

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
Monday, 7 April, 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - FITNESS, RECREATION AND SPORT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): Order please. Call the committee to order.

(1)(a)--pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we were so rudely interrupted by the 4:30 bell I think I was commenting on some of the statements by the Minister.

He seemed to say that the TCI were brought in. He doesn't deny that they were given special treatment of something that three other partners had started to work hard, then they come in with special treatment and the reasons given were this: That they were breaking the law and this way it would stop them from breaking the law. Well, I don't think that the province has the responsibility when somebody else is breaking the law. When they are given a licence to run a lottery they know what the law is and they know what they're entitled to do and what they're not supposed to do. These are the same groups pretty well; some of these middlemen presented a brief to Law Amendments Committee a number of years ago during my temporary forced absence for a few months and had quite a few things to say about the lottery and they made the accusation at the time that we were ruining a good thing. It's obvious now to everybody that with other provinces coming in with lotteries, that those smaller lotteries and the lottery only in a place like Manitoba, for instance, could not survive and especially if we had done - which we weren't able to anyway - but if we had tried to get a deal with other provinces that we could sell our lottery in theirs and they can sell ours here, how could we compete with the lotteries in Ontario, and so on, when the prices are so much higher?

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept these reasons. The Minister said he wants to set it up properly and I agree with that. And if he wants to say that he wants to stop their proliferation and try to cut some of the lotteries, I agree. But the Minister also said something that surprised me greatly.

I was under the impression that the Minister was one of them that felt that we had too many lotteries here. I can say that although for a number of years I was responsible for lotteries in Manitoba when we were in government - I might say that I was the first chairman of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation - but I also always said that I felt that we were in lottery too deeply. There's nothing we could do because then they would sell other lotteries if Manitoba wouldn't be in. So as a kind of a self-defence or to take care of ourselves, we went in and offered those tickets for sale because they were being sold all across Canada. But the Minister mentioned something as instant lottery awhile ago and the way he said it I understood him to say it that is the coming thing. I know that the Minister responsible for Western Canada for years resisted that. I know what the Western Canada Lottery Foundation wants, this is their job. They're not responsible to the electorate in their respective province. But does the Minister really think we need more lotteries here? Is Manitoba then going to be the betting capital of North America? Are we going to have casinos? We seem to be going in that direction; there's more and more instead of having less. Well, there's more temporary permits given. They're talking about off-track betting. That might come in. And let's examine the lotteries that we have now. You know, this was the idea of getting the four provinces together to co-ordinate that and try to save money, to have uniform regulations all across the west, and now when the

provinces took over Loto, well then, they're partners in the west for some lotteries and they're also partners with the Maritimes, Ontario and Quebec in the Loto Lottery.

And you know, for the population of Manitoba, don't we have enough lottery when we have the Loto Lottery; we're turning over how many millionaires in how many few months in the Loto Lottery? We're doing the same thing in the Provincial Lottery; how many millionaires? You know, there's only so many; and if you keep on doing that, you're going to run the NDP out of business. There won't be any room for socialism; everybody will be a millionaire in Canada, so you know, you've got to watch that. That would be a tragedy if we did that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm making a point to show that I don't think any other country has more lotteries than we have here and I would suggest to the Minister that he should go with his colleagues in western Canada, we go easy in all these lotteries. Sure, they might be successful but then you're going to saturate everything with lotteries. There are so many lotteries now, there's a limit. And if you have those lotteries; that's no excuse to have one partner more equal than the other. They can be retailers of that; anybody can be retailers. They had that right even though they were running their lottery. They had the right to be retailers before. Anybody can be a retailer. But that's not the part that I'm against. I'm against the part of them being partners in the wholesaling operation with three others and then starting their own wholesaling besides that in competition to their partnership. This to me doesn't make sense. I don't know anywhere else in the business world where this would be allowed and I think that's wrong and I think that's going to come back to haunt the present Minister and on any future Minister it's going to be very difficult. As I said earlier, I don't think that you can change that. Once you give somebody, it's a lot harder to take away. I think the Minister was in the driver's seat. If they came to him and wanted a partnership their lottery can't be doing that well. The Minister ran the amount of \$3 million. I would ask the Minister, how much net did the organization of TCI have, that's net, to give to their members of that corporation, and I suspect it wasn't that much. I'm talking about net now.

And another question. I would like to hear the Minister tell us something about the middleman. I don't think there is any need in this kind of operation where you have a bearer's ticket, where you have a system of retailers; there is no need for a middleman. What will the middleman do? You know, that company has a budget to advertise. They have a budget to do that and to sell; that's their job. Why do we need a middleman? And the whole thing, I say this without fear of contradiction - there might be contradiction but nobody will prove it - I am positive that this whole thing, this whole system was done with one thing in mind - to protect the middleman. I know that some of these middlemen were quite active in the different political campaigns and I know what party they supported, and I think this is a payoff. It is an awful thing to say but I think that this is a payoff. I can't see any other reason in this system where you have to keep on with middlemen, and I'd like the Minister to tell me what the role of the middleman is. When you have the retailers all over the place, and you have the wholesaler, why do you need middlemen? What are they going to do? Coming in on something that they said could not exist, they said that this thing would go belly-up. What are they going to do here now to earn their money? I am not against this money going to these organizations, as I said I would like to see each one studied, I think that some of them, although they are good organizations, shouldn't belong in there. I think that should be checked and I think the Minister should give direction on that, in other words not just a group that is going to be a very small group that could be well organized and could make a lot of money for a limited number of people. I'd much sooner it go to sports in general, the culture in general, and let the Sports Federation, let the government, let the Manitoba Arts Council decide, the United Way, let them decide, if at all possible.

But I am not going to prolong this I just want to know why you need the middleman and I think somebody mentioned or it is in here somewhere, that a middleman can't make more than 40% or something like that. Did I dream that or is that in there? I didn't hear that maybe the Minister can correct me on that, and when he does, I wonder if he can give me the page if this is in there. But I know, I made a mental note at this time that this was too much for one person to make a killing on the growth of these organizations.

Now these organizations don't have to do anything. When these lotteries were brought in the House, when the Members of this House voted for the lottery, they had the impression that every little organization would be very active, that you would run around if you were a member of the Kiwanis you would be running around with some tickets and trying to sell them to your friends, like we were used to. Its not that at all. These organizations do not lift a finger, haven't lifted a finger for a long time. They have paid people working, and this is why this lottery has become such a big business. And Mr. Chairman, no matter who participates in this lottery you have to be careful because there is greed, there is so much money around that there is greed. Now a lot of people feel that the end justifies the means; if it is for a good cause everything is allowed. I don't happen to believe in that and I know that some people are not too pleased with me. My Alma Mater, for one, are not too pleased with me because I think that if you've got a good cause I don't think that anything justifies the means. And I resent and I don't think this is proper, a lottery set up by a government where you establish the middleman. This is the same thing, you're hiding. I was talking about districts earlier, in areas and districts that you had in Quebec and Ontario and so on where friends of government were getting that. Well now it's middlemen that are getting it, and that is hidden in there somewhere.

I would like to know what justifies the retaining of these middlemen in this new setup. If the middleman wasn't there and if they were equal partners, then I would have nothing but praise for the government and the Minister, because I am afraid, and the Minister will see the greed there is when you talk about lotteries. And I think the Minister was in a . . . You just paid somebody to bring you, what is it, an examination or a commission of one to look int the lotteries. The Minister says he wants to start things right, why do you start with something like this then, that you invite trouble and it isn't fair. The only reason the Minister said yes, I am right, when I mention that we shouldn't go back to a non-bearers ticket but he is saying well, if it works, it's not going to happen anyway; why put it in there? If it doesn't happen, why put it in there? Why is it needed? And if it happens, well, then its wrong.

And again I say you don't owe these people anything. You've set them up to run a lottery; they're going to make an awful lot more money now. This year was the time to do it, not wait and say "I'm going to review this in two years", too late. Your politicians, you are going to have so much pressure by politicians that its going to be practically impossible to do, and you are going to have all these non-profit organizations that'll be pushed by their middleman that'll do the same thing as they did a few years ago, and if you resist and try to set up a fair thing you know what's going to happen.

Mr. Chairman I'd like to hear the Minister comment on some of these things and I think he has some information for me now, that he received, about the percentage of what I call the "middleman".

MR. BANMAN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, on the third last page of the agreement it spells out that nobody can make more than 50% of gross revenues. But I would like to point out several other things. The particular group that we are dealing with, with regards to TCI, in 1978-79, the best information that I have, they sold roughly \$2.4 million worth of sales, gross receipts to the agencies was \$960,000.00. In 1979 . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Excuse me. Gross, is that before they paid, that's before they paid the middleman and all that. Okay, can I have the net then? Say that again; say that again.

MR. BANMAN: These are the figures that I have. They sold \$2.4 million worth.

MR. DESJARDINS: For the year?

MR. BANMAN: For the year, on their draws, and it was \$960,000 to agencies.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's gross? \$960,000 gross.

MR. BANMAN: In 1979-80, because of the negotiations, they didn't run as many lotteries and they dropped to, let's say, \$1.7 million and gross to the agencies was roughly \$680,000.00. So out of that, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the member made several statements with regards to getting into more lotteries. I think one of the benefits of this agreement, which is attractive to me, is to see two lotteries suspended and being taken out of the system.

You know, we have a lot of concern about the amount of advertising that's going on and things like that. This particular group was spending, I think in that one year, spent close to quarter million dollars on advertising, that particular lottery. It spent something like \$100,000 to print those particular tickets. I think to that extent, this is a very positive move. I just have to reiterate again to the Member for St. Boniface, that in the whole scheme of things, as this thing is evolving and as I see it happening, is that what should be happening - and this is one of the indications that the Haig Report came out with and one of the recommendations which we're looking at very seriously now - is to form a Lotteries Licensing and Gaming Commission which would encompass all the aspects with regard to gaming, whether it's the licensing of new lotteries, the operation of the existing government sponsored lotteries or the licensing of casinos. Because as the member has stated and as I have stated on many occasions, is that when a group, when the Festival du Voyageur, when the Ukrainian Dancers, or whoever, gets a casino licence, what happens is there is large sums of money involved. I understand that the Festival du Voyageur made something like \$180,000 this year on their casino licence. That far outstrips any kind of money that we're talking about with regard to middlemen or anything that's involved in this thing.

The monitoring of those particular sports groups, or particular groups that receive that money, I think should be done very carefully, and I agree with the member, but if you give somebody a casino licence and they can make up to \$150,000 to \$200,000, there should be some kind of follow-up by the government to see how those funds are being expended, and this is where I think a Lotteries Licensing and Gaming Commission would come in very handy. That all aspects, a number of items that are big and were identified in the Haig Report are things like it's estimated roughly there's \$13 million spent in Manitoba on things like Bingo, Nevada cards, on the casinos as well as additional lotteries licence, never mind what the government is running. So I think there should be an umbrella group which will work this whole thing together.

We think that with this agreement we'll be able to tie down, to see what the sales agents that are operating on behalf of some of these groups will be getting; we will have the authority to, upon occasion, if the commission feels that the moneys aren't expended properly, or there is exorbitant bills being submitted to the different agencies, that we will have the right to go in and check those books. That is something which I think is something new that we will be able to get a good handle on.

Now I come back again. I have no magic formula in trying to solve some of these problems but I think we are moving in the right direction and hope that we can consolidate this. Far be it from me to consider expanding it but there are certain things that are creeping into the system that I think are much better controlled under one central body. I think that will give the people of Manitoba protection and avoid some of the problems that we have had in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is throwing up a smoke screen. Some of the things are not related to what I said at all. I am not denying many of the things that were said. The Haig Report recommended an overall body to license and police. Well, it wasn't that bad what was existing. Now the thing is, it's small and it has to be increased because lottery is now big business. Now the thing is that this is not something new. I don't think we needed the Haig Report at all to be honest with you. I don't think they said anything that we didn't know. Now this suggestion was made before. In fact, my boss at the time suggested that the Lottery Licensing Board be combined with the Manitoba Lottery Commission and that I would accept the responsibility and I refused. And I'm not talking out of school because I mentioned in the House why I refused, that

Monday, 7 April, 1980

I could not accept when there was not full accountability of tickets. I wanted no part of it. Maybe I was in a huff and I didn't accept that.

Now, the thing is it's not so bad that the Lottery Licensing Board is under the Attorney-General, for one thing, maybe if you have that body the whole thing then should go, especially if the government is not going to take any revenue in it, maybe the whole thing should go to the Attorney-General because I think it has to be enforced. I agree with him on that. I agree, and I agree that you have to be careful. But I have a solution. I wouldn't allow Bingo, not Bingo, I mean, God, I'll get thrown out of my church if I say that. I wouldn't allow a casino, and I can get thrown out of St. Boniface for that too because the Voyageur did quite well.

You know, this easy money is all so dangerous, Mr. Chairman. And try to get that away from the Voyageur now; see what happens. You can't do it. That's exactly my point. Now if you give it to the Voyageur, why not to the Plum Coulee lumberjack or somebody else. I think that that could be done and that is dangerous for a place like Manitoba. You're going to attract crime here. You know, that looks corny and square when I say that. You're going to attract crime. When there's easy money, crime comes in. It's okay to co-ordinate and have a body that will supervise it but it's a hell of a lot better not to allow all these things in. That's the point. But going back to this contract, that has nothing to do with this contract. You know, the Minister talks as if this group did us and did him a real favour by becoming partners. Their lottery wasn't doing well and the Minister knows it. He says that they were coming down because of negotiation; that isn't that at all, they ran their lottery. And it's just that there is too many lotteries and the others are well organized and they couldn't compete; and the Minister is giving me the gross, not the net. I'd still like to have the net; how much goes to the - and that's the important thing, that's what the members around this table want to know. How much do you have to raise? How many tickets do you have to sell? How much money has to be spent to give what to these associations? You know, you start with \$2.4 million, you're already at 960, and you're talking about the middlemen getting 40 or 50 percent of the take. So what's left? What's left for the organization?

MR. BANMAN: That's precisely the problem. I don't know because the Attorney-General looks after that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, all right, all right; you don't know. Well, okay.

MR. BANMAN: You know, that's what the whole argument is about.

MR. DESJARDINS: But you negotiated with this group, you should know. When somebody negotiates with me I want their books open. I thought you were a businessman. If somebody negotiated with me, they're not going to pull anything over my eyes, I can tell you that. But they sure pulled something over your eyes, over the Minister's eyes, with this. I am saying fine, bring a fourth partner but bring an honest - you know, you were in the driver's seat and you had to give the whole thing away. Why didn't you just bring him, very simple? You say, you want to come in; I'm not saying you should step on them, help them out, they were told that before. They didn't agree; they could run it better. And then they realized with the competition all over the place they can not keep on. The same with the Sports Federation. It is not viable so they came to you in trying to join something that they tried to destroy and you were in the driver's seat. I'm not saying shove their noses in the mud. I'm saying get them in as an equal partner. But that's not what you did and I'm not going to prolong this because you're not bringing in any reason for that at all. You're talking around and I can disagree with you in some of the things you want. I think you want to go in the right direction and I suspect that this was dictated by somebody else. I can see the writing on the wall with this thing and that's unfortunate, and I think it's my duty here to bring this up. It's after the fact if you wish, but this is something that's going to cause the government only problems.

I'm not against the partnership. I'm not against trying to get everything under one Minister if you want; it has some advantages. I'm not against being careful in letting any new games come in or any of these things and I hope that

you're not just going to open the doors and give everybody that requested a licence for a casino. If you're going to do that, heaven forbid, you might as well have an organized casino, that you're going to have the proper man in there because who has experience in running a casino here? You get the fly-by-night operators that you don't know. They come here and you don't know how much they're stealing you blind and that's a very, very dangerous thing and I couldn't agree more with the Minister that somebody has to be able to look at that. But the Minister hasn't given me anything, he hasn't mentioned the middleman at all. Why do we need a middleman in this? But he's got all kind of provision in that to help the middleman and he could make up that certain amount of money. Why? I thought this lottery was to help sports, culture, groups in the United Way and other associations, non-profit organizations. They start with what? 2.4; they're down to 960 and what? They've got about half of that net? Not a hell of a lot more than that. Look at how much money and how much energy is spent to raise that.

