to multi-groups, Mr. Chairman, and all these interests have to be considered.

I believe that the government is clearly within its prerogative to set policy as they see fit. And it is their prerogative to do what they are doing. I want to caution them that so far it would appear in the ill afforded information that we have before us at this time, this program is now, I'm not sure if it's two years, but it's going on two years anyway. That the program has been placed in force. I think it started in 1979 if I recollect, and it seems to be proceeding very, very slowly. There must be a lot of problems developing for the government to try and implement this policy, it seems they are running into a lot of difficulties on it. And I want to caution the Member for Emerson who is now acting as our Chairman. I want to caution that there will be a lot of

discrimination taking place. There will be discrimination. Unintentional maybe, but there will be a lot of discrimination when you're implementing as you continue to implement this program. And I can point them out to you right now. I have some of the information right before me. You know, a lot of people have applied to purchase Crown land, some 1,200, I believe, have applied and so far only 145 parcels have been transactions and you know, Mr. Chairman, that indicates that there is problems with the system of doing that. You know, there are so many different things to take into consideration and the flack that you're going to get will be in an area where one person is able, his application will be accepted and the neighbour just down the road, for whatever reason. He's applied for Crown land and they'll say no dice, sorry, you can't get it. I'm telling you that you're going to have some very very uptight ranchers, or ranchers that are going to be uptight over this issue. And there are already some. Now I've sent some letters to the Minister. I don't know if he's had the chance to look at them but we have, we have already,

MR. ENNS: Ranchers are always uptight.

MR. ADAMS: it's becoming known that the government has already sold some land to Joe Blow, but it won't sell any to the other guy just down the road. Now you've got a problem there are on your hands. You've got a problem and a political problem, as well. And you're going to have a lot of political problems. You're going to have problems. Here's one for you. A man that's applied for a parcel of Crown land and his neighbour applied for another, just within a few miles, a mile or two. The other guy is already processed and this other fellow hasn't heard a word until he came to the MLA to investigate what was happening. And here's what happened, Mr. Chairman. He never even got a reply, you know, to say what is happening. Here he's been sitting since February, sitting since February, waiting and hoping. He sees his neighbour has already has his land and here I'm sitting and waiting. You know, he wonders what's happening and he finds out that you know — we apologize for the delay when we finally get the thing going again and get the files straightened or whatever the problems were you know and it's not the departments fault. In some cases it's just a mixup. And anyway, in any event it has been determined that these applications to purchase have been deferred, pending the result of a proposal by Water Resources Branch to establish a water power reserve on Lake Winnipegosis. Now that's, you see, that's probably a legitimate reason. For 30 years down the road; thirty years down the road they need Lake Winnipegosis. They need Lake Winnipegosis for a water power reserve. So that guy is out of luck. He's out of luck. The guy down the road has got land and he's happy. I'll tell you this guy is not very happy right now.

So these are the problems that you're going to run into and you're going to run into them all over the place. Now the Minister indicated a while ago, the other Minister, the Minister in his comments, the Minister of Natural Resources indicated that you know, we're not forcing anybody to buy. The member for, the critic for the Agriculture Department, clearly indicated what was happening in

the Land Lease Program. The gun is at their heads. They're forced to buy because the rental rates have escalated to such a point that it's no longer feasible for them to rent any ore. So that's one way of putting the gun to their head.

Now let's look at the Crown lands that we're talking about here. Let's talk about those lands. Now I have a letter and I'm not sure whether, I think I sent it to the Minister, but in any event I think I sent a copy to the Minister, but just for the debate this evening, I want to point out what's happening. And this rancher writes and says to me — first she phoned and I said, well look, have you got the legal description of the land because you know, could you kindly send me a letter and give me the legal description and we'll look into it. And she says, well, regarding my phone call to you and complaint of the lease being too high — she's complaining about the rents on them — this land was cleared in 1968 so it is no longer producing very much hay. Still I have to pay such a high and unreasonable rental on it. Due to the drought — not the government's fault, not the rancher's fault — I only got 35 bales of hay this year off of that quarter, and had to pay this much. The land I am speaking of, and she goes on to give the description, 168, she gives the class, the assessment is \$1,400; the municipal taxes — that's for the Northern Affairs, or Local Government District — \$153.60, and the rental is \$563.29. She says the total is \$716.89 for 35 bales of hay and she finds it pretty high and I am sure many of you will agree.

Here is another way of putting a gun — the Minister said nobody is forced to buy. She may well have to look at trying to buy this piece of land but I don't think she is going to get it because I just read a letter here where they want a conservation outfit going. Hydro wants water 30 years down the road to supply Lake Winnipeg, and so on, and maybe possibly a dam on the Waterhen River, which is another big issue that is going to stir up a lot of interest in that area if that ever comes about. They have been talking about that for 20 years and every time it comes up, I'll tell you, it causes quite a stir.

So you have a situation here where the lady is having to pay that kind of rental fee in a drought year on land that is no longer producing that good a crop in any good year. So she is either faced with having to buy it and maybe not be able to get it, or let it go, and that's unfortunate.

Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture should have looked at this situation this year, to see if there was not some way that this problem could have been addressed and to take into consideration that these lands are not insured, the crops are not insured, and they are left holding the bag and they have got to fork out \$700.00.

So I bring that for the information of the members, that it is not all a rosy picture that you paint and say now everything is going to be hunky-dory; we are selling it and everything is fine; everything is going to be happy in this country; free enterprise has succeeded. There are a lot of problems involved with this kind of thing and one of the problems that concerns me is that the government ends up deciding who owns the land and that bothers me somewhat. It bothers me when the government has to act as God and says, "You shall have land, but you shall not have land." That's the way the system

is working. Just because somebody sits on a lease and gets a preference on it, because the land belongs to the people living in Brandon, in Churchill, in Killarney; it is owned collectively by everyone, and that is the problem that I have with the sale of Crown lands, is that the government has to make a decision on who gets it. In the olden days, you set up a tender and the guy with all the money got the land, and that's no good either. That's not a good system either.

I have one more item that I want to talk about and that has to do with the lands that have been bought back for conservation purposes around Riding Mountain Park. I believe that around the park we have, I am sure even under the previous administration, we have purchased some lands for conservation and erosion purposes and have seeded these lands down to grass and legumes and so on. I was told last fall that in the Mountain Road area, that quite a bit of land has been purchased for conservation purchases and the lands within this block, I was informed that there is an assessment. In order to put that conservation project in, going, there is an assessment on all the land within that conservation area. It is assessed on all land, a mill rate, an assessment of some kind. I received some criticism, and we have to look at that — I am not sure whether that policy was there before, it probably was — but we may have to look at this because I am told that even though these farmers that are in that conservation area, this land is leased out again after it is seeded out to grass. It is leased out for forage and pasture and so on. But it is not the people who are footing the bill for the conservation. Those who are assessed in that conservation block, it is not necessarily those farmers who get access to that land. I was told that there were many farmers who were coming in from outside, from miles away, and they had the leases. It seemed a bit unfair, when it was explained to me that, you know, "We are being assessed for this conservation project, a certain amount on all our land, and here we find that outsiders are coming in and have access to the land." It didn't seem to be quite fair.

I think we should be looking at that particular situation to see if there are any solutions to those kinds of complaints.

That's all I have to say at the moment and I'll allow my colleague, if he wants to go ahead.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I was not intending to get to my feet until the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose raised the subject of political problems regarding the agricultural use of Crown lands. What brings me to my feet, Mr. Chairman, are the concerns that have been expressed in the House by the Honourable Member for Elmwood the other day when the First Minister was not in his Chair, away guarding the rights of the people and property in the constitutional debates that are going on in this country.

Reading today's Winnipeg Free Press, there is a very interesting article by Peter Thompson, the Ottawa editor, about what has been going on in Ottawa on property rights with this Broadbent-

Trudeau axis in the back room, on property rights. It is very interesting to read, Mr. Chairman, why my Premier was away, why he was concerned, and why he was down there fighting for the rights to own property in this province, or for any person in this country to own property anywhere. Today's article says, Mr. Chairman, that, "It is history now how Solicitor-General Robert Kaplan, sitting in for Chretien, accepted a Conservative amendment to retain the holding of property as a right in the new Constitution." Mr. Chairman, "On the following Monday," the article says, "under pressure from the NDP, the government reversed its position. The NDP have now wiped out all reference to God, the Queen, and property rights." Now I wonder who is kidding who in this debate or the right to own agricultural lands or the right to own property.

I ask my Minister of Agricultural or the First Minister of this province to get copies of those transcripts of those debates that went on in Ottawa and spell out to the people in this province, in this committee, what the NDP axis, and that includes my Member from Dauphin, Lewycky, what are they doing in the back rooms in Ottawa with people's property rights under this constitutional debate? What are they doing to farmland; the right to own farmland in this province? What about the right to own your home, Mr. Chairman? I just wonder what are they doing. I hope the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will stand up because he must know. I saw the federal members coming in last evening when I was going out, so they have had conversations with them as to what took place in Ottawa, what was said and why they did that.

Why did the NDP Party on the Monday go and convince Trudeau, which was the Broadbent Liberal axis that's going on in Ottawa, and take away the rights for people to own property? I would certainly like to know and before the debate goes any further, I ask either the Minister of Agriculture or the First Minister of the province to get those transcripts for the people of this province; at the earliest possible date. The debate on owning agricultural Crown land is meaningless because the members opposite are not sincere. They don't believe, as I understand it, that a person has the right to own property, farmer or anybody else. I think it's long overdue and I congratulate the First Minister, if that's why he was in Ottawa the other day, or Montreal, if he was down there defending the rights of people in this province to own property, I hope he will go back tomorrow and stay there until we get this corrected. That is a right that I hope that nobody in this province should have taken away from them, yet the article says, "On the Monday, the following Monday, under the pressure from the New Democratic Party," that includes my member from Dauphin constituency, and I would like to have him tell me what he is doing and voting or putting pressure to take the rights of people's property away from them. They now — but they have not only taken property rights away, the have wiped out all reference to God and the Queen as well.

Mr. Chairman, what is going on across . . . with the members opposite? I hope Father Malinowski, the Member for Point Douglas, is a man of the cloth, that he will stand up and tell us what took place. I am sure the Member for Ste. Rose will, or go back

and tell your people in Ste. Rose Constituency or St. George Constituency, what are you talking about when you are taking away rights to property, and that includes farmland which we are talking about on this debate.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Minister of Agriculture or the First Minister of this province to get those transcripts of what took place there at the earliest possible date so that we can alert this committee and the people of this province what the New Democratic Party are doing in Ottawa with that Liberal New Democratic axis that's taking place, and tearing this country apart at the very seams.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member that I will do all I can to make a copy of those transcripts available to this House and to the population of this province.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly, in taking part in the debate on this portion of the Estimates dealing with the matter of land and land base in this province, must say I appreciated the remarks of the Minister of Natural Resources in his comments with respect to the land base in this province and the way it is broken down. There is really only one place, I believe, that the key issue in the whole land question is really management, is really who looks after our resource, or the type of resource there is in the best way. That is really the key. I don't think it matters, and even though the Member for Roblin can get up and rant and throw all kinds of red herrings around about land. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, if those members on the Conservative side don't understand the issue, I will not explain it to them. Possibly when they get themselves a new leader maybe they will understand, or when their leader agrees with their colleagues in Ontario, or when their federal leader agrees with the Premier of New Brunswick, maybe they will come to some kind of an agreement and consensus as to their party's position on the Constitution in Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there is about as much dissention, if the member talks about other parties not agreeing, the Liberal parties have disagreements amongst themselves. Purely and simple, the Tory party are certainly no angels in this respect. They are about as divided as any group in this country, Mr. Chairman. Does Joe Clark agree with Premier Davis of Ontario or Premier Hatfield of Nova Scotia? Oh, they agree 100 percent, Mr. Chairman. Maybe they will have a new federal leader, so maybe we will have a bit more agreement on the Tory side insofar as his understanding as to property rights.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there is . . . Mr. Chairman, the Tories would like to pass the buck. Are you going to have a federal leader in two weeks time, is that going to be the . . . ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the item under discussion is agricultural Crown lands. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly respect your admonition and I see you are leaving the Chair and possibly you will be heading up the debate in the same manner as the Member for Roblin who wants to bring up all kinds of red herrings with respect to the issue of property rights. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the issue was defeated in the House. Unfortunately the Liberals in the first instance who voted in favour of that motion, I guess they really didn't know what they were doing because the fact of the matter is, as I understand the issue of the property rights issue that the member talks about the ownership of land, that is really an economic issue; whether or not the public has the authority in this country to do things on behalf of all the people in this province. We would not, if that issue was entrenched in the Constitution, the chances are of us having a publicly operated insurance scheme in the Province of Manitoba would go down the drain, Mr. Chairman. That's what would happen. That is what is at stake, not the very issue of whether I have title to my —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the issue of Crown lands was related in the argument, Mr. Chairman, and I only made a few comments with respect to it. There was quite wide ranging debate.

