

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, July 16, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day -- The Honourable Member for Riel.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether there's been any decision made or announcement made by Manitoba Hydro respecting the purchase of thermal equipment.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Government Services. I wonder if the Minister could tell me if the expenses incurred for yesterday's proceedings with the Queen and the Royal Family here - and I must say it was a beautiful job - if the expenses incurred for yesterday will include towing charges and fines levied against members of the Legislature for parking in what is normally considered to be legitimate parking areas, particularly Kennedy Street? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I'd like an answer from the Minister, if he . . .

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services) (Transcona): I thought, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend was being rather facetious. I'm not aware of any towing charges that were incurred as a result of illegal parking. I do agree with my honourable friend that it was a tremendous day yesterday, that Manitobans should be very proud of the services rendered by the Department of Government Services, and if it was necessary to incur a few towing charges, I think in the spirit of July 15th being the hundredth anniversary of the Province of Manitoba and the anniversary of the New Democratic Party taking over the reins of government in Manitoba, that we will take care of towing charges.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friend for his answer and I wonder if he would then accept at this time, if the page boy would accommodate me, this small document that I received yesterday on the front of my car.

MR. PAULLEY: I will do my best to accommodate my honourable friend, and if it is necessary for the Minister in charge of Government Services to absorb the cost on a personal basis, I will do so because I know the plight of the farmer in Manitoba.

MR. WATT: Well again - on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker - I thank my honourable friend, because with Operation LIFT now that \$3.00 ticket would leave me \$3.00 in the hole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate to the House whether or not Manitoba Hydro has come to a permanent arrangement with respect to the employment of the chairman.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

MR. ENNS: Would the First Minister - a subsequent question, Mr. Speaker - would the First Minister deem it appropriate to advise the House of the terms of the employment?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is a very intelligent person. The matter is on the record now and I am sure that he will be able to read the Order-in-Council without any difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege if I may, relating to the question by the Member for Arthur, if any member has received tickets issued by the City of Winnipeg, if they're finding difficulty I'll be very happy to show them where to pay them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I was asked this morning about the activities of the House. I explained to the Leader of the Opposition, and subsequent to my explanation to the House that we would be sitting this afternoon until we complete most of the work on the Order Paper and we would then go to Law

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . Amendments Committee and then come back to the House to committee as necessitated by operations, and that I would announce that the Law Amendments Committee will meet for the purpose of considering the remaining briefs on Landlord and Tenant on Saturday at 9:30, but that the House would meet on Saturday as well, following the completion of Law Amendments Committee work on Saturday, so that Saturday would be a normal day, that is of House sittings, but we would meet in the morning at Law Amendments Committee for the purpose of hearing the briefs that have yet to be presented.

I've no announcement to make with regard to Public Utilities Committee as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if he could advise the House on developments on the proposed overpass on Highway 200 at Emerson.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I've been in contact with the Commissioner of Transport in Ottawa. It seems this problem has been around for four years, and the main problem is the CPR is not sure whether they should put an overpass in there. There's been some suggestions by the previous government on cost sharing. The CPR apparently didn't accept it and the government didn't accept it.

As it stands now, I think we've asked the CPR to make a decision and if they're not going to build to tell us, in which case that means that they will have to put in extra air pipes because I understand the law is you can't block a track or a road more than five minutes and they've blocked a road there for fifteen minutes. So we have to take the position if they can somehow break up their train so it wouldn't stand on the highway for more than five minutes then we can't force them to go ahead with the bridge. If they can't, of course then we're going to insist that they approve payment - I think it's 87-1/2 percent in this case - because I have the money in the budget and we have really been held up by this thing. We were prepared to start two months ago on the construction of this overpass, but until the CPR makes a decision there's not much we can do. All I can say is that we're applying all the pressure possible at this time.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This does mean therefore that both the federal and provincial governments are in favour and the delay, if there is a delay, is caused solely by the CPR. Is this correct?

MR. BOROWSKI: I would say that there is one other matter that I should have mentioned. The CPR wants to close an additional crossing at Emerson and the Council of Emerson refuses to agree to this. This seems to have been the stumbling block for a year. We've contacted the council last week and they still insist they will not allow the CPR to close it, and therefore the CPR is saying well, if you won't let us close that one then we won't build this one, so outside of that, the responsibility and the foot-dragging is with the CPR.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Member for Pembina which I had taken under advisement at the last sitting. I perused the Address for Papers of the Honourable Member for Pembina, and Beauchesne Fourth Edition, Citation 209, subsection (3) indicates that an Address may be moved for Papers between the government and any company, corporation or individual. A caucus in a legal and legislative sense is neither a company nor a corporation nor an individual. Therefore, I rule the motion of the honourable member out of order.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call bill No. 148, please, on Page 3 of the Order Paper.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 148. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) presented Bill No. 148, The Municipal Tax Deferral Act, for second reading. (Referred to Law Amendments Committee)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the increasing problems that has arisen in the twentieth century with the very rapid development of the urban areas, particularly noted in North America, has been the effect that this growth, this development has had upon the

