

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, July 17, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF PORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in committee the other night I said I would table a copy of the resolution which I received from the Cow-Calf Association. I would like to table them now.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion in the life of this Legislature when we unhappily have had occasion to move the traditional motion of sympathy to the family of a former member of this House, now deceased, and I rise on this sad occasion to move that traditional motion with respect to a former colleague of many of us, in the person of Michael N. Hryhorczuk, Q.C., who was the Member of the Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Ethelbert from 1949 to 1966.

Mr. Speaker, while the older members of the House recall that this is a motion which is worded in the same terms for all members, it is a motion that is traditionally sent to the families of members by those who are presently in the House to mark the contributions and the service which former members have given during their lifetime in this House.

In the case of Mike Hryhorczuk, he was known to many members, as I have mentioned, who are presently members of this House. Indeed, he was the Attorney-General of Manitoba from 1956 to 1959, and it was in that capacity that I first came to know him personally, when I served as a Crown Attorney and a member of the staff of his department, and had the occasion to work with him in that onerous task which he fulfilled with great success during those three years. I served as well as his successor as Attorney-General of Manitoba, and I can say from all shades of experience that I had with Mike Hryhorczuk, that, without question, he was one of the best-liked members of the opposition, during the years when he sat in opposition, and in his retirement from public life he was certainly one of the senior men and respected advisors to all of the people in his community, and indeed to a wider community in Manitoba, for those who would stop at his door for conversation or that kind of genuine, warm hospitality, which he and his wife Mary would extend to all visitors.

Indeed, it was my privilege, on more than one occasion, to stop at Ethelbert, during trips through, and to sit in Mike's home with him, and of course, discuss matters of politics because he never lost his interest in public affairs in Manitoba, nor his concern for what was happening in the Province of Manitoba. When asked, he would give his advice, from time to time, as to how he thought things should be happening in our province.

So from this personal knowledge of him, Mr. Speaker, I can say, without any fear of contradiction, that I found him at all times to be, first of all a gentleman. He was that. He was one of nature's gentlemen. He was, secondly, a man of extremely good will. A man of very even temperament. He carried onerous responsibilities in the Cabinet of the government of Premier Campbell, but he carried them out with dispatch and he carried them out with good will and he carried them out with a minimum of rancour at all times, whether in this House or in his office dealing with many people throughout

Manitoba.

Thirdly, I think it could be said fairly of him that he was an extremely able spokesman for his constituency. As I have mentioned, I had seen him in his community, living and working among fellow citizens in the Ethelbert area and indeed his range of knowledge of people and his range of communication with people extended out from Ethelbert to all corners of the province. But it was in his own community of Ethelbert where you saw Mike really flourishing and at home with his friends of long standing. He was a natural leader and he carried the trust and the affection of the people, particularly of northwest Manitoba, in a manner that few other people could attract. Indeed, before he came to the Manitoba Legislature, he served in his community as Chairman of the Ethelbert School Board, President of the Ethelbert Chamber of Commerce, and he was formerly Reeve of the R. M. of Ethelbert in his years of service before coming to this House.

I think it is not without significance, Mr. Speaker, that we count among the achievements, not only of Mike Hryhorczuk but indeed of his family, the fact that he was descended from a family whose father was equally dedicated to public service. I speak of course of his father, Nicholas Hryhorczuk, who was the MLA for that area for some 22 years, having been elected in 1922. He, along with Douglas Campbell, former premier of this province, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, are the only two members still living who were elected to that government and to that House with the first Progressive government back in 1922. He was of pioneer Ukrainian-Canadian stock, Nick Hryhorczuk before him, and indeed at the funeral that I had the honor to attend the other day, Mr. Hryhorczuk Sr. was present at Mike Hryhorczuk's funeral and is still in apparently good health.

The public service that this family have given to the people of Manitoba is being carried on to this day, of course, in the person of Mr. Hryhorczuk's son, Boris, who is the General Manager of Parks and Recreation for the City of Winnipeg.

Mike was a man who truly loved his province. He loved the out of doors. He used to tell me, when he decided to retire from politics, that he wanted to get back to horseback so that he could ride out in the Duck Mountains, which was one of his favourite pastimes, and occasionally in the fall he would engage in a bit of hunting, he loved big game hunting. But more particularly, he just liked to get out amongst the beauties of that northwest part of our province in the Duck Mountains where he felt so close to the land and where he manifested his love for the soil and for the terrain and for the people of that area as perhaps few others have.

Well he is gone from our midst now, Mr. Speaker, but he has left us all a great legacy. First of all, in the pride of his ancestry. Unless I am mistaken, I think that Mike Hryhorczuk was the first Canadian of Ukrainian extraction who served on the Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba and he served with great distinction. He had pride and strong loyalty to his country as well and to all of its people. His record of personal service to the people and the province is one which I am sure all members present would hope in their time in this House to emulate. And so, Sir, on this sad occasion, to his wife, Mary, his son Boris and his daughter-in-law Elaine, his two grandchildren, his father, Nicholas, his brother and his sisters, we extend our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Roblin, that this House convey to the family of the late Michael Nicholas Hryhorczuk, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKECZIE: Mr. Speaker, it's with a very deep sense of sorrow and regret that I second the condolence motion that is being presented to the House today and to the province on behalf of the First Minister, with our condolences going to the father, Nicholas Hryhorczuk, and to the wife, Mary, and of course the son, Boris, and the other members of the family.

