

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

Time: 2:30 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - FITNESS, RECREATION AND SPORT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris MacGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order.
2.(e)(1) - The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to see that the two main antagonists are here, namely my colleague and I so that we can at least have a debate going here. I did want to make a few remarks on what he said and then I want to ask some other questions about coaching and so on. My colleague from St. Boniface was talking about the fact that most nations support their athletes and that there is wide-spread professionalism in the eastern bloc and I agree with that; I don't dispute that; I recognize that. All the information we have seems to indicate that but there is also a great deal of professionalism among other places in the United States. I raise this because of the fact that there seems to be a lack of support in Canada so that if a typical American athlete - I don't know if you want to call a college athlete an amateur when he has his tuition paid, his fees paid, spending money, some cases cars and everything else - and some of the people who are really into sports might remember Hugh McHelhenny who was a great football player, I think from Washington, who was introduced as the only college football player that ever took a cut in salary to turn pro.

So I'm saying, on one hand, you have the United States with it's vast supports through fraternities and alumni associations providing their so-called amateurs with all kinds of funds and then, on the other hand, you have the eastern bloc which is government sponsored and then way off on the sidelines is Canada. And so I'm simply saying that there is a need for support. Now if the business sector wants to, I suppose step in, that might be a good thing. The problem there is if you leave it up to business is, I suppose, in most cases they want recognition. And if they want recognition then you're into people wearing signs on their clothing and on their training suits and their shoes and their armbands and their sweatbands and hats and everything else, and that's a particular problem.

In terms of drugs, there are drugs being used, there are drugs being used throughout society and I don't think that benzedrine and all kinds of other drugs are unknown to Canadian and American athletes. I used to compete and I never took anything and never dreamed of it but there were always rumours about amateur athletes taking things, I guess which would vary from pain killers, which might sound okay but when you're injured it might not be a good idea to play to benzedrine and other things.

Now, I want to get onto a couple of other points and I want to ask the Minister what he has done, or what his government has done, to develop coaching in Manitoba to improve the quality of coaching and again, I take as an example my own experience in being an observer and a keen fan of the Olympic Games, that the big team that has come along in the last ten years is East Germany. If you went to the Games at one time, there was a great deal of excitement, I guess, when the Soviets started to get into the Olympics again somewhere in the '50s or in 1960, and all of a sudden in the last couple of Olympics you start seeing all these East German athletes wiping out the competition. A country of 20 million, smaller than Canada, and if they don't come first, they come second, and if they don't come second, they come third. And it wouldn't surprise me at all if either in 1980 or 1984 they won, because normally I guess it's a toss-up between the Russians and the Americans, and the East Germans come third in total points in medals and so on, and my understanding is that their success is due to their investment in coaching, that they decided somewhere along the way - and I'm really quoting a CBC

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

radio documentary that I heard - that they made a substantial investment and continued to do so in terms of properly training coaches who can then properly train athletes, and that obviously is the only way to go. If you start training individual athletes, that's fine. You train one at a time, but if you train one coach, he might then train 100 or 1,000 athletes in the proper diet, proper training, weight lifting, everything connected with sport.

So I just ask the Minister if he could enlighten us as to what the provincial government does in terms of coaching clinics and providing seminars and literature and anything else that would improve the calibre of coaching. And in that I also say that my colleague from St. Boniface talks about some of the more unsavoury side of coaching where you have lunatic coaches who instruct their players to go out and maim and anything short of kill opposition players. This is all too frequent in hockey. Hockey is the biggest offender, I suppose football to a lesser extent, and then I don't know where you go from there, basketball where you shove somebody into the brick wall or what, but there's a lot of bad coaching going on in hockey where young players are really taught violence and practice it with great skill. I'm just thinking now, in particular, of coaching in regard to track, but in regard to all sports, can the Minister tell us whether he has made any improvements, had any plans or ideas to do something there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that either my confrère here hasn't really understood what I said or he wants to help me make my point. It was mentioned that I talked about professionals, and I was talking at the Olympic level, and he's saying that there's a movement now and there's more and more. Of course. I understand that and that is what I deplore. Not truly professional, but those that masquerade under amateur and are professional, and I certainly, I'm not going to accuse the member of saying, well, if we can't beat them, join them. And try to say, well that's being done, let's do it. But that's the impression that I have, that he was saying. Maybe I'm a dreamer, but that's exactly what I don't want to see, especially if it's going to happen, let's not have any government encouraging that. Let's stay out of it. There is no doubt in the States you have college football, which is professional up to a certain point, and even there there's a lot of politics, because they are looking at lucrative TV contracts; they are looking at new facilities and being able to use that money to build up the university, and they'll stop at nothing.

Of course I don't want to generalize, but every indication and the pressure they get from the alumni, and so on, will induce them or encourage them to break every rule possible. For instance, not too long ago, you've had people that were forging degrees, so people can participate in sports at the university level; that has happened all over the place. Forging degrees, not even attending, or some stupid degrees.

I'm saying that this is what we want to change, if anything. We want to change the whole concept of sports. I don't think that sports should be an end in itself. What is sport? Sport could be, what? You can have, well of course you need professional, because viewing sports, if you want to call it that, is important. There's nothing wrong with somebody, after a hard day, going to see a hockey game, or a baseball game, and saying people that are devoting their life to give you this enjoyment. I don't see anything wrong with professional sports but I don't think that it is the role of the government to even encourage professional sports. I don't say they shouldn't but certainly that is not the responsibility of the taxpayer; this is not more than they would somebody else in another form of livelihood. I think it's great. I'm a real fan.

But when we are going back to the Olympics, and he was referring to what I said before the lunch hour --(Interjection)-- No, I'm not against the arena grant; in fact this is something that I want to talk about, and the arena grant was done for a purpose and it is to get a team in this league, and the cost, actually, the way it's done, I'm not against it at all because that was supposed to be done by Canada and then there was a deal, and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong, that they were going to pay that out of Loto Canada and the province is supposed to take over that lottery and they are taking part of that to help Winnipeg build an arena. But certainly, if I was to prioritize it, it wouldn't be my first

priority. Mind you, this might not meet with the priorities of the sports writers but they have their responsibility and we have ours, and I have mine. And I think it's great. I have encouraged that and advocated that in the past, but it is not my priority.

But the main thing that I'm talking about is that the government is involved in community recreation, in fitness and amateur sports for what? To use sports to help people in their leisure time for recreation, and then to promote a lifestyle that will promote the good life and a healthy body and a healthy mind, and people will be much happier. --(Interjection)-- Like me, yes. This is what I would like to push. And I certainly would not say, well all right, the communist countries are doing this, they are doing it in the States, and why is Canada, we'll join them. No, I would say, at the risk of having everybody against me, if that was the idea, I would advocate that we pull out of Olympics or any of these games at all. And if you're going to have the true spirit of the Olympics, you might decide to have the Olympics in Greece or somewhere else, a permanent site, and I think that you should have less of this temptation then to try to make a big show, the government stepping in, to have all kinds of facilities, the biggest stadium and so on, and you will resist the temptation of giving, adding the points by countries, and you will make it equal for every participant. Maybe a delegation of one from Panama, compared to the United States' delegation, or Russia. This is what I would like to see.

Now, if somebody has developed skills by competing and being developed to enter the Olympics and so on, and if later on they want to turn pro, I don't see anything wrong with that at all. I don't want to be misunderstood, but the responsibility of our government is mass participation and not to try to go, not more than, especially the party that my honourable friend and I belong to, pride ourselves in trying to give as many people as possible an equal chance, not to go to the elite, and it would be wrong, just as wrong, to just favour an elite. Again, it's not a question of communism that everybody will be the same and you'll block the athletes that have more talent, that's not what I'm saying at all. But we can't put all our eggs in one basket, and this is not our first priority as a government. That's the main thing.

Maybe we can't reverse the trend, maybe it's too far gone. If that is the case, well, I'll go to the Olympics strictly as a spectator to see the talent and I won't worry about the other thing, but I won't worship at the altar of Olympic and amateur sports anymore. That is the different thing.

As I say, maybe I'm a dreamer, maybe it can't be changed. You know, they are stopping games now in the middle of a game so you can have your commercial on TV. The TV runs the show. They can start at 6 o'clock in the morning, a game, so it could be seen somewhere else. And that to me is defeating the purpose that we have here, at least as a very humble Department of Fitness and Amateur Sports in the humble province of Manitoba, where we are trying to promote sports to help change the lifestyle and to make people happier and healthier, and enjoy recreation instead of being drugstore cowboys. That is the difference.

Leaving the Olympics for awhile anyway, talking about the coaching and talking about hockey, again, I want us to be fair. I would congratulate Manitoba and the Minister and the Manitoba Hockey Association, because they've come a long way. I don't know if my honourable friend knows that there's no body contact or slapshots at all until you're 13 years old. And that's a good start. And the mask, the mask in all amateur sport. I think that's a big improvement. They don't do that in Ontario, they don't do that in - I don't want to go on the record as saying they don't do it in other provinces, I'm not too sure, but I know they don't do it in Ontario and I think that maybe Quebec is moving in that direction. They've sent somebody to see what we are doing. And there is none of that. I've got interested because I've got grandchildren playing, and I've got interested in that type of hockey and I've had a lot of fun. They're playing good hockey. I haven't seen a single fight. Who in the hell in his right mind is going to punch somebody with a cage on, for one thing, and there's no body contact at all.

In fact, I think that that would help in going in the . . . I still deplore the brutality; not roughness, because hockey is a body contact sport and I like a good rough hockey game, but the brutality that you see. There was an article that I cut, in yesterday's paper again, about the brutality that you see in professional sport. I think that maybe where we can help is in co-operation with the

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

CAHA and I know that the department - I don't know if it's continuing that - has helped people do exactly what my friend was talking about, help in developing coaches, I don't know if you still have that, you had Buck Matiwski helping with that, and special funds for that for developing coaches, and I think they are coming a long way. And I would like to see more and more keep that cage on as long as possible and eventually - and the pros will probably laugh at me for saying that - you might see it in the pros. It's not as glamorous when you don't see the blond hair --(Interjection)-- well, that's it, if you don't see, but I remember that, I was connected with Montreal Canadiens when they got rid of Jacque Plante because he wanted to wear a mask and I thought that was ridiculous. He was supposed to be a sissy. Who in the hell, people in his right mind's going to play in the net when the teams practise to hit the shot, park themselves in front of the goal --(Interjection)-- I hope that my interest is more than watching to see if they have a jock strap; my friend can take care of a jock strap and I'll try to take care of the rest.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is something - now you wouldn't see any goalee without a mask and I think eventually . . . You know, when I first started playing football, there was no mask at all, in fact very small helmets, and I think that's an improvement. I think people losing their eyes and all that . . . I think that if the other provinces could do that, I think they can bring the NHL to their knees. Because I think if you force the people, even in junior ranks, eventually, to wear that. Mind you that'll be a fight because everybody will resist that, it's not as glamorous, but if you had that, the people wouldn't dare go, they'd feel undressed. You can't go all your career up to junior with a mask and all of a sudden go without a mask, you'd feel undressed. I dare say that the catchers in baseball at one time didn't wear masks.

So you know, it would stop a lot of this fighting, because nobody is going to hit you in the face with a mask; and you've got pads, if they don't hit you in the face they can't do much damage. There would be less accidents with sticks, and so on.

Again, maybe this is a dream, but nevertheless I think that when somebody tries something they should be congratulated, and I certainly congratulate the MAHA for what they are doing here in hockey in Manitoba.

I think that's all I have to say on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Well, the Member for St. Boniface touched briefly on the program, a number of years ago there was a program instituted called the Coaches Certification Program, which is run in conjunction with the universities and the community colleges. For that particular program there is about \$80,000 in funds for this year. We also have a program called Sports Special Projects which different groups can apply to to receive proper coaching.

One of the problems we have had with regard to the development with sports such as gymnastics and other things is the lack of coaches available, especially in rural Manitoba, to participate in these different clinics. I'm happy to say that, and I use my own small town as an example, for instance there is a gymnastics class starting up there; there seems to be more coaches and people interested. This is one of the programs, as I mentioned, which started three or four years ago and it is one of the most advanced in all of the provinces of Canada right now. It's progressed to a stage where it's well received and we are turning out some very good coaches.

Again, I have to reiterate really what the Member for St. Boniface said. If we're looking at the East German or some of the communist bloc countries, they're not running a sports program or an athletic program, they're running really a state athletic program, and you've got coaches hired by the state and the students are selected, and I think they have taken a totally different tact than we over here have. We have said if a little boy or a little girl wants to excel in gymnastics or hockey, we're going to make that available for them and they can. We don't weed out the ones that are better and then work on those to bring them to an international status. And it's really, I guess where we're going to put our emphasis, and I guess our emphasis has been more on individual participation rather than seeking out the excellence in the whole thing.

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

There are some other groups that are running coaching facilities such as the Legion has their sports camps, developing some coaching, so we do have a number of programs in place. But as the Member for Elmwood pointed out, in order to refine a sport and make it even more enjoyable for the kids, I think coaching is an intricate part of it and has to be pursued and therefore we're continuing with these programs and expanding them in a few areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister if he is providing any support for track and field in general, and I'm thinking now in particular of that big once-a-year meet now that the Tribune has taken over. I was just wondering whether any provincial moneys or support was going into that particular meet.

MR. BANMAN: Not directly, Mr. Chairman. Some of the groups that participate, like the Manitoba High School Athletic Association, the Manitoba Runners Association, the Manitoba Track and Field Association, are people that are funded as sports governing bodies and they are involved in those particular events but the Tribune track meet which is put on is put on by the paper and they bear the cost.

One of the unfortunate things, I guess, when you're dealing with track and field, is the problems that we have of drawing a large crowd. If that stadium could be filled when we bring some of these major stars in, that would make it much easier for us to run some of these events and keep them going. But as a spectator sport it hasn't really caught on that well in the province and that has been one of the problems in trying to meet the overhead of those particular games, but they sure have brought in some tremendous athletes. I have attended them and seen some good athletes, and I think it is a good way to get some of our local track and field people involved in the sport.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the Minister, you know, I've been involved in track I guess since about 1952 or before and track has never had widespread spectator support, but those particular meets are kind of a focal point, there are thousands of high school kids who participate. One of the things that I often find interesting about those meets is that some of the most exciting events in the evening are when the high school relays go on. You know, you somehow or other get emotionally involved in these events because of the fact they are high schools kids, a number of teams running and the great enthusiasm. So I simply say there that I would ask the Minister if he would, in the favourite word of his government, monitor that situation because I am concerned that it might go under. A couple of years ago we provided funds for a track and that was a major expenditure and a major improvement, but as a result of that and the shift from the Knights of Columbus, who couldn't carry it any more, and the new track, there was a one year absence, so, you know, you kind of had a break in the pattern. Then a year ago there was, I think, a blizzard. I have gone to, I think, all of them, and there was just over 3,000; this year is was 5,000 or better. I would ask the Minister to watch that situation carefully in the event that it might go under, to see whether he can provide support.

The other point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, before I leave and participate in the farewell to Bob D'Hont, a Government Services employee of long standing, which is next door, is I just wanted to ask the Minister for a comment on the Sports Hall of Fame. This was, I guess, a dinner last night which was a new institution, it sounded very interesting, I regretted that I wasn't able to attend, didn't really know all the details about it, but it seemed like a great success. I heard some of it on the radio, some of Capozzi's speech which was quite funny, and I gather the Premier was present, I don't know if the Minister was there or any MLAs were there to represent the government. But I just wanted to ask whether what was obviously an excellent idea, and will have a lot of enthusiasm and support behind it, whether the province had any direct involvement or whether the funding and support was indirect through one of the amateur athletic bodies?

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the evening was put on by the Manitoba Sports Federation and I guess we can't really say now it is government funding, but moneys that they derive right now and use are the ones that they earn as a partner of the Western Lotteries Manitoba distributor. It was put on by the Manitoba Sports Federation and it's the first annual, they hope to have that every year now, and I believe there were, how many inductees were there? I believe there were ten inductees and I understand that the evening went very well. Unfortunately, I wanted to be there, but with the Estimates and the Supply Bill going the way it was I couldn't be there, but I understand they were really enthused by the response from all the people that were there and will continue that in the years to come.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Before we leave that, we have been covering quite a few things on that and I am trying not to introduce anything new that shouldn't be there, but we talked about the arena. Can you give us a report, can the Minister give us a report where that stands now, what payment we have made, and what is our commitment, and will there be a debt to the city? The different levels of government, what is their contribution?