Mr. Chairman, as well, the issue, I believe, in terms of the Crown land issue is management. The other key issue that the Minister of Natural Resources, in his remarks, really didn't touch upon is really how the use of that resource is made in relationship to where the greatest need is in terms of where the people of this province are. And that is really what is also an issue in terms of the Crown, how will we deal with those resources in proximity to where the bulk of the need is. You know while the Minister spoke about 100, close to 100 million acres of Crown land in the Province of Manitoba, there is no doubt about it, historically the vast portions, a vast amount of the province is Crown land. But the problem is, Mr. Chairman, where is the resource in relationship to the greatest use in terms of its residents, in terms of other resource needs of this province. You know the bulk of it is south of 53, the bulk of the use. The most intense use in terms of agricultural Crown land is in the south half of the province, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate and I'm pleased to see when I hear the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Resources, the Minister of Agriculture talk about the needs of sand and gravel in terms of preserving our resources that are under the surface of the land; the Minister of Resources in terms of preserving the resource base for whether it be wildlife, in terms of water fowl or deer or elk or any type of trapping that goes on in the province and the Minister of Agriculture in terms of trying to set, give his priorities into the process in terms of the needs of the agricultural areas. There is no doubt that there are competing views. There are always, there are always competing views in terms of the needs and the requirements of various resource groups within the province. And the issue will never be clear-cut in terms of how it is dealt with and whether or not — you know the Member for Emerson has one particular point of view in terms of at least one direction that he would like to take this debate over. I am pleased that some of his colleagues at least see the need of the multi-disciplinary use and involvement of the resources that are here within the province.

Mr. Chairman, the Member makes some comments about land that was classified agriculture. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, in terms of agricultural land, there is still other competing resource uses on that land and you know, in terms of the process that was set up, your government, your administration, I believe is following on it. It'll be interesting to know what changes, if any, they've made in terms of land use policies. It doesn't appear that they have, at least from the declaration of your government in terms of the land use policies that you have accepted. I think they were developed and in the process of being developed and the present government has accepted them at least in terms of their policy statements. One doesn't know what actually is happening in practise, not fully, but one can certainly surmise by some of the comments and responses that we get from citizens within the province.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources, when he spoke about this policy being a natural evolution of Conservative policy in terms of Crown lands, you know, the Conservatives did have a policy in dealing with Crown lands in terms of leases, which really was very unfair and I am pleased that they haven't gone back to it, and that was the leasing of Crown lands to the highest bidder. To the highest bidder, Mr. Chairman, whoever had the most dollar was able to lease Crown lands. They haven't, and I give them credit, they haven't gone back to that policy. They have adopted the policy of allocation of Crown lands on the point system and on management ability and I believe, and the Minister of Agriculture shakes his head in the affirmative, that they are continuing on with that policy. I would like to know whether they have amended any parts of the policy that was adopted in '74 of this policy, in terms of allocation.

Why I say that, Mr. Chairman, because there have been instances and maybe last year is an unfair year in terms of attempting to judge this administration in how they have handled the Crown land resources in this province. Maybe this last year is very unfair, but certainly there is much to be desired in terms of the actions of this government in the last year towards the way the Crown lands have been handled, Mr. Chairman. There certainly is much to be desired. We've raised the issues and I think we should point — Mr. Chairman, we raised a number of these issues in the last session. We pinpointed them and you know, the Member for Emerson maybe forgets.

Well, I'll remind him, Mr. Chairman, in the way that the whole issue of agricultural Crown lands were dealt with in this province. We had the issue of the Swan River area, the Red Deer Lake area, Mr. Chairman, in how this government handed out Crown lands after they had staff that made commitments to farmers in the area. The staff came back. It was strictly a political decision in terms of how those Crown lands were handed out. Strictly it was handed out, rather than handed on the basis of need to the people of that area, it was handed out from the government, from the Minister of Agriculture to the municipal leaders who happened to have been very close friends to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and they were to hand out the Crown lands in that area, Mr. Chairman. There is one, Mr. Chairman, there is one example.

Mr. Chairman, there was also the issue in East Selkirk in terms of community pastures, where it was found that people who bypassed the system of entering a community pasture, bypassed the local committee, put their cattle into the community pasture without the authority of the local board and it was condoned, Mr. Chairman. The Minister whitewashed it when it was raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Mr. Chairman, number 3. The area in Gypsumville, the area where there was a conflict between the Department of Natural Resources and the Minister of Agriculture. I don't know who gave the Minister of Agriculture the information. He came back to this House when I raised the issue that Crown lands were put up by the Department of Natural Resources for people to put their names in on a draw system for a couple of parcels of land that were under Resources control, had been used for nesting areas, but it had tame hay there previously. That was put up for draw. Before the draw was concluded the draw process was stopped, the Minister, and I say probably in all honesty at the time, came back to his house and said that the land was previously leased to an individual. We took the Minister for his word and that was the end of the issue.

But, Mr. Chairman, I happened to go out to the area a month or so after the Session closed and I asked some farmers in the area what happened to this land, that we were told it was under lease to somebody on a long-term basis. Oh yes. There were 2 farmers that got that land. The one that raised the issue with the department and said that, look, the process was wrong, because the Resources people said, look, don't come to us, it wasn't our decision that changed this process and we thought all farmers would have a chance. He complained and the individual I presume that the Minister talked about, who had a long-term lease, he got part of the land. So now we had one lease that was supposed to be a long-term lease, that the land had been leased out, now two people had that lease, Mr. Chairman. Now, somebody was snowing somebody. When the Minister came to this House, the information that he presented was not accurate, Mr. Chairman. There couldn't have been a long-term lease of the entire property because two people ended up cutting hay on that land, Mr. Chairman. That is really what happened, and the information that the Minister brought to this House was not accurate. That is what I heard from the people in the Gypsumville area, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the Minister says that the issue of Crown lands was handled properly. Mr. Chairman, there is also the issue in the Dauphin River area, northeast of Gypsumville. I don't know how the process was conducted but the Crown lands in that area were allocated to farmers in southwestern Manitoba, and rightly so, Mr. Chairman, southwestern Manitoba was one of the hardest hit areas. I don't want to try and pit region against region, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the whole area of the western portion of the Interlake had been, first of all, hit by frost, so the hay in that whole region was damaged by frost in the early spring, was subsequently damaged to a greater degree by the drought, Mr. Chairman, and around haying time, they started getting the rains, so the need for hay in that area

was certainly equally as great as the area in the southwest.

So what did we end up doing in that sense, Mr. Chairman? We ended up having the hay cut in the Dauphin area; we had to pay transportation for hay from Dauphin River to the southwestern corner of the province, about 400 miles or better, and now we are ending up bringing the hay from other parts of the province into the interlake, Mr. Chairman, a very good policy in terms of very efficient handling of the resources in the area in the way it worked out. That's really how we have handled this issue. The Minister can smile if he wishes.

Mr. Chairman, there are other issues in terms of handling of the Crown land and the Minister knows — he has received letters from myself on behalf of people in the northern interlake — and here is a real gem, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the way the situation was handled that really is astounding, Mr. Chairman.

There happened to be a dispute over boundaries, but never over the last number of years — hay, I guess, was at a short supply and two leaseholders, one decided to take some hay from the other leaseholder's property, both of whom were on Crown land, Mr. Chairman. The dispute occurred. One of the leaseholders said, "Look, we can settle this. Let's get the Crown lands people here and let them settle the boundary land. Since the Crown is doing the leasing to both of us, let's not dispute this issue." One farmer had already taken — I think the amount was 57 round bales, which was no small amount, about 30-some odd tons of hay. So they contacted the Crown lands people to say, "Look, settle this dispute. You are the lessee on behalf of the Crown; you are leasing the land to us, come and settle it." "Oh, no, no, no, no, we have no authority to involve ourselves in this and we are washing our hands."

So what is the leaseholder supposed to do? He now has a claim and says, "Look, somebody has stolen my hay; my neighbour has taken my hay. Is the lessor of the land going to involve themselves and settle this dispute?" No, Mr. Chairman. I wrote the Minister and said, "Look, settle this matter." Do you know the reply, the position that has been taken, and no doubt it is a legal position in terms of the department. (Interjection)— I believe it is, Mr. Chairman. The legislation that they have hinged their position on is the — I should get a copy of that legislation — it is The Boundary and Fence Lines Act, Mr. Chairman, and that is an old piece of legislation — maybe I can get that. The statute is gone out of here. Maybe the Clerk has the statute.

Mr. Chairman, the essence of the legislation is an old method to settle disputes dealing with fence lines. (Interjection)— Yes, where you appoint fence viewers, and if we can't agree, we appoint a referee. (Interjection)— But, Mr. Chairman, what kind of a fence are we going to view when there is no fence, there is no line, there is nothing. The irony of the whole thing is there is no fence in the area. What fence are we going to view, Mr. Chairman? Is it going to be an imaginary line? Are the farmers going to have to put up a fence so that we can now appoint a fence viewer? Mr. Chairman, the legislation reads, and the Minister in his letter to myself indicated that, "Where adjoining owners or occupiers of land disagree as to what is a lawful fence, or the proper location of a proposed or existing line or

boundary fence, or the necessity of repairs to or the manner of repairing a line or boundary fence, or the just proportion of a line or boundary fence that each owner shall or occupier shall erect or put in repair, or the amount of compensation that the owner or occupier shall pay to the other erecting or keeping in repair a line or boundary fence, or any other matter in connection with the erection or repair of the line or boundary fence, that dispute shall be settled by three fence viewers, or the majority of them as herein provided," Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the irony of the issue is there is no fence. Who is the lessor in this case, Mr. Chairman? It is the Crown in both instances. Mr. Chairman, one of the farmers, as a result of the position of the Crown in this case, he ended up spending, having to put out a cost I believe in excess of \$1,400 to run a fence line, to hire a surveyor, to hire local people to chop the line to find out where the exact boundary is, and the Crown has washed its hands of it. Mr. Chairman, in any other circumstances, would you if you were leasing a piece of property from someone, if there was a dispute over the boundary line, would you end up having to encounter or take up or pay for such expenses on your own? You would go to the owner and say, "Look, what are my rights; what are my rights in terms of what have I leased from you? You have given me a description on the lease of certain lands. Tell me what I have rights to." The same thing for both parties.

What we have had here is a complete abdication of responsibility in terms of how the Crown lands issues are settled. Where, in this day and age, would you administer Crown lands on the basis of not getting involved and yet asking people to pay leases and not be able to handle the lands that you were leasing. Mr. Chairman, that is another one. Mr. Chairman, there is also the issue that has come up and it was a personal issue that I was involved in. For the first time I was asked by a constituent to prepare an appeal against a decision of the Crown lands allocation committee, I presume based on the allocation of Crown lands under the point system. It was the first time I became involved. I have never been involved in this kind of a situation before, Mr. Chairman. As requested I prepared the appeal on the basis of the information that my constituent gave me. I prepared it for him, it was submitted and the hearing was held. I was asked to attend the hearing and it was dealt with in the normal way. The appeal was dealt with and the appeal was lost. The constituent that asked me to prepare the appeal lost the appeal. Mr. Chairman, that would have been fine, it would have been the end of the matter. Mr. Chairman, I would have had no matter of raising it in terms of the . . . but, Mr. Chairman, I was advised when my constituent went back to find — to see whether there was any alternate land uses — lands available to him, he was advised or the information came to him, and I am giving it to you as second-hand information. I am, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't told to me, but, Mr. Chairman, the constituent was advised that had he gone to that appeal himself, the appeal would have been handled in a different matter. That's what he was advised. Mr. Chairman, when I prepared the appeal I was not prepared to go to the appeal board on the basis of just the information he provided. Mr. Chairman, the age in

terms of using the department's own criteria, in terms of the considerations that are used in allocation of Crown land, the age which gives one applicant over another a higher priority was clearly in his favour. Number two, the need for land in terms of the size of operation, I think, was amply demonstrated by this gentleman, and number three, was the issue of net income potential and the type of operation the gentleman has.

Now had the incident not been raised and came back, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that any one would have mentioned and no one would have raised anything in terms of the appeal decision, because I do know the matters of appeals are very hard to judge, but for someone in the field to make a statement to the effect that you would have been treated differently had you gone there alone, Mr. Chairman. . . .

MR. GREEN: Who said that?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it is a staff member of the Minister's own department. Mr. Chairman, it can be corroborated by a municipal official within the LGD of Armstrong, and that's where that issue was raised, Mr. Chairman. It was mentioned there. I raise it in all seriousness. I say one thing to the Minister, if that is in light of all the various problems that I have raised, various issues that I have raised in terms of how Crown lands have been handled, I can only come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister has allowed over the last number of years to have this branch become a political arm of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Chairman, whether the Premier of this province had said that or didn't say that, there is certainly enough evidence that we have been able to bring forward to certainly substantiate the charge that I have made, Mr. Chairman, and I make it very seriously in terms of how the issue is handled. I make this charge, Mr. Chairman, knowing that it is never an easy issue in terms of whether you sell the land and who you sell it to in arriving a policy; whether you in terms of settling who should Crown lands be allocated to in a first instance in terms of the procedure that was settled or, Mr. Chairman, in terms of allocating the Crown lands in terms of an appeal against a decision, is not to be taken lightly.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister certainly has, I believe, mismanaged this resource in the Province of Manitoba. He has certainly not worked towards the interests of farmers in Manitoba with respect to the Crown land resource in the way he has handled it. It has become a political football in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. It's been a little game, Mr. Chairman. It was very evident last spring.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of Crown lands while it can be drummed up about state farms or whatever, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the issue of ownership or not, is one that I don't think has much merit in terms of the arguments put forward by the Member for Rock Lake previously, about somebody wanting a state farm or not. Mr. Chairman, the options were always there but in terms of the public owning land and having some control over it, is always . . . and you know, your Minister of Natural Resources stated that. It will always be an objective of whoever is in government. Mr. Chairman, the key is how the resources are being managed. Mr.