To substantiate the comments of the First Minister, it is very interesting to go through the history and background of this truly great Ukrainian family and find that Mike's father, who is still living today and enjoying good health, arrived in this province in 1899 at the age of some 11 years and attended public school in that area north of Gilbert Plains and then became a very successful implement and lumber dealer in the Ethelbert community.

Another interesting statistic of the late Mike Hryhorczuk's father was the fact that he started the — he was the director and the promoter of the Rumanian Farmers Elevator Company in those early early days of Manitoba's history, and Mr. Nicholas Hryhorczuk was one of the keys in that, and of course to follow up, he was a Reeve and a Member of the Canadian Order of Foresters and, again, was elected to the Legislature in 1920 as the MLA for Ethelbert Plains and if the record serves me correctly, I think that was when that constituency was first established, the Ethelbert

Plains Constituency. So, his father served in this Chamber with great distinction for some 22 years.

Now, the son, Mike — as everybody knows him — Hryhorczuk, was born north of Gilbert Plains, the Venlaw district, in the year 1905. He graduated from the University of Saskatchewan with his Arts degree and went on into the University of Manitoba to study law, and graduated from there. There is one son from the marriage — the First Minister has related to Boris.

As well as being the Chairman of the School Board, the Chamber of Commerce, a Reeve of the municipality, Mike was very interested in dramatics and sports, especially among the Ukrainian communities of Ethelbert, Pine River, Fork River and all through that part of the Parkland region. He was also a member of the Masonic Lodge, Vermilion Lodge, in Dauphin, and of course, served 17 years in the Legislature with great distinction.

I have had the honour and the privilege to become very closely associated with the Hryhorczuk family since Ethelbert Plains became part of Roblin constituency, and found great leadership and courage and strength and kindness, and great sincerity from the Hryhorczuk family. So I say today, Mr. Speaker, that the late Mike Hryhorczuk will long be remembered as one of the truly great Canadian citizens of our time who served his province and Canada with great distinction. As the MLA for Ethelbert Plains for those years that I mentioned he, I daresay, gained the undivided and the total respect of an enormous wealth of men and women from all walks of life, across the breadth and depth of this jurisdiction, and Canada.

I again say, Mr. Speaker, he will be, no doubt, long remembered for his total dedication to the well-being of all mankind, as the history records, I am sure, will show. He endeared himself to so many people throughout the years, especially in the ethnic communities, in municipal affairs, community affairs, so I daresay that we should add in the message of condolence, "Well done, good and faithful servant." It's indeed an honour to second the condolence motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere)SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Manitoba is one of the few, and perhaps may well be the only, Legislative Assembly or body in our country which persists in the very commendable practice of taking, if only some few moments during the course of the Legislature, to pause and reflect on the life and work of those amongst us who have served here, whether in recent or dim past. In the case of the honourable Mike Hryhorczuk, I certainly wish to join my colleagues and myself, in the words that have been expressed here already this afternoon.

In the case of Mike Hryhorczuk, there are some of us still here — I haven't paused to count, but there are some few of us here — who did have the, in a sense, personal privilege of having been directly associated with him as contemporary members of this Assembly during the time that he was a member here. Having served for 17 years as a member of the Legislature, having served for a good part of those years as a member of the Treasury bench, and as Attorney-General in particular, he is a former public servant, former MLA and former Minister of the Crown whose life and work will be well remembered by us here and by the many thousands, and tens of thousands, that he served, both in his capacity as constituency MLA and as a Cabinet Minister.

It is, I think, very very rare and unusual that he should have had the kind of career he did of dutiful service, being the son of one who in turn, served in this Assembly for what must be close to being a record number of years. Both of them, I think it can be said, without the slightest of hesitation or equivocation, having served their province as out-and-out Canadians and as those who love their province. In the case of Mike who was native born, to this country and this province there can be no question, that in addition to his preoccupation with public affairs, that he was one whose roots were very much back in the area in which he was born and with the people which he represented.

Upon his retirement, while I didn't have occasion to see him often, nevertheless on some few occasions we did have occasion to simply chat. It was then I learned that his attachment to the land and to the agricultural community, even though agriculture was not his primary occupation, was nevertheless very strong.

I should mention too, by way of personal vignette, that one of the reasons why in the most recent years of his life he was not in particularly good health may have to do with the fact that in the many years he served here, the many weekends he commuted back to the home district he liked so much, that he commuted these long distances by automobile in hot weather as well as cold, windows open, draft, and then some of the consequential complications affecting health. This is what he related to me personally.

It should be mentioned too, Sir, that in addition to his direct duties as a public servant in elective office that he served his community in various volunteer contexts and situations. One of which that I remember well, which in his typical fashion he carried out with great dignity — great dignity —

Monday, July 17, 1978

befitting the people that he was descendant from, when he was hospoda for the National Canadian Ukrainian Festival at Dauphin some few years ago.