MR. BANMAN: Well, as the member will appreciate about a year and a half ago the former Federal Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport came into town and made the announcement that they would be helping out, up to a maximum of \$5 million on a matching basis, all the cities that would be accepted into the NHL system. At that time the only hitch was that the province come up with \$5 million and the city come up with \$5 million. That was refined later to the point where, after the city had done a number of studies, that they anticipated an expansion of \$6.5 million to \$7 million would be one which would enhance the arena and provide a lot of the things that we needed to help out the handicapped and look after all people concerned. So what happened in the pursuing negotiations when the province took over Loto Canada, the Federal Government said that commitments made by Loto Canada would have to become the responsibility within the province that they were made. In other words, they didn't want all kinds of people coming at Loto Canada once it had been wound down and say, well you owe us that and you owe us that; so within the jurisdictions where those commitments were made then we were responsible for them. After talking to the Winnipeg Enterprises and negotiating with them and the city of Winnipeg we arrived at the figure of \$6.7 million, I believe, total expenditure, of which the province under this formula would have to pick up a third and the commitment on the Loto Canada was a third. We have to date paid out the commitment, if you want to call it the province's commitment, dealing with the \$2.25 million has been paid from general revenues to cover our commitment. The other \$2.25 million will be paid over a series of five years, the first payment beginning in 1982, out of lotteries' revenues. So as it comes in we will be earmarking, hopefully, from the sale of the \$10 ticket to cover that particular cost, so we will have to be setting it aside and making the payments out on a yearly basis.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is where I am going to turn my attention to the Minister, I guess, before that I was fighting with the Minister for the value of the some of the programs that we had when I had the responsibility, but as I said this morning I am not quite as happy with the government in this field. I think that the government seems to be dragging their feet on this. They froze programs, some of them I mentioned earlier, and I would like to know what happened. This was a commitment of a government and I think that the Minister has to accept the responsibility if these were frozen. Have they been replaced by any other programs? It seems to me, and the Minister made a big thing of saying, well now we have our own department and it used to be all helter-skelter before in two different departments. Well, because of the question of fitness as far-reaching, I felt that there was nothing wrong when it was with the Department of Health and

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

Social Development, and I think I would like to refresh the Minister's memory by reading some of the things that were put out in the news service. The reason why we were going in that direction and the reason why I think that - because those things haven't changed - why I think the government should go in the same direction. But I get the feeling now that this department is fun and games in sports and recreation mostly, but that fitness is but a very very small part of this. This is what I was saying, that the Minister is not taking advantage of that Advisory Committee, although I think that it did excellent work. And the Minister did not pursue, the former Minister also - if I direct my remark at the present Minister it is because he has the responsibility, I guess he knows that - I am actually addressing these remarks to his government, the fact that we were talking about an interdepartmental committee that would take representation from the Department of Health. And as I said before, you can't just talk about fitness and so on if you are not talking about nutrition, if you are not talking about prevention, and I think there was the Department of Education also, which I think is very important, and that could be far-reaching also. You know, we are talking about Day Care Centres and we are talking about providing meals and hot meals for kids, and we have all kinds of junk food being sold in schools for instance. Is that what we want?

Mr. Chairman, if you bear with me I would like to read something, I think that will make it, that it will explain exactly what I mean and why I think this should be very important. "Of course, it is not possible to legislate fitness, however to reach different groups of people with varying needs and concerns with respect to fitness and lifestyle, we intend to introduce a number of programs to encourage positive lifestyles' participation in different types of physical activities." I might say that Manitoba was the only province. I think there was an effort by the federal government and there were meetings with the then Minister responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sports and the federal government to go in that direction also.

"To reach these groups, fitness activities and resource materials would be developed and assistance given to groups interested in introducing these activities. Organizations and community agencies would be aided in strengthening their development of activities that would enhance a fitness and positively influence the lifestyle of their members.

"The concern about lifestyle and health is shared strongly by Health Departments in other provinces and by the federal government. Health and Welfare Canada announced in November 1976 that two goals of the Department were improvement of the social and physical environment in Canada, and modification of certain living habits influencing Canadian levels of health and fitness. These goals stem from the close relationship between state of health, lifestyle, environmental factors.

"The Federal-Provincial Health Ministers' Conference agreed that a priority item would be adoption by their Departments of an aggressive policy of promoting better health and lifestyles. To this end a National Task Force is being set up in the Manitoba Government and the Advisory Council of Fitness and Amateur Sports are actively developing policies in this field.

"Physical fitness and a fitness-oriented lifestyle are being recognized as keys in maintenance of good health among all age groups. It is also being recognized that Canadians are not doing enough to keep fit. Fewer than 15 percent of adult Canadians meet. . ." - that was in 1977 - ". . . meet internationally accepted standards of physical fitness.

"The government programs will attempt to increase individuals' own motivations through an improvement of lifestyle and make communities and groups more conscious of the importance of physical fitness. They will try to create a social environment that supports the goal of fitness and provides access to safe, well-operated programs and facilities. Programs will be developed to cover groups of different ages. . ." - I think that is important also, it is not just the kids. ". . . occupations, states of physical and mental health, and interest. Existing organizations such as YM, YWCAs, employer-employees groups, service clubs, senior citizens groups and recreation commissions will be used with the initiative remaining with these groups to avail themselves of assistance."

Then, of course, there was the announcement of the quarter-of-a-million dollars for the Reh-Fit Centre, which I think was money well spent, and the government had recently assumed responsibility for the operation of the Sports Injuries Treatment Centre, and that has been covered by the Minister.

"The government also planned programs to encourage fitness and participation in physical activity being developed through the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch. Others will be developed through a Committee on Fitness and Lifestyle which is now being formed within the government, among other interest groups concerned with fitness. Physical fitness is seen to be an effective way to achieve much needed ends in terms of better and happier lifestyle, increased productivity, better health, disease prevention, and overall happiness."

Then we went on to announce programs in the amount of \$770,000 for these programs, part of the money coming in from the part that was for sports taken care of by the partner, the temporary partner, the Advisory Committee, so sports wouldn't be deprived while the Sports Federation made up their mind; and some of it, quite a bit of it, came from the government share of lottery revenue. There was, as I say, this party community project, this provincial fitness recognition scheme, the Manitoba Marathon, the Fitness Incentive Grant Program, and Fitness Instructor's Training and Certification Program. Well, I think that last one is still there, you have the Sports Injury Centre, but there doesn't seem to be much more than that, and there is an actual reduction in cost. So, I think that, vaguely, the Minister subscribed to everything I said, I am sure that he does, but I don't think that the government has done anything concrete on that. I think they have kept a minimum of programs and there certainly hasn't been any improvement at all that I know of. Maybe the Minister can point out to me that I am wrong, but that I think is the important thing, and that is why it was with the Department of Health.

This Department seems to be working in a vacuum, it is not working with the Advisory Committee, it is not working - whenever they want something I think it is just a show, as I said earlier, that Commissions that they had. They have got people in that field, there were medical men, there were heart specialists, there were people that had expertise in different fields. And I think that Manitoba was becoming a leader in this field and I don't think that it is any more. And this seems like a lot of money, but there was a lot of money saved. You know, when you've got a healthy population, you have less people in hospitals for one thing, and then they produce a heck of a lot more when they are healthy than if they are missing work all the time. And then also it creates - when people are healthy, they are happier - you know, it is very very far-reaching.

Those were amongst the first programs that fell by the wayside because of restraint, and that wasn't fair because that money was coming from lotteries and this government is saying the same thing that we said, that that was no way to raise tax unless it is for something special and it belonged to the people. I think that it has been a joke, what this Department has done. This Department is trying - I don't think there is any other Department that has been hit by restraint as much as this Department. You know, when we took office there was \$30,000 spent on sport, \$30,000 on sport, and there was money when we left office, there was way more from the Estimates here that we are dealing with, there was money coming in from the lottery, there were funds that we had on the lottery money that was kept getting interest because we didn't want to go blindly and have all these programs until there was somebody that could look at these programs. It wasn't just a political thing to expedite and to spend to get rid of the money. We were criticized at one time because we weren't spending the money fast enough. I think that is important.

Now there are so many things that were done for sports at this time. We had a big announcement that the Sports Federation would become a partner. Sports lost on that because the whole portion of that partner, sports, let's call it sports, was being spent in these programs without interference. Yes, because of the nature of it the government participated in that but we accepted their recommendation. It was their recommendation. They knew where we wanted to go and they accepted that, and they agreed and they made recommendations. We went in that direction. There was money coming in even from our share of the olympic, not the olympic but Loto tickets sold here. That money was going in there and then there was, on the community side, and I'm not talking about only recreation now because community recreation wasn't under us but directly with sports. We had started and the Minister announced, it was in the Throne Speech, that something big, a program for, what is it? Something for the 80's and by adding 80's in there it was supposed to be a new program. It was just an extension of the programs that we

had. --(Interjection)-- Well, yes because the facilities, the capital is there, the facilities are in place, now you're going to help to maintain that. In effect that's what it is, which was the second step. --(Interjection)-- Well, all right, yes, but I think the aim and the intent and pretty well the people that you serve are doing the same thing because you had places there.

I wonder, if you're talking about that, I know that at the time we had charts and maps and all kinds of information. We had, and your Deputy Minister will remember that, we had an excellent man that was doing research for us. What was his name? Taylor was it; years ago, was it Taylor? And we had charts and everything showing where they were, the arenas and the curling rinks, the skating rink, if it was artificial ice or not, all over the place. So there were millions of dollars spent in sports and fitness mostly with that in mind.

Also I am not satisfied with the answer that the Minister gave me before the lunch hour - mind you he didn't have much time to reply - on the question of the games, because I think the games was what we were both after. After listening to the Minister I can make that statement. He was trying to get mass participation and the games were giving us that. The games were developing volunteers and leaders in the communities by, first of all, starting with the regions and then it was giving recognition and it was also developing future elite athletes - when I say elite, the top athletes - who would, first step, compete in the Canada games and then maybe, hopefully and certainly, in the olympic or world-wide competition.

I don't want to mix the two. We're on fitness and this is where I have more criticism of the department of the government, on fitness than anything else. I'd like the Minister to tell us if he subscribed to the same thing, if they feel that this fitness that sports and, well fitness mostly, is something that they are aiming at and if this is going to be helpful to keep people healthy in Manitoba, save money for the Department of Health, I would hope and make a happier people. And if so, I could understand that he didn't have the responsibility when these programs were frozen.

Now I don't know of any new program that this government has brought in. Some of these programs were frozen and then months after the then Minister made a big thing of coming in with a new program and it was, I guess they were unfreezing, if I can use that term, unfreezing some of these programs. Now fine, there was a lot of work to do. We were going in a certain direction. We had somebody looking in fitness and wanting to work with the private enterprise, as I mentioned. The government couldn't do it all. The government was showing leadership and tried to motivate the people by providing the means and trying to interest the people in the communities. Because you can't force people, as I said. You can't legislate health or any of these things, but we were motivating them. We were trying to introduce programs that would get these different groups to do something like - what is it - Participaction, that they have in Saskatchewan, that the government of Canada helped promote and tried in Saskatchewan, and I understand it's been very very successful.

So could the Minister take a few minutes, as long as he needs, to tell us where he wants to go, how important he thinks it is, what leadership his department and the government will give, and then we can go back to the sports and things that I've said? I'm talking mostly about fitness.

Now I want to go back to the Sports Federation because it was said when they became a partner that was the best deal that sports ever had. Well it was, and they accept the responsibility, that they were covering from their own money and we were covering that. That has been reduced. The Minister said himself for instance, that it's been a reduction of funds voted when the Sports Injury Centre, because that wasn't through lottery money, that was right from here and that is the responsibility of the . . . No, excuse me, not the Injury Centre, I mean the Administration Centre. I don't say that's wrong, providing that there's not less money going out. I think that if you make somebody a partner and they want to run, there are certain responsibilities that are theirs. But the total amount of money has gone down in the last few years. The total amount of money that was spent in sport has gone has gone down quite a bit instead of increasing. If you take everything from the lottery, from the Sports Federation, from the Advisory Committee on Sports, and from the department's own estimates.

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

MR. BANMAN: We're dealing the latter part, so that the record will be clear. The member made reference to the Sports Facilities 80 Program. It is a facilities program dealing with recreation facilities in rural Manitoba, and to that extent it's the same as the program which was started back in 1972, I believe, dealing with the specifics. This particular program is - the criteria are a little different because it's done on a per capita basis for rural Manitoba only; it's done through the municipalities and a certain fixed amount per municipality, with the other . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Why for rural Manitoba only?

MR. BANMAN: It was to offset the funds that were given to the City of Winnipeg with regards to the arena expansion.

The other thing that should be pointed out is, just the amount expended till 1977 was "4.8 million on this particular program, on the Capital Facilities Recreation Grant, 4.8 million was spent then. The total now with that Sports Facilities 80 Program would be \$9.6 million. So it really breaks out that we've spent about 50/50 as far as the dollars are involved.

The dollars that go for sports, if you include the amount spent on behalf of the lotteries, has been slowly climbing over the last seven, eight years, and there has not been a drop. Some years there has been some anomalies because of the Canada games and some other things. We spent a little more because of the Canada games, but there has been a steady increase over the last number of years.

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you including the arena?

MR. BANMAN: No, no, I'm just including lotteries and the programs, not the facilities.

MR. DESJARDINS: The lottery revenue is increased, but I think we're both on record, both parties, to say that we would like to see that this has to be done in an orderly fashion, that eventually all revenue from all lotteries, after the expense of policing and so on has been paid, would all leave government.

MR. BANMAN: That's why. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, okay, that's fine, but you are reducing your Estimates. Your Estimates are reduced compared to what they were, and so on. This is what I meant. I don't see in the Estimates any program, anything here that you. . . it's vague, you've got nothing for games, so therefore there's no policy that you're going to keep the games. You have nothing. . . you've just got staff, and certain grants that are changed. For instance, the grants that you have under the next item, sports development, was 358, now it's 270, because you're including some of the money from the lottery.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to deal with that last question, last year as far as the grants to the 61 sports bodies for \$270,000 in the next item, that was in the paid-for-out-of-lotteries before. We worked that into our appropriation this year, so that. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it was always paid completely out of the lottery. . .

MR. BANMAN: No, last year it was paid entirely out of lotteries. Well I should seem concerned - the member does - I would like to get as much of this work into my Estimates as at all possible and I'm striving to that end, but the member can maybe appreciate the difficulties. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Can I correct the Minister, that in 1977-78 the last budget that I was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, if the member wishes to speak, maybe he could draw it to the attention of the Chairman so that he could be recognized.

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: We're not too many here; we were doing quite well mister, before you came in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that they're going to have some difficulty back there. The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, I'll try to behave and make you happy. I might say that in '77-'78 the Minister had made a statement that those grants were paid. . .

MR. BANMAN: That was last year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, last year. I'm talking. . . last year, unfortunately, I was sick in the hospital when this was going on. My friend from Elmwood was the critic, and after hearing him today, I'm quite concerned.

MR. BANMAN: Now, dealing specifically with the comments that the member has with regards to fitness, one of the areas that was weak when I took over - and I accept full responsibility as a member of the government for what took place prior to that - but one of the areas that we were lacking some initiative and some direction on was the area of fitness. As a result, we have appointed a fitness co-ordinator, and what we have done, as I mentioned the other day, we have advertised for a full-time consultant. We have put three people in that particular group that will now be working particularly with that. We are coming out with different programs very much along the level that the member was reading from the press release.

MR. DESJARDINS: This year?

MR. BANMAN: This year we will be engaged as one of the four provinces in a new program called Corporate Challenge with the federal Department of Health and Welfare, which will encourage corporations to get teams together and we'll have sort of many little challenges from one province to another. It's a new program which we said we will participate in and our people will be working with that. We have come up with things like Fit-For-Fun. It's a program where someone out in rural Manitoba could pick up the necessary information and the different challenges that are involved to getting to a certain level of fitness. When they have achieved that, they can go to our local - we're using our local recreation directors through the seven regions that we have directors in. They'll be issued certificates. So we are moving on that front.

We've also got the Senior Olympics going again this year. We've got the Sports Injury Centre, which I mentioned before we hope to expand, to get into sort of an area where we can judge an athlete before he. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Don't forget the equipment also.

MR. BANMAN: That's right. And we are moving on providing instruction classes, not only in Winnipeg here, but in rural Manitoba, for different fitness levels.

The other thing that has happened, with the advent of things like the Manitoba Marathon and other things, the heightening level, if I can call it that, of public awareness as far as fitness, has really increased, and I think we see that everywhere. We will continue to enhance that and sort of help that along by pamphlets and posters.

Now, the other thing the member mentioned too, is that you can't really make people get fit if they don't really want to, and I have some trouble, I don't mind saying, with just the straight advertising aspect of it. I haven't allotted too much money for just straight advertising, because I think what we'll have to do is get the people in the field and get the interest going. But it has caught on, and the different instructors that have started classrooms - I know, in my area there's a person that's instructing a class of 40 housewives, that have got it going, it's a small town. And this is happening throughout Manitoba, that people are getting involved, and hopefully through things like providing certificates and

helping them a bit, we can get that rolling. But we are, as I mentioned, going to be having three staff people dealing with this particular item and doing a number of things with the different groups that are involved in fitness programming, including the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister disarmed me. He takes some of the responsibility, and he agrees that less was being done in fitness. I kind of suspect that he is taking the blame for somebody else, but I won't argue. I can't fault him with saying that, in effect, they are ready to move in that direction. . so, I only encouraged him. And I'm not vain enough to think that the program has to be exactly the same. They change, and if we are going in that direction, I am quite happy.