It makes sense to go in with the other thing as a partner but don't destroy something that's working well. This group wasn't working well so we're going to destroy something that's working well or endanger something that's working well to please them, to try and rectify. When something is wrong, you correct what is wrong. You don't change what is right, and the Minister hasn't said a word against the Manitoba distributors. It's working. So why didn't you just give them a partnership, an equal partnership like the others and take less money, like you already said and I agree with you 100 percent, take less money as revenue for the province and give it to these worthy groups? But my main complaint, well my only complaint now, is that you are talking about, you are starting on one of the first pages, talking about four equal partners and then you do everything to show that one is more equal than the others, and I could never accept that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there's one very significant point that the Member for St. Boniface keeps mentioning and I still haven't heard a comment from the Minister in that regard, and that is the fact that it is possible for middlemen and frontmen and promoters to earn up to a 40 percent commission and this just strikes me as absolutely incredible.

If we were to talk about administrative costs for a business or for a government operation where we're always trying to measure in some sort of quantitative terms what would be reasonable in relation to gross income and profits, and so on, if anybody ever talked about 40 percent I think they would find that staggering. When you get to that type of a breakdown where some organization, a participating organization, might receive 60 percent and the promoters receive 40 percent, I think the question has to be asked, whose benefit is this for? Who's receiving the benefits under a breakdown where it's a 60-40 split? And the question becomes at that point, who's fronting for whom or who's working for whom?

And the Minister said earlier in a debate sometime this afternoon there's always fighting going on, and I don't know the personalities that are involved here in some of the history but I think they're fighting over the spoils. I mean, there's big money involved here. There are lucrative contracts and I don't see anything that would really prevent somebody from making under-the-table payouts to a promoter so that some sharp promoter could come to an organization and say, "I'll handle everything and I'll take so much and so much under the table and you just loan me your name. We'll use your name and you'll get some money", and this person will get the bulk of the benefits.

I think that's a very dangerous situation and I think the Minister still hasn't said a word on how he can morally justify or logically justify a system whereby a so-called public organization gets 60 percent and a so-called promoter gets 40 percent. I think that's something that is beyond me and I don't see any justification for allowing that kind of a profit taking or rip-off, or whatever it is, because it's no longer a lottery for the benefit of the public; it's a lottery for the benefit of the promoters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I can just briefly reply to that. One of the problems - and the members opposite will realize that - when you license a lottery, when you license a casino, if you license it for a group or whatever it is, the problem that we've had in the past is to have proper control on that particular item, whether it be \$100,000 lottery run by a group of individuals or whether it be a casino which has been traditionally receiving a licence for the last five or six years. And what I am saying to you here today is that I think, by this agreement, we will be able to find out exactly where the money is going and have the powers to step in and find out where those moneys are going.

The member can say that is an exorbitant rate. I think that we will be able to, by controlling the contracts that are made with the different groups as well as the different people, be able to better control it. If you issue somebody a licence to run \$100,000 lottery, the controls on that are very, very limited. The promotion, as I mentioned before, they're spending a quarter of a million dollars on advertising. These are duplications which we hope to overcome and to try and tighten down the system in order to try and bring a little bit of harmony with regard to this here. We feel that this is a step in the right direction, to try and get the accountability up front so that everybody knows what's going on.

Now I know we can sit here and argue, I guess, until the cows come home on this particular matter. But all I'm saying to you right now is that I think the public of Manitoba will be better off in the long run for having sat down and negotiated this type of agreement so that we do have a handle on it and can come down on people abusing the system rather than the other way.

But coming back to the point that the Member for St. Boniface raised before, I share the same concerns with a number of casino licences that are issued. But let me say again to the Member for St. Boniface, I do not have control over that; the Attorney-General does. I look after the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, and this is my own personal concern, I think that it would be good for one Minister to know what's happening throughout the whole scheme of lotteries things. Now that's my own personal view.

MR. DOERN: Well, I just wanted to ask one question here of the Minister and that is, why did he allow such a high profit to be taken by the promoters? Was it not possible to limit that to 10 percent or 15 percent? I mean, why do you allow a 60-40 split? That strikes me as excessive.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, you have to also take into consideration 40 percent of what? And that is the question that will have to be determined in negotiations with TCI, how this structure is set up. It does not mean that because an agency will sell 25 percent of the tickets that are sold by TCI, that they are automatically entitled to 25 percent of the profits.

We have said all along that we want this to become a vehicle where non-profit groups can get involved and that means that some people will be able to apply to this organization on a basis of need, and other things. Those figures have not been established yet by the Minister and the Ministerial group that's looking at this, as well as in consultation with the Manitoba Lotteries Commission. So we're saying 40 percent. I say to you that the rates are not struck and I believe, with this agreement we will be able to control the type of moneys we are talking about, and I think that is one of the benefits of the agreement. We didn't have any control before and I think now we will be able to control the whole situation and take some lotteries out of the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I will pass because I know my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, has some points relating specifically to this topic, and I'll put my name down at the bottom of the list because I do want to return back on the general topic of Lotteries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to try to understand something. He is saying that if he brings in everybody in the same lottery

and if they co-ordinate that it is going to work. I couldn't agree more. The Minister had a unique opportunity to do just that and to do away with a lot of this extreme, a lot of this needless cost, very easily. You invite or accept TCI as a full partner, period. This is what the partners do - for the members of the committee who are not too familiar with this - the organization, TCI in this instance, would give three names to the Minister and he would select two who would go on the board of directors, and then TCI is out of it as far as that is concerned. The same goes for the Sports Federation, the United Way, and the Manitoba Arts Council. Now, they have an organization, they make the profit of this, the four partners. They are in the wholesale business; they have an exclusive, the wholesale business in Manitoba.

They have paid employees; they promote the tickets; they have a network of retailers all across the province; they sell the tickets. And then there is a cheque whenever the amount comes in, there are four cheques, equal cheques going to the four partners. All right. Then you would eliminate all these other things and they would be doing the same work as the United Way is doing now. They would name two members to the board. They would receive their cheque. They would decide how to spend that money. And it would all be net, no expenses to them at all, the same as the United Way.

You have the situation at hand. You can do that. There is no need to have a duplicate wholesale organization that will spend more money to advertise, that will be competing against itself, that will have more middlemen, more people, that will have another system of advertising to try to induce the people to buy from them instead of the partnership they are in. They are going to compete for the kiosk; they are going to compete for the retailers; that's what they are going to do.

Let me refresh the memory of the Minister, to say the things that I am concerned about. I have a copy, and I am not going to read the association, I don't think it would be fair. It is only an example, and I'm not going to read the name. This is a contract that was in force when, not this Minister but when this government took over, and I have no reason to think that it is not in force. And tell me, even the most partisan member of this committee, tell me if you think this is fair, and I'm just taking some of the things in there; it would be too long to read. "Stubs from lotteries, bingos, etc., that is being conducted by the Winnipeg office of this association will remain under the control of the middleman and should not be turned over to the association. The association agrees it will refer all professional fund-raising programs to the middleman." Okay. "The middleman should be paid a management and consulting retainer fee in the sum of \$20,000 per year. The middleman will, in addition, receive a car allowance of \$150.00 per month, which does not include the payment for gasoline." He will get \$150.00 so he can beat the tax and then they will also pay his expense besides that. "All business promotional expenses and receipts for gasoline, 75 percent of gasoline receipts, are to be remunerated as included in the budget. A percentage arrangement of 25 percent of net revenue, after expenses, and payment of salary to the middleman will be paid to the middleman. this percentage payment to be calculated on a quarterly period subject to adjustment after annual audit." Retroactive pay, okay. "The association agrees to pay the middleman for expenses incurred in the amount of 25 percent of all revenue received from the corporate, business, private, and donations in kind." Any donation.

For instance, under this contract, if this group receives something from TCI, he is entitled to 25 percent of even the retroactive thing, according to his contract, and there is nothing that anybody can do. It is a legal contract with an association, unless you spell it out, and it isn't spelled out anywhere here at all. They can put a middleman that will work for the TCI and there is nothing you can do because TCI is a wholesaler. And it is just repeating, repetitious.

For instance, this group that made \$2.4 million, we still don't know how much went to the association but we know that the maximum of half a million dollars, out of 2.4 million. Mr. Chairman, if you think this is fair. Everything that the Minister wants - he wants to co-ordinate this - I'm with him 100 percent; he wants to stop their proliferation of lotteries - I'm with him 100 percent; he wants to be able to regulate where the money is, he can make arrangements the same as had been made with the United Way, with the Sports Federation, he can do the same thing. Why then, does he let somebody in that tried to destroy the system, that



could not make their system work? Why does he say, you are coming in as equal partner, but you can do this, you can do this, you can do this that the others can't. That is my point and the Minister can talk all around it. I agree with him on most everything that has been said about the casino. This has nothing to do with this contract. And what he wants to achieve, I'm all for it, but there was no need to have this kind of thing. The Minister was in the driver's seat and I say that they would have been very happy to come in as an equal partner and instead of having less than half a million dollars, they would have had \$1 million. You are practically doubling what they would receive, and that's without lifting one finger. But this thing is set up for the middleman; that's all it is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Does the Minister know - has he checked up any contracts like that? Is he aware of their existence? Does he have any policing mechanism?

MR. BANMAN: We are not aware of a contract like that, no.

MR. PARASIUK: I think that the Minister should, if he is going to get in the process of establishing general contracts like that, he surely should investigate these type of charges because I think that if you are into a situation like that, basically the lotteries are in fact being set up for the middleman, especially since they are designated specifically as middlemen.

I would like to ask the Minister if he knows if Manitoba Lottery tickets are being sold in states where lotteries are not allowed, and is this illegal and are various public organizations in Manitoba, then, acting as fronts for illegal activities in other states?

MR. BANMAN: We are not aware of any, Mr. Chairman, and if the member has any information to that effect we would appreciate hearing from him because that's precisely the things we are trying to tighten up on and we don't want the extra-provincial, especially into the States, sales.

MR. PARASIUK: Has the Minister made any attempts to determine from any of the sellers and the wholesalers, where the tickets are being sold? Has the Minister made any attempt to determine where they are being sold?

MR. BANMAN: The tickets, the WLMD, which is the Manitoba distributor, only sells tickets to Manitoba retailers.

MR. PARASIUK: So no one is selling them by mail to - they don't have outlets in Chicago or other places like that?

MR. BANMAN: They are not supposed to.

MR. PARASIUK: Are they specifically prohibited from doing this in any of their agreements that the Minister has signed with them?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, everybody that is a retailer has to abide by the rules of the Western Lotteries Foundation, and one of those rules is that extra-provincial sales are not to be conducted, and this is the problem that we have faced, whether it be Winsday tickets coming into Manitoba or Wintario tickets coming in. But the rule is that you are not supposed to solicit tickets outside of the jurisdictional limits of Manitoba.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like to ask a couple of questions relating to the whole concept of gaming. You raised that term in some of your earlier answers. I would like to know if the Minister has a definition of what is acceptable gaming or gambling and what is unacceptable gaming or gambling, from the government's point of view?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is the same problem that we were talking about, and I think the member was here. I am not responsible for the licensing of

lotteries in the Province of Manitoba, the Attorney-General is. I am in charge of running the Winsday and the Provincial tickets, in other words, the government-sponsored lotteries. But the licensing of bingos, Nevadas, other lotteries, does not come under my jurisdiction, and I don't have an input into that except through, of course, the Executive Council. There is no magic way in which you move departments around, and I think that we would all have our own ideas, but I think it would be good for the Minister who is in charge of the government-sponsored lotteries, also be responsible for the other things, to know what is happening with regard to other things. But I cannot give him any specifics, because I do not deal with those.

MR. PARASIUK: I raise the question in that you yourself had talked about the Haig Report, and you talked about some of the problems, and you raised the matter of gaming licenses. Now I feel somewhat frustrated when you say that you are interested in this topic and then you say you can't provide any answers. I am in a position right now where since we have passed the Attorney-General's Estimates, it is virtually impossible to get a definition, unless of course we go on an emergency debate, because it is a critical issue; or secondly, unless I ask you questions, and other people who are sitting at this table and are participating in this committee process, decide that they would like to involve themselves in the committee process and give me a definition of what acceptable gambling is and unacceptable gambling, from the government's point of view. If you are not in the position to do that, perhaps other members of the Executive Council who are participating in this Estimates process in this committee could give me that definition on behalf of the Executive Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)--pass - the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I see that the Attorney-General is sitting here. I don't know if he is sitting in on the committee discussions. He is, I assume, participating in the committee discussions, and I would just like to note that he is the Minister responsible for lotteries licensing, but is choosing not to participate in the committee process and provide an answer to this question which in fact the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport has raised himself in his own answers. Again, I feel frustrated that the Attorney-General can in fact provide the answer but chooses not to at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)--pass; Resolution 68: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty . . . The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Excuse me, I have some difficulty shooting this arm up quickly; I hope the Chairperson will be a bit indulgent. I then would like to make a comment on the fact I think it is rather unfortunate that the government doesn't have a public position on the whole question of gambling. I think that we are moving beyond just a question of lotteries and bingos. I think we are getting into a stage where we are talking about gambling, and when the Minister himself throws out a figure of some \$160,000 being derived from a gaming licence of a very short duration, then I am very concerned that we in fact can become a target for organized crime, and I think that's a danger. I think it is very important for the government publicly to state what it feels is acceptable, what it feels isn't, before any momentum starts developing with respect to legalizing gambling on a broader scale in the province.

I raise this because a couple of months ago there was an article in the Weekend Magazine, and they were talking about gambling as if it was inevitable, that somehow we would have legalized gambling in Canada. They talked about certain provinces running short of revenue and finding themselves in a difficult, tight situation - that sounds somewhat familiar - and that one of the ways out here would be to legalize gambling. We have the experience from the United States, in certain states, in deciding that they would like to follow the lead of Nevada and they recently have legalized gambling. Again, there has been a great debate in the United States as to whether or not that move to legalize gambling has been followed by a move of organized crime into places like Atlantic City. When you start talking about numbers like \$160,000, and then when you start talking about figures

like \$13 million, you start presenting a target that certainly isn't out of line with past dollar amounts involved in illegal distribution of liquor, or it isn't out of line with dollar amounts involved with drug trafficking. We know that there has been some type of an organized attempt at drug trafficking.

So I ask the Minister to take this up with the Executive Council so that we can get a clearer statement from the government as to what its position regarding gambling is. I think we should be cutting back on these types of activities. I think we are developing a momentum on the casino side, which is disturbing, because we are reaching a stage where various well-intentioned organizations are looking at a casino licence as some type of panacea, as some easy way out of dealing with a money problem. Perhaps the budgetary problem exists because there has been government restraint or because people aren't fully behind that organization, or because of a number of factors. But, you know, if the public, either through the groups that they belong to or publicly through the Treasury, isn't prepared to support a number of these organizations, then maybe they don't have sufficient public support to continue. But if in fact we get a type of front for them which then is able to get casino licences and do a good job or promotion, do a good job of inviting anyone in to get involved on casino night; and if we start talking about figures of \$150,000, and if in fact on the Lotteries scene we have situations where a professional organization of middlemen do exist to run the lotteries, and the lotteries seemed like a pretty blasé type of an operation, a pretty bland type of operation compared to a casino operation; if we've already had the firm intrusion of middlemen into that area. then I shudder to think what is going to happen if we have a continued proliferation of gambling. Is the Minister in a position to indicate whether the revenues derived from licensed gambling has increased over the last two or three years and does he have any numbers in this regard? I think that's an area that he could provide us some answers with. Is he in a position to answer that particular question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, without sort of getting into specifics because as I mentioned, I am involved with specifics, but I agree with the member that, No. 1, I don't want to see the proliferation of lotteries or casino licences happen. There have been a number which have been established over the last four or five years, and as we all know around this table here, is that, for instance, if you'd pull the licence on the Festival du Voyageur, the organization would literally fold. So you would be faced with the responsibility of having created a need and then trying to pull that, sort of the rug, from under them and you would have to come up with an alternate source of money. So I agree with the member, I know that the government has been very careful in not trying to expand the number of casinos that were operated. As far as legalized gambling is concerned, I am definitely one hundred percent opposed to that and I believe that is the general feeling of my colleagues, even though the point has never come up for discussion, because it just hasn't been considered by the government. But the expanding of the whole system is one which I have indicated repeatedly that I am not for.