Chairman, this Minister has mismanaged the Crown land resource in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to indicate that I did not intend to get up before the Minister answered, but if the Minister is not going to answer and I am going to hear from the Member for Rock Lake, I prefer the sound of my own voice to the sound of the voice of the Member for Rock Lake, so I will answer. But I am prepared to yield the floor, if the Member for Rock Lake will yield the floor and let the Minister answer a charge, that because a citizen got an MLA to deal with his problem that that citizen did not get the same consideration from the department that he would have received from the person had not gone to his MLA to have this done.

The Member for Emerson says I don't buy it, but a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson interjected when the Member for St. George was talking about how the Conservatives are using Crown lands as an arm of the Conservative Party. The Member for Emerson shouted, "The same as you did." Now I don't agree that we did it, but he says we did it and now he says, "You are doing the same." Mr. Chairman, if it's his position that we were doing it out on the basis of political patronage, which I deny, and he says now you are doing the same thing, then he is saying that the Conservatives, Mr. Chairman, are doing it out on the basis of political patronage.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat I am prepared, because I think that what has been said is serious enough that I would like to hear the answer, rather than even hear my own voice and that's going some, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not going to yield the floor if it's going to be picked up by the Member for Rock Lake. I have some remarks to make on another issue. I will yield the floor if it's picked up by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am quite pleased to pick it up and while I'm up on my feet I can respond to the Member for Ste. Rose as well on a couple of items that he had.

I would like to make the record very clear, Mr. Chairman, that in no way, shape or form has there been any direction from this government to staff or anyone else to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, and if there is that kind of thing then it would be corrected immediately by me. I am the Minister who answers the questions. I did not accuse anybody across the way for using the Crown land section as a political arm of the New Democratic Party and we as a Conservative Government are not doing it either.

There is an appeal mechanism, whoever presents their appeal are quite free to present that appeal. It is documented and if that Appeal Board recommends to me that there should be a change, then there is a change. But by no way, shape or form is there any direction of how that appeal system is handled. The judgment is made by competent people and that's the way it will be.

I would like to just answer briefly the question from the Member for Ste. Rose, if the member would give

me that opportunity. The question of the individual on the hay. It is a situation that many people found themselves in, that they did not get the yield off of the leased land that they had of the Crown. There was no change made for anyone. The member did not indicate the size the 35 bales were. They could have been a half-ton bales, they could have been 60-pound bales or they could have been one-ton bales. If in fact they were the large round bale that would be approximately 1,000 pounds in weight, my calculations were that those bales would be approximately \$20 a piece, which is not an unreasonable price for hay this particular year. So that's my basic answer to that. I can't determine whether it was high, low or indifferent unless I know the amount of tonnage that there was involved. But just to say 35 bales, we know that there are 60-pound bales, 1,000-pound bales or 1,500-pound bales. But assuming that this kind of a year . . . that's number one.

Number two, if it was tame hay, there could have been insurance taken on it, and I would think it wasn't tame hay, I would think that it would be wild hay.

On the issue of the Swan River, Red Lake hay situation, Mr. Chairman, that hay was turned over to the local municipality to provide to the producers of that area as they saw fit and I have nothing, I have no problem with doing that. I have faith in the elected system, that the people in that community should act responsibly. Our staff were very much involved in the allocation of all the pasture land to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated last spring, last summer, that it was handled in a normal and proper manner.

I think that it's also important that I answer the question on the boundary dispute. Is the member suggesting, and I don't think he is, that we should, in fact, forget about the laws that are made. Whether they're old laws or new laws. The law is there and if he is suggesting that there be a survey of that line done, I think that his recommendation should be considered. That we have to determine that boundary line as the Crown and I have no difficulty with that. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, he says that's not what my position is. Well, it appears that the position that was taken originally, that in fact, we couldn't settle it with the present law that was in place. There is nothing wrong with recommending that kind of a process. (Interjection)— Well, I don't want to get into a harangue over this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order? The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of clarification.

MR. URUSKI: Just for clarification, the staff, — the Minister should realize before he goes too far for his good, the staff were invited to come out. They came out but would not involve themselves before the boundary line issue went too far. That's what I'm advised, Mr. Chairman. If that's not the fact of the matter, then let the Minister clarify that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I may indicate that the staff who probably were involved are not qualified survey people and I'm talking of a matter of

a proper survey that would have to take place to resolve the issue properly. Because if an individual who works for the department could run into the same kind of accusations that we're hearing here, that favouritism would have been played on one hand or the other and, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to see that that is resolved, prepared to see it's resolved in a proper manner and if it requires a survey it will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said in answer to a charge that a person from his staff told a citizen of the Province of Manitoba that he would have gotten more serious consideration or different consideration if he had not gone to his MLA, if he had filed the appeal himself. The Minister responded by saying, "I can assure the Honourable Member that I gave no directions to my staff in that regard."

Now I have some respect for the Minister. But even if I have no respect for him, if it was a person who I had less regard for his honesty, I wouldn't expect that Minister to give directions to . . . staff. What I am concerned with is not whether he gave directions that that happened, but whether it happened. And the Member for St. George says that it happened. He says that there was a witness to it. He says that he is prepared to substantiate it. And I ask the Minister whether if indeed it is substantiated, if the names are given, if the staff people are identified, will that staff be disciplined? Will the appeal that was launched be reviewed and the member given proper consideration, not whether the Minister gave direction? But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the people who are doing this, if it is being done and I'm not privy to it, but the Member for St. George says and I take him at his word, that he is prepared to give the Minister the names, that he is prepared to identify the witnesses to it, and he said that there were — I presume that if he is saying this that he will identify the people — whether the Minister, who has not given such directions and who has indicated that this is contrary to his directions, that these people will be disciplined, most severely, most appropriately, and more important, that the citizen whose appealed, and I'm not privy to the nature of the appeal, but whatever the appeal was, that it will be reviewed and that there will be assurance by the Minister that the man will not be prejudiced by virtue either of the fact that he hired, not hired, but asked his MLA to help him out, or by the fact that we've had this discussion in the House? I would expect, Mr. Chairman, that that would be done by virtue of what has been stated to be ministerial policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did want to enter the debate earlier, but I am able to do so under Crown lands because these are the lands that are owned by the public of the Province of Manitoba. And what sometimes is not appreciated by most of our citizens and many of our politicians, is that over 75 percent of the land in the Province of Manitoba is under what the Conservatives would call Communistic control. We all own it, Mr. Chairman. Seventy-five percent of the land is under Communism, Mr. Chairman, according to the Conservatives. (Interjection)— How long has it been owned? At least since 1867

and before then 100 percent of the land was owned collectively or virtually collectively and they didn't have any laws to say that one person can have a piece to the exclusive of all others. (Interjection)— Yeah, okay, excuse me. The Member for Lakeside corrects me as to time. I would say that before 1534, before anybody came and said that some pieces of this earth that we call North America, north of the 49th parallel, is going to be owned by certain citizens to the exclusion of all other citizens. It was owned publicly, collectively. We all own it. Then some people came and said I'm going to stake out a piece for myself, but 75 percent is still owned collectively by all of the people of the Province of Manitoba and even the Conservative Government will not parcel that out to individuals. Even the Conservative Government will now say, "We will not divest the public of its recreational land, of its land that is adjacent to rivers, of its land that is adjacent to lake, because they do not believe in private property and land, and they won't do it, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the reason that I entered the debate and I'm glad that the Member for St. George is here and the Member for Rock Lake is here, is because the Member for Rock Lake was trying to make a very big point out of the fact that the Liberals and the New Democrats in Ottawa, refused to entrench a provision which would have guaranteed the rights of property. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Liberals and the New Democrats did not say there should be no right to property. They said they should not entrench such a right in the Constitution, which is quite a different thing, because I gather my Conservative friends and opponents also agree that there should be no entrenched rights in a Constitution. So why did you attack the Liberals and the New Democrats for opposing a Conservative amendment to entrench the right to property in the Constitution if you agree then it shouldn't be entrenched? I mean the Minister of Agriculture says that we Conservatives also agree that you should not entrench the right to property in the Constitution. The difficulty, Mr. Chairman, that we are in, is that all three of those parties, not the Conservatives in Manitoba, I take them off the hook in this area, but the Conservatives in Ottawa, the New Democrats in Ottawa, the Liberals in Ottawa, all agree with entrenching many other things in the Constitution, any number of which, Mr. Chairman, includes the right to property. If you entrench, and the New Democrats who say that they have made a great saving by keeping this piece out, if they really believe that they are deluding nobody but themselves, because they are agreeable to entrenching the right to life, liberty and security of the person and many other things, many other things. (Interjection)— Well no, the pursuit of happiness is the American Constitution, but the security of the person and liberty, Mr. Chairman. They are certain, and you know the Member for St. George got up and he said, "If you entrench the right to property in the Constitution you would never have been able to have Autopac." I'm glad that he sees that. I wish that more New Democrats saw that, because if he's saying, Mr. Chairman, that that applies to the use of the word property, then anybody who has any imagination whatsoever, or who has had any knowledge of what takes place in the courts, will know that the right to property can

be derived from the right to life, the right to liberty and the right to security of a person. And, Mr. Chairman, I find it astonishing that people who have never been near a courtroom will come to me, and I think that you can go outside these 4 walls and across the road and find out that I am in court as often as most lawyers in the Province of Manitoba and have been through all of the court system up and down, but these people who have never been near a courtroom say to me, "The courts will never do that." They know, Mr. Chairman, these people know that the courts will never do that and they are willing to fight elections, collect nickels and dimes from old age pensioners and run around and go ahead on a platform on their knowledge that the courts won't stop that platform if it is entrenched in the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, take this as a logical argument, that a judge will say the right to life involves the right to the enjoyment of life. The right to the enjoyment of life is impossible without the enjoyment of property and therefore the right to life involves the enjoyment of property. Or if you don't want to have life used in that way, then they will say the right to liberty, one cannot have liberty unless one has free choice. Freedom of choice involves being able to choose what insurance company you get. What does liberty mean if it does not mean choice? It means the right to have different options because liberty where there is no choice is not liberty. Now, if I am talking like a Conservative, Mr. Chairman, I am also talking like a judge. I suggest to you that under liberty you have the right to property. When they go to this new concept, security of the person, Mr. Chairman, the gates are wide open and if anybody is suggesting that I am speaking in the realm of speculation, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what happened, and I relate this all to the right to property. My right to property is guaranteed by The Crown Lands Act. That's right. I am an equal shareholder in that property.

But in the private property, I have no guarantee of property. It may all be held by other people to the exclusion of me and as a matter of fact, that is the case. If there are a million people in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, a small minority have private property. So my right to property is my right to be a part owner of what all of us believe in in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to relate to you, just to show you how this process developed, there was a strike at Codville's many years ago —(Interjection)— Codville's, the grocery supplier; they supplied the IGA Stores. The people who were on strike at Codville's walked in front of the IGA — the store was Dusessoy's — and they said to the people going into the store, "This is a store that sells Codville; please don't buy at this store." Now, you people are Conservatives, you would think that a worker would have a right to walk in front of IGA, and say that, "This store buys from Codville's; we are on strike; we would like you not to buy from this store." And that's all, Mr. Chairman. Yes, cars came up and they tried to get the attention of the driver and tell him not to go in and if he went in, he went in, and if he didn't, he didn't.

The judge who heard the case said, "We are here with conflicting rights. These employees claim they have the right to communicate information. The IGA,

on the other hand, claim they have the right to trade. I find that the right to trade supersedes the right of these employees to communicate information."

Mr. Chairman, the interesting thing is that he found that and created that without an entrenched Constitution and fortunately, those who disagreed with him were able to come into this Chamber and say, "People have the right to trade but we, the Members of the Legislature, the representatives of the people, duly assembled, hereby say that an employee has the right to walk in front of that store in a peaceful manner and persuade people not to go in.

But if that right to trade and its exclusion of a person's right to walk in were entrenched in the Constitution, we wouldn't be able to do that here; we wouldn't be able to have a New Democratic Party get elected and move it. We would have to get seven out of ten provinces, representing over 75 percent of the people to change that decision of a court who devised . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, the last bit of the discussion has no bearing on agricultural Crown lands and I would certainly ask the honourable member to please refer to the subject under discussion.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I do this because I am talking about the right to property and Crown lands and my right to property and Crown lands as distinct from — other members have raised this — it was the Member for Rock Lake who said that we don't believe in the right to property. (Interjection)— He didn't say that. He said the New Democrats and the Liberals don't believe in the right to property. He didn't say the Independent doesn't believe in the right to property.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the right to property. I believe that my greatest assurance that I will have property is that it is not parcelled out to a whole bunch of individual people and that I am now an owner of 75 percent of the property in the Province of Manitoba, and the only part that I am not an owner of is the balance of the 25, of which I do have several small pieces, and which I treasure and covet in the same way as anybody covets their own land, and I will concede that, Mr. Chairman. But as to the right to property, I am suggesting that that only comes . . .

MR. ENNS: You covet mine; that's what worries me.

MR. GREEN: No, I don't covet yours; not yours in particular.