There is so much that could be said that has already, however, been well said by those who have spoken before me. I wish, therefore, on this occasion to join my colleagues and myself in direct expressions of sympathy and in support of the motion of condolence to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a number of fine words have already been expressed in condolence for Mike Hryhorczuk, but on behalf of members of the Liberal Party of Manitoba who number many friends and associates of Mike Hryhorczuk, I would simply like to add on their behalf a word of our sympathy and feelings about a man who played a role in public life during the formative years of this province and took great pride in the accomplishments of the government of that time and accomplishments of the party at that time. He was, as both the First Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Member for Roblin have indicated, a noteworthy individual and has been one of those people who, I think, has provided certain touchstone for many others in this province who have gone into public service to honour.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to add our words of sympathy and condolence and associate ourselves with the resolution that has been forwarded by the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

(ONE MINUTE'S SILENCE OBSERVED)

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education which flows from a published survey taken across Canada of the pay scales of various university teaching positions. Given that the province's funding, indirectly through the Universities Grants Commission, is predicated on assumptions with respect to inflationary trends and the like, given that the survey shows that the pay scales for the various university teaching positions in Manitoba are not leading the inflationary parade but rather below the national average of pay scales, can the Minister say whether in light of all this there is any intention to look at and revise the level of funding for the universities through the Universities Grants Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, we are constantly looking at that particular situation. As far as revision is concerned at this particular point, we have nothing planned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. In view of the recommendations and plan that was issued on behalf of the Tri-Level Committee on Friday which indicated that Winnipeg has one of the highest concentrations of poor quality housing, can the Minister now indicate whether the province intends to live up to its commitment of transferring a million dollars to the City of Winnipeg in order that it may start or initiate the workings of the city non-profit housing corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister responsible for MHRC, has, I believe, been meeting with certain representatives of the city with respect to that particular matter. But in general, Sir, that is the reason why the Tri-Level review of the development plan has proceeded. Under the previous government some year-and-a-half ago, I believe, it started, but it's an attempt by the three levels of government to review the development plan of the city and in concert to develop proposals and policies hopefully that will assist the City of Winnipeg. This again, as I said the other day, is the first stage of the review and the plan will now proceed to public hearings. I intend within the next few days, as soon as enough reports are available, to make them available to all members of the Assembly, but with respect to the specific matter, my

colleague, the Minister responsible for MHRC has been meeting with City of Winnipeg officials.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then. I would ask the Minister of Housing if he could report to the House whether the Provincial Government intends to go ahead and help the City of Winnipeg in its non-profit housing corporation to initiate some programs that could be started this summer, in order to respond to the kind of conditions that were outlined in that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General has mentioned, it hasn't been me personally meeting with the City, but one of my staff has been. We are meeting with them to make sure that the million dollars is properly spent for the benefit of the people of the City of Winnipeg, mainly in the core area. But I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge should know that at the present time the City of Winnipeg could open up their non-profit housing corporation right away and receive funds from the Federal Government under the new program that is presented very easily. But we are still working with them to find the best way to use the million dollars for the benefit of the people in the core area of Winnipeg.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister indicates that the City of Winnipeg could initiate immediately the undertaking with the Federal Government, could the Minister indicate whether the province has yet formulated or agreed with the Federal Government on terms of the new housing program, the guidelines that will be applicable to Manitoba. As I understand it, in order for the moneys to be allocated to the province, there has to be agreement by the Provincial Government in order for those moneys to be allocated. So by his remark does he mean that there has already been a signed agreement or an agreement between Central Mortgage and Housing and MHRC as to the allocation of funds for the Province of Manitoba for the low income housing field?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there has not been anything signed between the province and CMHC at the present time, according to the regional manager of that organization in Winnipeg. Those arrangements will be here shortly; we have been expecting them any day to sit down and finalize them with us. But there is no reason why the City of Winnipeg cannot be also working with CMHC under the same conditions. There are several non-profit housing organizations. In fact, one right now is starting to work with CMHC so that they can use those funds; under the new arrangements of Section 15(1) it's available and it should be being worked on by the City as well as the City working with us as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a fourth question.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a final supplementary then. While the City has the opportunity to sign for mortgage arrangements with the Federal Government, does the province intend to assist the City to cover the administrative costs in order to allow it, the non-profit corporation of the City, to initiate the kind of, I think it's a 200-unit action that they were contemplating, taking into account that they will need those front-end costs which are no longer available to the same extent or would take a long time to negotiate with the Federal Government?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't think the member is completely right, but I could stand corrected also. I think the front-end money is even better, and, Mr. Speaker, the million dollars is still there and we will work with the City to see that it's properly spent.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This morning I asked the Minister in charge of the Environment about whether or not the government has discontinued the cleaning up of the Dutch Elm Diseased trees in Manitoba, which he took under notice and indicated that he would consult with the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if they have a report that they might pass this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Dutch Elm Disease, there has been no change

in the tree removal program that has been carried out in the past. We plan to continue on with the removal of trees that are affected by the Dutch Elm Disease.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister then explain why his staff are refusing to do just that very thing and have indicated to people who have been identified with Dutch Elm Disease problems that they have to do this job themselves, that the only thing the department will do is identify the problem but will not eradicate the problem or clean-up the trees?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any specific case that the Member for Lac du Bonnet might be referring to, but would ask him to relay any information to me that he has that might be helpful in the situation, to see if it is inconsistent with what has taken place in the past.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister may clarify once and for all, is the department continuing with the cleaning up of and eradication of diseased trees on all properties in Manitoba where such are reported, private or public properties.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will take the matter as notice and check into the problem which the member is referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a fourth question.\$