MR. PARASIUK: Well I'm glad we can get the Minister's individual position on this matter. I'm sorry again that the government representative who is directly responsible for this matter doesn't feel obliged to present the government's position with respect to the continued proliferation of legalized gambling, because I do believe that there has been an increase in the number of licences issued for gambling purposes in Manitoba over the last three years. I'm just saying that this is a very dangerous trend. I am against it very much. I think it starts getting beyond the stage where certain groups would find that they wouldn't be able to carry on if these licences were withdrawn. I think we start developing a frame of mind, a certain attitude, whereby as a society we start relying on that more, and we can reach a situation where we can start talking about the economic implications to the province, as I am pretty sure the people in Nevada would start talking about the economic implications to the State of Nevada if they started withdrawing gambling licences or tightening up procedures.

And you know, in the last few years, there is that drift developing that really does concern me. I think that it's important for the government to make a clear

unequivocal statement that they are against the further proliferation of legalized gambling, that maybe what's required is some type of rationalization and cutback on what's been taking place to date, rather than some type of a continued expansion. Because one of the difficulties, I am quite certain that exists is, that if a couple of organizations have licences, then what about those organizations that don't have licences and possibly feel that they are just as entitled to a licence as the group that already has a licence, and then in that situation, you don't have an objective definition of gambling. Then it becomes a relative definition, where gambling is legal if sponsored by a certain type of group, but gambling is illegal if sponsored by another type of group. Then who is going to make those types of decisions as to which group is a good group to run a gambling operation and which one isn't; which one is in sufficient financial difficulty to run one and which one isn't?

And those are tremendous dilemmas of an administrative nature, but I think beyond that, they are very much moral dilemmas which I think reflect the value system that exists in society, and I think that politicians and legislators and legislatures and governments have to take fairly strong positions on these types of moral issues. I think that my own position is if we are going too far with them, I think it's time for us to cut back. There are many other ways of raising funds, possibly more difficult, and that gambling is an attempt to follow the path of least restraint in terms of raising funds. It caters to the vices of people rather than to their virtues and I think we can start trying to shift our values back in a different type of direction by stopping them. Again, I'm sorry to hear that the Attorney-General has been conspicuous by its silence in this discussion and I'm sorry again that we have gone past the Attorney-General's Estimates because this is an issue that I think warrants comment by the Attorney-General as the official government spokesperson with respect to this particular issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, just before passing this item, I want to put on the record once again my opposition to lotteries in general, and to publicly confess my guilt that I was responsible as one of the people who voted for the Centennial Lottery Bill some ten years ago. I really got sucked in on that, as a lot of people did, that there was a one-shot effort and had a self destruct clause in it and that would be the one-time effort and it would be a fun thing. But, Mr. Chairman, I wish it were the case that somebody had put in a can all of the advertising which was done by the gambling interests in the State of Nevada in the election of 1956 in the State of California, at which time they had a Proposition No. 6, and they spent millions of dollars advertising the bad points of gambling, billboards with parents with their children in rags, dumping their life savings into slot machines, and they were successful in their campaign in California in defeating Proposition No. 6, which would have legalized gambling. Albeit there is some legalized gambling, once again in California, where I think five-card poker games are legal.

I sympathize with the Minister in a sense that once something has been started, it's very difficult to reverse it. But that brings it into the area, my general opposition, to such ways of funding, that's what perhaps we should do in the first thing, by everybody taxing ourselves, because there is certainly no relationship at all between the ability to pay and those who pay. Because those people who have the wherewithal take their few dollars and gamble with much more certainty in stock markets and the rest of it than they do in Provincials or Lotos or Silver Sweepstakes, or anything else. This money, I am positive, that the little research which has been done, and will be substantiated, that this money is taken from a group in society that can ill afford it.

So with all due respect to the Festival du Voyageurs and all the rest of the agencies, which I think should be funded if there is some need for these organizations to have public funds, then it should be done on the ability to pay by all of us in society. It shouldn't rely on lotteries. I know that there is a resolution before the House at the present time which is being considered that we can argue further in this regard. But the continued reliance on lotteries to fund things which are in the social interests of us all, I think is an error, and it will take political intestinal fortitude to reverse the tide. I will confess also that even

King Canute confessed his humanity, that he couldn't hold back the tides. But just to keep suggesting that it's inevitable that gambling will exist, and to use that as an excuse for continuing to fund legitimate social involvements in our community through, in my terms, conning people into thinking that they're going to catch the brass ring, I think is an error.

And some of the advertising which is used I think is deceitful. I notice in the ads that appear every Wednesday, they print out some numbers and they say that there are so many winners. That's if every ticket is sold, that's how many winners there are. You got twenty winners of this, and forty winners of this, and a hundred of this, and I think that they should account to the public on a week-to-week basis just how many people do actually win money on these things. Well, as I said, I just wanted to put on the record my opposition to it generally, and I'll save some of my arguments for the debate on the resolution which is before the House. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: The unfortunate problem I guess, dealing with lotteries, Mr. Chairman, it's a little bit like the prohibition on liquor. Manitoba is one of the jurisdictions I guess that we could say we were not going to have any lotteries any more, but I think the Member for St. Boniface, who was one of the Western Lotteries foundation, to try and make sure that the ticket sales between provinces stayed within their own jurisdictions. I agree with the member that some of the advertising leaves something to be desired and is not in the taste that I think it should be, but we are caught in the bind, I guess, of being in the position that if we would outlaw sales in Manitoba the same as if we outlawed the sale of alcohol in Manitoba, I think we'd only be kidding ourselves if we didn't think that we would have lotteries coming in under the table like the Irish Sweepstakes used to be years ago. So I say to that extent, we are trapped the same as with the liquor sales. I would be one of the first ones to agree with the prohibition if it would work, but indeed from past experience, didn't work, and I think it's much better then for governments to make sure that they have a pretty tight handle on what's happening. So unfortunately, I guess we're so far down the tube that we can't say we can get out of it totally, but I agree with the member that certain things could be done to try and minimize the effects that they have on the people in society.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, if we follow that reasoning on every piece of legislation which is before us, we wouldn't get too far. I think I had argued in another debate that it wasn't my position to prevent people from building beer troughs on Portage Avenue, my opposition was to the extent that they shouldn't convince people that they have to drink it. I think that all the provinces and the people within the provinces should put pressure on the federal government to amend the Criminal Code, in that it takes us back a bit prior to the amendment which has allowed the proliferation which has taken place. I agree with the Minister for one province to stand alone won't get us very far, but nevertheless to adopt the attitude that there is nothing we can do about it, is just taking us further and further down the road into an area which is causing problems as pointed out by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, that I didn't get an answer to some of his questions that he raised, relative to the contracts which are being given to middlemen.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that we all have to try and convince our colleagues, legislators all, to take a darn good look at where we are and perhaps see if there isn't some way of Canada, as a nation, taking a look at this, in co-operation between the provinces and the federal government to take a look at the whole concept of holding false hopes before people who can ill afford the money which is being squandered in this area.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before you pass this, if there is nothing on the lottery before we leave the Department of the Minister's Salary, I have one

other point. But I want to make sure that we have finished the lottery first. If the lottery is finished, there is a very short point I would like to make.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I was quite impressed with the Minister earlier, who I think we both agreed on the importance of the fitness and of working towards that in sports in his department, and I was shocked by the answers of the Minister of Education when he was questioned re the gym in the schools. I think the Minister, earlier in this debate while we were talking about lottery, repeatedly mentioned how important it was to coordinate this and bring it under the same Minister, and I would hope that he would see the value now of something that I suggested to him, something that was in existence, that was taking place and that has in advance since this government took office, that is in interdepartmental a committee to look at the question of fitness.

The Minister went to the trouble of telling us that he's funding - well through lottery now, through the share of the Sports Federation - no, I think that is still through the Estimates of the Minister in Preventive Sports Medicine, the Minister made a very big point of this and I agree with him. I think the Minister should look into this. I think it is his responsibility. If he's the man who's looking after the fitness of the people and the prevention of injuries in sports, I think that he should get in the act and get involved and talk to his colleague, the Minister of Education.

And it's quite obvious the Minister of Education never played anything but tiddly winks or snakes and ladders because he would know that you can't just put a mattress below a net, that people trip in it. A basketball player jumps in the air, something five feet high is not going to protect him; these mattresses the way they are now, could be more dangerous than no mattresses at all. --(Interjection)-- Yes, sure they're on the walls. They come in and --(Interjection)-- They're not on the walls. They're not on the walls. He's talking about what happens now, and on the walls when they're about five feet high that's not enough for anybody that understands anything about basketball.

We were talking about all these millions of dollars coming in through lotteries. I think that the Minister should look into this and I would suggest quite strongly to him that he take an . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt the others but I'd like to know what's being said and I can't do that while I'm talking to you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some of these mattresses then are - even if they were on the walls - are too low. The padding has to be done in certain places and any new gyms that are constructed - I'm not saying that you have to condemn all the gyms that are now - but certain basketball games, certain league games should not be held in these places if it's going to be dangerous. We have a coroner's report on that and different suggestions, what's the point of having these people making these studies and that? It's a dangerous thing. It is not affording the protection . . . Sometimes when you think there's protection and it's only partial protection, sometimes it's worse than none.

So I would just suggest to the Minister that you cannot talk about fitness. The Minister cannot, in his own department, try to promote fitness if he doesn't receive help from the Minister of Health and Prevention of Injuries, also from the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education. These are the two that I think of now, and I would hope that the Minister, if he hasn't done so already, would take some interest and look into this matter immediately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a)--pass. Resolution 68, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$348,300 for Fitness, Recreation and Sport--pass.

That concludes the Estimates of the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . I move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Move Committee rise? Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 84 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources. The item under discussion is Clause 13. Acquisition; Resolution 112. 13--pass.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, just before we concluded for the supper break, the Minister had indicated to the House that he would be seeking more information regarding the questions we were directing to him regarding the purchase of the Grandome Hotel. I wonder if the Minister has his material with him now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): No, Mr. Chairman, I undertook to get a complete report on the situation from the Attorney-General's Department and that's what I'll do. I can assure the honourable member, however, that his allegations about other people that he named earlier are untrue.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues mentioned to me, he thought the Minister had indicated the name of an owner or owners of the facility. I didn't recall him making that statement to the House. I wonder if he could indicate if he has determined at this point to who the owner or owners of this facility were.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think this is about the third time that I've provided this information. It was a Mr. Klus, spelled K-l-u-s.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate if this was the only owner of the facility, and if this was the person who owed the debt to the mortgage company which the department paid off?

MR. RANSOM: To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, he was the owner of the facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 13.--pass; Resolution 112--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,647,700 for Natural Resources. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, \$8,647,700--pass.

MR. ENNS: Page by page, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page by page. It doesn't seem that we have complete agreement. I saw a shake of the head. Do I have a "nay" or just a shake of the head? --(Interjection)-- I have a "nay". I would ask the honourable members to revert back to Page 78 of the Main Estimates, Resolution No. 105, Item 6. Lands, (a) Administration, (1) Salaries--pass.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there were 51 staff man years in the entire Lands Division. In the Administration Item, there were 3 staff man years - the same class

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1. Salaries--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, as I have done in the past, I propose to ask general questions for the entire Land Section under this item and would not ask detailed questions on the other sections unless it specifically relates to those.

My first question to the Minister on this is does he have a definite policy with respect to the sale and/or lease of Crown lands? Can he give us an indication of what his policy is in this respect?

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps it might facilitate discussion, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would like to place a number of his questions. He has indicated he has several questions; perhaps he would place them and then we will attempt to deal with them all.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would propose to ask the specific questions and lead into discussion on each of those, if there is to be a discussion on each individual issue. This is one issue that I would like the Minister's comments on, if he could indicate to us if the government has changed the policy with respect to the sale and/or lease of Crown lands. I would follow that, if he would give us that information, with some specific questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. If I could just take the time of the honourable members for a minute. On Tuesday, March 25, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources had brought up a point of order and I said that I would make a ruling after I had had a chance to purview the Hansard. It was on a point of order where the Honourable Minister said, "The point of order was with reference to materials to do with the Jarmoc case, was what the honourable gentleman was referring to. He has alleged that we filed incomplete orders of return and that we burned or destroyed papers. That is a very serious allegation and I think that the honourable gentleman should either be prepared to substantiate it or withdraw it."

Now, the remarks from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland were: "When asked for an order of return, there didn't seem to be very much information available." I'm sorry, it's on Page 1626 of Hansard, dated Tuesday, March 25.

At the top of the page: "When we asked for an order for return, there didn't seem to be very much information available. The Minister's department has been practising file burning or book burning, or whatever they do to destroy such files, shredding maybe."

I should think that the honourable member really was making a remark that possibly wasn't meant to be made in regard to the actual accusation of the Minister's department practising file burning or book burning, or whatever they do to destroy such files and I would think that on looking over the matter, that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland was out of order in making such a remark without proof to substantiate it. I would hope that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland would reflect on it and withdraw his remarks.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I believe the way it was printed in Hansard is not the way in which I said it but I was phrasing the remark at the time, if I recall, more in the way of a question to the Minister as to what exactly was happening to information from the department; and as I recall, we were discussing the issue of the alleged missing information regarding the park policy. And I believe, if you recall, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing a proposed policy, a policy which I said was in existence in the department when the Progressive Conservative Government took office, and this minister was not able to find that information in the files, or at least he indicated that it had not come to his attention. And I believe I was discussing this by way of questions, and wondering what happened to the information that was available. So I would suggest that I should withdraw the information as it is printed in the Hansard, but that is not the way in which I phrased the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Withdrawal of the remarks as printed in Hansard. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there have been some changes made in lease sale policies but still I wonder if the honourable member wouldn't like to . . . he said he wished to deal with this section in a general fashion and then go on to the specific questions. I would like some direction from you, Mr. Chairman, are we going to deal in a general way then, and I would assume that would involve raising a number of questions from the members opposite, or are we going to deal point by point with specific topics.



MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister, and to all the members, we are under Section 6 Lands, and Item (a) Administration, which covers quite a latitude of questions that could be asked and answered under this particular department, under Administration (1) Salaries. I think if the honourable members would care to specific questions, then the Honourable Minister would be prepared to answer specific questions.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am asking a specific question and the question is, what is the Minister's policy, the government's policy with respect to the administration of Crown land, and with specific reference to the policy of the government regarding the selling or leasing policy. I phrase that as a general question, and I think it is specific enough that he would be able to give us what exact changes, if any, they have made in the policy of the government since they've been in office with respect to leasing and/or selling of Crown land.

MR. RANSOM: There have been a number of changes announced, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the honourable members are probably familiar with them, one being that of making agricultural lands available to the long-term lease holders on those agricultural lands in order that we might strengthen the basic land-holding system which has been the foundation of our agricultural development in this province, and indeed throughout the country. One policy which was not being pursued which was in fact being reversed by the previous administration, members opposite are probably aware that we have reimplemented a policy some time ago which allowed for persons holding long-term leases on agricultural lands prior to the 1st of June, 1977, to have the option to purchase those lands at an appraised market value, or to continue to lease them if that was their desire. The terms under which the land would be made available for purchase, of course, had a number of built-in protective devices to see that lands that were subject to perhaps excessive erosion, or lands which the local government was not prepared to service, didn't agree with the sale policy, that we had built into the system a means of applying those sorts of checks.