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) . . . . . peripheral of those urban areas. The situation has become very apparent and Manitoba is no exception to this development, that areas in what is sometimes known as the additional zone or in the peripheral range immediately surrounding the urban centres, such as Greater Winnipeg, have been faced with a situation by which bona fide farmers and market gardeners have been forced, chased off their lands due to increasing assessment. This assessment has developed due to powers outside of their own making, powers which have developed because of the increased demands for these lands, often lands that had been increased in value through speculation, through industrialization and other reasons.

I think that Manitoba is probably heralding a "first" in respect to the provisions that are now before us, though provisions of some similar nature though varying in detail had been passed in some parts of the United States, but to my knowledge there has been no legislation similar to this legislation passed in Canada. The purpose of this legislation is in principle to ensure that the bona fide farmer and market gardener may be able to sustain his dealings, his means of livelihood in the peripheral areas despite the outward growth of urbanization.

The method by which this is being done is to take the assessment and to have two areas of assessment. First of course is the regular assessment, the assessment that by law now this farmer or market gardener is being assessed by, an assessment which includes the speculative portion in addition to the actual value of the land for agricultural purposes, and also equates this with special assessment. The special assessment is based upon the assessment value if the land was used only for farming or for market gardening. The farmer or market gardener is permitted under the provisions of this bill to defer his taxes in respect to that area which is attributable to the special assessment over a period of time. This provision will continue until such time as the farmer, first, either ceases to farm, sells his farm; or (b) if because of death or other reasons the farm leaves the possession of the farmer in question or his family.

Moneys will be advanced by way of legislation to the municipalities in question in order to permit them to underwrite the deferral of tax collections. When the tax deferral money is eventually collected by the municipality in question, there is provision in the bill that this money will be due and payable to the province at that time.

The tax deferral area will be restricted to areas that are participating in orderly planning and that they will either therefore be required to come under the provisions of the planning legislation of Metropolitan Winnipeg or under the Planning Act of the Province of Manitoba.

The Act also provides for the various limitations by which the taxes may be continued to be deferred in the future. It also provides that in event of sale of the property some time in the future that there will be a downward adjustment in the tax deferral account if the market at the time the land is sold does not equate with the value imputed to the land when the assessment was made. So in other words if the property is not sold at an amount which justifies the assessment imputed to it, then there will be a downward adjustment in respect to the account by which the owner will be required to pay back at the time of the sale of the property.

The tax deferral will be secured by way of a lien against the property so as to ensure the payment of the proper account when the various conditions have been arrived at by which the deferred taxes are to be paid.

It's our belief, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation in this bill will go a long way towards assisting farmers and market gardeners in this transitional period. Certainly it is not the end answer. I would trust that when we are dealing with this entire matter in Municipal Affairs Committee that we'll be able to move in the direction of more equitable assessment methods for people throughout the entire length and breadth of the province; but we are satisfied that in this particular instance of transitional areas that this legislation will move a long way to making the assessment less burdensome, less difficult insofar as those that, due to no cause of their own, are being pushed into very awkward and difficult situations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this Act was introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I wonder if the Minister in his own wisdom has really considered the implications that could arise from an Act of this nature. I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that it is permissive legislation, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to state that two wrongs do not make a right, and I for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that this type of legislation is perpetrating an injustice on the farmers in Manitoba.

The farmer is being taxed on his property for a use for which that property is not being

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . . served. He is being taxed on a special assessment which in effect says, we know you're only a market gardener today but there's a strong possibility that sometime in the future that land could be used for other purposes, therefore we will assess it for those other purposes now and you will be charged. The farmer has the right to defer the taxes, but in doing so a lien is placed against the property, and if my interpretation is correct, once the deferred taxes eat up the difference between the special levy or the special assessment and the regular assessment at interest rates of nine percent, from that point on the farmer is going to have to pay the taxes anyway, and even though the Minister admits that there is a possibility of a downward adjustment at the time of sale - in other words he's saying that we might very well have over-assessed the property - the farmer is not going to have the opportunity to reduce his assessment because the downward adjustment will only come at the time of the sale, and in the meantime if the difference has already been eaten up, the farmer is going to have to pay the full tax. This is the way I understand the Act and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very unfair type of legislation to place on the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this pertains to a relatively small portion of the farming population in Manitoba, that area commonly referred to as the green belt, an area which is in some cases outside the boundary of the Metro area of Greater Winnipeg and yet still comes under the influence of Metro in their planning, and if it doesn't, Metro has very little difficulty in bringing it under the Planning Act of Manitoba. And here again the farmer is powerless, or next to powerless. He can object, but he is just a small voice and we find big government taking over and assessing against the farmer's property, not for what he is using the property for but for its anticipated use. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when a farmer or a market gardener is using his land for the purpose of his livelihood in that market gardening or farming operation, that the taxes assessed against that property must be related to the use to which that property is being put. Once he sells the property and it becomes a commercial development, then is the time and only then is the time to change the assessment.