But I'd say that the Minister, who repeated a couple of times that they had set up a co-ordinator of fitness, that there was somebody there that had been hired for that, that either that person left or was fired, I don't know. And mind you, I'm talking about Johnston who went to the RehFit, so he was in effect doing that kind of work. I think he went to RehFit, and he's no longer there. So, you know, it's not something new. I want the Minister to know that we were moving in that direction. When he's talking about three, I think he's talking about a clerk also, and that work was provided. But anyway, better late than never. I think we lost a couple of years, but if we're going in that direction I'll be very careful to see what happens next year. I hope that we'll have more of these programs.

Now there is one thing that I take exception to. I hope it's not because the Minister is . . well, maybe it's good to change Ministers from the rural to the city. Maybe a city Minister might favour the people in the city and maybe once in a while you have to do the opposite. But I don't like the idea that these programs are only for rural areas. I don't think that you can compare the arena - the arena was for Manitoba - there's many, many people that will never go to the arena. That is professional sports' facilities, and it's helping the enterprise, which is good, but I don't think that the people - you're in effect charging it to the people of Winnipeg now. Yes, because the Minister said that he's got programs, and I ask him why only in rural Manitoba, and his exact words were "to upset what is being done in the grant that we gave to build the arena."

So you can look at it any way you want. That in effect means that the people of Winnipeg are paying for the arena. And that is being done in so many cases, where people of Winnipeg are paying the shot for a certain thing. And I don't begrudge this program in the rural area. We went in the rural area also, but we also allowed and gave the same facilities to the city, you try to even up. .

Also, I talked about the charge that we had and so on to see where things were, and we tried to, first of all, look at the facilities, the distribution in Manitoba. And it was a matching grant, but we also had some money for remote areas that could not match the grant, or they didn't have to do that. So we tried to cover that. But I don't think it's right to start another program and say the city doesn't need it, because the city . . you look around in the community clubs here and see the need that they have; there's many, many more kids. I don't say they should do it at the detriment of the people of rural Manitoba, but I say that they have the community - you're helping the community clubs, different small communities, and you're saying in Winnipeg, well you've got an arena. Those people that are working in the community clubs don't give a damn about the arena. They might go and see a game once in a while but it doesn't help their kids, it doesn't help at all.

Now if you tell me it's a question of - we're starting, there's a limited amount of money and we're going where the need is, I might still argue, being from the city, but deep down, I would understand. But if you just tell me that it's because of the arena. And then, actually, they're paying for something that was paid by the federal government. That was part of your deal. You're taking that money from the - well, the other programs come from the lottery also, but your taking that from the addition of the Lotto - that's what you said. You said that you have a deal with Lotto Canada, or Sports Canada, so they don't go and bother Sports Canada, that one of the conditions when the previous government turned the Lotto Canada to you, to the provinces I should say, that they would accept their

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

responsibility, that's exactly what you said. So that is a commitment to get that, and now they are paying for it, because you are giving another program to the people, and I think that is unfortunate because they sure need it. They need it in the rural area, there is no doubt about that, but they certainly need it in the community clubs here. If you could see the amount of kids that they have, for instance, in their hockey program or soccer program and so on, I think that it is needed.

So I have no argument with the Minister if this is going to be reviewed every year, and I hope it will. If your new program could be reviewed every year, and if you felt that you had to start where the need is greater, I'll accept that, but don't lock it in that this is something that the urban people - there's more than half percent of the population of Manitoba that are in urban centres, so don't lock it in that these people cannot take advantage of that program, I would suggest to the Minister.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, the sports development, (f) development, I guess in all fairness, I think we've covered that quite close. And the Minister and the Chairman were good enough to give us leeway, so I'm not going to harp on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f). . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, that's the same number of people as you had last year or before, in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)(2)--pass; 2.(f)(3)--pass.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, not (3); (3) I'd like to know about grants, and I still say that your grants have gone down quite a bit. Anything that was done by the sports federation that was clear to these groups - well mind you, they lost money in most of the years. But then there were grants - the last year that I was responsible for the budget there was \$358,000, plus the amount of lottery. We were taking full responsibility for the administration centre, which was a fair sum, and we had taken over programs from the sports federation also. Now, under this grant assistance, why are you going down? Are you going down because you're asking the sports federation to take part of that responsibility and therefore, confirming what I said, that they're losing out by taking over, because you're giving them quite a share of responsibility with the partnership that you give them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: This figure is broken down into \$180,000 to assist provincial sports organizations and agencies to provide opportunities for participating in different technical clinics, national coaching program and that type of thing. There is another \$90,000 in this particular amount which deals with the hosting of major championships. In other words, when we have a national meet here, whether it be with gymnastics or running event or something, these funds can be applied for and are then paid out for to the different sports governing bodies to help alleviate some of the costs of putting on a major championship.

That's the \$270,000 that we referred to in the Estimates. Then, on top of that, we provide \$22,000 for the Frontier Games . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Where's that coming from?

MR. BANMAN: That's from lotteries now. I'm sorry. \$79,500 for the Coaching Certificate Program, \$100,000 which I mentioned for ManPlan before, another \$100,000 for special sports projects, another \$90,000 for travel assistance to championships, \$175,000 for regional development.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. But you're just proving my point. I'm not saying that this is not being done, and in fact I don't recognize any new program. That's fine. I hope that they were good programs. I am saying, well, a new program might be, but just a changed program, programs that might be modified somewhat. But, from your explanation of what that money was doing, I have in the Minister's book of my last year, exactly the same explanation. And the amount was quite a bit higher. And we were also making a contribution from the lottery. You're using lottery. The point that I'm trying to make is that you are spending less money now than even two years ago, total, when I look at the total. You are spending quite a bit less money for all fitness and amateur sports than we were then. That's the point. I hope that I'm even helping the Minister in saying this, where I could maybe make his position a little stronger when he goes to Cabinet and fights for the Estimates. I know how you handle Estimates, and I know that he came in the middle of the year, but I think that the former Minister was too lax, didn't have enough weight, and that's not a pun either, enough weight in Cabinet to push his program.

That's what I was saying, I don't want you to think that we're blinded or we think that that statement that was said by some members of the Sports Federation was the greatest thing that happened to sports, because I think in general that they have suffered. They have suffered some. Mind you, there are certain things they have gained; they are going to make more and more money, I would imagine, with the lottery, and some day it might come that you might put in the revenue, all the revenue, to divide, of course, now there's a fourth partner, we'll talk about that later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)(3)--pass; Resolve that there be Granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,515,800 for Fitness, Recreation and Sport--pass.
The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the co-operation of you, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister in dealing with these Estimates. I, for one, I'm not speaking for the rest of the committee, do not want a rehash. I think that we had a fair chance, I don't want to rehash anything unless somebody reminds me of something when we're talking on the Minister's Salary, except that it was agreed that we would cover the lottery, now and I would like the Minister to make some kind of a progressive report on what is happening, what has happened in the last year or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are returning to 1.(a) Minister's Compensation.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say, in a brief overview of the lotteries operation, the ticket sales with regard to the Winsday, the Provincial, are very much the same as last year, I understand. There have been fewer, maybe a few less Winsday tickets sold, but generally the operation is very much the same. As of January 1, 1980, the distributor Corporation A, started to distribute the Loto Canada tickets, the \$1.00 tickets. The distribution of those tickets will be carried on the same way the other two products were distributed. Also, what has happened is that because major banks were selling the Loto Canada tickets, and I think all the Ministers of the provinces wanted to possibly use that as a vehicle to maybe sell the Provincial and some others, the banks have indicated that they did not want to deal with individual groups with regards to the sale of those tickets, and therefore the distribution and the sales of tickets to the banks in the province of Manitoba will be done exclusively through the Western Lotteries Manitoba distributor. Some of the other provinces will be handling the marketing of that themselves.

The major changes that have happened is that the Manitoba Sports Federation has taken the position of the Manitoba Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport and will, at the end of this fiscal year, at the end of March now, start taking over a certain amount of programming. As we went through the Estimates, we noticed that some of the programming was being taken over by them, so they are assuming a certain amount of responsibility. In that particular agreement they have to come to the Minister in January to get their budget okayed so that we have

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

control. The Member for St. Boniface, I know, is concerned that the control is exercised with any agreement, and I can assure him that that is No. 1 priority with the government of the day also. So, we have checks and balances in place.

The other change which will take place, as of the 31st of this year again, will be the inclusion of TCI, which is a group that is made up of a number of non-profit organizations. The objective in including TCI is to, and I know this will have to evolve as we go along, is to become the arm of the lottery system where non-profit community groups can become involved in the sale of tickets. One of the things that small groups have been complaining about after we got involved in the lotteries field was that it was becoming increasingly difficult to sell their \$10 ticket, or their \$1 raffles on cars and other things locally, and in order to try and overcome some of the problems that they face, we moved in this particular direction.

Mr. Chairman, it's got its problems to it. I'm the first to admit that, but I think one of the things that has to be recognized when we are dealing with this particular subject matter is that we had a lot of problems before, too. The extra Provincial sales, another two products in the field, and the other things that went along with it. We hope now that we have everything under one umbrella, that we can have a close scrutiny and a close control of everything that goes on in the field of large lotteries in the province. I'm not talking about the car giveaways and that type of thing, but in the field of \$100,000, \$50,000 lotteries, so that we can assure the public protection in those fields.

So as I said, I'm the first to admit that there might be some rocks along the way that we're going to have to deal with, but I think hopefully, if cooler heads prevail in this particular issue, we will be able to work out an agreement and a working relationship which will be to the mutual benefit of all the citizens of Manitoba, as well as get us out of the confrontation with the other provinces for extra Provincial sales and that type of thing. Because that has been another long-standing problem and we really couldn't go after other people and tell them to stay out of Manitoba if we couldn't even assure them that we were not doing that.

So we hope we will, by doing this, be able to tighten up the system in such a manner that we will have total control of it and total disclosure of everything that's going on.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to say that I recognize that the government of the day has a mandate to govern the province of Manitoba as it sees fit, and they will have to answer to the people of Manitoba. I don't deny him that right, of course, it would be ridiculous to try. I think it is their right and their prerogative to bring in legislation or make the arrangements that they want. What I mean is that if they want to bring more people to change the lottery set-up and so on, this is fine. This is their right. And I don't think this is bad. The idea was to start something and then as we go along, I think we went through the rougher years, I think the Minister has got a picnic now compared to what we went through, and I wish him well.

I can't help, maybe this is childish on my part, but I can't help spend a couple of minutes to say that these people that came in, the two new partners since we met last, namely the Sports Federation and the total involvement group, are people that resisted, that did everything possible, some of their members, most of them, anyway, to prevent the lottery as we have it now to being a success. I could, I won't read too much of it, but I could refer you to this group, that group together, that had a submission to Law Amendments Committee regarding Bill 27 in May of 1974, who, fortunately that was a short period of forced holiday for me when I wasn't sitting in the House and I remember being abused quite strongly on this. There was no member from either side, any side of the House, that came to my defence. That's fine, that's fair enough, I've got a broad back.

But Mr. Chairman, what we did, I think that now, and I think I should be allowed a few minutes to crow and to show that we were all against tremendous odds, we were building something because we felt that we had to. We brought in this lottery, if you remember at the time, there was a lottery in the province of Quebec, the other lotteries were getting ready, and there was this Golden Boy lottery here in Manitoba. And it is unheard of. And the Minister, I'm sure, if

he's not absolutely sure now that after a couple of years, well one session anyway, I won't wish him any longer years than that, although I have a high regard for him personally, but I think he will admit that nowhere else do they even know what a non-bearer's ticket is. It just doesn't make sense in these days of large lottery where there is no security for the people and so on, and then the share, also, of revenue and prices being inadequate.

But anyway, this was not aimed at disturbing anything. This was not aimed at anything but we felt that the other provinces, we knew that the other provinces were getting ready to introduce their lottery, so I think it was foresight and I think it was leadership on the part of Manitoba, who were the first ones to suggest, while we still had something to sell because we had the expertise, we were the only ones with a lottery that went over to the other three provinces and suggested we get together to have more security, to cut down on duplication, and to try to make it easier to police the lotteries and not raid the other's territory as much. So this is what we did.

Some of these things evolve, there are certain things in a political sense, we're all intelligent enough to know that there are politics and if we pretend that we don't care, we'd be nuts. And we'd be lying, or we wouldn't be here.

So Mr. Chairman, I think certain things, and I'm pleased the way things have evolved. But at the time it was very difficult because the biggest, the people that resisted the most, it could have been settled long before, to everybody's benefit, but there were middlemen, and I'll keep on calling them middlemen that did not want to see the kind of bearer's tickets come in, who did not want to see the accountability that we have, and who made, in my estimation, an unfair profit because after all this was something that the licence by the province, and most of the money, all the money except the cost, was supposed to go back to the people in fitness, recreation, arts and sports, and they were making way too much money, as far as I was concerned. So it was very difficult, if I had my way I would like to look at who is a member now of TCI, and I think that if the Minister reviewed everything, it would be tough, maybe politically he wouldn't take the step, but I don't, there are certain people that I feel shouldn't be there. You know, compare, they might represent one sport, or one part of a sport and so on. It's a good thing, and it came out as a business, and I don't think that's there.

Other people of course, I don't think should be there but I wouldn't try to get them out because I'm talking about private schools because I think that, and I'm not going to start a debate on that, I think that private schools should be recognized and I don't think they should have to go, to resort to this means. But in the meantime, fine, I wish them luck and I hope they do quite well. That is the situation on this group but there are certain groups that I think, first of all, there should be a review to see. Not just a grandfather's clause and that's it.

Let me say that this group then who did everything, who went to the press and lied and made all kinds of accusations, some of them personal, and now it's ironic that now they're begging and they're coming in to be one of the partners of something they tried to destroy, that many of them tried to destroy. Having said that, I have no objection. I hope that peace will be made and everything will work well. But I might say that because they insisted through their middlemen, through the people that they had a contract with, to keep the non-bearer's tickets, they as I say, some of the statements that they made that you couldn't enforce it and so on, they were getting 70 percent outside the province - we knew that couldn't last because it wasn't going to be allowed in other provinces when they started their lottery, and the Minister now knows that I'm right. So this was one of the reasons that was done.

So what did we do? We let them organize and run their lottery and keep all profit. When you had the Golden Boy, part of that went to Manitoba, but not when this was set up as a total involvement, what is it? TCI - Total Community Involvement - they could keep everything except enough for the management, for the operating of the, of helping their share, I guess, of the licensing board and so on. I think this is a group that should be very pleased to be in. I'm not sorry. I'm not saying it's bad, but I say their contract is very bad, very very bad. The Minister was good enough to give me the contract and I think it's very bad, and I think you're going to regret the day and the government . . . I suspect that the Minister is not the person really responsible for that. I might be wrong. I think that this was something that came from above, like so many of the

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

bad decisions of this government. --(Interjection)-- Well then, accept all responsibility if it's your fault, because it's a very bad document.

You are taking a group, as I said, who did everything to kill that before it got started. And you are not just bringing them in as equal partners, you are giving all kinds of privileges which do not make sense. First of all, you are saying come in and the idea - it's a good idea to bring them in - is to try to bring order in the lottery business here in Manitoba, and to try to do away with an obsolete form of non-bearer's tickets, and you are saying if you don't like it you can go back to the non-bearer's tickets, which is a step backwards. That's very bad. That should not be done. If they want to go back, it shouldn't be non-bearer's tickets, and if you ever go, Mr. Minister, or through you, Mr. Chairman, to any of these conventions, any of these ideas, and I expect that you will go. You should go. You will see that they don't know what the hell you're talking about if you are talking about non-bearer's tickets. It doesn't make sense when there is so much money involved. You are giving them a chance to go back to the non-bearer's tickets, and I think that's wrong. That's No. 1.

No. 2 - can you explain why a group that came in, their own lottery, all of a sudden your making that retroactive, they're going to collect from last April? Why? I'd like to know, which is money that doesn't belong to them. You are taking it from the other three partners. I can understand the Sports Federation because that was their slot, and it's going to sports, but all of a sudden you're bringing another group and you are taking money away from these three partners to give it to them. Well, aren't you saying that this is going to take effect from April, and this thing was signed when? This thing was signed in January 1980. Are they going to start collecting from the 21st day of January 1980? --(Interjection)-- When you asked, the Minister shook his head. You're saying that I'm wrong. This was made. I don't know when it was signed. I guess I could take from the same day of January 21st, 1980. Are they going to start getting revenue only from that date, from January 21st, 1980?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. They'll enter the same time the Manitoba Sports Federation did.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's the point that I made. Why?