In addition, we have moved to allow the purchase of commercial sites in northern communities which previously had only been available on a lease basis. It is our intention to provide, or we are providing the opportunity for people to purchase recreational lots in subdivisions outside of provincial parks, and indeed some remote commercial sites be available for purchase as well, providing that the necessary surveys, etc., can be carried out by the purchaser.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, with respect to the sale of Crown lands, there is one aspect of Crown lands which was under some consideration for resolution when we were in government, that is, the LGD Crown lands. These were, as the Minister may be aware, lands that were administered by the department, by the Crown Lands Section, but were in actual fact lands that belonged to the LGDs in question, and some of the LGDs were applying to have these lands returned to their jurisdiction. Some were requesting that the lands be put up for lease and/or sale. Some were already being leased by the department, but some people were requesting purchase of them.

I wonder if the Minister could give us a description of the status of those lands at this time, and what his department has done or is doing or planning to do to resolve that issue?

MR. RANSOM: We are in the process, Mr. Chairman, of transferring lands back to the LGDs, lands which were held in trust for the LGDs under a 1964 agreement. We have at this point transferred several thousands of acres back and we are processing Orders-in-Council quite frequently as we turn lands back to individual LGDs at their request.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just revert back to the discussion that took place this afternoon dealing with that burnt-down hotel that the government took over, to find out whether it is under this item that we would discuss with the Minister the disposition of that parcel which they acquired, as he described this afternoon.

Now, I don't want to shuffle around too much, but I'd like to know from the Minister, is this where we should be discussing the expected disposition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Allow the Honourable Minister to answer.  
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's helpful, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister indicate just where he is prepared to discuss that.

MR. RANSOM: Well, it should originally have been raised with the Parks item, Mr. Chairman. We passed that. It was then raised under the Capital item. I assume that the next time when it would be discussed would be under the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has made a commitment to supply some answers, and they would come under Minister's Salary.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, you said that it would come under Minister's Salary. Has the Minister committed himself to producing the material before we deal with his salary?

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I've said perhaps four times now that I'm prepared to get a detailed amount of background information and make it available to the members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say to the Honourable Minister that I might have made a remark that was confusing when I said that the answers would come under Minister's Salary. The Honourable Minister has just made his remarks.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and although he did not say it, I assume he means that it'll be made available to us for review before we deal with his salary. I think I have a right to assume that. If I'm wrong, he'll correct me.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about the acquisition of the parcel which he has agreed to file with us, the particulars of which he'll file with us. I'm not talking about the disposition of that. And it seems to me it comes under lands, the administration of all Crown lands, and he's already talked about the sale and lease of Crown lands. Now, this is a parcel which the Crown has acquired, and we will yet get information and discuss the manner of acquisition. I'm not talking about the intention as to disposition and I don't know of any place other than administration of all Crown lands and the disposition of it, that it seems to me it comes in right here, certainly not under his salary.

MR. RANSOM: The question which we were discussing previously, Mr. Chairman, was not one of land. It was one of buildings.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to get involved in this kind of a discussion, then I can debate that with the Minister, too. I wonder if he knows that the building that we're talking about is situate on Crown land, and I want to know whether he's going to deal with the Crown land or just with the building. Is he talking about selling the fire ruins of a building? Is that what he's talking about, and therefore doesn't call it Crown lands? Or is he talking

about the disposition of the land along with the building, or the building along with the land, either by way of lease or by way of sale?

MR. RANSOM: I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, at how many points throughout the Estimates are we going to deal with this item?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister was addressing you and asking for a response, or addressing me. If he wants a response from me, I would say that the Minister should supply us with the information under the relevant resolution. I realize he may be not clear on just where it is that he is accountable, but I would say that we're now dealing, I believe, with the item involving the administration of Crown lands. And I heard him say this afternoon, loud and clear, that this building, this hotel, was on Crown lands. And I am asking the Minister - I don't know why it should be so difficult for him to respond - whether or not there is any intention of disposing of that Crown land, that parcel or the buildings separately and therefore he doesn't want to call it Crown Land but rather Crown building, and what is his reluctance to tell us about the plans for disposition. Mr. Chairman, I think I made it clear - he is going to tell us all about the acquisition - I am not asking about the acquisition, I am asking about the disposition of it.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member had been present during the discussion of the parks item, he would have heard what action we were taking to call for proposals on how we would deal with the buildings, and what sort of new facilities might be put in their place. He should also be aware that lands that fall within the provincial park are not generally considered in the same category as Crown lands that fall outside the park, that Crown lands within a park cannot be sold because of the provisions in The Provincial Park Lands Act.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that if the Minister had been prepared to give us the information at the time I was involved in asking questions, I would have been here to hear his reply. But failing that, it is not for him to decide when any member should be present in this House, and it is really a matter for him to justify his Estimates. And if he refuses to answer the question as to the intended disposition, then he has I suppose, yes, of course he has the right to refuse, and he is accountable to this committee for whether or not he is co-operative in response.

He said that there is the suggestion that there will be proposals requested. In what way would there be this effort made to get proposals submitted, and what has the government or this Minister thought about the manner in which this property is best improved and made available for the benefit of Manitobans? Is it that they are only asking for proposals? They did have a proposal from one Jarmoc on one occasion. Do they just sit back and wait for proposals to come in? Or do they themselves make plans of any kind, saying, we would like to see this property developed in a certain way, and then on that basis, ask for proposals. But surely a person can't make a proposal unless he had some idea as to the limitations or restrictions that the government has for the development of Crown lands. As I say, if the Minister wants to go back and say, well, that was something he wanted to discuss in park lands, he has a right to refuse. Nobody can force him to answer a question.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume by the fact that the Minister, although present in the Committee, did not rise to respond, that he does indeed to refuse to deal with that at this stage.

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

MR. RANSOM: It has always been my assumption, Mr. Chairman, that the Estimates are set out in an itemized fashion so that we may go through them in some type of logical order, some type of logical fashion, and that the procedure is to go by those items rather than according to the convenient times for the members

opposite when they wish to ask questions. As it happens, we went through the items, item by item, we dealt with the parks question, there was some discussion of that particular topic, and I can refer the honourable member back to Hansard to see what questions were asked and what answers were given. If we are not to proceed in that kind of what would seem to be an orderly fashion, Mr. Chairman, then I fear that we are going to face a lot of difficulties in trying to provide the information when it is requested.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Minister's estimation of what was always his assumption. I would only have to tell him that experience has shown that his assumption is not well founded.

Regardless of that, I made the comment that I thought we were dealing with the Administration of Crown Lands, and I said it would appear from the failure of the Minister to rise to respond to my question that he is refusing to deal with this item at this time. My statement was correct, and the Minister's point of order which, as you know, Mr. Chairman, was not a point of order even though he was permitted to make his statement at great length, that all he did then was to confirm my statement that he was not prepared to deal with this item at this time, which of course leaves it, Mr. Chairman, to his Salary, because that is the only place that we can discuss his administration of his department, in view of his failure to respond to my question now. I don't fault him. If he feels that Parks was the one place that he wanted to discuss it, then that's fine. He cannot be compelled to answer otherwise. That's an assumption he can make and accept, that he is not bound to answer anything. He is not here on that basis.

I will read Hansard, but I have a feeling that I won't read much more than what he said, "We are going to ask for proposals." And the Member for Rupertsland has opened the question as to the future policy or the announced policy of this government as to how it is going to deal with Crown lands. Now he makes some distinction. Am I to assume that under this item dealing with the disposition or leasing of Crown lands, that he is not discussing any land that is in provincial parks? Do I also assume that the land we are referring to is clearly within the provincial parks and will be dealt with in a separate procedural way? Is that a fair question that the Minister can respond to?

MR. RANSOM: Lands within parks, Mr. Chairman, are dealt with under provisions of The Parklands Act. That Act does not allow the sale of any lands within parks and therefore obviously it is impossible to dispose of land through that means, within a provincial park. Otherwise, it is some form of lease.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am just bound to point out to the Minister that leasing is a form of disposition. He may not be able to sell it outright but he could certainly lease it for 99 years, I assume, under The Parks Act, and as I say, it is something that should have been discussed earlier, so we will wait for his Salary.

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

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate where the Land Acquisitions Branch appears. Are we in that section now or is that in . . . ?

MR. RANSOM: The Land Acquisition Branch is not in this department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Due to the fact that you are selling leased lots to cabin owners outside of parks, my question is how do you value these lots, by their size, location, whatever?

MR. RANSOM: That will be done, Mr. Chairman, by land appraisers, according to the system that land appraisers use to try to arrive at evaluations. I am not familiar with all the individual measurements that go into determining it but of

course there are lands being evaluated all the time and it's a pretty standard procedure.

MR. BARROW: Well, then, if I want to buy my lot, I get in touch with a land appraiser. Where do I find him and who is he?

MR. RANSOM: We simply ask people, Mr. Chairman, to contact the Lands Branch when they have a piece of land that they feel they would like to purchase and if it would be eligible under the policies. Then they would be contacted with the details. There are some situations, I'm sure, that the people will prefer to continue leasing rather than to take the route of purchase. They would have that option.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister: Would this be the same discussion as what we had under Parks previously? --(Interjections)-- I just wanted to find out for my own information.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. BARROW: I see. The Minister referred me here for this question, Mr. Chairman. Then the Minister can't give me any direction of how these lots are valued. I mean, would you pay the same for a waterfront lot as one five blocks back? Would it go by size?

MR. RANSOM: I think it stands to reason, Mr. Chairman, that those factors would be taken into consideration by an appraiser, that a standard waterfront lot is worth more money than one that is farther back, given that other factors are the same, access and that sort of thing. There may be other factors that would enter into it. In some cases, it could make a back tier lot more valuable than a lakefront lot. But the evaluations are carried out by qualified appraisers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: On this section, the Minister did give us some general comments regarding a policy of the government regarding the sale or lease of Crown lands. On at least one of those uses, the residential use, we were proceeding to adopt that policy and in fact were practising the sale of residential land where it applied to MHRC housing in northern Manitoba and other areas where people required actual ownership of the land in order to apply for mortgage financing because of the CMHC requirements.

I would ask the Minister, in that specific area, what the status is of the land in the Great Falls area, which was in the process of being surveyed at the time of the change of government and it was proposed that that land be offered for sale to the residents of the area. From my information, people in that area are still waiting for the government to take action on that.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate what is the reason for the holdup in that area.

MR. RANSOM: I am advised that any holdups are not a matter of policy, Mr. Chairman, but there apparently are some environmental concerns and some discussions under way with the Local Government District about servicing. The policy as such continues in place and we, from time to time on a fairly frequent basis, transfer lots under that policy, or sell lots.

MR. BOSTROM: In the area of leasing as well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what his policy is with respect to the leasing and/or otherwise disposing of the wild rice concessions in the province of Manitoba?

MR. RANSOM: Well, that's a topic that we have had under discussion with a number of the individuals and groups involved in the rice industry. Generally, it would be our intention to move towards long-term leases with individuals or with corporations with identifiable entities, and that's essentially the way we're moving. It's only within the Whiteshell Park, in particular, but there may be some other situations as well where it's not quite that simple because of other

potention conflicting uses, and so there has to be some more extensive involvement and supervisions by the department. But, generally, it's a question of moving towards long-term leases, so that people have some security of tenure.

MR. BOSTROM: I would ask the Minister what his intentions are with respect to the long-term leases which were made available to Indian bands in Northern Manitoba which gave them access to wild rice areas in the area that they traditionally harvest wild rice. That is, as a general rule of thumb, when we were in government we used the trapping zones or trapline areas of a community to be the basis of the economic or resource base of the community, and the wild rice resource in that area was assigned to the communities on a long-term basis by way of a lease. I wonder if the Minister can indicate if he's intending to change that policy and to allocate those areas to individuals and corporations, or is he going to continue to make those areas available to the Indian people?

MR. RANSOM: We still have, I think, some 15 community leases that we're involved in at this time. I think there were 14 last year, so there's one additional one there; plus there were a number of leases that the Algonquin Company had held previously and they were able to transfer those to the new corporation, Manominiki Corporation, so that there were some 22 leases there, I believe. In the long term, I think we have through discussions with the native communities, and the individuals and corporations involved, we would prefer to work towards having some kind of recognizable legal entity holding the leases.

MR. BOSTROM: In the case of the Indian bands, does the Minister not recognize the Indian bands as a legal entity to which the government can relate in terms of leasing?

MR. RANSOM: Well, it depends whether they choose to operate through a structure that's established for that purpose, or whether they're operating as a band. It's my understanding that they're simply operating as a band, that it does create some difficulties in terms of lease-holding.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, could the Minister indicate what those difficulties are and if he is attempting, in any way, to have his department work towards resolution of the difficulties that may arise? And if he believes that some other system will be superior to that, I would ask him to indicate to us what he believes to be a superior system.

MR. RANSOM I think I indicated, Mr. Chairman, we're continuing to have discussions with the bands and, as well, with other users of wild rice and it's simply our hope and intention that the wild rice resource would be utilized to the fullest extent possible. One of the best ways seemingly to bring that about is to have individual people directly involved in the harvest. Now we recognize, of course, that has not been the traditional fashion that Indian people have used to handle the harvest of rice, so we don't intend to simply move in and change that system overnight. But in the long term - the member asked what's a better system - I think a system where individual people or owners of a corporation have direct interests in that corporation. I think that proves to be a better system in terms of production.

MR. BOSTROM: In view of the Minister's enthusiasm for individuals and individual corporations, can the Minister indicate if he will give a priority to the leasing of traditional wild rice areas. These are natural wild rice stands. They are not stands which require a great deal of work. They have been growing for centuries in their present state with very little, if any, man-made improvement of any kind. I'm asking the Minister if he will give priority to Indian people in the leasing of these areas. And I ask this because, Mr. Chairman, there is no other wild resource which is as closely related to the Indian people and their culture than the wild rice. Traditionally, they have been the only harvesters of the wild rice resource; and they have harvested the resource as a part of their economic livelihood, as well, it has served a social and cultural purpose. It has brought people together during that harvesting period of the year when they

would gather at the lake, whether it is the Whiteshell or in some of the northern lakes and would work together as a group in a social or cultural setting in the harvest of wild rice for a period of two to three to six weeks in the late summer and early fall of each year.

In recent years, Mr. Chairman, private businessmen have noticed the lucrative return that is possible from the wild rice resource; a very fast return that can be achieved with a minimum of labour and a maximum return on capital investment. If one were to put a machine picker in a wild rice lake, where there's a natural stand of wild rice, it's not unusual for a person to make several hundreds of dollars per day harvesting wild rice. The native people of Manitoba tend to look on that resource as one of the last areas that they still have access to, to make an income for themselves and their families, and I must say they resent the fact that the government seems to be moving in the area of leasing some of these prime wild rice areas to individuals who formerly were not involved in the wild rice business. I will not mention any particular names here, but I think this is an impression that the native people have of this government, that this government has an intention - if it has not already done so - to move towards the leasing of these wild rice areas. And they're traditional wild rice areas. They're not something that requires a great deal of improvement. They're not farms that need cultivating and planting and a lot of preparatory work to make a good harvest. They're areas where the wild rice grows in a natural way, and one can go in in a short period of time in the fall of the year and make a very good income from harvesting the wild rice.

I would ask the Minister if he could answer those fears and concerns of the native people that they have of the direction in which his government appears to be moving. I would appreciate him telling me that I'm wrong, and the people that have talked to me are wrong in that regard, and that the government is not moving in this direction. I would expect that they would be better advised to be moving in the direction of making the wild rice resource more available to the Indian people and give them some assistance in being able to make a reasonable income from this resource, rather than taking that resource away from them as well as other resources that they've taken away and given to Abitibi and whoever else may be operating in northern Manitoba. I would ask the Minister to answer that specific concern.