What I do covet in the way in which the Member for Lakeside is talking about, I do not covet for myself; I covet it in conjunction with all of my brothers and sisters and fellow citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, there is a difference of opinion on this question. The way in which that difference of opinion is resolved is not by entrenching it in the Constitution and not by saying, as has been said by — well, they say that I take the reactionary position against an entrenched bill of rights, so I can use the same language; we call it an exchange of insults. It is said by those reactionaries that if you do not believe

in an entrenched bill of rights, you do not believe in rights. Mr. Chairman, every other argument, I can take; the last argument is a stupid argument, a stupid argument which is used because the people who use it do not have any intelligence and are not able to discuss the issues. I tell the Member for Rock Lake that when you accuse the New Democrats and the Liberals of not believing in the right to property because they voted against entrenchment, there are many other things that you can accuse them of with relation to this constitutional debate and be on much firmer ground, but they believe in the right to property; they don't want it entrenched in the Constitution. I am suggesting that they are not going far enough; they should not have any of the other things entrenched which they want to remain within the province of the democratic process and legislative authority, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I will respond to the first questions of the member and try to refrain from getting into the constitutional debate, though, on Crown lands.

The member, who I consider is an honourable member and would not make allegations in this House if in fact they were not true, however, he did indicate they came to him second-hand. I think if he is prepared to provide me with the proper information, I am quite prepared to first of all review the situation with the individual staff member; number two, the individual whose particular case was before the appeal mechanism, if in fact there is reason for reconsideration, that will be put back before the appeal mechanism, regardless of who is there to represent that individual. The individual has the right to be represented, as far as I am concerned, by who he chooses. That is how I feel, Mr. Chairman, and that process will take place.

I would just like to add further to what the member has said. It is something that is very well put and that is that I don't believe a bill of rights should be entrenched in the Constitution. A good example of how the rights to hold property, or the rights of land ownership, the rights of the farm community are protected, is in fact through this Legislative Assembly. It has been demonstrated with the last administration who felt that the Crown, that the government should own the property, and they had the power and the right to do that. The people of the province did not support that and changed those people and the people who had the power, and that changed right here in this Legislative Assembly, that their rights to hold property, or to own or to buy Crown lands are now reflected in the policies of the people that they have put in this Assembly. If they are not satisfied with their rights being protected that way, then in fact they have the right to change them. I think it is a system that has demonstrated right here in the last few years, to me, one that has worked —(Interjection)— One-hundred-and-thirteen years, but I haven't been around for quite 113 years. I have seen the working of this Legislative Assembly protecting the rights of the farm people in that way. It is demonstrated and I think it is one that we feel very pleased and I am very happy to continue to support, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in listening to the Member for Inkster this evening speaking to the matter of Crown lands. I am not sure whether I misunderstood him — I only wish he were still in his seat — but he accused me, if I understood him correctly, of being utterly stupid because I didn't understand the difference in the Constitution which is being dealt with, as far as Crown lands are concerned, in this case, and the entrenchment of the rights to own property into the Constitution as opposed to not entrenching it. Mr. Chairman, I think I understand — the Member for Inkster is a learned lawyer and I am not, I am a layman. If I understood the matter correctly, as the Member for Roblin brought up this evening so very effectively and so very forcibly, which to me is a very important issue to not only the people of Manitoba but to the people of this country of ours. As I understand the entrenchment of our rights into the Constitution, it means that the courts will deal with issues such as that and not the Parliament, nor the Legislatures.

Now, if these rights are not entrenched, which we stand for them not being entrenched, it means that Parliament will be supreme; Parliament will deal with those kinds of issues; and so will the Legislatures of this country.

I want to say to the Member for Inkster, if he is telling me that I don't understand it, I want to explain to him my version of it and I only wish he were here to respond to me and I would be allowed to interrupt him in what I am saying if he were to get up and respond to what I am saying.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster also said 75 percent of the acreage in Manitoba has been Crown lands for a hundred years. I couldn't give him the exact acreage in Manitoba as being Crown lands. (Interjection)— All right, Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned but I want to say something, Mr. Chairman, in regard to Crown lands, which was introduced by the NDP, which was introduced by the Member for Inkster when he was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in the Province of Manitoba. I don't have the exact acreage but you know, Mr. Chairman, that member, when he was the Minister on this side of the House, introduced legislation to buy up X-number of acres of land for the preservation of wildlife, which is now Crown lands in the Province of Manitoba. I want to say to him, to his colleagues and to the people of Manitoba, that the X-number of acres that they bought for the preservation of wildlife was not necessary; it was a cost to the taxpayer that was absolutely not necessary because I want to say to him that there are many farmers in my constituency of Rock Lake who have provided the kind of preservation for wildlife in that part of Manitoba without not even one dime being spent of taxpayers' money. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I have become very concerned with my fellow members opposite when they want to get into the business, because as far as I can understand when they campaigned in 1969 and 1973 on their election campaign, I don't think they told my people that they were interested in buying up good farmland, pasture land, that was owned by private individuals, to provide that for the preservation of wildlife. (Interjection)— There were many acres in my constituency bought, Mr. Chairman, but I just

don't happen to have the actual acres that were bought. All I have to say, Mr. Chairman, to the people of this province and to what the NDP stood for, and I become suspicious, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I am suspicious by nature but you know, Mr. Chairman, when I have to deal with the kind of people that I am opposite, who don't believe in the right for an individually owned property, and I think that the Member for Inkster, believes that also even though he may be on a independent fling right now. He still doesn't believe that a person should have the right to own property. Sure he talks about his own kind of ideology where it's all right for him. He's got a share in X number of acres of land with the rest of the people of Manitoba. It's all well and good for him to use that kind of philosophy and espouse that.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with that, that is as far as I'm concerned, but as I said before, I don't agree with it, and I am going to fight him on that basis, because I don't think that this is what the people in Manitoba want, and I don't think this is what the people are going to stand for. And as far as I'm concerned I am going to fight that philosophy, and I don't think that we in Manitoba, come the next provincial election. Mr. Chairman, we're going to fight it on that basis, and I hope that we will win; that we will have the right we are going to restore the number of acres of good farmland that the NDP bought will be put back in the hands of private ownership where people will take pride in owning that land.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, they have been defending Pierre Elliot Trudeau now for the last week. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, Pierre Elliot Trudeau never was a Liberal and that's a sad commentary to have to make, because I say Pierre Elliot Trudeau is even left of left — of the worst socialists in this country. That's why the NDP have no trouble in getting in bed politically with them — no problem. I am sorry the Member for Fort Rouge isn't here, because she must have an awful time standing up, Mr. Chairman, and trying to defend her position as the one lonely Liberal speaking on behalf of the Liberal people in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, having said that about the Prime Minister of this country, I regret to have to say that because I've always had the greatest respect for people who have been on the Liberal Party, but the Prime Minister of this country has destroyed it. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, in that Constitution when we're talking about Crown lands, it has a significant bearing insofar as the entrenchment of not being allowed to own property, as the Liberals of Ottawa, the NDP of Ottawa, and the NDP of the Province of Manitoba want to see happen.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues and my Premier will continue to put up the fight that he's being doing for the last several months to make sure that this doesn't happen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Member for Inkster even suggested that the Member for Rock Lake was stupid. I certainly wouldn't and I respect his strongly held views and the fact that he was able to prevail upon people that the policy of the government was to state farm

everything and they had some success with that particular approach. I don't believe that we were.

I would like to put on the record a couple of remarks relative to what the Member for Rock Lake said. I recall back prior to 1969 in the Interlake region where a lot of underproductive land was taken out of production and was given over to the administration of Ducks Unlimited — acres and acres and acres of land. The Member for Rock Lake sometimes, and with his strongly held views reacts to anything which even smacks of socialism — even smacks of it. I understand that. The Member for Rock Lake and I — I consider him one of my friends in the House.

It's very interesting and another thing, when the Crown took underproductive land out of production, to whether or not we should have taken some particular piece of land out for wildlife preservation, I don't know. I am not an expert in that field and I have been in some of the areas where wolves are a problem with sheep and all the rest of it, and I really wouldn't like to address myself to that particular argument because I am not an expert. But just to the basic philosophy of whether you should use different instruments that we have available to solve a problem, I think that should be the approach and it was the approach under former Conservative administrations. I used for an example the taking of underproductive land out, and I hope the policy is not to put land back into private hands which will incur future public costs such as infrastructures and drains and roads and the rest of it.

On the constitutional part of this, I am going to leave my comments on the constitutional debate until another time, but it is very interesting to see in the Province of Alberta, the height of conservatism, where 80 percent of the oil which is being produced is owned by the Crown; 80 percent is owned by the Crown; people forget this. They are not giving it away. The people in Alberta, and they talk about Albertans, they talk about Loughheed. Every place he goes he talks about Albertans, and the Crown owns 80 percent of the oil producing lands and 100 percent of the lands which haven't been brought into production yet. In Saskatchewan, that socialist problem, it's 60/40 with the Crown having 40 percent of the land on which oil is leased. This reaction of the New Democratic Party being a bunch of state capitalists, I completely reject it and that the policy which this government will pursue, I hope is in the public interest and that the lands which for whatever reason were taken out of production are not being put back on a marginal basis which will be a future cost to the public. It shouldn't be this old red herring dragged across it. It is better to have stuff in the private hands even if it is some future cost to the public. It should be decided case by case, Mr. Chairman, and not on a philosophical reactionary base.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) pass; (d) pass. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to rise once more and I thank the Minister for his advice on the matter. I will provide him with the information that I raised with him in respect to the incident in the Interlake. I will give that to him in writing so that information is available to him. In listening to the

remarks earlier with respect to the debates in Crown lands, I was pleased to hear the Minister of Agriculture basically give a much more indepth review of the issue that is involved in terms of Crown lands. Unlike the Member for Emerson whom the Minister, I believe, disassociated himself with respect to the exuberance that the Member for Emerson displayed with no understanding of the entire procedure that this matter has to undergo in terms of determining which lands are to be sold or disposed of, in which every way the government deems advisable.

Just to put the record straight, it should not be left unsaid that totally that any Crown lands were never to be sold by the former administration in terms of where there was need shown that Crown lands were required for the need of people in areas. I think the Minister of Finance, who was Minister of Natural Resources, has on record many areas where Crown lands were made available to people in terms of development housing, and various kinds of projects. The issue of the Crown lands with respect to the local government districts in terms of turning those Crown lands over, that whole process was started two years before you were elected in terms of starting negotiations with the local government districts. The issue of whether or not Crown lands should be disposed of and in what manner really boils down to what the public use of those Crown lands should be and how those lands are managed. That's really the crucial part; how those lands will be managed, how they will be looked after, and that really is the issue.

Mr. Chairman, we have felt all along that in the main, Crown lands publicly operated with consideration for the various uses, could best be managed in terms of being within the public realm. I think you have seen that in the last year and a half. Your own Ministers have really seen that. They have really had to do some, if they are really serious about their responsibility to the people of Manitoba, they've really had to do some soul searching in terms of how those lands will be managed in the future. It is obvious that it wasn't just a holus-bolus policy of getting rid of Crown lands, even though, as the Minister of Natural Resources said in the heat of debate, some certain commitments are made. The fact of the matter is commitments were made and people's hopes were raised. Those that would have liked to purchase Crown land at a very reasonable or low price, those hopes were raised by the very policy direction that you took in terms of the previous election. I think you will have to live with that, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt about it. But I think your colleagues, the Ministers of the Crown, including the Minister of Agriculture, have a responsibility to all the people of this province in terms of how the resources are handled.

In respect to the issue where the Minister tried to whitewash the issue of the Red Deer Lake area where he said he had the fullest confidence in the elected representatives of the area — there is no doubt that the elected representatives, whether it be on municipal council or the like, they have the confidence of the people in that area. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has had and has a battery of staff who have administered Crown lands for years. What he has done is he has

really handed over a resource to people who have had little or no experience in terms of handling that vast resource. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, his own staff met with farmers in the area who objected to the procedure that his government undertook and the farmers were given, if not assurance, but at least an indication that this whole matter would be reviewed and they would be recommending that the issue be put out to public tender; the lands would be put out to public tender and the farmers would have a chance to go and cut in those lands. Was that done, Mr. Chairman? It was not. It certainly was not.

In the issue with respect to the boundary dispute, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that the Minister says now that he will review his position and he is prepared to undertake a survey. Mr. Chairman, had that indication been given within a week, even a week of receiving my letter, my communication on behalf of the people of that area, I think the expenses that were incurred by the people in that area would not have been undertaken. It's not a small amount. The survey was undertaken. They had to bulldoze a line. They had to do some hand clearing. They had to hire help. It cost that individual, I believe, in out of pocket expenses some \$1,400 or more, Mr. Chairman, to hire those surveyors, and yet there is no way that one could take the legalistic position that the Minister has taken that yes we are only bound by The Boundary and Fencelines Act as he has mentioned in his earlier position. He did not take any other position in the letter that he sent us; no other position. If he is prepared to review it and indicates now that there should be a compromise reached in this matter, I believe then he should be prepared to communicate to my last letter that he has on file which has not been answered. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, you see, in terms of the handling of the situation one can only call it very inappropriate and to say the least, quite sloppy in terms of how this matter was handled.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of Crown lands while it has — we have felt that certainly he has been handling it most inappropriately, Mr. Chairman — I have still a couple of questions in terms of the extent of Crown land development that is to be undertaken this coming year. How much money is being provided? Is that in the capital estimates? If it is, then he should make a note of it as to how much money is being provided for further increase in development of Crown lands and how many acres were undertaken this last year in terms of development.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Crown land improvement program is the same as last year with \$800,000.00.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether the entire amount was expended this year in terms of development? Was the \$800,000 expended in the 1980-1981 fiscal year?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, it will be Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: When the Minister indicates it will be, is there a large portion of the funds not allocated at this time?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's all allocated, but all hasn't been paid out yet.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate to me the procedure that is being handled by the department in terms of determining, as I understand, and I think the minister knows that there is probably more applications for development of Crown land than there are funds available and whether or not the applications that are left over, and if there are some left over, are they put on the first of the list for the following year in terms of applications or then are they thrown into the basket and redetermined again on the basis of those applications. How is this handled?