MR. BANMAN: Which is retroactive to April 1st, 1979.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister, when I said exactly this, shook his head.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that does not effect the other groups that are involved in it, because the structure of the ticket commissions will be changed with regards to the Manitoba Lottery's Commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would the Minister explain? I don't know what you mean. It will be changed when?

MR. BANMAN: It will be changed to ensure the level of funding for all the different groups at the level that they would have received had these groups not entered.

MR. DESJARDINS: Where are you going to get the money from?

MR. BANMAN: The funds are right now accruing to the Manitoba's Lottery Commission, like they always had. The price of the ticket to the WLMB is set by the Manitoba Lottery Commission. Right? In other words, the Manitoba Lottery Commission is the agent, if you want to call it, for the Manitoba government.

MR. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. BANMAN: We can control, the Manitoba Lottery's Commission controls the profit to a large extent of WLMB by setting the ticket price. Right?

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes they control the profit to them. Are you saying in effect that the people will have, the three former partners will get the same share as if there had been no change, and then you're going to make it up with your share - when I say your share, the province's share of the profit? Is that what you are in effect saying?

MR. BANMAN: We have said all along, Mr. Chairman, that we are moving in a direction where hopefully we will get the different groups involved in this particular lottery and slowly move our way out of it, and that is what we are doing. I don't want to see something happen that the member is talking about, that the Sports Federation or that the United Way suffers from another group coming in. I don't think that would right. The Art's Council wouldn't want that, and neither would the Sports Federation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I commend the Minister for saying something that I suspected, that he's saying officially, that they eventually would like to get out of the lottery all together as far as sharing the profit, and that is the direction we were going. --(Interjection)-- Okay, having said that, but I still don't understand. The thing is that there are so many tickets that were sold and the money went this way, that Manitoba bought it for so much. That can't change, from Western Canada Lottery Foundation, that they kept some of it. They made a profit on the ticket, on some tickets, not on the Winsday - well just enough to pay the bills, but on others. And you are saying, the Minister is saying, that the groups will not suffer, so that would mean that the Sports Federation, the Manitoba Arts Council and the United Way would get exactly what they have if there had been only three partners in that time. But you are, in effect, saying that they'll start sharing from the day that the Sports Federation came in, which was April of last year. Where will they get that money from? If it's not money from the three other partners, is it money that comes in from you, your share, that is Manitoba's share of the revenue.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The ticket structure will have to be changed now, starting in the new year, to reflect that the groups that are involved there right now, do not suffer from this other partner coming in. In other words the ticket structure, our share of the take at the Manitoba Lottery Commission level, will be less so that the overall profit of the corporation A, if you want to call it, next year will show higher, but it will have to be divided. Instead of divided by three, it will be divided by four.

MR. DESJARDINS: Right. I think understand this part, that for the coming year - we'll go back to this last year, this retroactive, because that's what I was dealing with - this coming year, to accommodate a fourth partner and to make sure that the share of three previous partners do not suffer, you relinquish part of your profit, approximately \$700,000 or \$800,000, which was a third-share of the total thing. All right, I understand that. That's fine. So you are moving in that direction, which I didn't know.

But let's go back to the retroactive. Where do they get that money now? That's the part that I want to know.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, from the moneys that are held in trust with regards to the Manitoba Lotteries Commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: And who did it belong to? Oh, the Manitoba Lottery Commission.

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. BANMAN: To us all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay, well then, Mr. Chairman, it's not those three partners that are suffering, but it's practically the same because the Act says that

money that you have, which was yours, belonged to the province, has to be spent in the field of fitness, sports, and the arts. Part of that, a percentage of that - that's the Act - a percentage of that was going to the . . . well, it would go to culture. A percentage of that would go for community recreation, which would be sports and culture and leisure. Part of that would go again to sports, the programs that you've been saying that your going . . . that's going to suffer. So you are taking that money. So the point that I was trying to make, that somebody that had their own lottery, that did everything they could to destroy another lottery, come in as partners and you're giving them a lump sum to come in. That in effect . . . And I can't see that. They had their lottery. They requested, and I don't deny you the right and in fact I think it was the right thing to accept them as partners, especially now that I know that you are going to relinquish some of the profit so nobody will suffer, that's fine. But why did you make it retroactive? That I can't understand. I don't think you can say anything, but go ahead, try.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the agreement - and as the member will appreciate, there are many things involved in this and somehow this thing has to try to be resolved. And in striking and arriving at an agreement, an agreement had to be struck, to my way of thinking, to try and bring a little bit of co-operation and harmony into the whole thing.

The thing that has to be appreciated now is that TCI will take on the role of an agency where the groups can help themselves, raise extra money, but will also take on the role of providing certain sums of money to groups for purposes that they feel needy. For instance, if there is a group that needs money for research in the medical field or something like that, based on a need criteria, that . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: It's another United Way.

MR. BANMAN: If the member will have read the Haig Report, one of the areas - and I don't agree with all aspects, but with most of them - the Haig Report said that there should be a Manitoba Lotteries and Gaming Commission set up which would look after the licensing of all casinos and everything and licensing of all lotteries, so that it was all under one umbrella. I have a tendency, after having gone through this whole thing, of sort of subscribing to that. But I would not want to see . . . the other recommendation was that group then should also become and hand out the rest of the government money that was available to the government discretion - in other words, the money from the Manitoba Lotteries Commission. I don't see that as being the vehicle for doing it. We have the different groups. I think if these four partners over the next year or two can blend and start working together, I think that is going to be the best vehicle for us to use for the whole lotteries system. And in order to arrive at a settlement, dealing with this whole thing, this is the agreement that was arrived at.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, either the Minister doesn't understand or he's trying to throw a smoke screen. He's bringing all kinds of things that I want to discuss later on, but that's not what I was discussing at all. Now, he tells me that in order to bring this contract, and my impression was that they wanted, that they requested to get in, they requested to come in because they had difficulty with their lottery, and it's understood. That's why we went into this kind of thing because we knew this would happen, that they couldn't fight all the lotteries of other provinces and so on, and I do not object to them becoming a partner. I commend the government for relinquishing part of their profit to make sure that the four groups, in order to pay more or less the share of the fourth group. Nothing wrong with that, but I still don't know of any contract - if I had a contract with you, Mr. Minister, if all of a sudden you could say to me, well okay, the fact that you're a nice guy and you want to enter a contract with me, I'll give you a part of something . . . I'll pay you to come in. You know, there is nothing that you can say that will make me change my mind on that. I don't think that they had . . . you're taking that money from somebody else. That money is not yours. You are not taking it from the three groups, as I thought originally, but you are taking it indirectly from sports, from the arts, and that, because that money, according to the Act, you can't spend it for anything else than that.

So you're taking money that was accrued, and a profit that was for one purpose, and you are giving it to somebody else. So you can be a nice guy.

I think that if there's something they didn't believe in, and they were given every chance to have the lottery they wanted it, even with non-bearer's tickets, they were given lots of latitude as far as accountability is concerned, and they are asking, fine, that's good, they are asking to come as partners, and I have no objection, but you are going to reward them for that. And I can't see the reason why that would be done, because they were getting revenue before, and that's extra money that they're going to get. Okay. That is not the major point, but I couldn't see, just as a straight businessman, and you're a businessman, a businessman's contract, I don't know of anybody else that would do that. And you haven't given me the reason that it should do that. Now, that is one of the situations.

But then, the main thing, as I said, that you give them the opportunity to go back to non-bearer's tickets if they want to. I think that's wrong, that's a step backwards, that's against the idea of all the concept of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation when it was started, and because of the political thing between the different provinces, you allowed for population that you had in the province, so many lotteries, and that was one of them - in fact we gave it all to them. We had special concession by the other provinces to be able to do that, to give them as much as we could, which probably wasn't enough but it helped, it was the most that we could do, and there is no need. I think that they should have a very good look at it before they come in. And if they decide to go back, are they going to give you that money back that you are given for retroactive? Are they going to give that back to the citizens of Manitoba? No. That's not anywhere in there. So I'm certainly not suggesting for one minute that that's going to be the reason, but they could sign to come and get this money and then give you whatever the time period is, advise you that they want to get out. That's pretty good. They can make \$800,000 and then go back and run their own lottery.

But the main thing is that you've got a group, and the intent of this organization, which the province is saying, you retail tickets for us, you wholesale tickets for us. It's a partnership. And within this partnership, you make one partner a little more equal than the other. It doesn't make sense, but I think you know what I mean. That they have some concession that the others don't have. They will, in effect, compete against themselves. They will compete to try because they are wholesalers as a group, and individually they are also wholesaling, and they will compete to have the retailers sell for them. You're going to destroy this organization, and mark my words, you'll have nothing but complaints and fights and problems.

How can you, do you know of any other company, if they had Eatons and the Bay would get together, fine, you're partners for this, and people are limited, but not one partner. I'm not saying, don't change. If you want a change, I don't think there's any need for a change, if you want a change, why don't you give the same opportunity - do you mean to tell me that TCI is more important than United Way? Does the Minister want to make the statement now? That TCI is more important than United Way? Why can't United Way become a wholesaler also on their own. And why can't the others, why can't the Sports Federation? Aren't they doing something worthwhile? I don't want to place one ahead of the other, I think it's all very good causes. But why are you selecting one, the one that did not participate at first, that did everything to destroy it before it could get going, and you had people that took the chance, that fought, they believe in work hard and they built something strong, now you're letting somebody come in that will destroy that. And that's what's going to happen.

That is going to happen because, if you have seen anywhere where you can give one partner a little more leeway than the other, can you give me an example of that? I am not against them at all. I suppose after this statement, it'll be said, there he goes, he's attacking us. I'm not. But I want everybody treated the same. It's the least you can do by somebody that persevered, that kept it against all kinds of odds, who had worked hard, and now you are saying, you're not equal, your own outfit, we bring somebody in, but they're going to have more of it than you are. It just doesn't wash. It doesn't make sense.

If you want to make, then destroy, disband that Western Canada distributors and let the partners go their way. In fact, cut the partnership and give everybody a

region like is done in Quebec and other places. And maybe that'll help the way they have it, bring in partisan favours and that, and that's not done in Manitoba, and I'm not suggesting that it's done now. But you're going to destroy that. You are getting people who, it is to their advantage, to talk somebody into not selling for Western Canada, and they're assured of one-fourth in that, but sell for them because they get a higher commission. They get more money for that. And I don't think, and I can argue that with anybody, it just doesn't make sense. And I defy the Minister or anybody else to give me an example - maybe they exist but I can't think of any - an example of what there is a partnership, and you're saying to one, well, you, there's a restriction, everybody has rules, but not you, here is your set of rules. Here is your set of rules.

Now, not only are you going to be a partner, that's what a partnership is for. That you join to work together, to try to cut down the expenses. To try to work together and not that kind of competition that you put everything in a pool and work to derive as much as possible. And they are assured of a partnership in that, an equal partnership, but you are saying, well, you're a little better than the others, your organization deserved more than the others, so what are they going to do, they can get the ticket at wholesale and set their own selling force. That was the intent of the Western Canada Manitoba distributors.

If you want to do that, Mr. Minister, why not do it for the others? If you do it for the others, I'm going to keep quiet because everything is fair. But you're getting a latecomer, certainly it didn't help setting up this outfit, and you are saying to them, there's an equal partnership, but here's where you're going to get, we're going to give you an amount of money that it took the other people hard work and that to work, we're going to take that from other group and give it to you. It's our money, you must think it's your money because you're giving it. I'm not talking about what your setting for the future, you have the right to do that. But that money, I don't know where you think you've got the right to use that money and divert it to somebody else.

And you're saying, you're going to sell. And then there's all kinds, I don't want to go into details, you're assuring them, there's another thing, that all the other partners, they could have used that money, they could have that money invested, they have a kind of a fund, what it is it? To protect them if something goes wrong, what's the name of that fund? They don't have to put anything in there, you're making a magnificent gesture, you're telling them that it's their money, they won't share in that. They should have to put one-fourth of that, if they were equal partners. I don't know of any other partnership that would say, okay, you three partners will have to put this money in case something happens, in case it goes belly-up, but not the fourth partner. Now, that is another thing that you're doing.

Another point, and I'm not going to, I think there are enough points, as I say, I'm not against this thing at all, and I think it's a good idea, if it was fair. And if everybody was treated equal. If the people that slugged it out against all kinds of adversity and handicap, if they weren't penalized at this stage of the game. And as I say, why do you select a certain group of people, and I'm not going to name anybody that it could be thought that I'm against them, I'm not. But anyone in that organization, are they more important of the work that the United Way, and I compare it to United way because it is a form of the United Way. You have a precedent there, United Way is the umbrella group for a certain group. And you are saying to them, but this is what you have.

And another point, Mr. Chairman, that you can supervise them to a point, but that doesn't mean a thing. And I had that problem too. Because if you look to an organization and you want to look at all their books, they'll have one line, Promoter - so much money and you can't question that, you can't get that contract. And I think that was a mistake, that was your chance to make sure that you can look into everything. And the way this reads now --(Interjection)-- You have it, you can look at, would you please show it to me and point it out later on in this contract, I'm pleased that I'm wrong in that.

MR. BANMAN: Can I just interject here, on two counts. No. 1, they do have to come up with the funds, I think it's in excess of \$100,000, just to clarify a couple of points here.

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

MR. DESJARDINS: In excess of what's in there now, if there's any future.

MR. BANMAN: No, no, with regard to the amount that has to be put in case of, you know, like a trust fund. So they're going to have to come up with that money and take it out of the retroactive portion to put in there.

MR. DESJARDINS: Right away.

MR. BANMAN: The benefit of this particular agreement, and you know Mr. Chairman, I have certain concerns and misgivings, along with the member on this particular issue. But I think, and I can give him the assurance, that I will do everything that is in my power - and that particular agreement gives me a lot of power - to ensure that that system is not broken down. The benefit of this contract is that everybody that signs or has anything to do with a promoter of any kind, has to file a contract, a written contract, with the Manitoba Lotteries Commission. In other words, if some small group hires someone to sell tickets for them, that contract that they have made with that individual has to be filed with the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, has to be ratified with them, it's on a yearly basis, and the Lotteries Commission can walk in and check those promoter's books through a registered accountant whenever they deem it necessary.

So what is happening here, and there is some give and take in this particular agreement, because before we did not have any control at all over this type of thing. We could be issuing licences through the Lottery Licensing Board, which really had nothing to do with the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, and we had no way of checking on these people or having any proper hold on them on these \$100,000 non-bearer tickets. And all I'm saying is, I appreciate there are some problems. I hope, it is my hope, that this agreement will go in the bottom drawer and that these three groups will work something out and, hopefully, in the future, we will have one group that is working to the benefit of all the different sports, cultural, and social agencies in the province. And that is my hope.

Now, if, - I will give the member the assurance, that if I see the system eroding, I have enough power within this system to make sure that that does not happen. But I think it's an agreement which was arrived at after a lot of serious negotiation, and hopefully will be one which will benefit the province. I have no hesitation in saying that if the system is destroyed, if there is any hint of misappropriation of funds in that, I will be the first to put the clamps on the people. And I have the authority, I believe, in the agreement to do that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments and I am pleased of his assurance. I want to say that I have never gone as far as to say that they would use those funds for something else. That's not what I'm saying at all. And I stand corrected on one point. I still feel as strongly on the other two. But would the Minister please show me, maybe I didn't have a chance to see, where he has this authority, or somebody has the authority to look at all workings of all these groups, including the contracts that they might have with promoters or middlemen or that, could the Minister --(Interjection)-- well, here, could you show it to me on that?

MR. BANMAN: I'll find it for the member.

MR. DESJARDINS: I want it before we finish; well of course we won't finish today, I can assure the Minister of that.

MR. BANMAN: I'll send it back to the member. It's 34 on Page 13, right at the top.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights. Fort Rouge. I'm sorry.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions to ask the Minister, if I may. First of all - and forgive my ignorance on this - is all the money that is going from the government to assist amateur sport lottery

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

money, or is there actual tax money going as well to assist - in amateur sport, that is?

MR. BANMAN: It's a combination of both. There is some in the Estimates and there is some in the Lotteries.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you. The ManPlan Program, I understand that the level of spending in that Program has not increased since about 1967. Has there been a recent increase?

MR. BANMAN: I couldn't tell you exactly, I would have to check for you and see exactly what the. . .

MRS. WESTBURY: My information is that it hasn't increased.

MR. BANMAN: Since 1967?

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, that was the information I was given.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, it didn't exist, I believe, until 1976 or 1977, so. . .