MR. RANSOM: There have been no resources taken away from any native people, Mr. Chairman, contrary to the allegations of the honourable member. And it certainly is not the intention to do that in this case. But it is the intention to provide the native local communities with the first opportunity to utilize the resources that are available in their area. That does not mean though, in the long run, that it's possible for them to tie up the resource without utilizing it. I don't think that's in the interest of Manitobans generally, that there be a resource in the province that could be utilized and not be utilized.

So when I say that the first opportunity is to be made available to the native groups and to the local communities, we also have to recognize that there will of necessity be some performance criteria involved as well. But I think that it's fair to say that at the moment that the traditional wild rice areas are already under the control of the community groups or the native groups of rice harvesters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourble Member for The Pas.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, while we're talking on wild rice I just want to remind the Minister that a number of people have been traditional harvesters of wild rice that are not immediately adjacent to the resource itself and it's been a cultural pattern and a cultural habit for hundreds of years for people to move into the wild rice areas for the harvest season. As the Member for Rupertsland said, it's been a social cultural occasion when people meet together with old friends.

Mr. Chairperson, I know that in a number of reserves that are presently in The Pas constituency, there are many people there who rely on the wild rice harvest for part of their income throughout the year. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Minister of that in allocating this resource. As I understand the Minister, he's not making any immediate changes in allocation, although, if I understand the

Minister correctly, he's hoping that in the long run he might be able to make some change in how these licences are allocated.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairperson, I would just hope that the Minister would - if and when he decides to make changes in the licensing system - that he would use a little bit different approach than he used with announcing the fishing regulations by letter to fishermen and then having to change his mind when the pressure came on him in terms of that particular policy of that particular program. So those are my comments on wild rice, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this general section, I wanted to ask some general questions before we get into the specific areas under consideration here. With respect to the overall administration of the Crown Lands Branch I would wonder if the Minister could indicate if they are moving towards having a central Crown lands registry for all Crown lands in the province of Manitoba, and if that is going to be on a computerized system.

MR. RANSOM: There are really two parts to that question, Mr. Chairman, the automated registry and the central Crown lands registry. In the immediate future it is our intention to work towards an automated registry for the lands that are directly under the administration of this department. There are other Crown lands, of course, that are held by other agencies of government and even other branches and other departments that don't fall within our registry. But in the long term we would have to move towards having that one central area where it's possible to get information on any and all pieces of land held by government and its agencies.

But in the immediate future we are simply working on the automation of the system that we have now because, you may not be aware, Mr. Chairman, that it's rather an outdated system where there is only a single entry available. It's quite time consuming and laborious in making I believe some 25,000 entries a year by hand, and that security could be a problem with that kind of system.

MR. BOSTROM: Before we leave this section, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some comments regarding general administration of the Lands Branch. It's one that relates to the Honourable Minister's comment, "That no resources have been taken away from people." It certainly may not be directly related to this section, but it certainly relates to a large area of Crown land when one considers the Abitibi agreement, which this government signed, which certainly took away a large chunk of resources from the effective control of the people that live in the area, and that area extends from the Winnipeg River north almost to Poplar River on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. Those resources are now effectively controlled completely by the Abitibi Paper Company and the people there can't even go to their own government to request cutting permits. They must go hat in hand to the company. And that's a result of Progressive Conservative policy.

With respect to the wild rice resource, one finds reports coming from the outlying areas that certain wild rice lakes have been leased by this government to people that have not traditionally been involved in the wild rice harvesting business. I would ask the Minister is he is not aware of those leases having been awarded, that he make himself aware of that and check into the policy to ensure that the policy that he has outlined to us is actually being followed by the department, because there are reports of individuals who are involved in other kinds of businesses - garages and lumber yards, and so on - that have applied for and received wild rice leases on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. These are non native people. And, Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the Minister that I hoped he would continue the policy of making those wild rice resources available on a first priority basis to the native people that live in the area. He indicated that is the policy they are following. Now, in at least those cases that I am referring to, certainly it has not been made aware to me and to the people that informed me, that these lakes were posted, so to speak, to make people aware that they were available for lease before they were, in fact, leased. So, I would ask the Minister, if he is not aware of those cases, to check into it and to ensure that his



wild rice policy as stated to the House here is being followed by the people that are administering it.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'm not familiar with the situation that he is referring to, Mr. Chairman, but I would have to draw a distinction, as he did, between traditional, what might be called traditional areas, and areas where culture of wild rice might be applied. And I don't believe I said anywhere that there would be any exclusive hold on the industry generally for native groups. It would not surprise me that other people, be they garage owners or woodcutters or farmers, that might hold leases. That in itself doesn't surprise me.

I should also point out to the honourable member that it certainly should not be the case that any individual has to go cap in hand, as he says, to Abitibi Paper Company in order to acquire some cutting rights, and no doubt we'll get into this in more detail in the forestry operation. They have the right to approach the department with grievances if, in fact, it's necessary to approach a company cap in hand, as he says.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, in the Minister's Report, it mentions the acquiring of land for the use of other departments, and I wonder if he could give us some idea of the - and it mentions specifically that the requests were made by the Departments of Highways, Northern Affairs, Municipal and Urban Affairs - I wonder if he could just give us some idea of the kind of acquisitions that this section would be looking after for the Department of Highways and for the Department of Northern Affairs.

MR. RANSOM: We don't acquire lands, as I understand it, for other departments, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps if the honourable member could refer me to the item he is speaking about, I can perhaps give a better explanation.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I am referring to page 75 of the Annual Report of the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment for the year ending March 31st, 1979. The paragraph says, "Requests for surface leases continue to be filed by Crown lands section, which also administered agreements with Ducks Unlimited Canada. Other provincial departments or agency required land for public purposes such as provincial parks, recreational housing subdivisions, public roads, municipal garbage dumps, transmission lines, gas pipe lines, and underground cables for Manitoba Telephone System, requests were made by the Department of Highways and Northern Affairs, Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs, as well as the Parks Division, Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System." And, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure then exactly what that is referring to; whether it's the permit to use the land, Crown land, or whether it's for surveys for these other departments - if the Minister could clarify that further please.

MR. RANSOM: It's already Crown land, Mr. Chairman, and it's being provided to the other Crown users by some means of reservation.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, then my original question would apply. I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of the kind of lands that the department would permit the Department of Highways and Northern Affairs to use. What is this section referring to then?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, that's either a specific question, I assume, asking for a report on lands that actually have been made available, or else a very general one saying under what circumstances would they be made available. And if it's the general one, then it's hard to anticipate but if Highways had . . . obviously they were going to be building a road and needed to build it on Crown land and needed a reservation on the land, then they would get it. And I suppose that other agencies might require it as well. If Parks were proposing to designate a new park land, and it would have to be other users of Crown lands taken into consideration before that designation was made, and the Crown lands branch would be brought into it to determine, for example, what other reservations

might have been placed on that land by other users, so that it would serve essentially as a clearing house to facilitate the Crown agency getting the use that they wanted.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, what would be the procedure then for another department, let's say Highways, has a road that is going to cross Crown land as well as private land that they are acquiring? What is the procedure that they go through, and then what is the procedure that his department goes through before the permission or before they are legally able to build a new road on Crown land?

MR. RANSOM: Well, there is a process within the government whereby the interdepartmental planning board would look at that sort of thing to try and resolve the conflicts within the government. And in some cases, of course, it would go further to the environmental impact assessment and review, depending on whether or not the preliminary discussions with the interdepartmental planning board indicated that a further, more detailed assessment was required.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to understand the procedure a little bit better. So the Department of Highways is going to put a road through. Do they then make a formal request to the interdepartmental land use committee? If that committee says it looks all right with them, then it goes to the environmental assessment people to look at? I would like to have an understanding of the process that's necessary for this.

MR. RANSOM: . . . their application to the lands branch first of all, and then it would be considered by the interdepartmental planning board, and only in situations where that board decided that some further assessment beyond that which is available through general internal discussions, where some additional information had to be gathered, then there might be an environmental assessment and review process applied.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, this section is the one that allows, as I understand it from the Minister's answer, that reserves be placed on certain land; that is, if a department has a future use they might put a reserve on that particular piece of land so that it is not used for another purpose of Crown Land, and there was a problem. I think I have raised this with the Minister before, and I don't think it is fully resolved yet, in terms of Manitoba Hydro reserves on Crown Land, the problem, Mr. Chairperson, being that Hydro would do a very rough estimate of some lands at some time or other they may have to change water levels, and just draw a line on the map to indicate that they would like those to be under Hydro reserve, those particular areas. There was no thorough surveying done and there was a real problem for many communities who happen to fall within that reserve because then they had trouble getting access to land because it was in a Hydro reserve. There was also a problem of getting Hydro to pay for a detailed survey to determine elevations to decide which lands could be released from the Hydro reserve that Hydro requested, and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could fill us in in terms of what has happened with that particular situation.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member really is referring to a general situation rather than a particular one, and it is a problem in that power reserves, as initially applied before severance lines are arrived at are very general and cover thousands and thousands of acres, and so it does place a restriction on potential developments that take place. So what we have to do, I think, is try and deal with specific situations as they arise. Those communities that were already in an area before the power reserve is applied then they have a different sort of status than people who are applying for a new use to take place within a power reserve.

In some situations we have provided long-term leases, as last year, I believe, when we settled some of the land claims to do with the Grand Rapids Forebay at Easterville. We provided the community with access on a lease basis to get to the

water and to be able to construct buildings and docks, whatever was required, but of course the Crown not being held responsible for what happened if the water was to rise within the limits that were set for the management of the forebay.

That is a very general description, if the honourable member has some specific situation that he would like to have us investigate, fine, I would be happy to look at that.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, my recollection was that there were a number of specific situations that were being dealt with in 1977, the last time that I had anything to do with it. My recommendation was that unless Hydro was willing to do the surveys, because Hydro was the one that wanted the reserve on it in the first place, that the restriction should be lifted. But the position that Hydro has taken is that the province, out of general revenue or through the departments, should pay for the surveys for their requirements in terms of putting a reserve on the land. I wonder if the Minister could say what is the position at this time, in those cases where a survey is required that hadn't been done before but the reason that the survey is required is very specifically to get elevations because of the Hydro reserve, and whose responsibility that is now and what position the Minister is taking.

MR. RANSOM: I would have to get specific information on that, Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that just offhand.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, it is my understanding, and the Minister can correct me if I am incorrect, that this is the section that also deals with agreements with Ducks Unlimited.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder then, if that is the case, if the Minister could give us some understanding of how those agreements are reached at and not the specific but what is the general nature of the agreement and what is the ability of the province once an agreement is signed if they become dissatisfied with the procedure, with the work that Ducks Unlimited is doing.

Then added to that, Mr. Chairman, how does the Minister deal with specific concerns that I am sure have been expressed to him, that he is aware of? The case I am thinking of is the Ducks Unlimited agreement near The Pas, and I am trying to remember the proper names, I think it's in the Reed Lake area, I am not sure if it is part of the Saskeram or not, but there was an agreement there with Ducks Unlimited and the province. So I wonder if the Minister could tell us how the agreement comes to be arrived at, in a general way the nature of the agreement, and then what is the ability of the province to change or to affect what Ducks Unlimited does if they become dissatisfied with what they are doing.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the areas in the agreements that the honourable member refers to probably are of some considerable standing, in terms of years, and I would have to refer to those specifically but I am sure that we could make copies of the agreements available, but, without having the agreement in front of me, I would be certain that the agreement says that if the terms of the agreement are not adhered to then the agreement could be cancelled. Now in situations where the terms of the agreement entered into are no longer judged to be good terms, then I am not certain what position the government would be put in, I assume it would be one of attempting to negotiate some changes in terms.

We are looking now at an agreement and proceeding to develop an agreement dealing with the area east of The Pas and I know that has involved discussions with local people and with the native communities, and generally those people who have some interest in the resource there, and we believe that the terms of the agreement are such that they would be met with general satisfaction, but it will be quite a long-term agreement. It's a commitment to land use for that primary purpose and in order for Ducks Unlimited or any other agency to make the sorts of investments that are required to bring about the water management and hence the resource management, it requires a substantially long-term agreement.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give me a little bit more detail on the specific agreement that's under negotiation at this time and the method for consulting and involving the various interested people in the area in terms of their input into the nature of that agreement.

MR. RANSOM: Well, the agreement hasn't been completed yet so I guess there are other steps that can still be taken, but it is my understanding that there have been discussions with resource users. Now, I am not certain who specifically carried out those contacts and whether they were publicly-held meetings or whether they were privately-held meetings with band officers and that sort of thing. All I can give, the assurance at the moment is the assurance that has been given to me that there have in fact been consultations and some explanation of what the purpose of the agreement would be, that it would be a long-term commitment to managing in the area for waterfowl and for the other wildlife resources that benefit from water management regimes that are good for waterfowl. I could get additional information if you want the precise details of what types of meetings were held.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister would do that because there are, that I am aware of, two Ducks Unlimited areas now, one east and one west of The Pas and one in an area that is somewhat marginally affected by the Grand Rapids Forebay between The Pas and Moose Lake. There has been some concerns that I have heard on that one, Mr. Chairman, but in the last three years, I have had nothing but complaints from both native people and sportsmen in terms of the Ducks Unlimited management west of The Pas.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it very much if the Minister would get the information on the new agreement because there is quite an interest in the The Pas area on that subject.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, when we come to the Wildlife Branch, then we will see that we have some more information available at the time. That really would be an appropriate place to discuss it.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just state my general concern in terms of the province and the dealings with Ducks Unlimited. Ducks Unlimited, being basically American - financed by American wildlife migratory bird hunters whose purpose is to come into Canada and to improve the breeding grounds to increase the number of ducks that are available to be hunted when they fly south. Of course, the problem of governments is that the government is always wanting to do something to improvement the wildlife situation and governments are always looking for new money, or money that they don't have to spend from their taxpayers' dollars to bring about improvements. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a real question in my mind in terms of do we in fact get the real benefit to Manitoba and to Canada from some of these agreements, from some of these projects, or is Canada just the base that benefits people outside of Canada but, in order to have some money spent in our province, that we go ahead on the basis that it was going to be some money spent here and that's good for Manitoba?

I'm sure the Minister is familiar in more detail with the agreements and with the operations of Ducks Unlimited. I was in attendance at one meeting at Moose Lake with officials from Ducks Unlimited when they were trying to deal with some of the concerns of the Indian and Metis people at Moose Lake in terms of the agreement that they had. I know the present Premier of Manitoba was previously on the board of directors, I believe, for Ducks Unlimited, and so I am sure that the government itself is quite familiar with that organization and how it works.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge and ask that the government be very careful in their negotiations and in their considerations of the benefits to Manitoba, and not be willing to bend over backwards just so the U.S. dollars would be spent here, but to ensure that those dollars are spent for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate of my colleague's Estimates at this time and I move to put on the record at least one or

two items, partly because of the modesty of my colleague that prevents him from underlining the very fundamental change in policy that this administration has brought about under his direction, and also to remind my friend, the Honourable Member for Inkster, that things will not always progress as he sees them progressing, that is, that when a socialist administration is in power they will take three steps in one direction and then when it is our turn at bat we may take one or two steps --(Interjection)-- not backwards, but in a different direction, but nonetheless their persuasiveness will prevail.

Mr. Chairman, the other reason that prompts me to put these few remarks on the record is the general reticence on the part of members opposite to take issue with this Minister, or this government, about the fulfilling, yes, the fulfilling of a very important election promise that was made to the people of Manitoba by the members of this administration, the then opposition, that is, that if entrusted with the affairs of the Province of Manitoba, that we would embark on providing in a judicial, not in a helter-skelter way, a controlled way, the availability of Crown lands to Manitoba citizens.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this Minister and this government is doing and it is interesting to hear, even from members opposite like the Member for Flin Flon, rising from his seat, because he knows whereof I speak. He knows that particularly in the area that he represents, throughout northern Manitoba where land is one thing that we have a great deal of but has not been available, nor has the average Manitoba, has it been accessible to him in terms of the way he wants it, ownership of that land.