MR. DOWNEY: Last year, Mr. Chairman, the funds weren't all used, so there wasn't a waiting list, and this year if there is a carryover of names, then they'll start from there, they won't just go right back into the general mix, they'll start from there and proceed on that basis. This year's will carry over and be the first ones next year to be processed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, just in response to the Member for St. George, the Minister said that \$800,000 was to be expended in the improvement of Crown lands. I wonder what criteria are used. How is this \$800,000 to be recovered? Is it to be recovered by what is being charged in the lease of those lands or what criteria is used to expend the \$800,000.00?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the monies are recovered through the lease system. The improvement money is paid back through leasing the land out; if it's improved land there's a higher lease on it than if it's unimproved land.

MR. BOYCE: Well, what recovery time is used and what interest rates are . . . in other words, how is it to be amortized?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's done on a valuation of productivity of the land, and there is no interest charge put to the money that's used as far as the improvements are concerned.

MR. BOYCE: As I understand the Minister's response, then the public generally is subsidizing those people who eventually lease the land, to the extent of the difference between traditional manner of amortizing costs and the Crown's policy relative to this particular allocation of funds. Is that correct?

MR. DOWNEY: On the interest only, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) — pass — (e) Agricultural Land Utilization. 1. Salaries pass The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in this area of land utilization, as I understand it, it is the area where under the Canada Land Inventory Agreement lands are being resurveyed. Could the Minister explain the nature of what areas are being surveyed, how is this being undertaken in terms of who does the surveys and as much background information as he can provide?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is under the Canada Land Inventory Soil Survey, and the soil survey program last year was carried out basically and some of it will be carried forward because it was not completed last year. The South Central was a resurvey area and it was not completed, the Rat River organic soils, the Normac Planning District, Roblin area, Swan River, Flin Flon, which was not completed, South Riding Mountain Planning District, Eastern Interlake Planning District, Duck Mountain Provincial Park, West Portage la Prairie, Whiteshell Provincial Park area, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's been indicated that this is not only done for the Department of Agriculture, it is also at the request of other departments as well.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate who carries out this survey work?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they are employees of the department. We have agronomists and technicians who work full time in this area.

MR. URUSKI: All this work is done in-house, I'm assuming.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 pass ; 2 pass ; (e) pass (f) Manitoba Agricultural Lands Protection Board - 1. Salaries pass The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This area in terms of the Department of Agriculture has certainly raised much concern in the Province of Manitoba over the last number of years, since the amendments made to the Farmlands Protection Act and the loopholes that have been put into the legislation following the policies that have been brought in by the Conservative Government. Loopholes, Mr. Chairman, that really basically are what one could say no protection in terms of farm land sales to anyone.

Evidence is certainly very clear with respect to dummy corporations being set up in the Province of Manitoba, farm lands are being purchased by those corporations, then the monies from the foreign investors are being loaned to those corporations at high interest rates, the loans go into default, the land is repossessed and the sales in effect go through. There is basically no control whatsoever in terms of the non-resident foreign corporation that is coming to Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this has certainly added one more pressure to the price, and a very large pressure to the price of farm land in the Province of Manitoba. The statistics are here in terms of how rapidly farm land prices have risen in Manitoba. One can only indicate that while the Conservative government has said that it wants to protect farm land, it really is doing exactly the opposite.

Mr. Chairman, they've opened the door. They really don't want to recognize that they have left really no controls in terms of foreign ownerships, it again becomes a philosophical issue as to whether or not we want farm land in Manitoba to be held primarily for land resident owners, owner operators who reside on the land. Whether they be foreigners,

if they wish to come in and settle in Manitoba from wherever they come, is immaterial to us. If they are prepared to settle on the land and farm it, we have no difficulties. We never have, and that's the basis of the legislation that was brought in. It appears that the Conservatives of Manitoba wanted to open it to corporations, and in so doing, Mr. Chairman, really left the barn door open, so to speak, to let the horses run out in terms of allowing speculation and long-term investment in farm land.

For we know, Mr. Chairman, the prices that farm land is going for today in some areas, as high as \$1,500. and possibly even \$2,000 an acre — (Interjection)— Well \$1,500, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that sales have been made as high as \$1,500.

MR. DOWNEY: Give us the proof?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I should give the Minister - I think I had it here - in terms of the information of his own staff in the field who have said that in their areas farm lands have been selling for prices as high as \$1,500 an acre

MR. DOWNEY: Who sold the land?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister appears, in his remarks to me, he wants me to do his homework for him. Mr. Chairman, he has his own Agricultural Lands Protection Board, he has his staff. Let him speak with his own ag reps in his own area. His own regional people will tell him what price farm lands are going for, Mr. Chairman, and his own legal people will tell him what the loopholes in the legislation are. I'm not even a lawyer but, Mr. Chairman, it's been amply demonstrated, and even in articles from other provinces, Mr. Chairman, that there have been a number of corporations who ceased their operations of buying farm land in neighbouring provinces and have moved — moved where, Mr. Chairman? - to dear old Manitoba. Those are the reports we have had, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the newspaper article —(Interjection)— I'm telling you that I read it in the paper, I'm not telling you that I have proof of it.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, those loopholes are there in the legislation, and there is no doubt, as I was saying, that the price that farm land is going for in some of the areas, in terms of the economic situation in agriculture today, that you can even return the interest costs on that farm land. There is no way that incomes from agriculture today can support that price of farm land.

So, Mr. Chairman, there has to be some other reason as to why these lands are being sold. They are being sold for very long-term investment. I believe what is happening is that we're really seeing the cycle of oil dollars coming back to Canada in terms of Arabian oil dollars, Mr. Chairman. What it is, really, is that the oil dollars have purchased European land, which is far in excess of the price of Canadian land, and what we are having now is those same dollars coming into Canada from Europeans. The money is just moving around the world, Mr. Chairman, that is really what is happening. We are really paying for the oil in terms of a cheap resource and a long-term investment, and stability, Mr. Chairman, and stability, because in terms of our

governments in the democratic world they are far more stable than many of the regimes elsewhere in the world, and it is stability, Mr. Chairman.

The other issue is - the dear Lord is not making any more of it. There is no more land. I mean there is only one resource, we are not going to be manufacturing any more new land, Mr. Chairman, so what is there? It's a long long term, it's not an investment that they intend to make their livelihood from in terms of immediate returns. No, far from it. In fact, there are cases where that land is being leased to Manitobans, and in some cases to owners at a lease rate that has no relationship to even the interest rates, Mr. Chairman, let alone recapturing some of the capital investment, not at all. It hasn't even any relationship to the interest that could be gained on the money market, Mr. Chairman, on the speculation that land prices will not go down. What it does is place another burden and another pressure for as much dollars as the Minister can throw into his loan program under MACC, Mr. Chairman, it will be eaten up by the very nature of the competition for that small resource and as much money as he can throw in there, there will be even less and less farmers able to take advantage to go on the farm. He can throw millions of dollars into it; he can double his budget, Mr. Chairman, and triple it. All it will do, with the loopholes that he has got, is continue the spiral in as much a competitive manner as the Conservatives accused the former administration by saying, "You are competing for the land base in terms of taking some land out of the marketplace, by buying it under the Land Lease Program." The very same thing is happening, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one can take out some of that uncertainty in the market by pulling out one of the actors, by closing the loopholes, and if you pull out one of those actors, Mr. Chairman, you will have some dampening effect, some slowdown. It may not be the end-all and be-all, Mr. Chairman, but if the government is really interested in preserving farmland for the owner-operator resident farmer, then one way of doing it is to plug the loopholes that they have in their legislation and in that way, that will at least take one of the actors.

Some of the arguments are that you are going to take away large profits from people and that people who will want to sell their land, you are taking away their freedom to make a large amount of money. Mr. Chairman, we have done that as a society for years and years. Every time you change zoning in a city from one type of use to another, for some people you make a fortune and for others, they lose a fortune because it may be down-zoned and it may be up-zoned, depending on the type of land. So, Mr. Chairman, precedents in terms of whether or not fortunes are made or lost in terms of land, they are there and have been for many years, Mr. Chairman. We have been doing that for many decades in terms of urban development and zoning. Zoning has been used in that way. In this sense here, in covering up the loopholes, it would be no different, Mr. Chairman.

So I ask the Minister — I think he has an opportunity show, maybe cover up some of the mistakes that he has made over the last couple of years, and it would be interesting to know where he stands on this issue at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just answer my honourable friend opposite by first of all saying that we, as a Government, fully appreciate first of all the emotional concern that rural Manitoba has with this particular issue. It was with those thoughts that after the 1977 election, when we had to address the issue of that particular day, that we had legislation that was in place that they in fact were forced to move into the particular area of The Farmland Protection Act and I don't think there is any secret, the Minister of that day was not overly anxious as an individual to proceed on that kind of legislation. I don't think he is prepared to make it a secret. I am not going to dwell on that. He, as a government, with his colleagues, made that decision to move.

So I do have to say that the Minister prior to my entering was not overly aggressive as an individual in proceeding that way. I think that should be made very clear.

We moved with all good intent to do what? To restrict the non-resident Canadian from buying or taking control of and creating a difficult situation for the farm community in Manitoba, particularly those new or beginning farmers who were in the land market to buy land. But we also have to remember that they, at that particular time, did not have some of the lending agencies available to them that they now have, which the member also points out, that the increased land prices in fact do have a heavy drain on moneys that are made available. But the point I want to make is they did not have a Provincial Government agency to provide them with some funds on a loan basis. So they were just left a little bit out of the competitive area with having the ability to have money from the province. The individuals who were buying from outside the country possibly did have sources of money that were less costly than what they are here.

I think we also have to appreciate, as the farm community does in Manitoba, that in fact land is a good hedge against inflation. What do we see happening in some of the countries in the world where the member suggests there are unstable governments? There are governments that they do not have confidence in and in fact they are trying to move that capital from those communities into where they feel it is secure. And why is it secure? First of all, there is a secure system of government, one that we have had for the last 113 years, protecting the rights of those individuals. And where are they being threatened? What kind of countries are they being threatened in? In state-controlled countries where there are heavy regulations in place. So that has to be pointed out very clearly too.

We do have a concern within the farm community — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, over the past few years, there have been indications of land — prior to legislative changes made by the present government and those by the last government. Italy, for example, is an area that there have been moneys flowing from. (Interjection) — No, it is probably as close to communism as you would get.

The point I am making is that there is a transfer of funds and they are able to move them and they have come to do what? To invest in what is a valuable

asset. It is an appreciating item that has been the real backbone and the resource base of this province.

Let us look at really what has happened in the last two years, because there have been several interesting things happen. Out of over 8,000 land transfers or land transactions in the last two years in Manitoba, 96 percent of those sales have been farmers in Manitoba transferring from one farmer to another, or newcomers who have settled in this country. That leaves 4 percent that there is area — and that's over the two-year period — to have some investigations take place. As I indicated last week, I believe it was, or earlier this week in our debate, that we had in fact hired an investigator to help with the work that had to be done. At this particular point, we have some seven corporations who are now being challenged by the board and are being asked, or requested, to divest of land that they have bought. So we have seven corporations and there is activity. The amount of acreage is around 3,000 acres. So there is some action and there are things happening.

I am not standing here to say that there hasn't in fact been an increased interest. In fact, there possibly has, but we cannot stand here and hear the Opposition say that the prices of land in Manitoba have gone up because of loose legislation. Let's look at the example of our sister province, Saskatchewan, because in Saskatchewan over the last period of time, the last 10 years, they in Saskatchewan believe that you should be a resident of that province, a residence of Saskatchewan, so that you can't buy farmland in Saskatchewan unless you live within the boundaries of Saskatchewan. That principle, as far as I am concerned, is not in the best interests of Canadian unity. I believe, when you draw those boundaries or those types of legislative restrictions, that you are in fact not uniting a country but in fact dividing a country because, I believe that as a Canadian, strongly about this, that as a Canadian you should have that protection within the rights as a Canadian. I think the Legislative Assembly should be there to protect those kinds of rights and that's in fact what has happened. We have, in fact, considered that Canadians should have that right.

I have also indicated in the Throne Speech that we are prepared to make those changes that are necessary to ensure that the intent of the Act is lived up to, that in fact if we are to preserve the land for Manitobans, particularly Manitoba young farmers, that we had to consider some changes.