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, obviously I have written something down wrongly then. Okay, I thought 1967 seemed a little early. Could I get an answer to that, perhaps, on Monday, Mr. Minister, whether then it has increased since in fact it was first established? And I wondered how much, for instance, how much assistance would be given to probably our outstanding amateur athlete in Manitoba, Monica Goermann, how much level of assistance would be given to her in one year for her training and travel programs?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, we have been through. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. You know, it is unfortunate the member is only one, and I know that she is working very hard. I have no objection if the Committee wants to revert, but we are now on the Lottery and we finished with that, I think was the understanding. Now I have no objection to help the member at this time, but I don't want this to be a precedent, because we are going to be in trouble.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, I apologize if I am out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on 1.(a) Minister's Compensation.

MRS. WESTBURY: I thought we were on Minister's Salary, and I thought on Minister's Salary we could discuss anything. I realize I have a lot to learn around this place, but that was my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Providing, to the Committee, providing it is not repetitious.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you will tell me if I am being repetitious. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we will try.

MRS. WESTBURY: . . . and if I can go back and read the answers in Hansard, I will glad to when they catch up with us. We are several days behind with Hansard, so that has not been possible for me to do until now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't want to be difficult, and I would extend all courtesy to the member, but if my memory, if I understood

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

right, we had agreed to pass everything including anything with Fitness and Amateur Sport under Minister's Salary, and just stay with the Lottery, that is why I made the statement. But I have no objection at all, especially if it is just a question, as long as we can finish the Lottery. So I have no objection if. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood. Does he have a. . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a brief remark. The total community involvement affiliation in the Lotteries, I have to echo what has been said by the Member for St. Boniface, that although I don't know all the ins and outs of that agreement, I have a great sense of unease about that group being incorporated, and I think that the Minister is going to have to be very vigilant. First of all, I think he was unwise in getting into that deal and secondly, I think that now that it is apparently approved, that he is going to have to watch that agreement very carefully.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will emphasize again, that in dealing in this matter, No. 1, it takes you a whole year to sort of try and get a smattering of knowledge. The Member for St. Boniface has been through the wars of the lotteries from Day One. It is a very explosive thing, the personalities are very intense, and I think the Member for St. Boniface will bear me out. The interesting thing is, you get somebody totally green and appoint them to a position, either on a Board of Directors - if the Board of Directors of some of the other things that I am responsible for would take as intense an interest, I don't know if it is the gaming aspect or what it is about it that really causes very intense feeling with regards to lotteries. I don't minimize the problems that we might have with regards to this particular agreement. I feel that I do have enough control on it right now that if something goes awry, that we can rectify that. . But in dealing with this problem, I hope it will be a resolution to one that has been in place now for the last four or five years, and under those terms we entered the agreement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying is true and I would want to cooperate, as he said I have been through the mill on this, and I certainly wouldn't want to wish even my worst enemy the same problems that I had. Some of things were quite unfair. But my point, and this is our work here and I think the Minister will recognize here, that I hope the contract works. I know that contract could be terminated, it is for a number of years, but what I don't like is that the Minister is starting on the wrong foot on too many things that are not right. You do the best you can and you try to be fair, and still there are problems. Now if you start with this kind of contract, you are going to have nothing but problems - that is my point. And it is a hell of a lot easier to give than to take away. Remember that. And politically, there are certain things that a politician can do and can't do.

Now going back to that point about this, why I didn't understand, and I'm not sure, I'm not a lawyer, but it says, "No contract or agreement between a retail representative and any person, firm or corporation acting on its behalf in the marketing and promotion of tickets". Well, there is wholesale, there is not only retail. Retail would be the last guy on the line that is selling the tickets in the store and things like that, not the middleman, who is a wholesaler.

MR. BANMAN: There are no wholesalers.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, yes, there are wholesalers, TCI is one that is a wholesaler. Well, anyway, I am not a lawyer, the Minister is not a lawyer, maybe they can have another look at it, and if he assures me that they have this authority, I am satisfied. But this is ambiguous, and I am not too sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour.

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

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, Item 13. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, Resolution 112--pass. . .

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Yes, before we adjourned for the dinner hour, I asked the Minister to provide me with some information - I am sure that he took down as notice - and I wonder if I could have those comments now if he has anything to report on those questions that I asked in reference to the Grassy Marsh proposal for construction in that area and in Ste. Rose, when that would be proceeded with, and when does he expect that it will be completed. And also in regard to the problems in the Grandview area, I believe it is, in regard to town water supplies, dams flooding out neighbouring farms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to those questions.

First of all, I would like to answer a question that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland asked a couple of days ago, when he inquired as to the percentage that the provincial grant covered out of the operating expenses for the International Peace Garden. The grant amounts to 12.83 percent of the projected operating expenditures.

In response to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I noticed this morning that I think he has been listening to the Member for Inkster, because he slipped in one of those little debating points this morning, that if allowed to go unchallenged, Mr. Chairman, it might give the impression that something was different than it actually was. He talked about further work on flood protection at Ste. Rose, and I just want to make it understood that this is not further work on the part of the government, this is the first work on the part of the government, because previously, Mr. Chairman, when the town had requested the province to undertake flood protection works for Ste. Rose, they were turned down by the government of which the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was a member. So the town was able to undertake on their own some expenditures, which fortunately was in place and was able to prevent the town from suffering what would otherwise have been very extensive damage this past spring, a year ago. So I just wish to make that clear for the record, Mr. Chairman.

As to the when the work will be completed, I am not certain of that. There is an engineering study which is just now being completed. We will be having discussions shortly with the Turtle River Conservation District to discuss the cost-sharing formula which I outlined to the Committee this morning. I would hope that this project would be able to proceed rather quickly and that a substantial amount of work could be done this summer, because Ste. Rose has a peculiar situation in that they live with the threat of a flood occurring, not only in the springtime, but whenever there is an excessively heavy rainfall in the Riding Mountain. In the fall of 1975 the town suffered extensively from flooding and these people have waited for some time for protection and we hope to be able to get on with it.

As far as the Big Grass Marsh and the Whitemud River Project is concerned, Mr. Chairman, that study was done on behalf of the Conservation District, the Whitemud Conservation District. The report was made to the Conservation District and we will be awaiting some ultimate recommendation from the District. We know that there is a lot of local concern about the recommendation, and that there is by no means full support for it, but in recognizing the authority that the Conservation District has, we must await their final recommendation.

The question was also raised about the Grandview Dam, the flooding situation that has taken place there, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the Honourable Member for Inkster is no doubt an expert on the Grandview Dam situation. There

have been a couple of problems there over the years. One was a question of flooding and the responsibility for it, and that situation went to the Supreme Court, as the Honourable Member for Inkster points out. The problem with the flooding went to the Supreme Court, and that much is settled, Mr. Chairman. The problem with the operation of the dam is one that was simply a matter of whether or not the town was conforming with the terms of their licence as issued by the Water Resources Branch, and we believe that the terms of that licence will be conformed with.

Then, as I mentioned earlier, it previously had been the intention to build a dam to provide a water supply for Grandview, and an agreement had been entered into to do that, but as we got into the engineering details, it became evident that that type of dam was not going to be a viable means of providing a water supply, and some rather extensive engineering studies had to be done to find an alternative. It has been determined that a reservoir is the best alternative, that some of that reservoir will have to be constructed on what is now the highway right-of-way and the construction will therefore have to await the realignment of the highway, the construction of the new highway bridge which is planned there. We hope to be able to get both those pieces of construction under way without too much delay, but it's not going to happen this year.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that should adequately answer the questions the honourable member placed.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much. I thank the Minister for his reply. My understanding on the problem at Grandview, that for many many years the engineering staff had maintained that it wasn't the level of the water above the dam that was really causing the problems, and that was the reason why the problem was never addressed, because of the fact that the engineering staff maintained that that wasn't the cause of the water flooding, but in fact when the water was lowered, for whatever reason, that the lands did drain satisfactorily.

Well I would ask the Minister if he could correct me on that if I'm wrong, and also, if he could advise me of the cost of the study of the Grass River project and if there are any plans for modification or cutting down of that original proposal, which had all the farmers living in the proximity of the Grassy Marsh area quite upset about the extent of this project, the original plans for this project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As those that have been involved with the proposed program in the Whitemud watershed are aware, some of those that maybe should have been involved and aren't aware of, was that the original program involved an expenditure of about \$23 million. There were three meetings held, and at these meetings it was very apparent that the general populace were not in favour of the proposals that were offered. One was the acquisition of about 50,000 acres of prime farm land and doing away with community pasture, etc., etc.

It was quite evident that there was a very strong feeling that the program was a little too rich, and for the edification of the Member for Ste. Rose, it's pretty hard to drive anything through his head - but in any event, there was another meeting held, another proposal advanced, and this one specifically stated that there could be some relief offered from the Big Grass Marsh by putting a ditch across north of Woodside to the lake, controlling the flow that way.

So consequently, Mr. Chairman, I think that there is an understanding at least, or there has been an undertaking by the present government to at least review the situations that existed. I always admire my honourable friends across the way when they come forward so strongly with their programs, and in eight years of government, I don't think that there was one major proposal made on flood relief in the province of Manitoba. If there was, I would like to know where it was, as compared to the previous eight years under the Tory government. As, of course, being good responsible people, being people that do really have the benefits for the people of Manitoba foremost in their minds, our government has started out,

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

and the program advanced by the Minister is quite indicative of what we intend to do. We are reviewing a proposal with the Whitemud watershed, as I stated, No. 1, the first proposal was too rich; No. 2, we are quite prepared to go ahead with the proposal that is acceptable to the people of the area at a cost that possibly the taxpayers of Manitoba can afford, which is another indication that our people do not rush in, helter-skelter, throwing money all over the place. They expect to get benefits for the people and protection for the people.

I am in a position, my constituents are, of probably being in one of the worst flood-prone areas that there are in Manitoba, including the Red River Valley. I'm quite aware of that, and of course my honourable friend from Ste. Rose has a portion of his constituency also involved in that area. But I do feel that the proposal that I received from the Whitemud watershed, it's dated the 11th of March, should receive consideration and probably will be acted upon.

And if it happens that we can go ahead with this particular program, then possibly we can go ahead with some of the other benefits, the environmental benefits that were included in the first program that were just unacceptable to the residents of the area and they're unacceptable because of the cost-ratio on them.

So I would think, Mr. Chairman, with this thought in mind, that the proposal of cutting the Whitemud south of Gladstone right up through the Rat Creek into the marsh, then out, would be No. 1 priority. I'm quite aware of the fact that it is a very expensive undertaking. We are also aware that it could be Step One in a program that would include probably the other benefits as funds become available and as the situation dictated.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that this thing has been reviewed, meetings have been held on it, it was unacceptable. I think the present proposal is within the realm of possibility and it would be one way of getting the action started, and with the accelerating value of farmland and the uncertainty that many of my constituents have had due to the flooding every spring, I think that I would recommend to the Minister very strongly that some action do start that is sensible, sane, and within the realm of the taxpayers and within the grasp of the people that are involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. It is interesting to hear the Member for Gladstone pay so many complimentary remarks on the program for the province of Manitoba on drainage, the overhaul program, and the member, the great Member for Roblin, who doesn't look after his own problems in Grandview. But, Chairman, we have another evidence here of the members of the government, good Conservatives, free enterprisers, lauding the Socialist programs, people doing things collectively for the betterment of all citizens of our province. But again, Mr. Chairman, we see the same thing happening in this department as we saw in the Department of Highways. Over the dinner hour, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased whoever gets drainage, and I'm pleased that Carman will maybe get some help and Ste. Rose will get some help and the little that goes into Lac du Bonnet gets help. I'm pleased with this. But, Mr. Chairman, we see the same thing again as we saw in Highways. The first guys at the trough are Conservatives. They're always the first at the public trough when it comes to Socialist programs.

Mr. Chairman, I took time during the dinner hour, just roughly, and the Minister of Government Services was lauding this great government with all the programs and how it was going to be done. Moving away from the Highways Program and sharing more. In other words, admitting what happened in the Highways Department, and now they were going to share a little more equitably in the drainage. Mr. Chairman, I checked roughly over the dinner hour, I didn't have much time, but I found about 31 projects to be undertaken. I find that of these 31 projects, there's going to be 25 projects in constituencies represented by Conservatives --(Interjection)-- and six out of 31 programs in constituencies represented by the New Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman. Let's look at the dollar values. We find that of the total dollars to be expended - and I'm just using rough figures because we went fast over the dinner hour to come with up - but I find that there is going to be \$3,765,000 will be allocated to Conservative constituencies, and

\$582,000 for NDP constituencies. So again we have another demonstration, a callous attitude of this government using public funds for political purposes.

So I condemned the Minister of Highways on his program as an abuse of his office, and I also accuse the Minister responsible for drainage in this province of abusing his office in the same manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, it is being said once or twice too often, and we are not doing the public that all of us are here to serve a favour by allowing it to go by without at least some suggestion and some appreciation of the simple fact of the matter, that when we are dealing with roads and we are dealing with drainage projects, when we are agricultural projects, yes, because the good people of rural Manitoba in a massive majority way have decided to vote for those people that they know represent their interests, that of course those figures will represent what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is trying to represent. But what is totally wrong, Mr. Chairman, is for his suggestion that there is any callousness or political motivation involved in that. The truth of the matter is when you look at the electoral map of Manitoba and you start from the southwest boundary of Saskatchewan and the US Border, and you look at the seat of Arthur, you look at the seat of Virden, you look at the seat of Birtle-Russell, and you look at the seat of Souris-Killarney, you look at the seat of Roblin, you look at the seat of Swan River, you look at the seat of Lakeside, you look at the seat of Emerson, you look at the seat of Pembina, you look at the seat of Rock Lake, you look at the seat of Dauphin, you look at - Mr. Chairman, are we supposed to ignore all those people? Are we supposed to penalize all those people because this honourable member does a little bit of arithmetic and finds out what he should have found out on the night of the election, that rural Manitoba votes Conservative. And if you are going to build any road, you are going to build it through a Conservative constituency; and if you are going to build any drainage ditch it is going to have to go through a Conservative constituency. And if we build personal care homes, we built two in an NDP constituency and perhaps one, with a great deal of difficulty, in a Conservative constituency.

MR. URUSKI: You haven't built them yet.

MR. ENNS: But you have the commitment, which we never got out of your government.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know I don't want to interrupt the Honourable Minister's Estimates, except that it cannot be left on the record, it cannot be left on the record, you know, this implication, this innuendo. If you really want to talk about tactics and ethics in this House, particularly when we are dealing with the building of drainage ditches, Mr. Chairman, where are we supposed to build the drainage ditches in North Winnipeg? I mean, are they supposed to snake through Burrows, through St. Johns and in through East Kildonan or West Kildonan? Is that where we - are we supposed to --(Interjection)-- Well, has the Honourable Member for St. Johns made a representation to this department, to this government? I will tell you, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, we provided the biggest drainage dollars for his constituency in the building of a 64 million-dollar ditch around this city, a 64 million-dollar commitment of public funds to protect Scotia Avenue and the bigger part of Winnipeg from the devastating floods.

Mr. Chairman, so let it be clearly put on the record, let it be clearly put on the record, that this kind of tactic, you know, will have a reverse effect. It will only have a reverse effect, because the majority of rural people who have shown and who have continued to show their confidence in the Conservative administration will only be prepared to demonstrate that with much more vigour come the next election, because of the kind of statements made by honourable members opposite, because they recognize there is some concern by this government for their needs and because we are concerned about providing better transportation systems throughout rural Manitoba. It is the New Democratic Party that has on numerous occasions gone on record now and said, "don't build roads in rural Manitoba." Last year it was, "don't build any roads with shoulders." That was the official position of the New Democratic Party last year. Now it is, "don't build drainage

ditches and don't improve farm and agricultural land in rural Manitoba; don't build flood protection in Manitoba."

They had eight years. Mr. Chairman, it really boggles one's imagination when you consider that in the '60s, out of a Budget, out of total provincial revenues of some \$300 million, the then Conservative administration found \$64 million to protect 500,000 people in the city of Winnipeg and provide them with flood protection. In addition, we found another \$18 million to build a Portage Diversion; we found another \$20 million or \$21 million to build the Shellmouth Dam to provide total - out of a \$300 million Budget in total. --(Interjection)-- Well, we dedicated those funds with capital amounts, and we were prepared to do that because it was needed.