MR. USKIW: Yes, this is to the Minister of Agriculture. It has nothing to do with the previous question, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with whether or not the Minister of Agriculture had canvassed a number of people throughout the province with respect to Bill 25; whether there was a draft bill that was circulated throughout the rural areas of this province during the early part of this year, and if so, whom did he canvass, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DOWNEY: No, I did not circulate any copy of any draft bill from my department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could he then indicate whether any members of his department circulated a draft bill which is identical to Bill 25, almost identical, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the last few months?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, no one from my department circulated a draft bill and the draft that the member is referring to is not exactly the same as 25; there are many variations in that bill and it was tabled in committee the other night. That did not come from the government or from my department.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister then explain to the House how Al Church, a member of his department, was involved in perusing this draft with members of the farm community in the months of February, March, et cetera?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone in the Province of Manitoba can put forward many recommendations, and as I have stated it is not the same and it did not come from my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a seventh question.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister didn't understand my question. I asked him to explain how it was, or how it is, that a member of his department . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that he has no right to demand an explanation. He can ask for an explanation; if he received it, then that is gratuitous.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on that very point. I agree with you, Sir, but I assume the Minister did not understand my question, Sir, so I will repeat the question. Can he explain to the House why a member of his department was busy circulating this draft throughout the province during the months of February and March?

MR. DOWNEY: There was not a member of my department circulating any draft of any bill in those

months that the member refers to.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary at this time to rise on a matter of grave privilege of the House on the answers that have just been given by the Minister of Agriculture. This is the second time that I have found it necessary to rise on a matter of privilege of the House because of the attitude and the actions of that Minister of Agriculture, a Minister of the Crown. On many occasions, Mr. Speaker, we have solicited information from the Minister and he has undertaken on many occasions to provide the information for us and he has failed to do so. In the matter that has just been raised, with the question of a draft that was tabled at Committee on Friday evening about 1:30 in the morning, I believe, I posed a question to the Minister on May 29, and I'll read directly from Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I believe that the honourable member has an obligation to state his question of privilege, and he is not doing that. Let's hear what the question of privilege is.

MR. ADAM: My question of privilege is that I asked the Minister on May 29, and I quote: "Is it correct that a draft copy for the legislation of Bill 25 was distributed in February and not to the members of the opposition?" Reply from Mr. Downey: "That is not correct, Mr. Speaker."

We have questioned a witness in Committee of Agriculture who spoke of Bill 25. We asked him questions pertaining thereto and he said, "I got it out of the draft bill that was distributed to us many months ago." He has had this bill at least since January, February at the latest. So the Minister has definitely deceived this House in that he says he had not distributed this copy. On January 16, a meeting was held in Winnipeg, called by the Manitoba Pool Elevators, at which Mr. Church was there, as well as Mr. Lorne Parker, and there were requests made for a copy of the draft and it was suggested that they may be able to provide it, and maybe not, and after several attempts by the National Farmers Union, by a Mr. Brad MacDonald, calling the Minister's office, they finally said it was not available for distribution; but it was available for distribution. It was distributed by Mr. Church to meers of the Cow-Calf Association and the Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Can the Member for Ste. Rose please raise his matter of privilege.

MR. ADAM: The matter of privilege is, Sir, that again today the Minister introduced a letter in support of Bill 25. This is not the resolution that he had received on May 12, or prior, and I will read again from excerpts in which he says . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find at the present time the member has not yet raised a matter of privilege and he is using up the time of the House. If he has a matter of privilege, I ask him to raise it now.