MR. GREEN: . . . the member would permit a question?

MR. GRAHAM: When I'm finished, Mr. Speaker. I think it is wrong to anticipate - we know today that the farmers are facing serious problems, not of their own making but because of government legislation, and any further measure such as this further aggravates the problem facing the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, while I will have more to say on this at a later date, I want to at this present time register my sincere objection to this type of legislation.

MR. GREEN: Does the honourable member say that the previous legislation, which was sustained by the administration which he supports and which offered no deferral, is better than the legislation which is now being proposed which does offer relief? Does he think that we should not bring this bill at all and let the assessments continue as they have been?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly thankful that the Minister has raised this question, because last year when I was a member on the government side, last fall when this present government was proposing legislation and again in this session, I have stood up and constantly advocated that a complete revision of the assessment practices in this province is long overdue, and to further aggravate the situation by measures such as this is certainly not a solution to the question of wholesale revision of the assessment practices in the province. And again I reiterate that we must, as quickly as possible, have a complete review of the assessment practices in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then may I ask the honourable member, is he opposing this deferral bill?

MR. GRAHAM: I have stated that already, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: You are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, among the many responsibilities that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has because of another matter that has superseded or taken so much of his time in this last session, I don't think we are always aware of the responsibilities the Minister has. Certainly I can agree, or show a degree of compassion with him with respect that this particular matter of assessment within the periphery of the growing urban areas and others is one that has no doubt involved a great deal of his time and will present him with a great deal of his difficulties and headaches in that department. It is a very hard question to try to resolve.

I profess to be no expert on assessment practices as such, but I rise to speak mainly

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . because both in my old constituency of Rockwood-Iberville which skirted the northwestern part of the city, and of course my present constituency of Lakeside which takes in a portion of that same area, namely the northwestern part of the city, I am well aware of the problems that this presents to the municipal bodies, and of course, more specifically, the problems that it represents to the individuals involved. I think maybe the areas most pronounced in this area are those we generally associate along our riverbanks. The Minister already mentioned the market gardeners both south and north of the Red River, going along the rivers, and the same with the sprawling development along the Assiniboine River west, but it affects all areas around these set of circumstances and there is not a very easy answer to it.

I would have to remind the Minister that the last time a deferral system was attempted it of course resulted in the eventual ownership by the municipalities or governments of great stretches of what was formerly private land, and I am referring to the depression era, the thirties. I understand the community - and the member isn't here - but certainly the Municipality of St. James achieved a lot of its real estate in this matter, simply by the fact that in those days it was unable to pay taxes, taxes weren't paid and while no formal program - I'm not suggesting there was no formal program of deferral, but you had a de facto deferral of taxation existing with people simply not paying their taxes, the land finally coming up for tax sale and reverting back to the municipality or to the Crown or the government.

Now I would not - quite frankly, let me state at the outset that I would wish to reserve my position with respect to whether I want to support this measure or not. I am somewhat concerned that again, very late in the session, a bill of considerable importance, at least to myself and to certainly all those members who have seats similar to mine, that it comes before us at this particular time. I have not had an opportunity to find out, and the Minister didn't indicate in his opening remarks in explanation of the bill just to what extent the particular municipalities that are involved, were involved in arriving at this particular conclusion. I'm aware that there have been pressures no doubt on the Minister, as there were on the previous administration, for some sort of a system perhaps such as is being introduced here, deferral of some kind to meet this need, but he didn't indicate this so I would hope that there would be opportunity given to hear from individuals as well as municipal people at law amendments where I believe the Bill is being sent to, and I would like to reserve my own position on the Bill until I hear a reaction from the municipal people involved as well as some of the people themselves that are involved.

However, that does not and should not be meant to be interpreted that I find a great deal of satisfaction in this approach in the Bill, and the one particular facet of it that I think really, Mr. Speaker, will make this an inoperative bill and it will make it, unfortunately, more window dressing really than in actual fact, because quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of paying nine percent interest on the taxes so deferred, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the arithmetic, the progressive arithmetic that's involved in paying that kind of an interest on property, on real property, within a very few short number of years, as has already been pointed out by the Member for Birtle-Russell, any relief is lost and the payment of taxes continues, but more important why this piece of legislation will not be used is because you have to consider the nature of the persons that are holding on to this land.