Mr. Chairman, during the tenure of times, during the eight years tenure of the New Democratic Party administration, when we were dealing with revenues that were in excess of \$1 billion, they never found time in all of those eight years to build one little flood protection measure for the community of Carman. They did not address themselves to the community of Gladstone and Westbourne on the White-mud. They did not worry about the community where their own member sits, Ste. Rose. They did not worry about where their other former member sat, the Member for Gimli, on the Icelandic River. --(Interjection)--

But, Mr. Chairman, you see one of the problems was, they were so busy finding the \$40 million to tinker around and play with model airplanes in Gimli, instead of fixing up a perennial chronic drainage problem. They were so busy with their other social dickering and engineering of creating basket weaving industries in the north that they could not provide these fundamental services, these fundamental services. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Member for Inkster interjects, because this is particularly on a favourite subject that I dealt with. When we talk about having the will to put into the high risk resource industry. You demonstrated in eight years, in eight years, that you did not have the will. You would not provide flood protection; you would not build the roads; and so now, Sir, there is understandably a bit of a catch-up period. There is a bit of a period where some of these long grievances, where these long grievances are being addressed to and they are being addressed to. And I invite the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to continue to label the programs as presented by the Honourable Minister as being political, which is nonsense, which is utter nonsense, as it was nonsense when it was talked about on my colleague, the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Sir, the irrefutable fact simply is this: That if you build a road anywhere in rural Manitoba, you are going to have to go through Conservative constituency; if you are going to build a drainage ditch anywhere in rural Manitoba, you are going to have to go through a Conservative constituency, because that is how those people voted. And that is one of the reasons, by the way - not the only reason, but certainly one of the reasons why they voted that way, because they knew that after waiting for them, and this Minister had the representations, the appeals from the municipalities, from the Flood Committees of Carman, from the Flood Committees of Ste. Rose, on his desk for eight years, but he was too busy. He was too busy with worrying about the greater things in his mind that were of importance.

Well, Sir, successive elections have demonstrated that when rural people want rural problems solved, they have had to turn to the Conservative Party. So now, Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly understood --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster is now talking about fat cats. Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly shown in this House that the kind of program that this Minister has presented has a sense of balance to it. It addresses the recreational parks problems throughout the province. It has and recognizes long-term standing grievances. . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, since the honourable member has chosen the words "fat cats" to me, let it be clear that I was referring to the Honourable Member's statement, that is the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Public Services, with relation to the people who live immediately south of the inlet of the Red River

Floodway. It is he who referred to them as fat cats for whom nothing should be done.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to show you that - where was Paul on the way to, St. Paul on the way to, when he went through his conversion? He was on a road to somewhere, and then he went through a conversion. It is true, the Honourable Member for Inkster is quite true that I made those statements, not in this Chamber. Those are back in the good old days, Sir, if you'll forgive me for a minute, that was the days before Ministers had their own coffee in their offices and we used to, including the media, used to expend most of our time in that lounge, which was set aside for members. That used to be the hub of social activity, Mr. Chairman, before your time in this area, that is where we used to be able to rub shoulders with our political opponents, where the media felt comfortable to be there with us, and were always invited to be there with us, and they would sometimes have the privilege of eavesdropping on the kind of exchanges that would take place when we were having our coffee. We didn't scurry to our offices now. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I really now wonder whether we shouldn't close down that lounge, because nobody uses it any more. But the Honourable Member for Inkster, you know . . . The Member for Fort Rouge has her hands up, maybe we can have some washroom facilities provided in there.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster knows whereof I speak, and indeed some members of the media remember whereof I speak. That, in fact, used to be the kind of continual meeting place during the Sessions. That unfortunately has dissipated for different reasons, but it was in that particular setting that that remark was made. But, Sir, we are all prone to conversion from time to time, and I have been so converted. And I have protected the situation, and we have protected the situation, and we have solved the problem of the Turnbull fat cats by building them a dike.

MR. GREEN: No, you haven't.

MR. ENNS: Yes, we have.

MR. GREEN: They have themselves applied to the City of Winnipeg . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want that on the record, because I have a sneaking hunch that perhaps at some point in these Estimates the honourable member will take a less charitable view when he discusses with the Minister as to how much public money went into the provision of that dam. But he is on record now - at least I am putting him on record now - as having said that they themselves have built that dam around their properties - which, of course, they have done to a large extent. They have decided to pool their \$10,000 maximum grant in a remarkable display of unanimity among the 22 or 23 property holders. They have put that up front as the down payment, if you like, on the dike and we, this government, responded to those chronic problems in this case at the head of the floodgates of the Winnipeg Floodway, and we solved that problem. There will not be ever, anymore, an issue of Turnbull drive in future floods; as, given the opportunity, the communities of Carmen will be resolved from their flood problems; as, for instance, Winnipeg has not had a serious consideration for flood problems any more; as Ste. Rose du Lac will not have flood problems any more - because the Conservative administration cares, because the Conservative administration puts their money where their mouth is when we talk about looking after the real and legitimate needs of people.

Now, if the honourable members want to confuse that with Socialism we have no problems with that. We have no problems with the idea that there are those things that have to be done by the state collectively for the benefit of all. Sir, Mr. Chairman, it was long before the NDP was thought of, it was long before the CCF was born, that Sir Roblin decided in 1908 to nationalize the telephone industry in this province, in 1908, because he said it was a public service that ought to be done. Mr. Chairman, it was long before the NDP ever got into power that a Minister of Agriculture of this administration, of a Conservative administration, said look, the insurance companies simply aren't doing their business, doing their job, so we set up the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation. Long before the NDP

ever got into office, we said the bankers, the private money lenders, aren't doing their job in providing credit for farmers, so we set up the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation. The doctrinaire isn't on this side gentlemen. It isn't on this side, gentlemen, and if the honourable members want to taunt us about being Socialists because we are building a park or we're building a drainage structure, that doesn't bother us at all. The difference is - and this is what ought to be of concern to members, and this is why the New Democratic Party will continue to be essentially an urban party, is because of the kind of speeches the Member for Ste. Rose has just made, because he has essentially been giving the Minister of Transportation and Highways difficulty. He is now attempting to give the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources difficulty because a long overdue recognition of some of their problems, some of the water conservation problems in this province, and if they wish to persist in this, be my guest. But it will guarantee, Mr. Chairman, that there will be on average 22, 23, rural seats back on the Conservative side of the House next election, and you add the natural 12 or 13 or 15 urban seats to that and it will continue, this government in office, for many years to come.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting contribution on the part of the Minister of Government Services. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that one would not want to associate the Minister of Resources with the Minister of Highways, at least I don't think I would want to, because there is quite a margin of difference between the two programs. If you look at the two programs, the spending on highways in Manitoba and the spending of dollars for water drainage or flood protection or whatever, you will find that in one department there was a very meticulous approach taken to make sure dollars didn't slip across boundary lines, constituency boundary lines, and that's the highways department. But, I don't think you can say that about water resources because I think it's fair to say that there is some several hundred thousand dollars of some \$5 million that is going into NDP ridings. So one could not really draw the conclusion that this Minister is behaving in the same fashion as is the Minister of highways, who chose to be very callous about how he was going to treat his responsibilities and how he was going to respond to the legitimate needs of the people of Manitoba.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think if anyone took a close examination of the Highways Department, one would know very quickly or would find out very quickly that just where the boundary lines appear, that's where the dollars stop and that's where the program stops. That, Mr. Chairman, is obvious to see. I would not want to accuse this Minister of the same thing, although I think this discussion arises mainly out of the contribution made by the Member for Roblin, who was trying to grandstand the fact that there are some dollars in NDP constituencies, and that's supposed to be a big thing. Well, they have already convinced themselves, Mr. Chairman, that other departments such as the Highway's Department, have denied dollars, new dollars, to NDP constituencies, so it now has to become something of a signal when you see some dollars in another department in non-Conservative ridings and it gives rise to some commentary and some fun, if you like, on the part of the Member for Roblin.

So for the record, Mr. Chairman, there are several hundred thousand dollars in NDP ridings out of four or five million dollars in total and so we cannot agree with the statement that this Minister is following the pattern set by the Minister of Highways, at least not to the extent.

Now I think it is obvious though that the Minister has undertaken a major policy position with respect to building structures, or channels or whatever for flood prevention, and that in turn sort of adds up the total very quickly when you talk about big drainage projects such as diversions around towns, you are obviously going to spend a lot of money. I'm not going to suggest to the Minister that somehow injects a political bias. I'm really not afraid of political bias in the sense that, as the Member for Inkster already suggested, everything he does in public affairs has to be political. I wouldn't want to attribute some sort of snide approach on the part of this Minister or some callous approach to his responsibilities. I don't think that would be fair. But it's only because of the

arguments made by the Member for Roblin that we have taken up the time of the House on this issue.

Now one of the things that I do want to point however, and the Member for Lakeside talks about drainage having to take place in Conservative ridings. I think I could make a reasonable argument, Mr. Chairman, with the proposition that yes, we drain PC ridings and we flood NDP ridings. One could make that argument based on the geography and based on the representation, Mr. Chairman, because it so happens that the New Democrats represent the basin, so to speak, the catchbasin of all the creeks, and rivers, and channels and drainage programs that flow into them. And so, yes, we happen to be the catchbasin for all of the PC ridings. There is no question about that, Mr. Chairman. So yes, one could make the argument that we drain the PC ridings and we flood the NDP ridings, and I wish the Minister of Government Services was here, because he wanted to flood a whole community up at South Indian Lake with his hydro project. So that was his regard for human considerations in New Democratic Party constituencies, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- No that's right, we didn't. One could make that argument if one wants to be facetious about it, Mr. Chairman.

It just so happens, Mr. Chairman, that as I understand the way the Water Resources Department functions - and I could be corrected and I hope the Minister would correct me if I'm wrong - but it seems to me that the Water Resources Department tends to want to develop drainage programs in sort of what they consider the better land areas, the more productive land areas first. And the consequence of that is, Mr. Chairman, that they are draining from the top of the hill down. And they have progressed downhill instead of progressing uphill. In many instances, I think you will find that this is true. And so as they are progressing from the top down, they are dumping tons and tons of water on the people below, until they complete their project. I think this has happened on a number of occasions, and if I am wrong, I would hope the Minister would correct me.

It seems to me that it might be logical to start draining the top from the bottom first, and so you start with a drainage program in New Democratic Party ridings, Mr. Chairman, and you work your way up the hill. And that way you have a drainage policy that doesn't unfairly interfere with the operations of our farm people and our communities.

MR. EINARSON: Sam, if we can't get rid of you one way, we have to try another.

MR. USKIW: Well, maybe that's the point, Mr. Chairman. But I know that we've had this discussion on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, and I don't know whether the engineers and the policy-makers have yet decided that in every instance they will drain an area from the bottom up, that they will start from the lowest end and work their way, and it may take ten years to complete the project. And you know, when it takes that long there's a real push and desire on the part of some people to do the reverse, because they feel the land upstream is much more productive and better we improve it first, sort of thing, and then you end up aggravating an already bad situation downstream. So if one wants to have a degree of fun and humour on this one, then one could easily make that argument, Mr. Chairman, for whatever it's worth.

Now, the Member for Lakeside went on to suggest that out of a 300 million-dollar budget, they were able to find \$60 million for the floodway and \$18 million for the Portage Diversion and several million for other construction projects in Manitoba, which you know, is a bit of nonsense, Mr. Chairman. Because the fact of the matter is, that some of it was federal money; the other thing is it's capital supply money; it wasn't current dollars; it wasn't that they squeezed out \$100 million out of a 300 million-dollar budget on a current basis; we are still paying for it. Oh yes. The New Democrats had to continue paying for it when they assumed the responsibilities of government over eight years. It's not paid for yet. So there's no magic about capital spending, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, the Minister may build hundreds of millions of dollars worth of drainage works in this year's program, with capital supply, and who is to stop him if that was his decision, and that was the will of the government. But that doesn't mean, Mr. Chairman, that there is some magic to it, that somehow they are better money managers and they are able to squeeze out such a huge program out of their limited

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

budget, it doesn't mean that at all. It just means that they impose a higher debt load on the people of Manitoba, that's all it means. And all capital projects have that impact.

And you know, the Member for St. Johns the other day was pointing out that fact, that notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative Party in 1977 was outraged at the per capita debt in Manitoba, only two and a half years ago it was quite an outrage that we had a per capita debt of some \$3,000-odd dollars per person in Manitoba, but we now are around \$4,000 plus. Two years later, that no longer is a problem. In the minds of my friends opposite, a per capita debt situation which is about eight or \$900 million greater than it was two years is no longer a problem. So that's the substance of their contribution to the political process, Mr. Chairman.

It is a con job, and the former Leader of the Liberal Party used to refer it to just that. He said politics was a con job. I think the PCs on the other side demonstrate very well that he may be quite right.

Mr. Chairman, this morning there were a number of questions that were put to the Minister and I was hoping that he would be in a position to give us some information on the hotel in Grand Beach. Perhaps the Minister has that information.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to rise further in this matter, but after the vicious, blistering attack that we got from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I thought there are some things that have to be corrected. I thought if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose had kept his cool today and attacked us in a quiet, easy-going manner, which he sometimes does in the House, I wouldn't have risen to my feet this afternoon. But the viciousness of the words and the outright attack that he came out with, I have to rise on my feet and ask him real quickly, and I think we can settle this in the committee this afternoon. We'll just withdraw the Ste. Rose project, because he is violently opposed to it, he doesn't want it, and there are many jurisdictions this province can use that money and that project. We are in committee here, we have a Chairman, and if the honourable member will rise to his feet, we very quietly can withdraw that sum of money and spend it some place else, in my constituency, or some other area of the province.

I hate to see us imposing projects and development on his constituency he doesn't want, he's so violently opposed to. I think, in committee, that's what we are here for. To not do anything that members are opposed to if we possibly can. The tremendous manner, the way he came out of the chute today on these Estimates, I became very, very alarmed, and I'm sure that the Minister and the government, and none of us over here in no way, shape or form, want to impose a drainage problem on his constituents without his permission. He likely will rise to his feet and tell us later on, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that he doesn't feel that we should proceed and we'll back off.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet --(Interjection)-- when I'm finished. I like to - and especially for a lot of the new members in the Chamber, of certain things that happen from time to time. I did have the unique privilege of having the Minister of Highways, the former one from their government, build highways, pave them, right up to my constituency boundary, Provincial Trunk Highway No. 20, paved it right up to my boundary, then gravel. And then that other - I'm not sure about the PR that goes from Gilbert Plains to Ethelbert, comes right up to my boundary, paved, and then gravel, especially for the new members to know that things weren't always as good as the members opposite thought they should be.

Mr. Chairman, I would very much like the Minister to, if he could, give us more details on the project that's in the Estimates for the people in Ethelbert municipality, the development on the Fishing River. This is a project that's been waiting for many years. I see an item of some \$230,000, and just for their records so that we could send a message out and elaborate what's going to take place, I would be most grateful if the Minister could give us a little more detail so that I

could send it out to the municipalities and the people in the area who have been waiting for years for development of the Fishing River.

Unfortunately the Deputy Speaker is not in his Chair this afternoon. He has a tremendous drainage problem at Manicino, and I don't see that in the Estimates, maybe it'll come next year or the year after. Maybe the Minister could - it's been something that the Deputy Speaker has been waiting for a long time, some kind of a drainage project at Manicino. Maybe we could spend a moment on that. Maybe not next year, it certainly will be looked after after the next provincial election when we'll be re-elected. I'm sure we'll look after the Manicino problem then.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member said he would respond to a question, so I simply want to suggest to him that I'm sure he doesn't want to leave erroneous remarks in Hansard. I'm sure he wouldn't want to be reported as to his interpretation of what the Member for Ste. Rose said. Unless, Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong with the acoustics in this Chamber - and, you know, I've not had a problem up until now - but I didn't hear the Member for Ste. Rose suggest that he didn't want any work done in Ste. Rose, as the Member for Roblin alleges that he said. So, Mr. Chairman, on the contrary, my understanding is that the Member for Ste. Rose was complaining that there wasn't sufficient funds in certain areas of the province. So, perhaps the Member for Roblin didn't hear correctly, and if he didn't, I don't think he would want to leave an untruth in Hansard, Mr. Chairman. So I would give him an opportunity to correct that.

MR. DEPUTY MINISTER: The Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: As the committee sat this afternoon, the Member for Ste. Rose stood at his place and told us about all the research he'd done during the dinner hour and came back with some figures and facts that he was being abused, or the people were being abused, and he came out with a very vicious, blistering attack on members that were sitting over here, and the Minister. I can only assume one thing from the way he rules in his place and the remarks, that he was opposed to the project. He didn't come out and say, I'm not going to take it, but the attitude of him, and after having done all his research at the noon hour and the way he came out of the chute just attacking everybody, I can only assume one thing . . . he doesn't want the project to proceed.

MR. DEPUTY MINISTER: The Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather interesting debate, because I know that one could almost put oneself in the position of discussing the social assistance grants. I can very well recall the Member for Roblin talking about the minimum wages being too high and about social assistance grants being too high and people getting too much money, but at the same time, taking the same position as the Member for Lac du Bonnet, just ask him a question about - well, despite the fact that you say that they're too high and that there's too much public largess, and that the taxpayer is being imposed upon to give money to lazy people, the Member for Roblin was always very quick to claim, on behalf of any of his constituents who had a problem, their rightful share of public assistance. I don't think the member will deny that, and it's more to his credit that I am saying it. So, for the Member for Ste. Rose to be suggesting that perhaps money is being spent in a way which is not right, it's not to say that he should not try for his constituency to have his proper share, and if the Member for Roblin regards it as a contradiction, then I ask him to refer to his own position.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is even more bizarre about what is being said, let us assume that somebody came here from outer space and he wound up in this Legislature in the last two hours. And he said that on one side of the House there are a whole group of people who are saying that we should tax the taxpayer, gain in a bunch of money and then pay out for the purpose of helping individuals who are having trouble with their land so they can make more money to give them taxpayers' money to improve their individual position. That what is the money now being

spent for? The natural condition of the land is such that, given normal precipitation or heavy precipitation or low precipitation, there will be more or less water on the land and it will be able to be used more or less effectively in a particular year for the growing of crops, for the purpose of getting income for the person who lives on that land.