I didn't, however, finish out the comments I was making on the value of the land in Saskatchewan and I should do that at this particular time. In Manitoba, we have seen an increase of some 159 percent in land values since 1970. At the same time, remembering that in Saskatchewan, you had to be a resident of Saskatchewan to buy land, their land prices in the same period of time have gone up 218 percent — 218 percent where they have legislation that restricts you as a Manitoban, or a person from Alberta or B.C. or Ontario or Quebec, from investing in that particular province, which I think is discriminatory. I do not believe that is in the best interests of Canadian unity because everyone — I would think across the way — would say that the individuals from Quebec should have the right to work in Saskatchewan; if they want to come and

work in Saskatchewan, then they should have that right to come and make a productive living there, the same as Saskatchewan people should be able to go to Quebec or Ontario and make their living there. I think we have to really look at this thing on the total basis of what are you doing. You are making your living. (Interjection)— I think, Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is that we do have pretty good legislation and we do have fair legislation. We made changes to restrict the ownership of foreign land from 160 acres, which they had put in place — and remember, against the will of certain people — 160 acres, and we reduced that to what? — 20 acres, Mr. Chairman, because when the Act was at 160 acres, the foreign investors were using multiples of 160 acres, or one quarter section, to circumvent the Act and all they needed was a family of 10 to buy 10 quarter sections in each person's name. So in fact it was the loopholes that we had to close up, not that we made loopholes; we in fact closed those loopholes up and I don't think that it should be left on the record that we did not close them, that we, as they would indicate, we opened them. That wasn't the case. I have indicated what has happened in price.

I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think it is a worthwhile thing to tell the people of Manitoba because again, protecting the rights of people, you are dealing with a two-sided sword because in most cases the people who are selling that land are farm people and they, I believe, should have the opportunity to sell onto a market that gives them full value for their product. Interestingly enough, I have had several discussions with the board and it is a tough problem. It is one that can be reared as a great political issue in any rural community because you are really talking about a Motherhood issue, the land ownership thing. I am quite prepared to deal with it in a responsible manner, not an irresponsible manner. I think the point I want to make is in some of the discussions that I had with the board of directors, I said to them, if you requested those people who wanted to come to Manitoba to buy a farm, if you told those potential foreign investors that they had to place a family on each farm, a family on each farm, before they had the right to buy that land, would they in fact buy the land and go ahead and bring a family to this country and put on it. And the answer that the board gave me, and they're responsible people, was yes, that they are anxious enough to buy this province's agriculture productive land and they would go, and this was a speculative question and a speculative answer, but they who have been dealing with this for some time said yes, that they felt that if a foreign individual, a person of any kind had the right to buy if they placed a family on each farm that was bought and in fact forced residency in this province, on each farm, that that would not stop them. So it is a tough situation, when you have to, and then comes the question, then comes the question, do you force that same kind of thing on local Canadian citizens, on Manitobans and Canadians to do the same thing?

So I'm not trying to avoid the issue. We're dealing with it as a government. We're dealing with it in a responsible manner. In fact I think the record would state, Hansard, if we checked it out, that in 1978, when we amended The Farm Lands Protection Act,

we stated specifically, and I will check the Hansard myself as well, we stated specifically if it did not continue to work the way in which we wanted it to, we were prepared to deal with it as quickly as possible. We have seen areas that we have to make some moves and we have announced we'll do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think probably it's something that the Opposition can try and make a lot of political mileage in rural Manitoba. I don't blame them. That's their job, to try and point out if in fact legislation is not doing the job that it should do, but on the other hand, I think we have to be very careful and make sure that rural Manitobans and farm people in particular truly do understand what the facts are because it is something that we all have to deal with it, as I said, in a responsible manner, because we are the legislators of this province, we have to protect the rights of those individuals when it comes to dealing with the right to sell their property and the right to allow other people in. And I think it's more important than ever that we start looking at this kind of legislation that has what I said earlier. It has not added to Canadian unity, but in fact has done somewhat to erode the right of what a Canadian can do in any part of this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I have one before I continue my remarks on this. The Minister indicated that 96 percent of the land transactions that the board handled were farmers and newcomers in Manitoba. Does he have the total acreage of land transactions that he is talking about?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in 1978-79 there were 840,989 acres and in 1979-80; 877,966 acres. So those two would have to be added together to get the total for the two years.

MR. URUSKI: I'm assuming, Mr. Chairman, that that's the total number of acres transacted through the Land Titles Office that the Minister has. Am I correct.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In listening to the Minister of Agriculture speak with respect to trying to make some defence in support of his legislation and the legislation that he's had for the last number of years, you know it's obvious to one in hearing him speak that with the increase in farm land prices that the alternatives that his government has presented, is that they will provide loans to assist young farmers to purchase land, Mr. Chairman. And there is where the crunch really comes in. What you're really doing in terms of the high land prices, as I said before, you can provide as much money as you want when you're having several competing

forces with large amounts of money in the marketplace, it doesn't take very long to establish a base in the market which has no relationship to the productivity or the return that can be had from that land. And that's really what is happening, Mr. Chairman. But I think the Minister should realize and this problem will continue possibly in some areas to a lesser or to a greater degree, that what we are finding that is every time that land changes hands, and the cost of it increases, the cost to society as a whole in terms of the long term costs of food and production from that land, we all end up paying that cost sooner or later. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member from Gladstone says it's going to happen pretty soon. The fact of the matter is it's already happening, Mr. Chairman. It's been happening. It has been happening but it is coming much more quickly to the crunch and much quicker because of the rapidity of escalation that we've had in the last number of year, Mr. Chairman, and it's really telling the story in terms of how quickly some of the land has increased in price.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that farmland prices increased in Saskatchewan 218 percent as compared to 159 percent over the same period, Mr. Chairman. Saskatchewan plugged some of their loopholes in the legislation just last year, Mr. Chairman. I think they finally saw that what they had in the legislation probably, I'm not sure whether their legislation was not even brought in prior to ours, but they did plug some loopholes last year of the very kind that we have tried to suggest. They have come in to realize that some of the features that we had in our legislation that you removed, were ways of plugging some of the loopholes. Now, Mr. Chairman, the legislation that was there certainly didn't, I must admit, and I think my colleague, the previous Minister of Agriculture . . . there probably were some more refinements that would have had to be made to that legislation. But the point we're making is that you've really opened up the barn door, Mr. Chairman, and you're going to have to live with it. You can go around and say what you like in terms of rural Manitoba. The fact of the matter is people are very concerned in terms of what is occurring. And no amount, no amount of backtracking and posturing on this issue now is going to get you off the hook in terms of how you've allowed this legislation to be opened up.

So, Mr. Chairman, we will await to see what kind of amendments the Minister will be bringing forward this Session and certainly, we are prepared to bring amendments of our own and if the legislation won't be forthcoming very soon likely we may have some legislation on the order paper ourselves and we will at least have to see what the government intends to do with that. So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a problem. I think he doesn't recognize it. He would like to whitewash it a bit. But we'll see what he has to come up with.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): (1) pass; (2) pass; (f) pass.

Resolution 13. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,629,800 for Agriculture; Agricultural Land and Water Development Division \$4,629,800 pass.

Resolution No. 14, Clause 8. Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement pass.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I know some of the programs that are part of that agreement. Is the Minister prepared to give us an indication what's in the agreement for this coming year?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to keep it as brief as I can, but I think we have touched base on some of them already, the type of work that is being done, and I can go through a list of some of the activities. I've tried, Mr. Chairman, and maybe the member hasn't received any of them. We've provided for the Agriculture critic opposite, I'm sure, with a copy of the Agro-Man Progress Report, which he's indicating that he did receive, so basically the projects were listed in here.

I would just make one basic comment, Mr. Chairman, that the projects are working very well. I'm indeed pleased with the way in which they are showing some results, and I can use specific projects, but I should just stop and give credit to the Deputy Minister who is now working for me, in the person of Rod Bailey, who is also an individual who was involved in helping set up this agreement, and had a pretty good hand in helping to put together the projects that are here. They are listed and I can go through them and just touch quickly on them. Of course the information part of it, so that we can tell the public what is going on; an assessment of the impact it has on the farm community; an irrigation study, which is ongoing with the University; corn production, where we're trying in fact to show a lot of new varieties and new techniques in the production of corn, working with the Corn Growers Association. Soy bean production, I would have to say is one that is getting along very well and I hope that we would have more product to supply to the crushing plants; the potato project which is being carried out at Portage was discussed under Crops Division. I'm just trying to highlight, Mr. Chairman, some of those areas that are of importance. The irrigation one basically, is one that I think will have a significant amount of impact on the longer run.

But these are basically the highlights and I have also indicated the progress report, that I have circulated to the members. It is an \$18,500,000 project of which a lot is crop production, with the objective of increasing our value added crops for either processing in the province or increasing our red meat production through forage crops in some of our more marginal soils. The drainage part of the project is basically handled by the Department of Water Resources, so if there are any further questions in that area, they may be brought forward at that time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating that there are some actual construction projects of drainage under this program?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We don't actually budget the money that's in the Water Resources Department where those projects are budgeted for, but the Enabling Vote or the Federal Provincial Agreement was signed under the Department of Agriculture and the delivery of those projects are under Water Resources.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, those projects would actually be listed under the Natural Resources, Water

Resources part of the Agro-Man. Those projects would be large provincial waterways, extensions and the like, I'm assuming. Mr. Chairman, in terms of some of the studies in red meats and I think, grasslands projects, are probably continued under that agreement. Are there any projects which may be discontinued? Grassland projects that have been open - is there an intent to discontinue any of the projects that are in existence today?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I think that was one of the important parts of the agreement, that there be a careful assessment made, and if a project is not meeting its objective or it appears that the money would be better spent in another area, there is that flexibility within the agreement. But the Forage Agreement or the Grasslands Agreement, there is certainly no intention of shutting it down; it is a good program and one which I believe should be carried on.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will be quite specific. I have received a comment, and it just may be a rumour with respect to the Grassland Project in Gunton, whether that is going to be continued specifically. That is why I asked the question that I raised. Is there any intent to change, slow down, or wind down that grassland project?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that is not an Agro-Man agreement; that is a separate project and at this particular point, there isn't any intention of closing it down but there is an assessment being made right now of how best it could be used.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the Minister on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8. pass; Resolution 14 pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,682,600 for Agriculture, Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement, \$1,682,600 pass.

Resolution No. 15, Clause 9. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, (a) General Program pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister give us the breakdown of the general programs, I am assuming that they are the Sewer and Water Programs, and also I am assuming that part of that is the veterinary. Could he give us a breakdown there?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the programs that fall within this appropriation are the sewer and water grants for the southern agriculture communities not the northlands water and sewer; also farm water source grants fall within that appropriation; community wells and community source water; water pipeline distribution grants, the same kind of a program that fits in with the water source development for pipelining assistance; for movement of water from either off the farmstead or out of the community to the community from the source; future water use work that is development of small projects or wells or ponding of water but it's not a large amount of money; the veterinary drug

centre purchases fall within this appropriation as well as the A.I. semen purchases, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister listed the projects but he didn't give us the breakdown of the funds. He can give me the sewer and water and all those related projects, and the A.I., and the Veterinary Drug Program in those three categories, if he wants to group them in the general sums.

MR. DOWNEY: In the veterinary drug and semen area there is some \$2,430,000 and the remainder is in Water which is . . . just a minute I'll have that total for him in a minute. In excess of \$4,000,000, Mr. Chairman, but I'll get the exact figure here.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether the costing formula for community water, has that changed? Is there a new program in terms of community, say sewer and water projects, for southern communities, has there been major changes or revisions to that program in terms of the mill rate?

MR. DOWNEY: No change, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the Northern Development Agreement is that basically the Water Projects for Northern Communities?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister, he doesn't have to provide us with a list of communities that are proposed for this coming year under the projects for sewer and water, does he have a list? You've done that? I'm sorry.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I provided that yesterday for the Member for Lac du Bonnet and that information is already on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) pass; (b) pass; (c) pass; 9. pass; Resolution No.15 pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,650,000 for Agriculture. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets \$6,650,000.00 pass.

Clause No. 10. Drought Relief Program no resolution. I can lump it all into the Minister's Salary, but I think that this is the point at which it should be discussed.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, before we go on I have a couple of specific questions with respect to the Drought Relief Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the clause we are on, go ahead.

MR. URUSKI: I would like to know the number of claims that have not been processed yet or are outstanding in terms of the Green Feed Program. Also, Mr. Chairman, whether or not, what I'd like to know specifically with respect to the Hay Transportation Grants, when they were closed off in

terms of out-of-province assistance, whether or not the Transportation Grants up until that point for the part of that grant above the \$20 limit that remained could have been used for transportation within the province, if hay was moved within the province at a distance greater than the amount that the \$20 would cover, whether or not the province assisted the farmer beyond the \$20 limit prior to the November cutoff, when it was announced, Mr. Chairman? That's No. 2.

I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, the breakdown of the feed; how much hay was purchased in terms of moneys expended toward hay; the amount of money that was expended towards transportation and of course, the water supply in terms of the breakdowns that the Minister has? That's for now, that'll do.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the first question, as I understand it was the number of applications that had been approved under the Green Feed Program and there are some \$4,992, some \$1,227 in process, and some \$600 under review. As far as the transportation is concerned there were some 1,589 applications.

The hay purchase in Ontario was \$1,036,147 and I may just explain that, Mr. Chairman, a lot of the hay that was bought, we initially got into the hay purchase but then the producers themselves started into the buying of hay, so we have no record of what the actual producers were buying themselves.