One of the principal reasons for people holding on to this land - and this of course makes the problem all that more difficult - is that that in fact is their bank account. A person that has had a small market garden out somewhere on the riverbank, while he's waiting with intrepidation and with hope at the same time at the advancement of the urban spread which on the one hand will do away or infringe on his way of life up to now, but on the other hand, he hopes and expects that it will be the bonanza or the windfall that will enable him or his family to retire on. He very often is content to operate, and I think among our smaller vegetable growers we have a prime example here, we have people who are quite content to work what we would normally consider in the agricultural field generally very meagre holdings, satisfied with very modest incomes, but they have the knowledge that their property is increasing in value and of course this is the problem, how do you -- my friend from Birtle-Russell says you can't anticipate -- so I'm well aware of the dilemma that this situation is involved in.

I will not try to offer the easy advice or solution that we should simply assess when property is used in a particular way, whether or not a fair assessment or a fair taxation method be used. For instance, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that with the event of action not taken by

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . this government, by the action taken by the Federal Government, with the potential action taken by the Federal Government with the introduction of the White Paper which starts to look at capital gain in a different manner, and certainly farm holdings or farm lands once evaluated at D Day, and if that property's evaluated at \$50,000 on February 1, 1971 and then five years later it can be sold for \$200,000 and that party then has to pay a capital gains tax on that \$150,000 gain, then I think you can ask the legitimate question, well is he not making his fair contribution, depending on what level or what rates of taxation there may be. But that would at least come closer to placing the tax at a time when the person can afford to pay it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, just simply that the rate of interest will preclude many persons from using this legislation, and of course I don't think that the government is particularly concerned one way or the other whether they use it or not. And that all the more, Mr. Speaker, reinforces my contention that really it's not an attempt, a serious attempt to solve the solution, but it is - and I take my hat off to the members of the government - it is in their rush to satisfy all or to tackle all problems at the same time in this one sitting of the House, for some reasons known to themselves, and to compile that legislative record to the thickness of a few fathoms in bills that we carry around every day we go to the Law Amendments committee, it is a nice piece of window dressing which puts the government in the position of being able to say yes, we did something which the previous administration never really addressed themselves to, because it was a hard question and it was a difficult question to solve and not one that you could solve with just a nice little bit of permissive legislation that really, Mr. Speaker, it would appear at first perusal, nobody really is going to take too much advantage of, simply because it is not an answer to the question.

However, I'd like to hear the immediate reaction of the individuals that are going to be affected by it and by some of the municipal people that will make representation on it, and I reserve my judgment on the Bill until we've had it before us in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief comments on this Bill at the present time. I am prepared to support the Bill to go to Law Amendments committee and also reserve judgment as to the final action that our group will take. I believe that tax deferral will be of some assistance, immediate assistance right now in some instances, but in the long run I think what will happen is that the excessive real property taxes which will follow will really place a crushing financial burden on many of the land owners and as a result it will be a form of expropriation. This is what will happen, because I recollect quite well when we did hear many people from municipalities and councillors, and as well many of the people themselves that owned land surrounding the Winnipeg area that were before the municipal committees some three or four years ago at the time tax deferral was proposed to these people, and they did not believe this was the solution to this problem. So I know it may be some small relief at the present time, but really the Minister is not coming to grips with the problem and I would like to say it is a serious problem.

The other point, I'm not so sure that the land, that the present assessment is done in a proper way because I have been doing just a very little amount of checking. I have prepared a small chart for myself and I've used Fort Garry in the Richmond area and I have a few pieces of land that I have charted out here: Eight acres, which is assessed at \$200.00 per acre and five acres assessed \$192.00 per acre; a 15 acre parcel also assessed at \$200.00 per acre; Bison Drive which is right opposite the University entrance, and assessment is \$74.00 and \$65.00 per acre - two parcels; La Salle River, that's between Waverley and Pembina Highway, there's parcels of 72 acres, 433 acres and 424 acres, and assessment is \$30.00, \$44.00 and \$41.00 per acre. When we use the comparative location in way of distance from the Metropolitan area from, say, the corner of Portage and Main, and I'll use a six to eight acre parcel in East St. Paul and it is assessed at \$250.00 per acre, which is considerably higher than the same type of land the same distance from, say, the corner of Greater Winnipeg, and East Kildonan or East St. Paul area is assessed much higher. There's another parcel, Douglas and McIvor off Henderson Highway, which is assessed at \$650.00 per acre which is nowhere near what we have in some other parts of the periphery of Greater Winnipeg which is \$65.00 or \$30.00 or \$44.00, so there seems to me a great amount of consistency in the way of assessment of land surrounding the urban area.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

Now I don't know if the Minister had time to look into this problem or not but I believe if he will and study it that he will find that this is the fact.