MR. BARROW: I beg your pardon, my honourable friend . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon on a point of order.

MR. BARROW: That is not quite right. My friend from St. Boniface, the Minister of Tourism, he went up there with the express purpose to find out what the residents wanted, whether to lease or buy, and they were very very undecided. In fact, they didn't even take a vote on it, so it's not that important really.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome that intrusion, because that of course is precisely what this administration and this Minister is doing. We're not dogmatic about it. We are not selling land to sell land. We are honouring and indeed encouraging and indeed insisting that certain lands can only be leased and will only be leased. We are insisting and I can assure you that under this Minister certain lands will always be dedicated to what in his judgment, what in his government's judgment, prime use is for, perhaps the protection of wildlife, the encouragement of wildlife, setting aside of wildlife preserves.

But, Mr. Chairman, I take particular delight - and I think it's important perhaps to mention because there are so many new members, I think perhaps only the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that even precedes the Member for Inkster or myself - it was a Conservative administration in the early Sixties that said, hold it, let's not sell any more Crown lands. Let's decide first of all what best use those lands ought to be put to. And so we agreed and we entered into long-term multimillion dollar program such as the Canada Land Inventory Program, where we mapped, where we studied the kinds of lands that we are talking about in this general heading of Crown Lands. It was a Conservative administration that froze any selling of Crown lands, with some flexibility, but essentially put that freeze down; not a New Democrat administration.

When the New Democratic government took office they took that freeze one step further. They made it into a matter of party policy because it happens to fit that party's policies and doctrines, not to sell, not to put into private hands any of the public lands the Crown then had or enjoyed. Indeed, they pursued a very active policy and spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, in acquiring substantial additional amounts of land; whether it was under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation or whether it was under the aegis of the former Minister of Renewable Resources, the Member for Rupertsland; whether it was in the massing of packages of land for wildlife purposes, etc. But the one thing they did not do, Sir, was make available to the

average citizen that cottage lot to the long term lessee farmer, that rancher, the possibility of acquiring ownership to a couple of quarter sections of land that he has leased over the years that made that ranch a more viable economic unit.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased. I'm awfully pleased and this is why I think it ought to be said. The problem with us Conservatives is, we simply don't blow our horn loud and often enough. And I speak to the Honourable Member for Emerson, to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and others that we promised the people in 1977 that under controlled conditions we would make it possible for them to acquire ownership of lands under certain conditions and that is precisely what the Minister is doing.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me expound on the odd Cabinet secret from time to time. The Minister has had some urging on the part of some of us from time to time to do precisely this, but he has resisted. He has resisted any attempt to be put in a position of putting on sale land that ought not to be sold or not to assure himself that the manner in which land will be made available for sale is above reproach. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that that is in fact taking place. I don't attempt to quantify the amount of land that will be sold in this way. I suspect it will always be a relatively small proportion of the total acreages of land that we are discussing, that are under his jurisdiction or indeed the jurisdiction of his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, who administered some of the agricultural Crown lands.

But, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't pass up the opportunity in listening to this evening's debate and chuckling quietly to myself, as the Honourable Member for Flin Flon gets up to say, "And what about the people up there? Will they be able to buy their lots for their cottages?" Or the Member for Rupertsland getting up to suggest to the Honourable Minister there was a land area up in his constituency that had been indicated that a possible sale was in the offing. Why hasn't it been sold yet? --(Interjection)--

Mr. Chairman, the general reticence on the part of members opposite indicate to me that they know very well that in the areas of the province where a substantial amount of Crown land is being used for agricultural purposes, the area where they have a member in Ste. Rose, or in St. George, not just NDP constituencies, not just Conservative constituencies. It is not a partisan matter, Sir, it's a matter of farmers, of ranchers wishing to have the opportunity to own their land. And it is the Conservative administration under this Minister that is making that possible. That was not possible for eight years, it was not possible for eight years. And, Mr. Chairman, let me repeat myself, this is not being done out of any knee-jerk doctrinaire reaction on our part.

I remind all members, particularly the newer members, it was a Conservative administration in 1963-64 that froze the sale of all Crown lands because that happened to be a responsible administration at that time, too. They said, let's find out before we dispose of any more Crown lands into private hands, what lands ought to be left in perpetuity for the preservation of certain wildlife practices, for parkland development, for future generations of Manitobans to enjoy. That was undertaken by a responsible administration in the early Sixties. This responsible administration, under this responsible Minister, is now carrying out a promise made and a promise that is being kept. And I'm very proud, Mr. Chairman, to be associated with the Minister in this program.

I look forward to the development of this program because it enhances a very fundamental and basic tenet of our belief, if you like, which separates us from you fellows who like to see one farm, one oil company, one bank. But I couldn't resist, Mr. Chairman, without interfering unduly with the Minister's Estimates that are going so smoothly under your stewardship, to simply remind this House and members opposite that once again a Conservative party is carrying out its election promises.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, it's a convenience that the honourable member takes unto himself to retroactively make the promise what the practice is because we who sat in this House from 1969 to 1977 heard the abuse that was showered on any government Minister who said that the public shall maintain ownership in land in this province, any public lands. It was looked upon, Mr. Chairman, by the

members opposite including the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as some type of satanic mission on the part, Mr. Chairman, of a group of land-grabbing Bolsheviks, to grab all of the land in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, and to nationalize the churches. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, indeed there was literature conveyed to the people of the province in that respect. But, Mr. Chairman, even to the most thick-skulled practical considerations, outside of political considerations, have to come into play and it becomes an axion, Mr. Chairman, that the land that is owned by the public is much more available to all of the citizens of the province of Manitoba than that land which is privately owned. And that without, in any way, suggesting that private ownership in land has not played and will continue to play - and it was part of the majority report, Mr. Chairman, of the Land Assessment Committee - that private ownership of farms will continue to be, is now and continues to be for the unforeseeable future, the major form of land-holding in the province of Manitoba.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina says, "You didn't believe that", because according to the writ as written by the Conservative Party, the New Democrats believe in state ownership of all land, Mr. Chairman; they believe in nationalizing the churches and that's the message that the Member for Pembina conveys to the people of his constituency, with some success, not, Mr. Chairman, because those particular people believe it - they happen to have a different attitude towards the politics of the various parties and will traditionally vote Conservative and that's how the Member for Pembina gets here. Because I am sure that they laugh at him just as hard as we laugh at him when he says that the New Democrats are trying to obtain state ownership of all land. I'm sure they say, "Well, you know that's just Don making stupid statements. We'll elect him because he's a Tory but not because we believe that kind of junk that he is trying to portray".

And, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the only party that suggested a radical change in the notion that lands in the province of Manitoba are owned privately and publicly; that essentially farm lands are owned privately; that essentially recreational lands are owned publicly; and that there are small exceptions to both of those rules the only one that had a complete change in opinion regarding that question was the Tories, who said that any land that is held publicly must be turned over privately, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. I'll have to find out. Order.

The Honourable Minister of government Services on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a point of order when another member makes a broad accusation, is stating a fact that simply is not true. That simply is not true --(Interjection)--

MR. GREEN: If that becomes a point of order nobody in this House is going to be able to speak for more than two minutes without somebody else getting up and saying that that's not the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll answer on the point of order. I don't believe that the Honourable Minister had a point of order in regard that the Honourable Member for Inkster made no direct accusations as such.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I said that the only party that made a radical proposal with regard to changing the system of land ownership, which I have described, was the Conservative Party, Mr. Chairman, which said that lands should all be privately owned.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In fact and in statement from the first Conservative administration that ever took office in this province, the statement made by the Honourable Member for Inkster is at variance with the

truth. And if that is not a point of order, if a member in this Chamber attributes to an individual or to a government an untruth, then I beg you to regard your rule books and rule on this question tomorrow. But that is a legitimate point of order. The Member for Inkster is making a statement that is blatantly, blatantly not within the realms of truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I will take the matter under consideration and give a ruling after I've had a chance to deliberate on the subject. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in making that ruling you try to assess what the Member for Lakeside, the Honourable the Minister was saying about the policies on this side of the House and what they were and, Mr. Chairman, ascertain whether I cannot state my view as to what the political position of the Conservatives were during all of the years between 1970 and 1977, Mr. Chairman. They referred to us as trying to grab up all of the land in the province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- The member is nodding his head, Mr. Chairman, as suggesting that is true. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is a patent untruth which I could not rise to a point of order on because that is the way honourable members characterize the New Democratic Party. And I am entitled, Mr. Chairman, to make my characterization of the Conservative Party, and I say that the Conservative Party in those years took the position, Mr. Chairman, that the New Democrats were grabbing up all the land and that when they came into power, they would turn over the publicly owned land to the private sector, Mr. Chairman. That's the position that they took.

Mr. Chairman, it just becomes completely nonsensical. There is no substantial difference. There is a difference in degree and a difference in direction, and there is no doubt about that. There is absolutely no doubt that there is a difference in degree and a difference in direction.

The New Democrats took the position that the fact that it was almost the exclusive position that anybody wishing to get into farming had to make a huge investment in capital and in land, and to buy those lands on the basis that he would have a heavy investment in capital, that he would have a heavy investment perhaps in interest to be paid on mortgages, but that he would live rather poorly and die rich.

And this, Mr. Chairman, is not a secret. The farmers always tell me about it; that we live poor and die rich, because we've got a whole bunch of money invested in land, buildings, and equipment, and when we die, we leave a big estate. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, you see? Now a member of the Conservative Party says we're going to confiscate it. Mr. Chairman, that is a patent lie, not an untruth, a lie. The honourable member knows it to be a lie and he would not expect me to rise on a point of order to indicate that is a lie. So he is being facetious, but it is not facetious, Mr. Chairman. They put out literature, those . . . I will withdraw the word before I say it. They put out literature, these guys who say that a suggestion as to their policy is an untruth which must be stopped in the House, put out literature suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that arms were grabbing around the churches, to nationalize the churches in the Province of Manitoba. And these people say that you can not get up and say that they believe in privatization of the land, because it's an untruth. What a bunch of garbage, Mr. Chairman.

Now the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that it's interesting, and I ask the Minister, I ask him, Mr. Chairman, because I am interested to know: Are you going to take all the cottage lots and give titles for them? Is that the suggestion of the Conservative Party? They said to the people in the north, those people on Paint Lake, when we went there, to Thompson, and people said that they wanted to get titles, the Conservative members on the committee said, "Yes, you should have titles; you should have titles." Are you going to give Torrens title to people in the Whiteshell; people, Mr. Chairman, on Falcon Lake; people in all of the . . . who have cottage lots in the Province of Manitoba? --(Interjection)-- Well, Paint Lake is in a parkland. Paint Lake is in . . . You never said that in Thompson, when they went there with the Land Committee. It was like Torrens title, Mr. Chairman, is the only way to own land, the only way to own land.



I want to know, since the honourable members believe, obviously believe, that more individuals should own land in the province of Manitoba, the greatest number of people should own land; is that right? Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have a million citizens, and provided that the Conservatives are not chasing them out faster than they are coming in, we will likely have a million and one while I am talking here. While I am talking somebody will be being born and we will ignore the fact that someone will be dying at the same time. I believe that those million people should own title to land in the Province of Manitoba. The Conservatives don't believe it; I believe it. The people on this side are in favour of the greatest number of Manitobans having land. The people on the other side are in favour of a fewer number of Manitobans having land. Well, Mr. Chairman, the mathematics is obvious. If you have individual landholders, it is finite, it can only go . . . Unless, and which is ridiculous, you know, which is the Bill Bennett policy, you divide the Province of Manitoba, take the map, divide it into a million titles and say, here is a certificate for each of these titles. And then when somebody is born the next day, you don't have a title for him. You add on a person, you don't have a title for him; you don't have a title for him.

Mr. Chairman, worse than that, of the million people who have got titles, and the Member for Lakeside has heard this before. It's like people sitting around a table playing shook. At the beginning of the evening, everyone has a certain amount of money in his pocket or on the table. Let's say it's the same amount. By the end of the evening the money has drifted to three or four players and the others are left without, and therefore there will be less people owning land, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of private ownership of land, not more people. The only way that you can ensure that there will be more landowners in the province of Manitoba, is to have, Mr. Chairman, a greater amount of public land. That's the only way. And I'm not suggesting --(Interjection)-- Well, it is true, it is true, it is a fact, and the only other way is to dispossess people of land. Every time you put land in the hand, from the public to a private owner, you dispossess people of land. I'm not saying that it's right or wrong but as to the mathematics of land ownership, it is a dispossession of people of land.

MR. ENNS: Will the member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, you know, I always like to follow the logical arguments of my learned friend. He has just finished saying that every time we transfer land from private ownership to public ownership, we are in fact guaranteeing the greater individual ownership of land. Well, would he then not agree with that logic progression that if the state, as it does in Russia, owns virtually all the land, that that would be the optimum under the arguments that he just pursued in this House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: You know, I will not upset the word "optimum" because it's a qualitative word. But as to whether mathematically more people will own the land, absolutely, absolutely. Whether mathematically, Mr. Chairman, whether --(Interjection)-- Oh, absolutely. My honourable friend thinks . . . I believe, Mr. Chairman, I believe that twenty-five million people own Air Canada. I believe that a far less number own CP Air. So if my honourable friends find difficulty with that mathematics or they think that I will back away from it, they are absolutely wrong. The fact is, that in terms of determining ownership, that if all of the land in the Province of Manitoba were publicly owned, there would be more individual owners of land than if part were publicly owned and part privately-owned.

As to whether it is the optimum, the optimum, Mr. Chairman, is a phrase that involves as to whether it will be better or worse. I am not suggesting it would be better but let's take the reverse situation. The honourable member believes that private ownership of land is a good thing and the more a private person owns,

the better; it shows that he has progressed. And on that basis the optimum is that one private person owns all the land in the Province of Manitoba. That's the optimum by his mathematics. That is, Mr. Chairman. If I own land, it's good. If I own more land, it's better. If I own all the land, it's the optimum, Mr. Chairman, according to the honourable member's mathematics. So if we are only dealing with mathematics, we get to an illogical position on the one side and an illogical position on the other side. But mathematically, there is no question, Mr. Chairman, absolutely no question, that the twenty-five million people of Canada are the owners of Air Canada and Pacific Airlines, or CPA, has much fewer owners. They, I am sure, have many shareholders, but I am also sure it's not twenty-five million shareholders, and certainly they don't have twenty-five million Canadian shareholders, which is what we have in Air Canada.

So on that mathematics, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friends think that I am embarrassed with that mathematics I can tell them that I am not the least bit embarrassed. And the private owners of land in the Province of Manitoba are also - and the Member for Lakeside knows it, and he's left because he doesn't want to face up to it - they are really tenants too, Mr. Chairman, they don't own the land. It is impossible to convey ownership in land. Ownership in land is axiomatically impossible. You can not say that one person is entitled to the land to the exclusion of all others for an indefinite period. And that's why a Torrens title is something which the state says, any time we want it, we will take it back. That's what they say. Did you know that? The Member for Springfield looks surprised. The state can say to you tomorrow: Since we own this land and since you have a lease on it, which we have called a title to make you believe that you are a kulak and that you own it and that you can do with it what you like, tomorrow we will take it away and pay you the compensation that we say you deserve. --(Interjection) - The honourable member says they have a fight. You're government does it every day. You're government does it every day. They are still too dense as to know, too dense as to know, that there is no such thing; there can ultimately be no such thing. The Torrens system or title, as we call it, is merely, Mr. Chairman, is merely a lease at the sufferance of the state, at the sufferance of the public, which can be terminated at any time upon payment of compensation to the lessor. That's what it is. And therefore it does not amount to the kind of ownership that you are talking about.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we got into this because my learned friend, the Member for Lakeside seemed to suggest that there has been a massive change in direction. It is still a fact that the major part of the Province of Manitoba is publicly owned, the major part. If I say 65 percent of all of the land in the Province of Manitoba is publicly owned, I am being characteristically conservative in my estimate, 65 percent; that the major part of the cultivated agricultural land is privately owned; that there is some publicly-owned farmlands that are leased by the state to tenants; that there are some privately owned farmlands that are leased by the owner to tenants. And, Mr. Chairman, here is where the difference comes in. It is my respectful submission that when the public is the landholder and there is a tenant, the terms of tenancy are far fairer and more conducive to the well being of the farmer and more conducive to the well being of the future of the Province of Manitoba than when the tenant leases from a private owner, that the lease from the public is always, almost invariably, a better lease than the lease that he could get privately.