And what is being suggested, Mr. Chairman, is that the state get together, tax the workers, the doctors, the lawyers, the miners, the plumbers, the shopkeepers; get a pool of money, bring it into consolidated revenues and then pay it out for the benefit of the Member for Springfield, the Member for Roblin, and for his constituents, on the basis that their land is normally sick, that under normal conditions their land is sick and that the state has to pay money so that their land should be more healthy. And there is one side of the House that is arguing that the taxpayer is responsible for this sickness in the individual's condition, and the other group of taxpayers are saying, if you are going to do it, please do it all over. And then the Member for Lakeside says that some of the taxpayers on this side of the House are suggesting, don't do it at all, that this is an individual responsibility. Not that it was ever said, but he is suggesting that there are people on this side who say, "Why should the state do for these people what they should be doing for themselves?" And this person from outer space would say, Mr. Chairman, "Those on the left-hand side of the House facing from the Speaker's gallery, they are what I have read about as being socialists. The ones on the right hand side of the House, they are what I have read about as being Conservatives," Mr. Chairman.

Since when is this group of people, and what are the circumstances under which they come in and brag that they will spend the taxpayers' money for the well-being of individual citizens in order to put them in a better condition than nature has put them in by itself, and saying that we spent more, we will deal more, we will raise more taxation, and we will give it to this group of citizens.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the syndrome of damn socialism which I experienced when I was the Minister of Mines. I had all of the representatives from that side of the House, at that time, the Member for Morden, and my friend, Mr. Henderson, the Member for Roblin, the Member for Emerson, before it was Mr. Derewianchuk, all saying, "Why are you asking the taxpayers to get together a pool of money for the purpose of dealing with sick children, of dealing with old age people who need help, for the purpose of maintaining an ordinary living? Why are you asking the taxpayers to deal with the healthy state of minds, to deal with mental illness, to deal with a person who is stricken with cancer, a person who is stricken with other types of problems, a person who doesn't have a decent house to live in? Why is that something which you say the taxpayer should be responsible for? That's the responsibility of the individual. The individual gets scarlet fever in 1935; that's not society's problem, that's his problem. If he goes to a hospital and can't pay for it, put a lien on his house; that's Conservatism. But if my land will only produce 30 bushels to the acre and it will only do that nine out of ten years and I have a tenth year when there is water on the land, you get all those workers to raise taxes so that my land will be dry ten years out of ten; that's real socialism, Mr. Chairman.

That's the kind of socialism that I would like to see on this side of the House more often, because they are never embarrassed about it, never. The welfare assistance that those people demand from the state, they take with pride, they take with arrogance. But when it is suggested on behalf of the the urban poor, on behalf of the working people who find themselves in conditions which society has made it impossible for them to get a clean living, on behalf of the ill, on behalf of the mentally impoverished, on behalf of the aged impoverished, they say no. On behalf of land, which is owned by an individual Conservative, they are the most doctrinaire Socialists, the most arrogant Socialists, the most totalitarian Socialists, the most taxation-conscious Socialists, that you will find anywhere. And I wish that person from outer space would have been able to see the debate that took place in this House about an hour ago when the Conservatives were bragging about the money that they will spend and that they will tax the people of this province for to pay for an individual's land so that it can be dry ten years out of ten instead of nine years out of ten.

Mr. Chairman, we never refused it, and I went to the people of the Inkster constituency and said we have a responsibility, a social responsibility, to deal

with conditions outside of this urban area. I believe that the rural people have a social responsibility to deal with conditions inside the urban area. But that's not the attitude that's taken on the other side by those people who speak hypocritically about using taxpayers' money for the benefits of individuals.

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

MR. GREEN: No, he has a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question? Will the Honourable Member for Inkster permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. FERGUSON: Would the Honourable Member for Inkster say that the taxes have gone up under the present government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the amount of taxation that comes into the Provincial Treasury for the last, since the Conservative government has taken power, have increased by at least \$250 million over what used to come into the Treasury when the New Democrats were in power. And the rate of taxation, Mr. Chairman, in connection with motor vehicle tax, has increased by two cents a gallon. The sales tax went up by two percent to five percent, and I use that advisedly. I use that as a trick, Mr. Chairman, and you know who taught me that trick? The Conservatives - because they said it went down from five percent to two percent. So during the Conservative regime it went up from two percent to five percent. What taxes went down? The taxes that went down are the tax on somebody who inherits a half-a-million dollars. He's in trouble. Those taxes went down.

There have been minor changes in the taxation, but the amount of taxes that have been collected by the Provincial Treasury, which is the standard by which our tax increases used to be measured, because we never increased taxes, Mr. Chairman. In the eight years of government, the rate of taxation in the province of Manitoba went down. Every time there was an increase in one form of tax, there was a reduction in another form of tax. They said we increased the income tax, only to reduce the premiums, and the income tax brought in less than the premiums. They say we increased another tax only to provide a property tax credit which paid out more than we took in. But the geniuses in the Conservative Party, they said the provincial government used to spend \$350 million, it now spends \$700 million, your taxes have gone up by \$250 million. That was your measuring rod. We used to spend \$1,250,000,000, you are now spending \$2 billion. Your taxes have gone up by \$800 million. Excuse me, let's take the figures, \$600 million. And what you have used the taxes for, and what you say you will use them for, is that you will not. You will collect taxation.

You could have a balanced budget if you eliminate your drainage, eliminate your water works, eliminate your highways. You could have a balanced budget. You could be true, blue Conservatives. You could walk in and say, we have no taxes. We say that the people who want to go from Brandon to Minnedosa, let them find a way of getting there. That's rugged individualism. Eliminate it! You could say - and by the way what I'm saying is not hypothetical. I believed that there should be a water program. I believed that - sure, there is a difference in emphasis. If my friend says, Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- You don't like the answer to the question? Do you want another one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. Would the member agree also that the increase in the gross national product has had some bearing on what the increase in the tax revenue has been? Would he also not agree that the Conservative government did reduce two percent personal income tax, one percent on corporate tax, also did away with succession duty and gift taxes, which was a very punitive measure which was destroying the family farms, the small businesses. It was also leading to the

fact that in one year there was an estimation of \$100 million that was shipped out of the province of Manitoba because of your taxation methods

MR. GREEN: I'll try to remember the order in which the thing was posed. As to whether the gross national product is increased, Conservatives have said for eight years, you do not take that into account. They have said for eight years sitting on this side of the House that you do not take into account inflation, and you do not take into account gross national product. All you say is that your expenses have gone up from \$300 to \$600; your revenues have gone up from \$300 to \$6 million. That's an increase in taxes.

So by, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member after eight years has learned arithmetic. It was never said from that side as with regard to the corporate taxes. Mr. Chairman, the corporate taxes have gone --(Interjection)-- The corporate taxes, all of the changes that you have referred to in corporate taxes, I will show the honourable member that they have been made up for in another form of taxation. Is the honourable member aware that the . . . --(Interjection)-- Well you asked the question. Do you want an answer? Is the honourable member aware that all of the increases that the elimination of the estate tax, which he has talked about, which has helped those people who have inherited \$500,000, was immediately upset even before it was done. The Minister of Government Services said that he was going to take two cents on gas and put it into consolidated revenues. Two cents on gas into consolidated revenues. This is \$8 million. It is seven to eight. The estate tax was seven to eight.

So you are saying --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? No the estate tax was seven or eight, too. It was almost identical. Excuse me, it was almost identical. So every time a worker from the packing houses, a minor in Thompson, a poor person on welfare, a doctor, a lawyer, a fire fighter, a policeman, a plumber, a student, goes to the gas pumps and pays two cents more for his gasoline, he makes it easier on this poor fellow who's inherited a half-million dollars and has got to pay some taxes on it. I do not call that a decrease in tax.

The other decreases that you have talked about - every time a citizen of the city of Winnipeg puts an additional, it's at least 15 cents more since they came into power, 15 cents more into that Transit box, that is 30 cents a day, that is \$90 a year, he pays for, the corporate guy, who says, I've got another \$400 with which I can go to Florida. Every time he puts it into the toll box, and it's the Conservative government who said that they will not maintain the freeze on transit by using general taxes to put into the transit, they have made it possible every time and I wish the workers of the province of Manitoba and the housewives and the students and the children and the other people who use the transit know that every time that they have privilege of depositing that 15 cents on the way home and on the way back, they make it possible for the small businessman or the big businessman to have another \$300 for which to pay his fare to Florida in the wintertime, and I don't criticize that fare to Florida.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would like to apologize to the honourable member . . .

MR. GREEN: I'm answering your question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I would like to apologize to the honourable members for having left the Chamber to go to the washroom. On my return, when I had left we were on Acquisition and Construction of Physical assets, and when I returned - I'm just trying to follow the debate very closely - to the Honourable Member for Inkster - and it doesn't appear to be from what it was when I left.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, you're quite right. I was distracted by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, who asked me a question, and I tried to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the honourable member to please - we are on Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that I believe in adolescence, I believe in adult - don't get me wrong, I believe. I believe there is a responsibility on all of us, a social responsibility, to deal with some of the conditions that the Minister is dealing with. I find it astonishing, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable members cannot see beyond the tips of their noses, to realize that that social responsibility, if it can extend to sick land, it can extend to a sick body; it can extend to an unfulfilled mind; it can extend to needed recreational facilities. They have never been able to see that, and I find it astonishing that we are sitting in the House, arguing the question, and hearing these people argue, "We spent more than you spent," because they were the ones who said, "We won't spend." They were the ones who said, "We won't spend." Now, I tell the Honourable Member for Roblin, this may shock him, and I hope the Minister will correct me if I'm wrong, but it was the case when I was the Minister, that the province of Alberta, a Conservative province, pays nothing for drainage. The province pays nothing for drainage. They are too conservative. You know what they say, "If there is drainage, it will be levied against the land that is improved by the drainage." They use it, as we in the city, a local improvement. There is no public support for drainage. None whatsoever.

And, I believe that it is true, and this I am less sure of, in the province of Saskatchewan, but it's certainly true in the province of Alberta, that it's a local improvement. Here is a man, he may be a millionaire. His land is good nine years out of ten; he wants it good on the tenth year, he pays the local improvement, they put in the drainage, and his land is good. That's Conservatism. --(Interjection)-- I wonder. Well, in Manitoba, when the New Democrats are in power, they are screaming, "Why aren't you spending more money on drainage?" And we maintained a drainage budget. I will admit that I would not, for the municipality of Carman, say that I am going to make a flood program in that area which I would not be prepared to do for every area that has a similar condition. Now, the Minister has said, he is willing to do it for that area, even though it will throw out of kilter what he is prepared to do in other areas. And you know, the Member for Springfield, he's got the same problem, it's not only one community, it's not only Carman, it's a whole area on the east side of the Red River. I want the Minister to know that we're not going to complain about trying to assist people, but we believe that people should be treated equally, and that it is not the case, as Orwell says, that people will be treated equally but some people from Carman are more equal than others, because that's what they wanted. And that's what we would not do. It's not as if we we not prepared to deal with it, but we are not prepared to say that the people in Carman have a privileged position within this province with regard to the tax dollar that is collected from all of the people of the province of Manitoba.

And when the Minister starts to do that, I really think he is holding them off, because they said, immediately there's going to be a flood program for Carman. It hasn't come yet. The scientist that gave us the statistics, I presume we're acting as objective scientists, and if the same statistics are given, Mr. Chairman, and this guy, this Minister, gives money to Carman, then people throughout the province, in all constituencies, New Democratic Party and provincial, it is one of the areas of less problems in terms of number of years that they can be subjected to flooding. I think the Minister's own constituency is more of a problem than Carman. I think Souris is more of a problem than Carman. I think it is.

And if you are going to start basing it on those statistics, Mr. Chairman, all we're going to insist on is that be based on that way throughout the province, and that it is not a special privilege for a squeaky wheel from that particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 13--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps I should respond to the last few comments of the Member for Inkster. Some of his earlier comments I don't think I'll bother to deal with. We've heard them a number of times.

I find it rather amusing to see the Member for Ste. Rose applauding the last comment about special treatment for Carman, since we have just spent part of today, Mr. Chairman, discussing a flood protection program which I said would be extended over the years to many communities in the province, and that Ste. Rose is

one of the communities to which it's already being extended. Either the Honourable Member for Inkster wasn't here and didn't hear it, or he doesn't understand it, but in fact that's the case. I don't really think that it's arrogance, Mr. Chairman, to come before this House and ask for money to provide for flood protection for the people of this province. That's what the major portion of the water control moneys are for, flood protection. It's not agricultural drainage. The major part is for flood protection.

Now, let the Honourable Member for Inkster stand and tell the people of this province that that's arrogance on the part of our government, to come before the people and ask for that kind of money. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, he is very good, he is very, very good at making something appear to be something that it is not. And when he talks - and we can go back in the record, and you'll see the figures thrown out, the global amount of money, not the 1.6 that's devoted to drainage.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose came back into this House this afternoon and embarked upon an attack on the water control capital program, Mr. Chairman. I was surprised at that, really, because I knew why the honourable gentlemen wanted the program, why they wanted the capital program to be raised from the end of the Estimates up to the middle, and why they asked for maps. I am quite aware of the reasons they asked for that, Mr. Chairman, and I provided them with more detailed information than they ever provided to the House when they were in government, because I knew that the projects that we're asking for money for are based on some kind of balanced need. And it really came as a surprise to me to see the Member for Ste. Rose come out of his corner like somebody had just put a porcupine in his trunks, when after being in government for the years they were, Mr. Chairman, facing the problem that they did in Ste. Rose, and not being able to deal with it, and we have dealt with it, and he attacks us.

I'd spend longer on it, Mr. Chairman, except that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think to his credit - and I assume he is speaking more for the members on that side when he acknowledged that this was a fair, balanced distribution of the capital program.

I must make a comment also in defense of what my colleague, the Minister of Government Services, said, because I believe that his comment was perhaps misinterpreted when he talked about the commitment to the Winnipeg Floodway, and the Portage Diversion and the Shellmouth Dam at a time when the budget was \$300 million, and he was simply pointing out the scale of that flood control project which the government committed to at the time. They committed to a package that I suppose was something in the neighborhood of 30 percent of the annual budget of the government. If we were to commit to a flood control project today of that magnitude with a \$2 billion budget, we would be committing to a \$600 million flood control project. I think the Honourable Minister of Government Services was simply providing that to give some perspective to the nature of the decision that was taken when Winnipeg was provided with some flood protection.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet asked about the Grand Beach Hotel. The amount of money involved to settle that was \$14,500, paid to a Mr. Micay. He was evidently the holder of a mortgage on the property, and in order for the . . . --(Interjection)-- I am advised he had a mortgage, and in order for the government to be able to acquire title to the property it was settled for \$14,500, on the advice of the Attorney-General's Department. That payment was made over a year ago, and I understand that it is only just recently that the title has finally been acquired.

The Honourable Member for Roblin asked about a couple of situations, one is the problem on the Fishing River, which we refer to the information provided, and the members will see that we have been able to allocate an amount of money to deal with that problem this year. Unfortunately the Manicino situation which the Member for Roblin raised on behalf of the Chairman is not included in this year's program.

I should comment on what the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet said about the drainage starting at the upper end and draining down. That has happened, there have been a lot of unco-ordinated efforts at drainage, I think to a great extent because of the provincial waterways system which divides the jurisdiction between the municipalities and the province, and at times the province has proceeded with the portion of a drain on the understanding that municipalities would proceed with

theirs, and it hasn't happened, and vice versa, the municipalities have gone ahead and the province hasn't been in a position to provide the drainage further down. I have been involved in the past several months, on a number of occasions, in having discussions with municipal people and talking about a new sort of concept for water management districts that would put the authority for management of water under one jurisdiction, basically a local jurisdiction, so that we could get away from the kind of jurisdictional disputes that we are constantly having which don't serve the taxpayers well when they approach one level of government and they say "No, that's a provincial responsibility," and they go to the province and the province says "No, that might show as a third order waterway on the map but it hasn't been designated as a third order waterway, and therefore it is not our responsibility."