On the Transportation Program, if the member recalls, that initially there was a program put in place to pay up to a maximum of \$20 per ton on feed hauled anything over 50 miles and that covered the screening pellets and products within the province that had to be moved. Then with the continuation of the drought conditions, with the introduction of the Ontario Hay Program there was an agreement worked out between the railroads, the Federal Government and the Province where there was a three way cost-sharing agreement, where in fact the total assistance at that point was some \$60 per ton, maximum that was received. That was also applied to hay moving in from other parts of the country or outside the province, I should say, to try and equalize some of the difficulties that the buyers of feed that were bringing in by truck were encountering to equalize that program.

Then the indications after the Green Feed appeared to have helped the situation and the later rains, and then of course the whole thing changed, from 1st of July on we were, and thank God we were, in a situation of improvement and the whole picture changed and as it did we were finding there were individuals that were requesting that more consideration be given to particularly straw within the province, be changed to be increased and at the same time that there was hay moving from outside the province coming in that really wasn't required. So what we had to do was, and what we did was give consideration to reducing again the removing the subsidy from hay outside the province and continuing on with the internal movement assistant program which in fact was \$20 per ton maximum over 50 miles. Now that, Mr. Chairman, I may indicate was a federal-provincial agreement, of which was the only area, that we received Federal Government assistance, that was the actual transportation program. I hope I have covered the basic questions that the member has.

Oh, I'm sorry, I have one more that he asked. There were some 663 dugouts filled as well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't give us the breakdown of funds expended on those three programs, the transportation and the like.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I haven't got the exact figures because the program is still in place and so it would have to be an estimated figure that I provide at this particular point.

In the neighborhood of approximately just under \$10 million in green feed; over \$4 million in freight transportation, and approximately one half million dollars in water at this particular point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am assuming from those figures that those are net, that is taking off the federal assistance or would there be some federal assistance that you would receive back?

MR. DOWNEY: The change would be on the transportation and the provincial share would be just under \$3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't pass the Item because there is no Resolution number on that. I would ask the Honourable members to turn to Page 9 of the . . .

MR. URUSKI: I'm not finished yet . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

MR. URUSKI: On that item I'm not finished yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister indicated that there were still some 1,297 claims to be processed that are still under the Green Feed Program and 600 claims in, what did the Minister say, in suspense or under review. Can the Minister explain that a bit?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there were certain situations as I indicated earlier of extreme hardship or areas where consideration had to be given and those are basically the areas. To be more specific on any individual one, I haven't got that information available.

MR. URUSKI: These 600 claims that, say roughly 1900 claims that you have, would any of those be in reference to looking at the claims that I mentioned the other day with respect to where the farmer had crop insurance and then shifted to the Green Feed Program and ended up losing everything because the hay, whatever was cut, floated away with the heavy rains; were those included in that or is that type of a submission that we discussed in our debate, over and above this.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the 600 that we referred to, that would be the type of the one that would be included in that, plus there might be an area of some discrepancy on the measurement of

the field or that type of thing. So, that is basically the review.

MR. URUSKI: I'm not sure whether the Minister in his remarks with respect to the Transportation Program answered my question. Did the Province assist producers in Manitoba on transportation of hay within the province over and above, at any time, the \$20 for hay to be moved within the province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if it was an extended distance of over 250 miles for that particular period, Mr. Chairman, between when the program was introduced and the first of November. I'm sorry, the end of November when it was introduced.

MR. URUSKI: At the end of November, right. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister and that was my assumption as well that if there was a long distance of transportation within the province over and above what the \$20 a ton would cover, the program did take into account that transportation and I have not received a response. Are you prepared to consider those claims where it can be verified that hay was in fact purchased but could not be moved? And again, the Minister I think knows in terms of the correspondence I have given him, I have not heard from him, whether he is considering those kinds of requests as well, with respect to hay that could be determined was purchased before the cut-off day but could not be moved because the ground was not frozen and vehicles could not get into the area. We know the area, it happens to be the Saskeram area where farmers from the Interlake had to move all the way to the, not Saskeram, the Red Deer Lake Area, I'm sorry, and farmers from the Interlake had to move hay all the way from that area but they could not transport that hay until such a time as the ground had frozen. But they believe that they could verify that the purchases, or the commitments at least, were made prior to the November 30th cut-off.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm aware of the situation that the member refers to and it is under review process at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the questions throughout the estimates and items that have been related to the Drought Relief Program, it's been a bit amusing in that, and especially from the previous press releases where the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba has been urging and lambasting the Federal Government for not first of all making the payments on time under the Herd Maintenance Program, that they were behind many hundreds of applications and rightfully so, that they had not made their payments, but low and behold, Mr. Chairman, what do we find here this evening? They still have close to 2,000 applications under the Green Feed Program that haven't been processed. They are not completed and, Mr. Chairman, if one would read all the announcements the Minister made he would lead one to believe that everything was hunky-dory in Manitoba, that he was doing a fantastic job, Mr. Chairman. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, here is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. I mean if there ever was a case of that, here it's been very evident. Throughout all the speeches and the press releases that one can go through and

'Drought Aid Helps Farmers Keep Herds', November 7th headline, Mr. Chairman, and it's helped so many farmers. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to sound as if I'm degrading the program because I believe, and I think I've said it publicly that the Green Feed Program has a lot of merit. There were some problems with it and we've raised some of the issues with respect to that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I really find the Minister of Agriculture, again his credibility in his position of lambasting the Federal Government with respect to their lack of assistance to Manitoba Farmers when we find out the very same kind of a problem in terms of dealing with the applications, has occurred and is occurring here in Manitoba. Why hasn't the Minister of Agriculture said that, look, you haven't paid yours, but we're also behind by 2,000 in Manitoba. Did we hear that? No, Mr. Chairman. We have had telegrams to Ottawa indicating that this isn't the case. At least, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture should have been much more open-minded and rather than making his comments sound like all the problems and all the administrative problems are Ottawa's fault and we're the perfect guys here in Manitoba, because that isn't the case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have an apology to make to the member because it was an oversight, an extremely important oversight, at this particular time. These figures that I have given him were something to do with earlier this year; well, not that much earlier, the latter part of January and I will be checking it a lot closer but I think it would be safe to say that we're down to about the 600 that are down to review, Mr. Chairman, and I would make sure that that is the case so that I am correct, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, I am going to be fairly brief. I've brought to the attention of the Minister in my opening comments on some of the problems that have developed in regard to, particularly in regard to the Green Feed Program, and I have sent the Minister some information and some copies of letters that I have received from people who feel they have not been dealt with justly, under this program. And I think I did mention to the Minister the other day, that I questioned him on whether or not the field staff were knowledgeable enough or had they been given enough information on the program to go out and deal effectively with people in the field. And perhaps that is the problem that the Minister faces now with the number of applications that have not been processed, I'm not sure. But I have one before me here and I'm not sure whether I sent the Minister a copy of this letter. I believe that I did. I have a response from him, January 27th. I had sent him a copy of a letter and again I can't say for sure or certain that this is the letter because I may have sent him the other letter that I read into the record on the Crown lands. However, I received a response from the Minister's Executive Assistant in which he acknowledged receipt of my letter and this is dated January 27th and he, on behalf of the Minister, acknowledged; well, it was my letter of the 21st. I sent him a letter on the 21st and, "you may rest

assured that your correspondence will be brought to the attention of the Minister." I hope the Minister will look into this particular complaint. I would like to read it into the record anyway, just in case the Minister didn't get the letter. It says, Dear Mr. Adam: This past July I filled out forms for the Grant Feed Assistant Program and at the time I asked the agricultural representative if need to, if I could pasture the crop. Now here is a situation that happened and instead of cutting it for feed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order? The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, that letter has been read into the record but maybe I'm wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure . . .

MR. ADAM: I don't think I read it into the record.

Instead of cutting it for feed I was told the response he got from the agricultural representative was, sure, go ahead if you have to, just put the cattle in and phone the office. Well, in October, I did just that but when the inspector came out, and he mentions the inspector's name, he mentions Mr. Lawrence Buhr, I guess it is. He told me that because I never had it cut for feed I couldn't qualify and that was his decision so there was nothing I could do about it. Like it or not] I had the cattle in there till December 6th until it snowed. There was about 65 Acres a crop and it was on the east half of 16-21-12 and I hope you can help me." And it's signed by Mr. Henry Halischak. This is why I raised the point with the Minister previously on whether or not the people who are dealing with the public had enough information on it. Here he suggests that the Ag Rep had made a statement that he took as being the proper course and followed that course and then he subsequently finds out from the inspector that he was not supposed to do what he did and therefore, he couldn't qualify for the program. And that's why I brought it to the Minister's attention. I hope that the Minister will reconsider this situation but if it's good information for the future that perhaps we should have more seminars or instructions provided to the field men on how to deal with the public because it doesn't seem like the gist of this letter suggests that there's a lot of public relations lacking in this particular situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Honourable Members to revert back to Page 9 of the Estimates, Resolution No. 7. Item 1 General Administration, Item (a) Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It appears that this may be the last opportunity in terms of discussing this Minister's Estimates, not only while he is in Government, but he may just be playing a different role the next time we enter this Legislature in terms of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. (Interjection)— Oh, I don't speculate but I would venture that some time within the next 12 to 15 months there may be the possibility, as a distinct possibility, that there may be an election in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr.

Chairman, these next number of months in terms of agriculture in Manitoba, are very crucial months and very critical. This Minister of Agriculture may have the opportunity in some areas to salvage some of his positions if he has the intestinal fortitude and the gumption to change some of his earlier positions and at least go ahead and be prepared to stand up and back the farmers of Western Canada, of Manitoba.

The one issue, Mr. Chairman, that I believe will be decided very soon, I believe sometime within the next number of months, is the issue that has been debated over the last number of years and that is the issue of transportation and the Crow rate, Mr. Chairman. That issue likely will be decided upon in, it could be in the very near future if one goes by the statements that have been coming out of the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and the Minister responsible for Transportation of the Federal Government.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board has come out very clearly in terms of indicating that the statutory rate for the transportation of grain should remain, Mr. Chairman, should remain as is as a direct benefit to Western Canadian producers as part of a national transportation policy, and he believes it should not be changed. But, Mr. Chairman, he has one government, one western government that supports that position 100 percent and that is the Government of Saskatchewan that has been fighting this issue steadfastly. The Province of Saskatchewan did have an ally in this, Mr. Chairman, the Province of Manitoba going back to '77 — that has gone by the wayside. We now have the Province of Alberta indicating that the Crow rate should go, that there should be some changes made in terms of transportation costs and we have the Province of Manitoba in terms of the present Conservative government indicating that they favour a change in the method of payment of the Crow rate, but not only the method of payment of the Crow rate, Mr. Chairman, they favour an allocation across the broad spectrum of producers, Mr. Chairman. Broad spectrum of producers where the Minister of Agriculture in this province indicates that the benefits should go beyond, far beyond the grain producers of Western Canada to all producers in Western Canada indicating that this benefit should be spread out and be paid out to all these producers rather than have the rate statutorily remain in legislation and any funds that are coming to the railways be paid directly by the Federal Government. He wishes that change to be made.

First of all, it is a change that will create, I believe, an increase in the bureaucracy in terms of the payments having to be made to several hundred thousands of producers in Canada in terms of what he is suggesting, and secondly, in terms of his premise that benefits should flow to other than grain producers, Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight his arguments in this respect to two studies that have been done, one of which that was done by the University of Manitoba with respect to the Crow rate, and that relates to the benefits of transportation costs if the Crow benefit is paid to all livestock producers and grain producers alike as the Minister has suggested or has alluded in his statements in December where he indicated that farmers who feed

their grain to livestock on the farm could receive Crow benefit payments or they might want to have the money paid to the railways if they shipped grain for export.

Mr. Chairman, there was a study done by the Alberta Wheat Pool that indicated that abolition of the Crow freight rates on grain could save Alberta livestock producers up to \$25 million a year. Mr. Chairman, that was alleged by the producers, livestock producers in Alberta. But, Mr. Chairman, it would cost the province's farmers about \$190 million annually, the Alberta Wheat Pool indicated, Mr. Chairman. The analysis that they gave, they said that if the removal of the Crow rate prompted a 25 percent increase in Alberta cattle herds, the livestock producers profit of about \$20.00 a cwt would meet net benefits to them of about \$25 million. That's the analysis made, Mr. Chairman. Meanwhile the price of barley would drop by 42 cents a bushel to cover increased rail charges for exporting barley through Thunder Bay. Total reduction in Alberta farm revenues would be \$41 million just on barley, Mr. Chairman, and of course they indicated that barley sold in Alberta would presumably suffer a similar price drop and cost farmers another \$60 million.

Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is proposing is really attempting to pit one farming segment against another in terms of trying to now weasel his way out of his Premier's earlier submission to the Western Premiers' Conference in Prince Rupert I believe it was a year ago when he indicated that while the Federal Conservatives were in power that the Crow rate should go, that there should be a fundamental change in the Crow rate. Mr. Chairman, the Minister's own University Study indicated that the implementation of compensatory grain freight rates would cost Manitoba grain producers an additional \$17.7 million in rail charges, a decrease in value of crop production by \$30 million and in increase in livestock sales by \$2.7 million if changes in agriculture production induced by freight rates included these kinds of changes. The study indicated that it would not make very much difference in terms of the added value production to other commodities by making this type of a change in the Crow rate.