Mr. Chairman, some private farmers want to lease rather than own land. The Conservatives, when they hear that, it rankles them that anybody could want to lease land. But there are some farmers who want to lease land and the New Democratic Party engaged in a program which said that there will be on a completely voluntary basis, we will not expropriate any farmlands but we are willing to buy farmlands from farmers who want to sell it to us. The Conservatives would deny the freedom of a farmer to sell his land to the public. They say: We won't let you sell it to the public, you must sell it to another farmer. We said that, on a completely voluntary basis, there are farmlands which we will rent to a farmer. The Conservatives, because they do not believe in freedom, said: We are not going to make any public lands available to farmers. Mr. Chairman, that's what they said; that's not what they're doing.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, who is doing this? "Notice of tender, farm property for lease. Sealed written tenders for property described below will be

received by D.A. Parnell, Property Manager, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, 1500 Notre Dame Avenue. Properties for lease: 865 acres, Rural Municipality of Eriksdale; 153 acres, Local Government District of Armstrong; 160 acres, Local Government District of Fisher; 426 acres, Rural Municipality of Eriksdale; 805 acres, Rural Municipality of Morden; 320 acres, Rural Municipality of Grandview."

Can I have a state, a tenant - what is it? - state tenants. What are they called? They had such awful names. --(Interjection)-- No, they didn't quite say serfs, no. They said that the province of Manitoba is not going to turn the province of Manitoba into tenant farmers of the state.

Here's a tenant farmer of the state in Grandview; does that cause you a problem? --(Interjection)-- It doesn't cause you a problem, I'm glad to hear it. You've grown some, you've matured.

"736 acres, Rural Municipality of Woodsworth; 160 acres, Rural Municipality of Rossmere; 620 acres, Rural Municipality of Swan River." These are, Mr. Chairman, for Manitoba residents only.

But we went through this province and we said that the person who leases the land or the person who has farmland in the province of Manitoba must use it and must be a person who is going to farm in the province of Manitoba. And, for some reason, practical considerations enter and say that the Conservatives now, without nationalizing the churches, without land-grabbing, without creating tenant farmers of the state, have now recognized that there is some validity to a program - they won't pursue it and I imagine that it will be less and less because they believe in less and less landowners in the province of Manitoba and it will gradually diminish - but they see that this is a necessary thing to do.

And when the Member for Lakeside, who has beat a hasty retreat from the Chamber, realizes that this kind of thing will happen under any administration and that the change in direction will be, at best, a nuance, he will have come to terms with the fact that the Conservative government has not made, what he has called, a reverse of the position because I gather that the Minister is not making leases on recreational land available. They're turning them into Torrens title, when he wants to do so, and if he wants to see how fast he can make people willing to take at the expense of their fellow Manitobans, say you're going to do it. I have a lease; I'll turn it into a title. My honourable friend thinks that is a contradiction in terms. Absolutely not, if it's going to be *sauve-qui-peut*, then I'm going to be in "sauving" myself. There's absolutely no doubt. That's why the program is so dangerous, Mr. Chairman. That's why the program is so dangerous, because if you make it "grab as fast as you can" then everybody will be in grabbing. There's nobody is going to say that I'm going to be the sacrificial lamb to everybody else.

So, he is not making that available, and the other thing that he has a problem with, and I want to know how he is going to solve the problem. Because when we were in government, Mr. Chairman, the Wildlife Federation - and he will remember this - was concerned that farmers were not giving hunters free access to their land. And I said to the hunters, "What rights do you have to expect that you have a right to go on a private farmer's land on the basis that you want to hunt there?" And they said that the wild animals belong to everybody and we should have a right to go on a farmer's land unless he posts it. And I said, "Why, what right does a person have to go on your land?" Now, Mr. Chairman, there was a problem and what we said was that we will make more public lands available, and we did. We went out on a program and saw that, where was recreational land, we weren't going to let the individual owner of that land prevent the hunter from going on. We were going to make it available to all of the citizens of the province of Manitoba.

But there was another thing, Mr. Chairman, it was a condition of the lease. It was a condition of leased land - and you can check with the staff and tell me whether I remember it correctly - it was a condition . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was a condition of leased land that you would not bar reasonable access to people who were hunting and that was different from Torrens title. And, therefore, when we did enter into leases, when

we did have the leased land provisions, and when we were taking land, it was understood that reasonable access for that purpose would be permitted and the more you go to the Torrens system, the more - you quite properly and I never objected to it - you quite properly said that the farmer has the right to exclude other people from going on his land. I mean, why would he not have that right? But, in leasing, we made a provision for recreational use by other citizens and you cannot do that unless you do it by lease and that was, Mr. Chairman, one of the commitments that we gave. We said that there will be no more public lands sold, because to sell public land is to dispossess the people of the province of Manitoba of their land. You dispossess a million people to give what one man in possession. That's what you do. To put one man in possession, you dispossess a million. We said we would not do that anymore.

Secondly, that we would buy land that was good for recreational use and, especially, where people were selling recreational use on their land that we would try to find areas of good recreational use; buy that land, so it would be dispossessing one person and paying him for the benefit of a million people, Mr. Chairman. I think that's a good thing and we did it. And if they are reversing it, it's a bad thing. Then we said, when there is leased land of which we have some control, there will be reasonable provision for people of the province of Manitoba to use that land for recreational purposes. That was the position and if there has been substantial change in that position, as is indicated by the present Minister of Public Services, then let the Minister of Natural Resources tell us what substantial changes have been made with regard to that particular position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My remarks are not going to be as dramatic or exciting, or create that many points of order as the two previous speakers but I would like to take this opportunity to relate the affect of the sale of Crown lands, the way they're set up right now, and the affect it has on my constituency.

Firstly, going back to the pre-election of October, 1977, I used it very strongly in my campaign, the fact that if our government got elected and got into power that we would release certain agricultural leased Crown lands for sale. And after the election, that process of development has taken, to date, things that possibly some of the members do not realize here, that through the department the resource people and agricultural people, together jointly, did map block planning and surveys of the whole areas of each LGDs and, basically, the sale of agricultural leased Crown land affects basically, mostly, local government districts. And if you look on the map, it's an area that surrounds the more better class lands, I suppose, although there are good lands within these areas as well.

After the block planning had taken place this was presented to the local government districts for their approval. A lot of negotiation took place. There's been certain exchanges took place between Crown lands and LGD vested lands which are also up for sale. Various local government districts are selling these and I would like to indicate to the Minister that a very capable job has been done because the LGDs, by and large, find it very acceptable, the program that we have embarked on, and are proceeding with their own program of sale of the LGD vested lands. I, myself, have a land lease. I have an agricultural Crown lease. I've had it for many years, as do many farmers. I have made certain improvements on this land: four-strand fencing, dug-outs, aerial spraying, brushing. But one thing, I've always sort of had an uneasy feeling it was not my land. I could not use this land for collateral when I go to the bank. It had no value because of the insecurity of it. It could be gone with the slight of a hand, the way the Member for Inkster says. The government could change policy and it's gone.

The thing that is very interesting is, that irregardless of party affiliation, that right now I think the agricultural Crown Lands' Division has more application than they can possibly process. There's a backlog something fierce and why do people want to buy this land? Security of ownership, that's why. when they break up land, when they have expenses on there, they can borrow against it, number one, and the improvements themselves, the security of ownership. There's a certain uncertainty with these people when they do it on leased land.

We have a good example of that in Russia, where a small percentage of people, who have private little holdings, produce more than the whole publicly-owned sector does out there. And that is the whole point here; that is the whole point here.

The Member for Inkster made certain remarks about recreational lands.  
--(Interjections)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: I have some personal opinions regarding farmlands versus recreational lots. For example, what we're doing right now and I feel it is a bit of an injustice to the farmers, we take and evaluate at present day value, assess the land and give them the option. Now, the thing is, the farmer can still retain his lease. At one time it used to be 99-year leases; now we call them 5-year leases and still call them lifetime leases. That uncertainty, the insecurity of it is what creates the problem in people's minds. But when we assess these lands at present day value and allow them the option of buying it or retaining the lease, I think the same approach should be used in recreational lands. Why should we be penalizing the farmers at present day rates when somebody can go and get a lot and pay a \$100 per lot fee, build a cabin on there, turn around and sell it for big money? You know, that thing bothers me from the farm aspect of it.

When the Member for Inkster talks about hunting privileges, I have three quarters of leased land and it's open to the public for hunting. I have cattle on there. Come chicken season, everybody is in there hunting; I have no control whatsoever. If some animal gets shot, I can go around and go through all sorts of processes trying to get compensation for it, but that is not . . . You know, the security of ownership again. If it's my land, I can post it. If people want to hunt, they come and ask me; I give them privilege, I know who's there. These are the things that make a big difference to farmers; they don't care which party is in power, the fact they want to own the land.

Well, I haven't got the ability to dramatize the issues the way the Member for Inkster does; I just have to lay it out in layman's language and this is what I'm trying to do. And I'm very concerned, Mr. Chairman, that we proceed along these lines. The thing that is, I think, very important is that we're selling only land that can used for agriculture. We're not selling at random. Where the Minister responsible for Resources feels that the land could be used for forestry or it isn't suitable for agriculture, we're not selling it.

The other thing is the LGDs have to give approval before this land can get sold. If it's somewhere away in the back 60, you know, five miles from any road or drainage, they will not give the approval. But it has a dramatic affect in a constituency like mine where, in the LGD of Piney, for example, 80 percent of the land is non-private owned. And this is where we have an assessment of school taxes where they're paying 130 mills for school taxes because of the low base that they're operating from, tax base. And what's happened right now is that we have so many applications in my area, and in conjunction with the brushing program that the government has introduced, land is being cleared. We're going to have more productivity. We're going to have a bigger tax base to operate from. We'll be able to provide better services in terms of roads, drainage and retain our communities. It's an encompassing thing.

In closing, I would just like to say I would like to see that proceeded on the basis that it is, and compliment my Ministers. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to dwell too long on the debate here but last year when we discussed this item in the Estimates, the Minister was to be congratulated then, as he is to be now because, as the Member for Emerson has pointed out, a situation of the positive benefit of selling agricultural Crown land to the leaseholders in his constituency, which is quite heavily involved with Crown land of agricultural value. He has pointed out to members opposite the very positive benefits that that is providing for the Local Government Districts, the citizens and the communities in his constituency.

Mr. Chairman, I guess that is recognition that is well worth hearing about because it is something that we on this side of the House knew for some time, was a necessary addition to the landhold structure in the Local Government Districts. Unfortunately, members opposite didn't see it quite this way and would not embark upon the sale of agricultural Crown lands.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is a program that is necessary and I want to just relate a few instances to my honourable colleagues opposite about their Land Lease Program and I want to use the Land Lease Program as an example of what can and does generally happen when there is no pride of personal ownership in the valuable commodity of land. In my constituency, there wasn't that much Land Lease Program, Mr. Chairman, but there was some land that was picked up, it was one of the last areas that the former administration forged into in competition with private land buyers, with farmers in the area to buy land lease land. There wasn't that much of it picked up. But I do know in the area around Altamont that there was some parcels of land picked up under the Land Lease Program and leased back to farmers who weren't in that particular case living in the area; they were some distance away but nevertheless they received the land lease.

Mr. Chairman, it was interesting to note the farming, the cultural practices on land lease land. They were not the best. It was rolling land and they were not practising soil conservation farming methods. They were plowing rolling land. They weren't leaving the stubble cover. They were burning the stubble even. And what it was leading up to, Mr. Chairman, was a very large amount of soil erosion, hardly a long-term benefit to the land or indeed to the province, or to the province as title-holder of that land. That land was diminishing in value in some instance.

I questioned some of the people as to why they were all of a sudden assuming those kind of farming practices when they didn't do it on the land they owned themselves at home. Well, they said, we have a five-year lease on this and we're going to ride it for what it is worth. They didn't really care about the future of that land.

Mr. Chairman, that's where ownership of the Crown lands, the agricultural Crown lands, is very very important to the future of this province. No one, as the Member for Emerson has quite adequately pointed out, is going to make the fencing improvements that are needed, is going to make the drainage and the brush improvements. Very few people will do that on land unless they own it. They won't take the pride to clear the rock, to build the fences and the corrals to make sure that that land reaches its maximum productivity. They won't invest in long-term fertilization programs or chemical brush and weed control programs because they are never certain that they are going to be able to, number one, retain that land for their sons or their grandsons, nor, Mr. Chairman, can they use that land as equity. The improvements they have made on it, the added value they have given to that land, means nothing to them when they go to their local financial institution. That is why it is important, Mr. Chairman, where desired, to sell that agricultural Crown land to individuals in the area. You end up with a community that is based on land ownership; you end up with a community that is based on permanent residence because of land ownership; and you end up with a much stronger and more viable community.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster got going tonight about his ownership of land and I suppose we could debate philosophy here for some time, but in his estimation, the ownership in the public hands is everyone's ownership. In other words, the moment we sell a parcel of Crown land, in the Member for Emerson's area, we give ownership to one individual and we dispossess 999,999 people. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's based on the premise that those million people in Manitoba owned the land in the first place, and that is the difference that I suppose his political philosophy and my political philosophy has. He equates state ownership with personal ownership, and it is not so, because not even the Member for Burrows could go to that piece of agricultural Crown land and take his one-millionth of a piece of it and say, "That's mine." He has no right to because it belongs to the Crown. It doesn't belong to him as an individual; it doesn't belong to any of us as individuals of this province. It belongs to the state; it is under state control and individuals have no personal attachment to that land. When they own it, they do. And, Mr. Chairman, as the Member for Emerson once again has pointed out, that is where you achieve the maximum utility of the land is under private

ownership and that is what this Minister is endeavouring to take and this government is endeavouring to do in the sale of Crown lands.

Now, the Member for Inkster made some interesting mention on land ownership and how his government, in their term, entertained a program where they give - I believe he said that his government gave individual farmers the choice where they wanted to lease land and not own it, they gave them the choice to lease land from the government. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster often does tell half of the story, but in this particular case, he forgot to tell the other half of the story.

In 1973, I moved back to the province from Alberta and in 1972, in the fall of 1972, I received one of the last long-term loans from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation under their Loan Program. Now, the Member for Inkster touts the State Farm Program as offering the choice to the farmer to lease the land and not have to own it, because some people wanted to lease rather than loan. But he forgot to tell us, Mr. Chairman, at the same time when they introduced the State Farm Program, they removed the option of ownership of land. They no longer provided the 29-year long-term loans to individuals desiring to own the land. That's what he forgot to tell us, Mr. Chairman. He said that they offered the greatest freedom of choice. Well, that's quite wrong, Mr. Chairman. They offered only one road and it was their road or no road. If you were to enter into a farming arrangement under their regime you entered into farming under the Land Lease Program where the state owned the farm and you were a tenant of the state. There is no other way you can describe that program because there is no other terms that fit it. That was the program. The long-term purchase was gone because MACC pulled out of the long-term mortgage to individual farmers for land. They left anyone in this province who wanted to own his farm, they left him high and dry; they threw him out to those terrible wolves they often talk about in the banking corporations, etc., etc.; that's where they left out young farmers in Manitoba after 1973 in the Province of Manitoba. They left them going to the major financial institutions to line up long-term mortgage money for land because they would not loan it. The only way that they would let a young farmer into farming under their regime was through the State Farm Program. That's freedom of choice, Mr. Chairman? Once again, the Member for Inkster tells one half of the story and neglects to tell the other half to us.