We have been having these discussions, and I intend to have more detailed discussions with the municipal people at the regional meetings during the first part of the summer, in which we are going to talk about this new kind of concept, and a cost-sharing arrangement that would make it work. We will look at a concept that is more along the lines of what the Honourable Member for Inkster is talking about too. We are looking at the possibility that the person whose land benefits from agricultural drainage can at least pay a significant amount of the capital cost of providing that drainage, because it is possible to identify the lands that benefit from drainage. When it comes to flood control, it is somewhat of different situation, and of course that becomes more of a public responsibility. I hope that we'll be able to, in co-operation with the municipal governments, develop a more workable water management system than we presently have.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I acknowledge the next speaker, if I could just interrupt for a minute, I would like to point out to the Honourable Members the gallery on my left, where we have 14 students from Belcourt School. This school is located in the Turtle Mountain Chippewa Indian Reservation of North Dakota. There are 14 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing and three adults, under the direction of Mrs. Barbara Kelly, and I would ask the honourable members to join me in welcoming this group here this afternoon.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman I would like to further pursue the acquisition of the hotel in Grand Beach. This Mr. Micay or Mackay or whoever he might be - is he an individual, or is he a member of a corporation, or party to a corporate structure that owned this particular facility? Is it a company or an individual, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RANSOM: Well, the best information I have with me at the moment is I would judge that he is acting as an individual, but I can confirm that or get the correct information.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that was a piece of property that was in, or the owners were in some difficulty for some period of years, and I happen to have some knowledge as to who the principals were. I am at a loss to understand the value which was paid for that property, namely \$14,500.00. Was that an appraised value by the Land Acquisition Branch? Is it based on the structure being refurbished, rebuilt, remodelled, or is it based on the theory that the structure would be demolished? Was that the market value, in other words, is what I really want to know. If the structure was burnt, which I understand it was, I believe it virtually had no market value, it sat there for quite a number of years without being utilized. I believe there were - well the last I recall, Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago, or three of four years ago, there were something like \$20,000 or \$30,000 of outstanding municipal taxes against that property, and I would certainly like to know what position the municipality finds itself in because of the change of ownership.

MR. RANSOM: The tax situation has been resolved with the action recently taken to remove the park from the municipality. On agreement with the municipality, the back taxes owing and so on, were settled. The amount of money that the

municipality had had to pay to the school division on school tax was involved as well.

My understanding of this, Mr. Chairman, would be that there was a mortgage to the extent of \$35,885.31 outstanding, and that the mortgage prevented the province from obtaining title to the buildings and contents, which the province required before they could embark on any new course of action there, and that after some negotiation with the person in question, it was on the advice of the Attorney-General's Department that rather than becoming involved in a court battle to try and resolve this thing, they recommended that a settlement be made for an amount of \$14,500.00.

MR. USKIW: Well Mr. Chairman, I am getting more and more intrigued by the answers given to the House by the Minister. The Minister suggests that the tax situation was resolved by a change in the government's parks policy which was, in essence, to remove an area out of the municipal tax jurisdiction, and bring it into the area of provincial jurisdiction, under the provincial park system.

That policy decision was only made in recent months, Mr. Chairman, but I do know that there were substantial arrears of taxes owed to the Municipality of St. Clements. Four or five years ago, I believe, they amounted to \$20,000 or \$30,000, and I would hazard a guess that if they were not paid, they were accumulating at a very rapid rate, that today it could be \$50,000 of tax arrears. And I hope that the Minister isn't suggesting to us that with a stroke of a pen, the municipality lost that kind of money because of a policy change in the department re parks policy.

MR. RANSOM: I hesitate to speak about actual numbers involved, Mr. Chairman, because I don't recall them precisely, but no, the municipality didn't lose that amount of money at one stroke of the pen. I believe this is the situation where they had undertaken court action to try and recover the taxes, and they were unable to recover taxes. So in effect, in arriving at the settlement with the municipality, the province has in fact paid to the municipality an amount of money, I believe - I will have to check the details - it was equal to the school taxes that the municipality naturally had to pay to the school division. I would be happy to get the details of it for the honourable member. I didn't really expect to be involved in this kind of discussion under the Capital Program.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, it seems now that we have an expenditure of \$14,500 for a facility that had no market value, that wasn't able to be sold for several years in the private domain. And on top of that, we have the Minister indicating to us that they have also absolved the owners of the responsibility for school taxes. Now, the tax laws in this province with respect to municipal taxation are very clear as I understand them, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the municipality could have realized this asset on a tax sale without any cost to the province of Manitoba. And if that is incorrect, I would like to know from the Minister why that is not so. My understanding is, well I have to assume that the properties are on park lands, and perhaps that is why they cannot do that, but perhaps the Minister would want to clarify that point.

MR. RANSOM: Again, this is my understanding of the situation. The previous owners have not been absolved of any responsibility. The municipality has a judgment outstanding against them, but there's no money, so they can't get their taxes from the previous operators and the municipality can not sell land if it's owned by the province. Naturally they don't have the same leverage on the person to collect their taxes that they do from privately-owned land within their municipality. Now that's a generality. In this situation here, I will have to get some more detailed information to be certain that I don't provide the member with any information that's not completely correct.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why it was then difficult for the municipality, if they have a judgment against the previous owners, why the moneys, the \$14,500, that the province is willing to pay for the asset, did not go to the Municipality of St. Clements? If there was a judgment, I would assume that

that would be a matter of course that they would receive that money to cover their taxes.

MR. RANSOM: It's getting into a legal sort of a question, Mr. Chairman. I am not in a position to answer it. It sounds like a good question to me and I will certainly get the answer for the honourable member.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is going to determine the answers to those questions, would he undertake to bring us an answer to another question, and that is, would he advise the House as to who the principals are in the company that was the owner and the owner from whom the province purchased the asset? Was there one owner, and who was the owner? Is it a company, and who are the principals of the company? What are the interested parties with respect to the ownership and the disposition of this asset, Mr. Chairman?

I didn't hear the Minister respond whether he's prepared to undertake that. The Minister nods that he is. I assume that that is. . .

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll get the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister also advise as to whether the municipal taxes on that property had been forgiven? I understand that the school taxes had been paid to the municipality. Is that also the case with the municipal portion?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind getting the information for the members, but this really isn't a capital item that we're into now. We're getting back into the Parks section, which we've already passed, and we had the staff here who could have helped provide some of this information quickly.

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, just briefly on some of the answers though that the Minister has given up until this point. He indicated that this property was transferred out of the jurisdiction of the Rural Municipality of St. Clements and into, I take it, the jurisdiction of the provincial park. Could he advise as to whether there was other property involved in this transfer, that is, is it only the hotel property that is now outside of the jurisdiction of the R.M., or is it also other property in that area, and is there a general rationale for the transfer?

MR. RANSOM: Yes, there is other property, Mr. Chairman, and that's an item that we dealt with when we were discussing the Parks expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.--pass. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to rise and make some comments with respect to, firstly, in the area of water control and drainage, and I thank the Minister for providing the extent of the information that he has in terms of the maintenance program and the cost figures of the various maintenance of construction programs that he gave the members this morning.

As well, I wanted to speak about the program with respect to water control, flood damage prevention and the like, but before I go into those comments, I wanted to ask the Minister, specifically in his maintenance program under the Interlake Region he shows two maintenance programs on Watershed 32, which I presume is the Icelandic River, and Watershed 3, which is the Fisher River, if my maps are correct, and what is the detail of the works that are proposed in those two watersheds.

MR. RANSOM: Is the honourable member referring to the Maintenance Program?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. RANSOM: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to get the information for him. I have distributed this information in response to the question that was asked when we were dealing with maintenance. We are now dealing with the capital items.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked specifically, there is an amount on Watershed 32, the Icelandic River, an amount of \$71,500, built in as maintenance on that Watershed. The Minister has had delegations from the Village of Riverton, the R.M. of Bifrost, which represent people living in the Riverton area. And the Minister has had correspondence from myself on numerous occasions dealing with resolutions passed by both the R.M. of Bifrost and the Village of Riverton, raising their concerns primarily with respect to spring flooding and the Village of Riverton when the ice flows come down the Icelandic River and lodge themselves against the railway bridge. In the village, the water seems to back up, and last year the school and a number of residences to the south of Riverton were flooded, because during the 1975 flood, the diking system in the area of Riverton would be that portion on the east side of the Icelandic River towards No. 8 Highway, towards PTH No. 8, a distance of approximately a mile to a mile and a half. As a result, the water backs up and has caused flooding of, I believe - I stand to be corrected, but I think approximately a dozen residences besides the high school in the Village of Riverton.

The reason that I asked for the breakdown on maintenance, I thought that the Minister may have the details of that expenditure, because that amount of \$71,000, certainly a portion of that, had it been under maintenance, could have been used for some dyke protection. And if that's not in there, I would like to ask the Minister what action the department intends to take in respect to this area. I know there have been suggestions made by the municipality that possibility of a drain, sort of an off-shoot off the Icelandic River, below the Village of Riverton, be constructed to take excess flows. I think it's probably a distance of about two miles, maybe slightly more, to the river; maybe not even that, it's maybe approximately a mile and a half to two miles - for a set-up control works to allow water to not enter the village but bypass the village through a kind of a diversion from the Icelandic River.

Are there any, not estimates, but any recommendations or studies going on in the department to look at this area. We know that extensive work on the Icelandic River through the FRED Program were undertaken over the last ten years or better, and this area now is very leery and is feeling the effects of sudden spring thaws. The water, as I understand it, although it causes the problem, is really basically not the problem, because it is the ice that jams up at the structures in the village that causes the backup of the water and the flooding. Could the Minister comment in that area?

I notice as well, Mr. Chairman, there are funds provided in the Capital Estimates for construction work on Ross Creek within the R.M. of Rockwood. I raise this matter and I ask the Minister what work is contemplated with respect to the, I think there are four artesian wells that were dug in the vicinity of Ross Creek or in the vicinity east of No. 7 Highway in the lower area in what is known as the bog area, and these wells, there are grave concerns being raised in the Gunton area and in the Teulon area, that these four wells that have been drilled a number of years ago, are lowering the water table in the upper reaches because of the escarpment that is in the Gunton area. I believe there must be a drop of some, and this is a guesstimate, 70 to 80 feet between the elevation of land that Gunton and the low bog area, and the wells that have been dug in the Ross drain area are flowing continuously and there are grave concerns raised by farmers; No. 1, because of the water table that seems to be dropping west of that area, and also the constant flow in the area I believe has caused some difficulties as a result of these four wells.

I would like to know what the department have in mind with respect to this, whether there have been any studies done, because the concerns appear. If there is some validity to the concerns that have been raised, there are some serious implications to the source and supply of water for the people to the west of where these wells have been dug. I wonder if the Minister has any information in this respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, once again, I'd be happy to get the information for the honourable member. It's not an item that really is appropriately discussed under the Capital. It could have been something we could have discussed under Water Management, but I'll get the information for him.

His first question concerning the Icelandic River, there are no funds included this year for flood protection project on the river. We recognize it as a problem, as we recognize many others, and it will be a matter of time as we work through in dealing with these kinds of problems. It unfortunately was not one of ones we were able to deal with this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 13.--pass. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that he will be providing information on the capital works of Ross Creek. Is he aware of the concerns that have been raised by, not only farmers in the area, but people concerned about wildlife and natural resources in the area of the Ross Creek and the four wells that are continuously flowing? I believe it's four. I think the Minister of Education probably is as much aware of this as I am, and I wonder whether he has any information on this.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps the honourable member didn't hear me when I said earlier that it's not an item for discussion under Capital, but I would be happy to get the information for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.--pass. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his remarks today commented, when he dealt with remarks made on this side, with respect to the drainage program and the problems that we face in drainage and other matters, and that his government certainly was going to proceed and provide funds that were necessary. And then the Member for Lakeside tried to at least defend the actions of the Member for Roblin in his commentary about the lack of will, or the lack of representation that members on this side of the House made to the Minister responsible for Water Resources when we were in government

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin, I don't know whether he was doing this in jest, or whether he was in all seriousness trying to criticize members on this side that it is their government that is providing the greatest funds in drainage programs in assistance to rural areas, and the Member for Lakeside tried to add to that by saying, well, all the programs that were brought in were certainly being improved upon by the Conservatives, and nothing could be further from the truth especially when it relates to the Highways Program, of how well we are treating areas of the province." There is certainly no, or very little, at least the impression he was trying to leave, even though it is very clear that there is very little political opportunism on behalf of the Conservatives with respect to the various programs that they are bringing in.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly was raised very clearly by the Member for Ste. Rose and members on this side how the Highway Program, this year especially, was brought forward. Certainly, while the Member for Lakeside can say, look, most of our Conservative members are elected from rural areas, and what do you expect. We are going to be putting in more works in Conservative areas than New Democratic Party areas. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that is very clear, not only in this year's program, in terms of the Water Resources Program, but in last year's Construction and Maintenance Program the percentage terms vary in terms of the number of projects. Unfortunately last year's and previous year's projects did not have cost estimates attached to the various projects, so that a valid comparison cannot be made, but it is clear that the direction of the government, and at least they should acknowledge that, at least the Minister of Public Works said, look, what do you expect? We're going to be doing it, and it is clear and there is just no doubt about it. And at least he's acknowledged that much, that they are prepared to do as much as they can for their areas, regardless of whether it hurts a little in the other areas, but let the other rural areas know that it

is the Conservative ridings that will do far better while they are in government than the projects they will put into the other areas.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very clear that that was the tenure of the remarks the Minister was making, it is very clear in terms of the Highways Project. Mr. Chairman, there were several projects that were left from 1977 in the Highways Estimates, and they will stay there, probably for the full four years that the Tories are in and they say, yes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the honourable member that the Highways Estimates take place in another area. We are under a different Estimate at this point.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that comments made by members today in the debate on Water Resources under the Capital Estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources that the debate has been very wide-ranging, Sir. And my remark to that, of course, is only in passing to the comments that were made by the Minister of Public Works about not only road projects but health care projects, drainage projects, everything was lumped into one Capital Program, Mr. Chairman, as to how the Conservatives were treating the Interlake Area, the New Democratic Party constituencies. And you know, whether they want to defend it or not, Mr. Chairman - and I'm sure they're defending it - but what they don't seem to realize, when you look down the projects that are listed in the copies that the Minister has provided us, that what they are trying to defend is the indefensible.

It is very clear what percentage of projects - not only the dollars, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose certainly pointed out that very clearly, but at least to the credit of the Minister of Mines that there is some recognition that there are water problems all over the province. And there is no doubt that the Interlake or central portion of the problem happens to be the catchbasin of water problems of this entire province. And we are like the rats swimming in the middle of the pond when it comes to water problems --(Interjection)--Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Public Works would not throw me off-key I might be able to finish my remarks on this thing.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the problems with water, not only in other areas of the province, but in the Interlake - and as I said, Interlake is one of the worst areas with respect to perennial water problems, some of which are maybe not quite of the magnitude that some other communities are affected with when it comes to heavy rainfall and flash floods in the spring, that at least to some degree the Minister has allowed his department to provide necessary assistance in terms of some projects, and that the projects are, at least to some degree, much better than in the Highways Department, and the Highways Department was very blatant, Mr. Chairman. The Water Resources projects are to a lesser degree in this vein, but there is no doubt, that the Minister will be hard-pressed by communities that have asked for flood protection.

And now that the province has embarked on a flood protection program to one or two communities that --(Interjection)-- three communities? Mr. Chairman, no doubt there will be many other communities now on the doorsteps with respect to flood protection to those communities, not only in southern Manitoba, but in the Interlake and in western Manitoba, so that the budget the Minister will have to, I believe, either in the long term provide additional funds if he is prepared to keep the maintenance program at a fairly constant level, because there will be a great portion of the costs in the Capital Program are for flood protection, and not for long-term drainage programs, so that there will have to be some either additional or as he has done, he is now shifting funds in terms of providing community protection funds. And that maybe should be a completely separate program, and maybe should require federal assistance; and if there is federal assistance in the community protection program, those areas should be reviewed.

As well, Mr. Chairman, he spoke about watershed conservation districts and the problems that various municipalities and the province get themselves into in trying to second-guess one another with respect to who should be doing their projects first. It is the kind of the chicken and egg situation, where a municipality will come in and say, look if you would only do your portion of your responsibility,

FRIDAY, 28 MARCH, 1980

which is a third order waterway, we can then do our projects and complete our drainage works, as is in the case of the community of Moosehorn where they have been flooded practically every year now for the last - to some degree, some more or less - in the last five or six years the situation seems to have worsened in the area, and probably is as a result of some drainage works that the LGD of the municipality put in their own.

The Minister, and he quoted about third order waterways, when he spoke about designation and non-designation - talk about passing the buck, Mr. Chairman. I mean, where does an MLA or anyone send in his constituent for assistance when the provincial water resources maps clearly outline whose responsibility a drain is, and it's clearly a third order drain as outlined on the map. If you look at any watershed map and there is a legend on the map, and the legend says first order drains...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.