MR. PAWLEY: Will the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I will.

MR. PAWLEY: The property that you referred to on Henderson Highway, the number on Henderson Highway, could you tell me just which -- East Kildonan, North Kildonan, or East St. Paul?

MR. PATRICK: It would be East St. Paul. Between Douglas and McIvor off Henderson Highway - assessed at \$650.00 per acre. Now I know that usually demand for adjacent lands gradually builds up as speculators and builders acquire land in planning for future development and bid and acquire parcels of adjacent lands, and this is the reason that this is why it happens this way. But what really happens is that in many cases there is a parcel of land that's purchased which may be a speculative price, a much higher price than the going rate for land in that area, and as a result it seems that this one sale becomes the assessment for the other lands surrounding from this parcel that was sold. So what's really happening, I believe that the assessment is based completely on the market value of the land, or on a market sale analysis of the land instead of tied in in any way, shape or form to productivity, and I feel that to a bona fide farmer there must be some productivity tied into the assessment.

I see a danger to some extent if it is not a bona fide farmer, but I know that I am told, and I've been told by many people that in many instances these farmers have farmed there for 25 or 30 or 50 years and the land is in the second or third generation and they are genuine farmers. They want to farm and they want to make a living off that parcel of land, and the assessment department will say well, if you can't pay the taxes why not sell the land? It's not that easy because many of these people do put their land on the market and there is no purchasers, no buyers for that quickly. There is an odd one that somebody wants a piece of property and he goes and pays an exorbitant price and buys it but there isn't for everyone. This is the problem that we have with many of these small areas, market gardeners and small farmers.

So really what the Minister is doing here, he is not coming to grips with the problem at all. I think that you're just delaying the matter and saying all right, if you can't pay your taxes this year you'll be able to pay it maybe next year if things are better, but what will really happen I think by delaying it year after year is we will create a situation where we will have a financial burden placed on many of these land owners, which in fact what will result will be expropriation of their property.

As I say, I am not against the bill, I am prepared to let it go to Committee to hear some of these people. I hope that they will have notice, but I know that when this proposal was made to all those people some few years ago when we had a large delegation before the Law Amendments Committee, they stated quite strongly that tax deferral was not the solution. I hope the Minister has met with many of these surrounding municipalities and consulted with them, if this was their suggestion, if they agree with his proposal. It's a very small, minute probably relief, but I don't think that it's really coming to grips with the problem.

So I hope that the Minister will also try to consider such a thing as settling on productivity to some extent to a bona fide farmer. I'm not concerned of the man who has purchased land and is holding it for the next ten years or five years and is leasing the land for farming, but the man that's making his livelihood off the land, I think there must be some consideration given to him.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: For how long would you let that person occupy that land and farm it?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, offhand I couldn't give you an answer. I don't think it should be for an indefinite time, I think there should be a period specified.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member be prepared to tax the other citizens of Manitoba or of the municipality itself to make up the differential, and therefore in the municipality all the other taxpayers, would they then have to carry the load for the taxpayer for whom the honourable member wishes to give that kind of concession?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have not all the answers but I certainly do not believe with forcing people off the land -- \$650.00 per acre or \$1,000 per acre tax. We're not saying

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . . the purchase price - this is how much the land is in some instances - I mean not tax, assessment, which amounts to about \$75.00 and \$100.00 per acre tax which is very exorbitant, and I don't think it is fair to any of these people who have farmed all their lives for 25, 30 or 40 years. I know it's not an easy solution, it's a very difficult one, but what I am saying is that the Minister is not really coming to grips with the problem.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member not feel that, if I may, Mr. Speaker, that the provision in the bill which provides that the value that he is being taxed at would be guaranteed to him in the event of the sale and that the general taxpayer of the province would take up that loss. Would that not mean that he is not expropriated but that he at least gets back the value on the use of the land for agricultural purposes? Is that not in the bill and would that not answer that part of the problem?