Mr. Chairman, you know, I don't want to dwell on that one too long but I think it's important and it's incumbent upon this House to fully recognize what the State Farm Program entailed. Now, if the Member for Inkster were here he would say, well, it was a lease and they had the option to buy. But, Mr. Chairman, under the original terms and conditions of the Land Lease Program, there was not one single leaseholder in his right mind who would end up ever buying that land from the province. That land, under the original terms and conditions of the Land Lease Program, was a permanent entity unto the government, under the Crown. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Chairman, because the way they had the buy-back set up, the man would pay the price plus the interest subsidy, and it would make up to be a higher price than what the leaseholder could take and move a half mile away and buy the next quarter section. It would make the price higher than that, so if a person was wishing to own land he certainly wouldn't buy from the Crown at a higher price than he would have to pay for the quarter section across the road bought outside of the Crown, bought from a private individual.

So their program, Mr. Chairman, was designed entirely to perpetually own the land by the state. That was their idea and no matter what they say today, what they say, what they try to tell us after the fact, is not correct because the one thing they wanted was the Crown to own the productive asset of farming land, as simple as that. They changed it, Mr. Chairman. They offered a purchase arrangement. Why? Because the opposition of the day, which is now on this side of the House as government, forced them into it, Mr. Chairman, forced them into offering a purchase agreement on the Land Lease Program. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, they would not have ever offered a legitimate purchase to any of the land lease holders, because they wanted the young farmers of this province to be perpetual tenants of the state, for what reason, I don't really know. I don't really know. I can speculate, Mr. Chairman, and all of us can speculate, but only they know what their ulterior motives were in that.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster talks about the ultimate utility in land ownership being the state owning it all because in that way every one of the country's citizens owns the greatest amount of land. You know, it would be interesting to have the Member for Inkster take that kind of theory and try it on the people in the USSR because that's the type of system they have over there and they also lack the incentive in that country, in the greatest agricultural country in the world, Mr. Chairman, greater by far than the United States in terms of land area, of arable productive land. He should take that theory and try it on over there because, Mr. Chairman, each and every year that great Soviet State of Russia has to buy untold quantities of grain, not just to provide a standard of living equivalent to North America but to prevent mass starvation. They buy untold quantities of grain and who do they buy it from? They buy it from the private freehold landowners and farmers in North America.

Mr. Chairman, if that doesn't adequately demonstrate where the maximum utility and benefit to the country stems from in terms of land ownership. then I don't know what it takes to demonstrate adequately to members in the ND Party which way this country should go in the future and which way it has benefited from in the past and what has given us our strength, our economic diversity and the wealth we enjoy in this country today. It has been the private enterprise freehold system in land that has built this country. It is the private enterprise freehold land system that has created the wealth in the primary industry of agriculture that allowed people by the hundreds of thousands to leave the farmland to do what, Mr. Chairman, to work in secondary and tertiary industries. It is that kind of efficient and very effective production system in the freehold land system that we have in North America that has made the North American Continent the idol of the world, the envy of the world. If anyone wants to leave their country and better themselves, the country that they choose, Mr. Chairman, is not the USSR; it is not China; it is not India; it is North America - it is Canada and it is the United States. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because they know that if they can ever get into this country and they want to work and endeavour diligently to succeed, that they have the opportunity in this country, Mr. Chairman, to own their own land and to produce revenue in grain and cattle and livestock and vegetables, whatever they want in farming. They can produce that to the maximum and profit from it.

Mr. Chairman, that system has led this country to greatness. Mr. Chairman, the preservation of that system and the enhancement of that system by programs such as the Minister of Natural Resources is now embarking upon, that being the sale of agricultural Crown Lands to the private sector, to the private farmers and ranchers in the area. The enhancement of that private land-hold system will make this country strong, will make this province strong; will give us the ability in this province to export vast quantities of grains to the hungry Russians who are sitting on the greatest agricultural goldmine on earth and are starving at the same time, Mr. Chairman. It is our system of land-hold that is working and Mr. Chairman, I will venture to say that before long that great Soviet Socialist Republic will undergo a change in their land-hold system whereby they will offer more and more land up to individuals to farm, not on the collective state-farm system as they have now but on the private enterprise incentive basis.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that our socialist friends in opposition were not going in the direction that made this country great. They weren't going to greater freehold land-ownership. They weren't going to the individual farmer owning his land and having the ability to pass it from generation to generation. No, Mr. Chairman, they weren't going that way. From 1974 on they embarked on a program of land-lease, of the state ownership of the land and of lease back to the individual farmer or rancher as the case may be. They no longer offered long-term mortgages so that the individual could own the land. They were going the exact opposite way to the way which made this country great.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is indicative of a lot of their economic policies and at the same time Mr. Chairman, hand-in-hand, and I've mentioned this before what the members opposite had on this hand was the Land Lease Program and, on this hand where the widow was involved, they had succession duties and gift taxes, so that when she couldn't afford to keep that land and pass it on to her son, they were over here with their Land Lease Program ready to gobble it up on her so that her son could never own it for the rest of his life.



Mr. Chairman, we changed both of those programs and, Mr. Chairman, the people in rural Manitoba know that this hand is no longer there with succession duties and gift taxes to grab on to the last lifeblood and savings that widow had and give it this hand where the state farm was, and Mr. Chairman, they're happy, they're pleased with that kind of a system and they're pleased that the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, has introduced the long-term mortgages again with discounted interest rates to young farmers who start up, to give them a chance to start farming and to own their own land. And the heavy hand of land ownership and state farms is gone from this province, Mr. Chairman, despite what the Member for Inkster says when he makes those patently blatant statements that this is a short-term government. He is wrong, because the people in rural Manitoba, the young farmers, the farmers my age and the farmers older know very well that our government is providing the direction, and the correct way and the way for the future in this province in terms of the agricultural community.

It is only this government, Mr. Chairman, that is offering the youth of this province and the individuals of this province the opportunity to own their own land and to pass that land from generation to generation if they so desire. If my son wants to farm, I can pass that farm to my son, and I don't have the heavy hand of the state in this hand clutching at my will that my wife is going to have to pay the state money through succession duties and gift tax just to keep what she owns, to keep what she worked for, and to keep what she and I both want my son to have. That kind of a system, Mr. Chairman, is going to keep this party on this side of the house in government for many, many years and I commend the Minister of Natural Resources for embarking on a program of selling agricultural Crown Lands to individuals who want to own it, improve it and pass it on to the next generation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the last member who spoke made two salient points, one the position of some Conservatives, I don't know how best to describe, the ultra-right, I suppose it would be, in the terms of left, right and the rest of it, that they see a differentiation between the state and us. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I will never accept the argument that there is a difference between the people's government and the people.

I can best describe the point that during one of the demonstrations I think it was during an Autopac debate when the agents mustered their help out in front of the building and one of the demonstrators was standing on a bush and I said, "Get off my bush", and he looked at me like I was stupid. Perhaps I am, but nevertheless I said, "I own part of it and you happening to be standing on the part that I own". But the last member who spoke doesn't see any identification between himself owning shares in Manitoba Telephone System or Bell Canada, that's his problem, perhaps I am of a passing generation that sees this government as my government, albeit that I disagree with them, I see the government as 'us'. He makes his point well, that he sees the state as 'them' and this legislative body as something other than 'us'. He makes the point well. It's a school of thought, it's something that perhaps should pass from the face of the earth.

But in his remarks he said something about there was only one alternative. There was nothing whatsoever to prevent you from going to somebody and borrowing money at the current rate of interest, without me subsidizing it, nothing to prevent you at all. I am not going to ask you how much you're paying on your 29-year lease. I want to open a coffee shop, I go down and I think it is about 18% that I have to pay on today's market. If we're going to subsidize businesses, and farming is a business, then perhaps we should look at this whole financial thing.

People forget so soon why governments across this country were concerned about land ownership and part of it was foreign involvement and for the last member to stand up and make his Red-baiting speech, I am not too sure what the problems are in Russia, perhaps when Canada is as old as Russia is it will have problems which are comparable. I know that in Greece, for example, with the absolute ownership of lands, which is even more stringent than the Torrens systems under which we occupy land at the pleasure of the government, no matter who it is, that they had estates that had passed on from generation to generation where it was one olive

tree. That was one of the things that brought about the difficulties in Greece, a country that has been in existence much longer than Canada.

The member, when he finished his remarks, said something about where the state, this nebulous group of people is going to come and take it away from his widow. I would ask him to cast his mind down the road. If he has one son, that's perhaps no problem for him, but if he's got two it is a kind of a problem. Then how about his grandchildren and his great-grandchildren? I think as legislators we are responsible not only for this generation but future generations.

I wasn't going to enter this debate except to respond to my friend the member for Emerson, because I emphathize with him. I think there were some weaknesses in the lease system. I mean, the Member for Pembina, in one of his typical speeches, kind of put a burr under my saddle, so I kind of reacted to it. But, nevertheless, I appreciated the remarks of the Member for Emerson because the points that he made were well taken and it's true. Having been a leasee in a house for some 18 years, the landlord that I had a relationship with never raised my rent in the 18 years that I lived with him. I paid the increase in taxes but I also put \$5,000 worth of improvements in the house because it was to my advantage, and in the market I couldn't live as cheaply as I was living in this particular house. But nevertheless, after I moved out of the house - and I had improved it to the extent that he made about \$15,000 more when he sold the house, then when I had improved it, I felt a little big chagrined that I didn't participate in the benefits. Perhaps those kind of leases should be looked at.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I am apprehensive about, and the member for Emerson alluded to it, that the LGD's are being responsible and they are not leasing some back sixty with, and if I recall his words correctly, he says "no roads or drainage", because this is one of my concerns as a city member.

Let me digress but briefly, Mr. Chairman, I support the assistance of farmers in this community because I think farming is the most important single business in the province. I get a little disappointed when the farmers, these great free enterprises that the member for Pembina spoke about, when they are in difficulty they come to us and ask for some assistance and we say: Sure well, here's a program; what do you think about this program? Yes, okay, we'll take it, but then when circumstances improved we didn't want that program. The Beef Stabilization is an excellent example. They don't want to pay the money back. This, as a human being, is understandable but to relate that to the point that is under discussion now on public lands going into the private sector, I hope the local administration people are being responsible because I sat on a committee that toured the province on reviewing the LGD administrative system and some of the lands that the pressures were on the government of that day, that should go over were marginal. Of course, when we get into the drainage of land at public expense, we have to be cautious in lands that we do turn over in this regard. But I just wanted to go on the record, Mr. Chairman, as having heard the Member for Emerson's concerns about protection in some way in leases of improvements. I don't what program could be initiated. Perhaps some attention should be paid to some kind of a provision in the lease that the approved improvements, with the lessor, which would be the government in this particular case, that if the lease is to be not renewed, or something like that, that the owner could actually be compensated so that it would, in my understanding, be an asset to him. I would disagree to some extent that leases have some financial worth, and of course, they're not like a title in negotiating credit but certainly they enter into the considerations as far as the credit-worthiness of an applicant is concerned, when some financial institution is making a decision whether a loan should be made.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words the Member for Pembina, I would emphasize once again, puts on the record that the people who believe that there is a difference between the people and their government still exist, as manifested in this house again tonight.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly on this point; I think it has been dragged around enough tonight as it is. However, I think that the Honourable Minister of Highways, the Member for Pembina, demonstrated the kind of misinformation and misrepresentation that the Land Lease Program was subjected to by members

opposite when they were making representations about this program to their constituents. I think it is recognized, on this side of the house at least, that we had a job done on us, so to speak, in terms of that program. It was a program that had merit in that it was done with all of the best of intentions and with the interests of the family farm at heart, when it was introduced and implemented by the New Democratic Party government. It was a program that I believe made it possible for some young farmers to get into the business when they were not able to raise the capital to purchase the land outright in the initial instance. They perhaps were able to marshal enough capital for the equipment but were not able to purchase the farm outright.

It also made it possible, Mr. Chairman, for a retiring farmer to ensure that his farm went to the individual of his choice, whether his son, daughter, nephew whatever, in that there was that kind of negotiation that took place at the time that the farm was sold to the government, that the farm was sold on condition that it be leased back to a particular designated individual. So that rather than have to sell his farm when he retired to some corporate entity or to some foreign interest or to some person from outside of the area, he was able to have the money from his farm immediately so that he could retire in dignity, and at the same time he could ensure that that farm was in the hands of a designated person that he desired to have the farm.

Mr. Chairman, it was always, from my information, the intention of the New Democratic Party government, to ensure that that person had the option of leasing and/or buying that land. Initially I believe the option was based on the market value of the land at the time that the sale was made. That was looked at, Mr. Chairman, as possibly an undue hardship on the person since they bought it, they took over the land at a time when land prices were escalating at rapid rates.

So we looked at that - I remember considering it in caucus and in Cabinet - and it was something we changed to allow the person to purchase the land at the original value. In other words, if the land went up ten times in value over a period of five or ten years, that person would still be able to purchase that land at the original value.

I believe the program was one that could have been advanced to the people of rural Manitoba on its merits. It should have been given an opportunity to be presented to the farmers, to rural people, on the basis of the merits of the program. It is unfortunate that the program was so badly maligned and misrepresented by opposition groups, because now the program has fallen into such disfavour, obviously, and I say that because I recognize that a job was done on the program and done on the New Democratic Party government with respect to that program. Now the farmers do not have that option. They do not have the option of being able to retire in that way by selling their land to a program that ensures that a designated person will be able to take over the land on the option of either buying or leasing it.

I think that was an important option. I think it is one that this government should consider reimplementing. I think you should just take off your ideological blinders for a moment and take a look at that option because I think it is an important option and it is on that should be combined with the option that you are talking about being an important one now. I am saying this to the Minister of Highways, he says that the option of having long-term loans at low interest rates for farmers is a good option. I say, bravo, that is a good option and that's one that is especially valuable in these times of rising interest rates. But I think that the other option should be available too. Why should the farmer not be able to lease if that is his choice? That's the freedom of choice --(Interjection)-- Yes Mr. Chairman, there is lots of farmland being leased and I'm sorry that the government has taken the tack that this program is no longer desirable because I think it could be a desirable program and I am sorry it was so badly maligned in the process of it being presented to the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (a)--pass. (b) Crown Lands Administration, (1) Salaries--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I have no specific questions on this area, other than the routine information that the Minister may provide us.

MR. RANSOM: Certainly. I'll just go through it and provide that information. In the Lands Administration, there were 28 staff man years in the item before us and there were 26 last year. In the Regional Management, there are 10 staff man years this year; that is the same as last year. In Crown Lands Registry, there are seven staff man years this year; that is the same as last year. In the Wild Rice, Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement, three staff man years last year and there are three again in the Estimates before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right through to Section (e)?

(1)--pass; (2)--pass; (b)--pass. (c) Regional Management, (1) Salaries--pass; (2)--pass; (c)--pass. (d) Crown Lands Registry, (1) Salaries--pass; (2)--pass; (d)--pass. (e) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreements, (1) Salaries--pass; (2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I have a question here and that is, of the \$157,700 that is proposed, can the Minister perhaps give us a breakdown of what his department intends to do with those funds?

MR. RANSOM: Well, that's basically to administer the leasing program and to assist producers in providing technical advice and market information and also some involvement with the Department of Agriculture in their Paddy Wild Rice Production Program. It is a continuation of the same kind of services that we have been delivering, that we delivered last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass; (3)--pass; (e)--pass. Resolution 105--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,059,200 for Natural Resources, Lands, \$1,059,200--pass.

Committee rise.