MR. ADAM: He is deceiving the House by introducing this letter here of support. He is deceiving the House, and I will prove it if you will allow me to read what he said on May 12, and here is the resolution that he received, that he claims he had in his possession on May 12, a resolution passed: "After lengthy discussion, a motion was carried by the Manitoba Cow-Calf Association supporting in principle of a Manitoba Cattlemens Association." This was on May 12 and this is dated June 26. That is a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and it is not even the same resolution that he read into the record. And this Minister has been deceiving this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Oreeer please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he has not raised a matter of privilege, in fact, he has abused the privileges of the House and I suggest that in the future he consider very carefully using up the very valuable time of this Chamber. —(Interjection)— Order please. I have just ruled there is no matter of privilege. If the Member for Lac du Bonnet has a matter of privilege he may raise one.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on introduction of Bill 25, the Minister read into the record a resolution from the Cow-Calf Association — at least he claimed he had one. Today he tabled the alleged letter after we have asked him on numerous occasions to table it, and this letter is dated the 26th of June and is not even in the same words as what he used in the introduction of Bill 25.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of privilege, the letter which I tabled was a copy of a resolution which I said I had. I had received that resolution from within the department and I am still prepared to table the resolution that I received from within the department. I have also received in addition that copy of the resolution from the Cow-Calf people, so now I have two of them, one from within the department and the one that was —(Interjection)— the original one can be tabled tomorrow. I have two letters of support from them now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance concerning his statement on the Manitoba Government's participation in the Federal Energy Program. I understood him to say on television, and I would ask him if he could clarify that he was going to in effect restrict the program or limit the program to individual experiments or private experiments such as solar energy for homes. Is this the extent of the Manitoba Government's involvement re solar energy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the intent of my comments with regard to the Renewable Energy Program was that I stated that we were at the point where it was time to move the technology into actual applications and that our emphasis would be on seeing it instituted and built into buildings, homes primarily, since the primary application of solar is likely to be in the construction of housing. I indicated that that there is where our priority would lie. I didn't mean to imply that we would not be looking at other aspects of solar utilization, simply that the technology has advanced far enough now that it is time to move in and get actual applications being undertaken by the citizens of the province who may wish to build housing in such a manner.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister whether in addition, if he wants to put his primary emphasis on housing, is he ruling out further experimentation by the University of Manitoba or the Solar Energy Society or the Provincial Government in other applications outside of housing?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker, not at all. As a matter of fact, we would like to encourage further research for that by the University or a technically qualified group in solar and other renewable work. I trust that we can work out some programs in conjunction with the new federal program that will see encouragement of that type of research work. But if the member is referring to the solar experiment on the roof, our feeling generally is that that type of research work should be under the guidance of an institute such as the University and that in the long run will produce better results by being under the scientific eye of a body such as that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question is: Assuming that our share of the \$380 million program is some \$15 million or \$16 million, does the Minister feel that Manitoba can access that amount of money from the federal program?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll be doing everything we can to attempt to even access that much money on a pro rata basis or on a per capita basis. The figure does work out to somewhere around \$19 million and certainly would make a major difference to programs in this province if we can do it and we'll be aiming to access as much as possible and we'll appreciate every assistance we get from the Member for Elmwood, too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the House as to what instructions have been issued to the Winnipeg police in respect to their attendance at various Safeway stores in connection with the picketing at those stores and the utilization of police?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: By myself, Mr. Speaker, none.

MR. PAWLEY: As the Attorney-General is responsible for the administration of law in the Province of Manitoba, can he advise us what instructions have been issued by the Winnipeg Police Commission to the members of the Winnipeg police?

MR. MERCIER: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Attorney-General assure us that communicating information, true information, at these stores is not being prevented the same as allowed under various provisions of the law in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MERCIER: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if she could inform the House whether she or her department has had any further communication in respect to the collective bargaining between Swift's and the Canadian Food and Allied Workers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: In that regard, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to lend her department's concurrence to help the people who have been locked out in respect to Canada Packers to gain their unemployment insurance.

MRS. PRICE: I don't think there's anything my department can do, Sir. That's a federal problem.

MR. FOX: I realize it's a federal problem, Mr. Speaker, but I just wondered whether the Minister would be prepared to lend her support to those people who have been laid off because of dispute in another company.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the Minister of Agriculture's answer recently about the letters and resolutions from the Cow-Calf Association, could he indicate which is the authentic resolution, the one that he read out in his speech of May 12th purporting to be the association's resolution of their annual meeting or their one of June 26th, which is also purporting to be a resolution of their annual meeting, and they both differ.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that they both came from the same meeting and they are both from the same group of people and it could be a difference in the wording. I am prepared to table the original one that I referred to.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now prepared to tell this House with what groups did he have members of his staff discuss the proposed legislation that he has tabled in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that repetitive questions — and that question has been asked previously in this session.
The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: I believe that that question has not been asked today.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that question was not asked. The questions that were asked earlier

Monday, July 17, 1978

were questions relating to the bill that was tabled before the committee. I've asked the Minister specifically, not dealing with any draft legislation that we know his department had, I'm asking him with what groups did he have members of his staff discuss proposed legislation that he knew and his staff knew back in January that was going to be presented in this House dealing with the Manitoba Cattlemen's Association.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as was indicated I'm sure in committee, if not in committee at many times in the agricultural press, that there was the opportunity for any groups or individuals to discuss the livestock association in the months prior to introduction of it into this House.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in light of that answer, is the Minister now admitting that there was a draft piece of legislation that was distributed amongst cattle producers?

MR. DOWNEY: No, I am not, Mr. Speaker. There was not one distributed or circulated.