MR. PATRICK: I would say if the interest doesn't eat up whatever equity he has left in the land.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution on the top of Page 4 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I don't have my notes with me. Anyway I didn't expect this motion to come forward at this time. However, I adjourned it the other day in order to make a few comments because I had earlier spoken on a similar resolution requesting that we should have committee of this House to look into the problems of the farming community. We now have a committee being set up under the Minister of Agriculture to hear people on various matters pertaining to agriculture, although I feel that there are certain overlapping between the membership of these committees that I feel is not warranted; and secondly, I don't think should be there because there are sufficient numbers in this House that it doesn't have to be. Certainly I felt that the other committee should be revised so it would be constituted of members other than those that are on this particular committee here. I also felt that the committee that we are reappointing here brought in a report and there is a lot in the report that should be first implemented before we first proceed with setting them up again and just resurveying what they've already done. I think this is about all that it amounts to, because the committee's report had a large list of matters that they were bringing to the attention of the government and members of the House that they feel should be implemented, could be improved on and programs that could be brought into effect. I feel it's not warranted at this time to re-establish the committee immediately after without even trying to correct some of the measures that the committee recommended to the House. That was my reason for adjourning debate the other time. I feel it is unwise to make further expenses of this type before trying to do something about what was already recommended.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing debate on this question. I just want the honourable member who just spoke to know that if he is interested in the committee's report which was done very intensely, but in a very quick manner, from the month of November to the month of January, that if he is interested in the implementation of those recommendations, then one of the recommendations was that the committee be reconstituted so as to continue its work. And if that's what he's interested in that's what this resolution proposes.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney-General, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Second Session of the 29th Legislature, pursuant to Rule 68 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, appointed a Standing Committee of the House on Statutory Regulations and Orders on Thursday, the 16th day of April, 1970;

AND WHEREAS the members of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders consist of Honourable Messrs. Borowski, Green, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw, Messrs. Allard, Barkman, Bilton, Desjardins, Fox, Froese, Graham, Johannson, Sherman,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . Spivak, Mrs. Trueman and Mr. Turnbull;

AND WHEREAS Rule 69 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba provides all regulations that, under The Regulations Act, stand permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders shall be examined by that Committee;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this session examine the Regulations tabled in the House for examination during this session or during recess or after prorogation and report to this House at the next session of this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs, that

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to reconstitute the Special Committee of the House on the Rules and Standing Orders of this Assembly to consider and review from time to time the Rules and Standing Orders of this Assembly;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of this House, composed of the Honourable Mr. Speaker, Honourable Messrs. Green and Paulley, Messrs. Bilton, Doern, Fox, Jorgenson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Turnbull and Weir, be appointed to examine and review the Rules, Standing Orders, practices and procedures of the Assembly, with special reference to improving the functioning of the Committee system, expanding the role of the private member, bringing about a closer relationship between the Legislature and the general public, and generally strengthening the role of the Legislature in regard to the executive arm of government;

AND THAT the Committee be empowered to consider matters relating to the decorum of the House and allied subjects and to report its findings and recommendations of these matters to this Assembly during the third session of this Legislature;

AND THAT the Committee have authority to sit during the present Session and during the recess or after prorogation and have power to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Special Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants. (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few brief words on this particular resolution. I want to assure the Minister that there is no objection on this side of the House to the reconvening of this committee because I feel there are a good many of the rules and practices that we have been following that we have inherited from the past - some of the practices that we've been following are posing some difficulties today in the light of the increased work load that the Legislature is asked to carry. I'm a bit sorry that the report of the committee that was set up last fall and which the members of the committee gave a considerable amount of time to has not found its way into our practices right at the moment. Had we had the opportunity of adopting that report and putting into practice some of the recommendations that were contained within that report there would have been an opportunity to evaluate them during the past session; I think that perhaps the committee then would have had something that they could have devoted their attention to. There would have been an opportunity of looking at the recommendations that were made to find out how they actually worked in practice and then perhaps bring in changes or recommendations that were required. Even at that though, the experience during the past session has certainly indicated that a further look at some of the rules and practices of this Chamber is required because I can see where several of the recommendations that we have made now are in need of a second look and beginning to

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) . . . . . wonder if further revisions may be necessary to the committee's report. But it would have been most useful if we had had the opportunity of putting into practice some of those recommendations that we had made during the course of our sittings last fall.

I would make one request to the House Minister and that's not so much in connection with the contents of a report or the studies but the manner in which the meetings are arranged - I made a similar plea earlier when an earlier committee was set up - and that is that some consideration be given to calling together the Chairmen of these various committees to make sure that there inasmuch as it is possible, there are not conflicting dates where several committee meetings are being called on the same day. It's a particularly great problem if a member happens to be on two or more committees that are meeting at the same time, and it's awfully difficult to achieve continuity if a member has to miss one or two meetings. My experience has been that having missed one meeting then it's necessary for to practically review all that went on in that committee meeting in order to catch up on what has been said and the conclusions that have been arrived at. So I would hope that the House Leader would ensure that the chairmen of these various committees would be given the opportunity of working out a schedule well in advance of the calling of its meetings so members can be informed and make their plans accordingly as to their attendance at these committee meetings. With that, Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation in agreeing to the proposal that has been made by the House Leader in the reconvening of this committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to deal at length with the resolution, however, there is a few interesting little details that I would like to point out.