So this Minister while he is wedded to a policy of doing away with the Crow rate or substantially changing it or watering it down to such a position, Mr. Chairman, he has the opportunity now I believe over the next number of months to if he wants to take a leading role in Western Canadian agriculture, to go down in history, Mr. Chairman, to make a point now to make sure that there are at least two provinces in Western Canada that will stand united on behalf of the grain producers of this great nation of ours, and he can say that those producers should receive and continue to receive the benefits that they received in Confederation back in 1897 when the initial legislation was put into being, Mr. Chairman. He has that opportunity, Mr. Chairman. He has the backing now of another western Minister in charge of the Wheat Board who says that the Crow rate should not be changed. The present position I believe of the Manitoba Wheat Pool has even shifted to that way, Mr. Chairman. This Minister should be able to convince his Premier, at least himself, to indicate to Ottawa, that's the least that he can do, that the Crow rate should not be changed whatsoever

because the change can only mean additional cost to western producers, Mr. Chairman. If he does not do at least that, Mr. Chairman, he is really letting the grain producers of this province down the drain. I, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues will hold him fully responsible if a change is made to the Crow rates which increases the cost of transportation which can only occur if the legislation is tampered with. It will occur if the legislation is tampered with and, Mr. Chairman, this is his opportunity. He may have a month, he may have two months, but by the way he has stood so far he has the opportunity to change, Mr. Chairman, and I urge him and his government to get off the fence and make his position very clear on behalf of Manitoba producers so that the Crow rate in Manitoba remains a historical benefit, a benefit in legislation and not by agreement to make sure that the Federal Government does not change this area.

Mr. Chairman, throughout these Estimates we have found this Minister any time that he has been confronted with a problem in the Agricultural Estimates in the agricultural community, there are two areas that he wants to shift his responsibility to. No. 1, the weather which we accept in terms of what has happened in the past and No. 2, the Federal Government. We have heard in every twist and in every one of his colleagues that have gotten up over the last few days, we have Ottawa bashed, Mr. Chairman, this is going to be the issue in the election. It will not be on how well or how well the Minister of Agriculture and his government have managed the economy, the rural economy and the economy of this province, it will be how hard we can hit the Federal Government over the head, whether it be the Constitution, whether we talk about property rights, whether we talk about anything, that will be the issue in the election, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that kind of gimmickry will last one week I venture to say. Do you recall '69? I should maybe remind you. Do you remember 1969? Do you remember a fellow called Walter Weir? Do you remember the Tory campaign that said Walter Weir is a statesman and we need Walter Weir in the Province of Manitoba because he is the only kind of statesman that can negotiate well on behalf of Manitobans? Do you remember that campaign? I think it lasted one week in the '69 election. That's what is going to continue. I'm pleased, I hope that you continue this kind of bashing Ottawa, bashing on, because you look at the articles, you've got very good press, Mr. Chairman, but everywhere in every speech that you've made you were bashing Ottawa, it's very clear. Good article, Mr. Chairman, that's really what has happened. You have done a marvellous job of attempting to divert the problems that producers face in all the areas that we have documented, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the cattle production, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the hog production, in terms of the grain production, in terms of the milk industry, in terms of foreign land ownership, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the patronage in Crown lands, in terms of the very great issue that we touched upon. There's been almost no commentary from that side of the House dealing with plant breeders' rights, Mr. Chairman. There are very fundamental issues where we stand diametrically opposed to where the Conservatives are, but there's at least one key issue that this Minister might be

able to come off. I'm almost handing him an issue that he can become very popular in the Province of Manitoba to at least stand behind the producers, but only time will tell whether he'll sink or swim with the issue. I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, if he's true to form in terms of his position over the last couple of years, we will see little or no change from this Minister, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the crucial issue, the historical issue of transportation.

So, Mr. Chairman, in ending my comments with respect to the debate on Agriculture, this Minister, I can only repeat what I have said, he has really lost credibility in the eyes of producers. He has provided an ineffective stewardship of policy in rural Manitoba. He is confused to say the least in terms of his positions with respect to orderly marketing and is very clear in . . . at least I have to give credit to the reporters, who in making his comments, were able to at least highlight how he has tried to be on both sides of the fence and really can't be on any side of the fence.

Mr. Chairman, all the programs and all his policies one can say have led to the weakening of the rural fabric in the Province of Manitoba. Weather has played part of the role but he can't blame the weather forever, Mr. Chairman, the weather hasn't been bad for three-and-a-half years. So, Mr. Chairman, this Minister may have an opportunity to salvage some of it but I believe that if an election is held very quickly there may be a new government, Mr. Chairman, who can provide some new direction and new impetus that is sorely needed in terms of rural policy in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. There's a few points that we brought to the Minister's attention during this debate of his Estimates, and I hope that he will review what we have said, and take into consideration some of the points we have brought forward. We have spoken on plant breeders' rights, which is a very serious problem, we believe, and not only as the official Opposition and the New Democrat Party members on this side of the House, but a lot of people out there right across this country, have grave concerns. They are looking for leadership in this direction, and you know the Minister is conspicuously silent on the two major issues which are going to have a profound impact, not only on the cost of production, the cost to the consumer, but what effect this is going to have on Western Canada.

We know that the plant breeders' rights has received very little study, so little that if I were the Minister of Agriculture on that side of the House, I would be asking the Federal Government to produce the data, produce the research so that we can judge for ourselves. The Minister has not done that. We asked him the other day whether he had any research, and he said he didn't have any. To me it seems to be irresponsible, to go along with something that we know not a thing about.

I'm surprised, Mr. Chairman, that there is a group of members on the government side that have got up from time to time and said, "you know, we are the true representatives of the agriculture, we come from an agricultural constituency." But how many get up

to speak on the issues of the day, the important issues? How many? There has been hardly a member who represents a rural farm community that has got up and got down to the plant breeders' rights, talking about the Crow rates, Mr. Chairman.

(Interjection)— Well, of course, but we would like to get some leadership. We would like to see some leadership. The only one we see who is speaking on behalf of the farmers is a teacher from a Winnipeg constituency. He is standing up behind the Chair, not in his place, and he is speaking from across the floor.

Mr. Chairman, a study made in Swan River, and I'm sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs will recall what I am saying here, because he was at a meeting which I attended. I'm sorry, he was at a meeting held in Swan River, I wasn't present at that meeting, or maybe I was at one of the meetings, I don't recall now if I was at one meeting or not. But anyway, the farmers in the Swan River area made a survey on the impact of what would happen if they had to pay compensatory rates or commercial rates for the transportation of grain, and this was done a while back. They have come up with a figure on the average, that it would cost each farmer in the Swan River area an additional \$6,500. a year, if he had to pay the compensatory rate for hauling grain. That is, the farmers would have each, approximately \$6,500 per year less to spend, and the business community would have \$8,400,000 worth of lost opportunities, lost sales, because the \$6,500 would not be spent in Swan River in the business community there, it would be transferred to the CPR, to the CNR, to eastern Canada - that's where the money would end up.

So it's a very serious situation, Mr. Chairman, and not a farmer will get up on the Government side and speak about it, not a one. They're sitting on the fence. There are a number of farm representatives there, you know, and the railways have received literally millions and not only millions, but billions — billions in subsidies from the public.

You know, the former Minister of Mines and Resources in October of 1979 - I guess he was obligated under the old agreement, and I'm not criticizing him for that, but on October 17th of 1979, the Honourable Brian Ransom gave another half section of land to the CPR, so the CPR is still getting the benefits. (Interjection)— Well, come and see it, I have a copy of the —(Interjection)— go and check it yourself; Order-in-Council 995, if the press want to check it they can go and check it themselves. "To be conveyed to Canadian Pacific Ltd. at no cost", there it is, right here. Come and see for yourselves.

Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General of Canada stated in his comments, and that's the highest position as far as expenditures go in Canada, and he says that rail financial loss is rarely verified. This is J. J. McDonnell. Rarely verified, Mr. Chairman. And I asked this question of Mr. McDonagh, the western President of the Transport Commission, I asked him this question in Neepawa, whether this information was correct and he did not deny it. He said, "You will have to ask Mr. McDonnell".

So we find, Mr. Chairman, that this has been going on for years and years and I give credit to the Transport Commission, because they blasted the CPR in Alberta at one of the meetings held to look

into an application for subsidies from the CPR on a rail line in Alberta. The Western Division of the Canadian Transport Commission has sharply criticized the CPR Limited for its poor record of performance on the . . . of its Rosemary Subdivision in Alberta, and they refused the CPR's application.

Here is a company that had not provided the service, but were coming in for the cash. They were coming in for the handouts. We say that there is no way that we should accept any changes in the Crow rate from its present status and I know there are things that could be improved in the Crow rate to include process oil seeds and maybe process beef and all that, but the trouble is, Mr. Chairman, and I was criticized when I presented a resolution in the House last year and I have a copy here, and he says "Why didn't you talk about the oil seeds? Why didn't you talk about this?" The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, the moment that you say you want to change the Crow rate and ask for more, you are going to see what happens to it. The minute you dare to suggest any change in it, it's gone and that's what you've done.

Mr. Chairman, there should not be a change in the statutory Crow rate until another study is undertaken on the role of the CPR, an in-depth study. There has been a study made in the past, in 1917, a comprehensive analysis has already been made on the CPR and this was in 1917. The Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation made an exhaustive study of public aid to the CPR and they determined a total of identifiable public aid as of June 30, 1916. They were able to determine that the CPR had received \$279,500,000.00. Allowing for 5.6 percent annual rate of return, typical for public utilities applying for rate increases during the period since, we compare that with what the public utilities have been receiving since that time, other public utilities, we're able to determine that in 1979 the value of the total gifts would be \$8,670,000,000. That's what we're able to determine by those figures. On top of this, since 1969, the CPR has received \$771,500,000 in subsidies from the Federal Government, it owes \$922,000,000 in deferred income taxes; altogether then, the identifiable public aid to CPR totals \$10,340,000,000 since — well, in 1916, it was \$279,500,000 — compared with its assets in its 1979 annual report, the CPR Limited listed its total assets at \$11,000,000,000.00.

So, Mr. Chairman, what has happened is that all the declared assets of the CPR have been given to them by the public, there is very little, and in addition, there were unidentifiable benefits from taxes and duties and benefits of operating subsidies before 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the farmers of Western Canada have a very legitimate argument to demand that the Crow rate is retained in its present form and while I would like to see it expanded to cover other products, I very much fear that if we start asking for more at this particular time, that we will lose the load with the truck and the whole business. It will be all gone.

The National Farmers' Union is organizing a train to Ottawa and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will be on that train. I am certainly going to attempt to go, if it's possible. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Minister on that

train, as I would like to have seen the Minister of Natural Resources when we went down to Bismarck on the Garrison.

A MEMBER: No way, we're going on the train to Churchill.

MR. ADAM: That's a good place to go, that's a good place to go, but I tell you that this is the one that's the "biggie". This is a "biggie" here, this is the big one.

I've brought other matters to the Minister's attention that aroused a lot of concern on the part of the Chairman, the Member for Radisson, in regard to modern methods of farming and I think that we should all be concerned about what is happening to our agricultural lands, to our future, to our destiny, to the production of food in the long term, what is happening to our energy. We certainly hope that at least if the Minister is unable to go to Ottawa to protect the farmers of Western Canada that at least he has his assistant, his legislative assistant, or someone that can come and represent the Government of Manitoba, because my colleague, the Member for St. George, mentioned that the Minister at the present time can go down in history as one of the greatest men in our time. If he can join with Saskatchewan and those other groups, who are fighting desperately to retain the Crow, if he joins that group and he is successful in doing that along with the Minister from Saskatchewan, the Agricultural Minister, he will go down in history as one of the greatest Agriculture Ministers in our time. But if he doesn't, Mr. Chairman, he will go down as one of the worst Ministers of Agriculture that this province has ever seen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just have to make one comment and it will be very brief because I know the members have stuck it in . . .

A MEMBER: They want to go home.

MR. DOWNEY: They want to go home, yes, that's right. (Interjection)— The only reply that I would have to make is that it would appear that the efforts that I've put in, in discussion with the Federal Government, are somewhat supported by members opposite because I've sat here and listened to Federal Government issues on transportation and plant breeders' rights, so I feel somewhat justified in some of the comments I've made. I will continue to, Mr. Chairman, do my best to see that Manitoba agriculture continues to be the most important industry in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I'm glad my friend, the Member for Morris, is here because he always likes to say how many acres have you got in Winnipeg Centre? But I had asked the Minister to send me some information on the deployment of home economists and I see the Minister nodding his head that he intends to send it to him. One of the reasons why I wanted to look at

that — I am going to be brief — I don't know what the solution to the problem is going to be, but it's becoming more and more difficult for the people in urban situations to understand some of the problems of farmers. It's getting to the point that they believe that hamburgers grow on trees and they dance around in suits and everything else. What I was wondering about is the efficacy of perhaps deploying a couple of these people in a PR type of a thrust at some future point in time, so that's why I wanted that information and the Minister said that he would send it to me.

I want to take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for his information that he sent me on strawberries and if I increase my production threefold I'll have three pounds next season.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) pass; (1) pass; Resolution No. 7 pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,384,800 for Agriculture. General Administration \$2,384,800 pass. That completes the Department of Agriculture. Thank you very much.
Committee rise.