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

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to pursue that question further. Did the Minister meet with the Farm Union group with respect to his legislation, and did he meet with the Independent Cattle Producers Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: On the bill in specific, I did not meet with any individuals. I met with individuals to discuss a livestock association.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether he or his staff met with the Farm Union people and the Independent Cattle Producers Association group to discuss legislation which was subsequently introduced, namely, Bill 25 — to discuss legislation, proposed legislation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I had several meetings with different groups, whether they be in the building or anywhere, and I discussed it with several groups.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General, in view of the fact the Attorney-General is not prepared to provide us with assurance insofar as the last question which I posed to him, in respect to picketing lawfully in the Province for Manitoba, and as he is responsible, as the administrator of the laws of this province, for obedience to same, would the Attorney-General investigate and report back to the House as to whether or not lawful picketing has been interfered with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have not to date received any complaints from either side of the dispute or any member of the public with respect to the matter referred to by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I am prepared to make whatever enquiries I can to assure him as requested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for MHRC. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many bids were received for the building lots in the Bell Avenue subdivision at The Pas, the bids which closed July 6. How many were received for those lots?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: I could stand corrected, Mr. Speaker, but none.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House that the reason that no bids were received for those lots for sale is because MHRC forgot to put ads in the local papers

that the lots were in fact for sale.

MR. JOHNSTON: I will check that, Mr. Speaker, but one of the reasons we didn't get many requests for sale is because we had to spend so much money cleaning up a mess, making the lots saleable, that they're too high in price.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister then could also confirm that the bids have been asked for again, up until July 28, because of the oversight and bungling of MHRC.

MR. JOHNSTON: Our bungling will cost another diet, your bungling cost a fortune.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development responsible for Corrections in the province. Inasmuch as there are no suitable holding facilities for juveniles awaiting trial in the City of Brandon, and inasmuch as they are now being held in the present Brandon Correctional Institute, is the Minister planning to establish a facility that is suitable for this purpose and in keeping with the laws in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): We would hope to do that as soon as possible, as soon as budgetary positions permit, Mr. Speaker; until then, we would make use of existing facilities for the handling of juvenile offenders.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, since there is a possibility that such juveniles will have to be sent to Winnipeg to be held in detention while awaiting trial when the old jail goes out of operation, because this is where they're held now, will the Minister be prepared to treat this matter of setting up a suitable holding facility as a matter of priority?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would say that there are some other areas of the province, notably one in the north, that would be ahead of that issue raised by the honourable member on the priority list.

MR. EVANS: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister whether he is knowledgeable, whether his department is breaking the laws of the province by holding juveniles in facilities such as the Brandon Correctional Institute, or indeed, any other town or city in the province' because there are provisions in the law for special separate holding facilities?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware, and my department is aware of the laws as they pertain to housing of juvenile and adult offenders. At the same time, we are hopeful that the construction industry will be back at work soon, and that the new Correctional Institute in Brandon will be completed and be available. There will then be existing facilities that we will utilize on a temporary basis for juvenile offenders.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a fourth question.

MR. EVANS: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as holding juveniles at any correctional institute is against the law of the province, would the Minister not consider — not necessarily constructing a new facility — but finding some facility, an old house or whatever to hold such juveniles and therefore be in keeping with the laws of the province?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member says that holding juveniles at a correctional institute is against the laws of the province, it's only against the laws of the province if that's a correctional institute being utilized by and for adults, and we are hoping that the new institution will be completed fairly quickly, and adults will be housed there, and the juveniles could then be housed in existing facilities, including the existing old facility, until we are in a budgetary position to provide new facilities for juveniles. But in looking at the list of priorities we have to look at some other points in the province at the same time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Monday, July 17, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to announce a change on the Committee of Statutory Regulations and Orders. The Honourable Member for Burrows is to be replaced by the Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that change agreed? (Agreed).
The Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friends would be prepared to deal with Bill No. 72 for second reading, and following that, if we could go into Committee of the Whole, and deal with those three bills, 43, 48 and 72.

SECOND READING

**BILL NO. 72 — AN ACT FOR GRANTING TO HER MAJESTY
CERTAIN FURTHER SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE
PROVINCE
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING 31st DAY OF MARCH, 1979(2)**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK presented Bill No. 72, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1979(2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, this is Supplementary Supply, Bill (2), which was dealt with in detail on Friday.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee to consider the said bills, 43, 48 and 72.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bills Nos. 43, 48, and 72, for third reading, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: The matter before the House is Bill No. 43, An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the borrowing of same.
Page by Page? Agreed? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 43 was read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 48, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1979.

BILL NO. 48 was read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 72, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, this bill we haven't had before us for all that much time. I think we might as well revert to clause by clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Clauses 1 to 5 of Bill No. 72 were read clause by clause and passed.)

Schedule A, 6. \$30,000—pass; Education 9. 1,100,000—pass; Finance 1.(e)— the Honourable Member for Elmwood.\$

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just ask a question or two again of the Minister of Finance here clarifying his remarks. He indicated there could be a sum available from the Federal Government to as high as \$19 million. This figure is certainly higher than mine, but I'm interested in the intention of the government in terms of accessing some of that \$380 million and attempting to get the most possible money for people in Manitoba, either individual citizens or university researchers, the government, etc.