Manitoba is a community of diverse people and occupations and the north certainly is an area of interest and an area that ought to be studied. I can't agree any more with the Premier in what he said yesterday in addressing the Monarch, that we are making strong efforts in Manitoba to bring our groups closer together and inform them more about each other as time goes along. In fact we are transplanting, taking groups of school kids from one area -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me. Are we not on . . . I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm out of order. I was speaking to the wrong resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Page 6.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Second Session of the 29th Legislature, pursuant to Rule 68 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, appointed a Standing Committee of the House on Municipal Affairs on Thursday, the 16th day of April, 1970;

AND WHEREAS the members of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs consist of Honourable Messrs. Green, Miller, Pawley, Messrs. Barkman, Boyce, Fox, Hardy, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), McGill, Claydon, Patrick, Shafransky, Mrs. Trueman, Messrs. Turnbull and Uruski;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to refer certain Bills and matters to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs for examination during this session or recess or after prorogation and to report at the next session of this Legislature;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs appointed at this session examine the Bills and matters referred to it during this session or during recess or after prorogation and report at the next session of this Legislature.

(Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed Resolution of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr.

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . . Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that the Standing Committee on Economic Development appointed by the House on Thursday, the 16th day of April, 1970, should continue its work as set out by a resolution passed by the Legislature on Friday, October 10th, 1969;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to develop better public understanding of the Province's economic situation and of the extent to which economic growth is providing adequate opportunities for employment, rising incomes and a better distribution of the amenities of life; and;

WHEREAS better basic information leads directly to better policy decisions for promoting economic growth;

AND WHEREAS there is a need for increased economic development in our province in order to provide more and better employment opportunities for the people of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that all Manitobans recognize that the drive for increased economic development is the responsibility of all Manitobans;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee of the House on Economic Development composed of Honourable Messrs. Evans, Schreyer, Toupin and Uskiw, Messrs. Allard, Beard, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Gonick, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, Molgat, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Turnbull, consider its terms of reference to be to maintain continuous surveillance of the progress of Manitoba's economic development and the activities of the Government affecting achievement of provincial economic goals;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient that the said Standing Committee should be authorized to hold such public hearings as it may consider advisable;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the said Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess or after prorogation and to hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable and report to this House on matters referred to it at the next session of this Legislature. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 114, Mr. Speaker. At the bottom of Page 6.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Bill No. 114; and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this bill for the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I hope that I'm in order this time, Mr. Speaker. I was directed by the Member for Fort Rouge and in that case I cannot be wrong.

I find this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting that has been introduced to the House this session. I can't say by this that I would like to stand up and wholeheartedly support it because I am not yet sure that I know all the consequences of this particular piece of legislation. I find it very interesting in some respects. If we look at our present system, we find that we have an executive council framing the kind of legislation that we've seen introduced in this House, and in a practical way, Mr. Speaker, it can be -- and I'm not suggesting that it is -- it can be an executive council dominated by two or three people, three or four if you like, but it is a piece of legislation that will do away with this kind of oligarchic possibility.

At present we have people in the back benches, especially on the government side, who are really playing the role that can be played by some well-trained individual and really playing a role that doesn't require a whole lot of thinking - and I don't say this, Mr. Speaker, with a lack of respect; I'm simply saying that because of our present system these are facts of life. I'm suggesting that this bill if implemented would revive some of the intentions and importances of the people in the back rows on the government side and would render a better, I think, better form of discussion and possibly a more thorough study of bills before they are introduced. I can realize that by the same token this could possibly lead to a situation where you have for instance money bills that would be turned down. You could have a situation where a Minister has had some decrease in the budget that he has proposed and yet not be defeated, which puts him in an impossible kind of situation. This is the other side of the coin for which I hesitate to say I wholeheartedly support the bill. Because this is a bill that has far-reaching effects, I would like to see it go to committee and I would like to see it studied in more detail. I wouldn't

(MR. GIRARD con t'd.) . . . . . be prepared to vote on this issue at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, are you voting on the bill now, in which case I would like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: On the amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: Beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: On the amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is moving adjournment of debate on the motion as amended?

MR. GREEN: I think you have to put the motion to adjourn as put by the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill 141, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 141. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. CHERNIACK in the absence of Mr. Mackling presented Bill No. 141 The Statute Law Amendment Act 1970 for second reading.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the notation on the slip provides that the bill should be referred to the - I believe the Committee of the Whole? Is that right? Committee of the Whole? And I would assume that the purpose of that is that it is, as members will note, corrective measures to a great many Acts and ones that one cannot really discuss on second reading in principle, the principle being to correct a number of errors. If there are any details then of course one would have to deal with them in committee to see whether they're acceptable or not.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the bills that are ready for third readings, please. Starting with No. 61.

BILLS NOS. 61, 68, 76, 78, 79, 80, 83 and 85 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield) presented Bill No. 86, An Act to amend the Corrections Act for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I just wanted to put on the record that I have certain reservations on this bill before it's finally passed. Certainly one of them is that we give \$1.00 to our people that leave the correctional institutions and I feel that this is too little. We are just asking for trouble when we do this. I feel that - well this was borne out in committee, this question was asked. It seems to me the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources doesn't believe . . .

MR. GREEN: The member misunderstands me. Is he not aware that that is the existing law? This law is not being passed to do that. You may have a point but this bill is not passing that law.

MR. FROESE: No, but this doesn't make any change in that respect and this is what I take exception to. I feel that if we're bringing in legislation of this type, far-reaching in many ways, that certainly we should be at least taking a look at that part and make sure that they at least will have an existence for a couple days so that they don't have to go and steal immediately and be in trouble again. I think this is one aspect that should be remedied.

MR. GREEN: This is one thing we didn't deal with, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did mention in Law Amendments, and I'm going to repeat again for the honourable members of the House, that this can and will be changed. We haven't got an amendment for this Act but we don't need an amendment to change this. This is one point that we will definitely make an amendment to.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. TOUPIN presented Bill No. 112, An Act to amend the Social Allowance Act No. 2 for third reading.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order. I still question the propriety of members that are not members of the front benches seconding bills that contain the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . . expenditures of money within it. I am convinced that they must be moved and seconded by a member of the front bench.

MR. GREEN: You won't have an argument there. I wonder if the Minister of Health would accede to that and use a different seconder.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance to second it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILLS NOS. 113, 116, 119, 120 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 132. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Transportation I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 132, an Act to amend the Highways Traffic Act (2), be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to record once more my objection to certain provisions in the Act that are there that should not be there. I feel that this Bill will haunt some of the members on the government side for the years to come, because certainly our farmers will not be too happy with what is being done here today and many will suffer as a result and especially at a time when the economy is in a state as it is today in rural Manitoba. So once more, I want to register my protest in passing of this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the situation has been aptly described by the Honourable Member for Rhineland but I wanted to make my own situation very clear too in this matter, and not for the Party, that what transpired this morning was a legitimate attempt on the part of the Opposition to offer a constructive note into the Bill. There are a fairly massive number of amendments contained in the Highways Traffic Bill before us and most of them that were accepted as being sound and reasonable. There were some amendments that were of some controversial nature but we attempted this morning, Mr. Speaker, and the speaker just spoke on the matter, to indicate to the government that this specific piece of legislation, or this specific clause in this piece of legislation which - and I should single out that clause because we do support the legislation otherwise - was not thought out all that clearly and I would have thought that the governments would have taken the opportunity of at least, if not crediting the Opposition with any great reservoir of brain power, but of some practical experience, if for no other reason than the number of farm representatives and people that are considerably closer to the farming community than the members opposite.

It's with considerable disappointment that I note that the one or two farm representatives on the government side of the side, such members as the Member for St. George, would not feel free enough to have taken up a position that I know he deeply feels himself and would have wanted to have turned out in support of this particular clause, but it's the regimentation of the socialists opposite which prohibit any expression of individual freedom of this kind, so that was not to be expected.

Mr. Speaker, what I did want to say, that here was a small clause, a small clause that affects directly the farming and rural parts of Manitoba, the government could have been well advised to have accepted this particular amendment; particularly this government that has found it so necessary to accept so many amendments - not so many amendments from us, Mr. Speaker, I admit - most of the amendments coming from themselves as they peruse and reread their legislation perhaps for the second time or the third time. I doubt if ever, if ever, Mr. Speaker, a government legislative program has been brought into this Chamber with as many amendments thereto attached, or indeed bills withdrawn, or changed or fundamentally altered. So I find it rather strange that having accepted - you know even just this morning my desk is littered with amendments - having had the difficulty to accept the wisdom of the practical experience of those members representing the farm communities which is in such preponderance on this side of the House, this particular piece of legislation, and I certainly want to indicate to the members and to the government that the words spoken by the Honourable Member for Rhineland - that this little clause will be long remembered by many in the farming community and will certainly come to haunt the farm community.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILL No. 131 was read a third time and passed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention now to move to Law Amendments Committee and for that reason I would like to move the adjournment of the House. I wonder whether members would consider it useful if we had the division bells go after the adjournment just so that members who come here will know that we have moved to Law Amendments Committee. That would be the . . . Mr. Speaker. It's intended to come back here at eight because there are some bills that require Royal Assent but we would go back to Law Amendments Committee again this evening. There are some adjourned resolutions which we might deal with tonight as well, but come back here at night.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Thursday night.