Can the Minister indicate, assuming Manitoba got 100 percent of its share, into what kind of projects we would attempt to put that money? Does the Minister have any kind of a plan in terms of how much would go towards solar research, etc? Can he give us any suggested breakdown or any areas of interest that he has?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the \$19 million is simply taken on a per capita basis, taking 1/20th of the \$380 million total that has been announced but we will not receive that money in that form. The federal program is broken down into some specific areas that they have an interest in and it's an undertaking, as they've indicated, to spend quite a large portion of that, I think nearly a third of it, in purchase of products made in Canada that are renewable energy products and thereby help foster a renewable resource equipment production industry. So that would not come to the provinces; it's likely that only a small portion — and we have no definitive information at this time as to how much of it would come to the provinces on co-operative projects, but we're working on it with them. All we've had so far from them is a general listing and the press announcement, telex, the day prior to the press announcement that the program was going to be announced. I haven't had any further word back from them to the letter I wrote about a month ago asking for support for a scientific centre on solar research for Manitoba and asking if we could look forward to discussing it with them. I'm still awaiting a reply on that.

In addition to that, we will soon hope to meet with them and to get down to the exact questions that I'm sure the Member for Elmwood has in his own mind as to what sort of joint programs we can hope to undertake here. I would hope to see us get into programs typically in the solar field now where we can offer some sort of assistance to people moving into solar assisted heating, I think perhaps on the basis that it would be instrumented so that we could produce on-site information so that we can develop a local technology and know-how as to what are the do's and don'ts of applying solar energy, as it has gone beyond the stage where really scientific-only information is required. Scientific information is available; the problem is the practical do's and don'ts of application of solar energy and that can only be done through actual building of some different principles into different styles of buildings, having them monitored technically over a period of time and having the information brought back and centrally pooled and processed and made available for further development. So that's where the comment came from that the member referred to in the Question Period, and that is where the sort of priority would go at this point.

I think it is also important to mention here that even to date, one of the main benefits from all of this is actually improvements in conservation and I think that there is a large body of the technical community, scientific community, that would agree that the major benefit from all of this may not in fact be the actual capturing and utilization of solar energy itself. What would come out of it, though, is just a highly improved technology with regard to building construction in this particular part of the world, with our cold climates and our unique conditions that are imposed as a result of being located in a climate that has a very severe winter, and already that sort of information is being produced and is proving that conservation methods are extremely important and extremely valuable.

I know that, for instance, the house that was built in Regina under the same program, I think, that provided part of the financing for the solar work that was done here, has shown some very remarkable results. Now, they have integrated solar into that house and at the same time are finding that in fact the house was so well built in that particular case and so well done in terms of a conservation measure, although expensive, that in fact the solar has a diminishing return in terms of the investment that has gone into it, that the return is far higher on a conservation side just

from the good building practices that went into the house. And that sort of thing we will only find out after we have done quite a large number of houses and people who are interested in this, of course, are legion in number.

er. There are just all sorts or numbers of people who want to get into building conservation conscious houses utilizing solar or some other sort of facility, whether it a wood-burning facility or some other facility, but part and parcel of it all is, of course, good conservation and design, or conservation conscious design. That's the important stage that we are now at and want to pursue with the Federal Government and get into some specific buildings here that do that, and of course, to take advantage of their program of trying to develop a secondary supply industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elound.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the points I want to make to the Minister is to attempt to maximize our share of these federal dollars that are available. They are going to certainly be picked up by the larger provinces and the larger cities and my point is that Manitoba should have an opportunity to experiment and to utilize federal dollars in this interesting and important field of energy development. We were one of the first, I think, off the mark.

In today's paper, for instance, it is mentioned that the National Research Council was involved in experiments with homes in only five instances in 1974, so the beginnings of experimentation were very very small and very faltering and of course in the last four years we have gone beyond that, but Manitoba, I think, was an early leader and still is with its experiment in this particular building. I want to urge the Minister to pursue that experiment and develop similar experiments, not to preclude it, not to show little enthusiasm for experiments by the university and by the province, or indirectly funded by the province, not to restrict himself only to the development of solar technology for homes, because we already have some valuable experience. There are some people now in Manitoba who work for the Department of Public Works, who work for the Energy Council, the Department of Industry and Commerce, the University of Manitoba, the Solar Energy Society — these people have practical experience. You know, it is always easy to be perfect in theory, but practical experience is worth a great deal.

So I simply urge the Minister not to disregard or downplay the sort of public experimentation that has taken place and secondly, to emphasize it as well on the basis of acquiring a larger share of federal funding. I think he should bear those points in mind as he is developing the new provincial program in energy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Finance 1.(e), \$300,000—pass; 2.(d) Refunds—pass; 8.(b) Other Expenditures s—pass Finance—pass.

Health and Social Development, 7 — Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, (k) The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, \$154,000—pass.

Industry and Commerce, 2 — Operations, (g)(2) Other Expenditures, \$60,000—pass.

Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on Friday last, the Minister of Finance was asked by one of my colleagues details with regard to the Northern Field Services Division grants of \$130,800, and the limited information the Minister of Finance had at that time, he wasn't able to give a full explanation. As I understand it, the Minister of Finance indicated that the money here was for special grants, I think through the Metis Federation — and the question posed was, where in either here or in the main Estimates, are the moneys that are to be paid through the Band Councils on the \$3.00 per capita which were not available up to now because there was a question of the census and the figures from Stats Canada? But the question — I believe he, the Minister of Northern Affairs, was out of the House at the time, and I believe the Minister of Finance indicated he would try to get the information as to where the funds were to pay the Band Councils the \$300 per capita which would be owing to them now that the population figures are in.

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll still get that information. The Minister for Northern Affairs has still not returned, and although I can get the information from Finance on this breakdown here, the other money provided on the per capita was contained in the Estimates, the regular Estimates that were approved, and there was no need to supply a special supply for the per capita grants. What I undertook to get for the Member for The Pas, I will still obtain that for him as soon as I can, perhaps within a matter of hours.

Monday, July 17, 1978

MR. MILLER: Well, as I understand it, the Minister of Finance is saying that the funds, the \$3.00 per capita funds were included in the main Estimates, although I think during the course of the Estimates the Minister of Northern Affairs indicated that they had not been included because they weren't known, and that we could look forward to seeing them in Supplementary. However, they are not in Supplementary either, so we'll leave it at that and the Minister will have to come up with some information. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6(f) Grants and Purchased Services—pass; 7(b)(5) Northern Flood Agreement—pass; (d)(2) Other Expenditures— —pass; Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services—pass.

Public Works, 2(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs 1.(h) Grant Assistance—pass; 2.(a)(3)(a) Salaries and Wages \$86,400—pass; Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs—pass — The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, before we dispose of this bill, because of being in brief conference with the Government House Leader I was temporarily distracted when we were dealing with Item 7.(b)(5), which is an amount of over \$1-1/2 million, in which amount I was asking the Minister of Finance for some particularization when we were in committee stage, and the Minister, I believe, was taking it as notice because there is some detail involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, we had some discussion on it on Friday and I think I gave all the breakdown into about ten categories to the Member for The Pas, and there was some discussion with the Member for Inkster as well. There are no moneys contained in this for the Northern Flood Committee. In other words, Manitoba is not participating and has indicated they would not participate in the Northern Flood Committee itself but the obligations of the agreement are met in here under a number of different categories.

The development portion, the development agreement part of it, is \$400,000.00. I did give a complete breakdown, pretty well a complete breakdown' with all the figures to the Member for The Pas, which are on the record and probably printed today, if that's satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be Reported—pass.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

BILLS 43, 48 and 72 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Opposition House Leader could now indicate what the disposition of Bill No. 4 is. —(Interjection)— But I would like to deal with Bill No. 4. There was an undertaking, I believe, this morning that the Member for St. Johns would withdraw his amendment. If that undertaking can be given now . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, that can be confirmed.

BILL No. 4 as amended was read a third time and passed.

MR. JORGENSON: Will you call Bills 67 and 68, Mr. Speaker?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 67 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FARM LANDS PROTECTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill No. 67, I wish to make the observation that on introduction of this measure by the Minister of Agriculture that we seemed to be somewhat on the same slippery slope that we have experienced with respect to Bill 25, that all things aren't as they are stated, Mr. Speaker, and I will allude to those aspects as I continue my contribution.

First of All, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that over the last several years it had become evident to the government, the political parties, to many people in Manitoba, that there was something wrong with respect to the relationship of farm land prices and the price of farm commodities and there was pressure brought to bear on government to try to bring greater relevance between land prices and farm product commodity prices, and so we moved towards the introduction of The Farm Lands Protection Act. It as felt that as the situation was at that time that it was very difficult for young people to begin their farming operations having to buy land at unreasonably high prices, high because of external pressures that were put on land prices. Pressures not brought about by other farmers competing for the same land, Mr. Speaker, but rather non-farming interests that were competing for the same land for other reasons, either investment purposes or tax purposes, or whatever, both domestic corporations and individuals who were non-farmers and foreign corporations and individuals who were not necessary interested as agriculture as such.

And so we yielded to those pressures in the introduction of The Farm Lands Protection Act with the view in mind that, yes, we would want to give our young farmers and prospective young farmers the best opportunity to establish themselves on land that was priced reasonably and based on its ability to repay the mortgage. Along with that, of course, we also introduced the land-lease program for those people who were not in a position to raise mortgage funds. And that was sort of the package that was to ease the financial burden on these beginners in agriculture. Perhaps it even extended to people who were already established in the agricultural county but were not necessarily viable farm units.

So we thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had a fairly reasonable package as between the lease program and the restrictive legislation on farm land ownership, in order to accomplish that important reality.

I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that land in the last few years has certainly out-priced itself in terms of the ability of production from that land to pay those prices. There is no way that grain farmers or livestock farmers, or any farmers in Manitoba, could amortize a mortgage based on current land values out of their operations. It's just impossible, and so it means that only those people who are well-established in the farming community are readily available to further consolidate land holdings, or it has to really fall into the hands of people who are not truly interested in agriculture as such.

So that has been the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, and we thought that we had addressed ourselves to it to some degree. So the intent, Mr. Speaker, was to remove external pressures on land prices and we thought, Mr. Speaker, that those external pressures were both Canadian and non-Canadian. We didn't think there was any difference with respect to the results of these pressures on farm land prices in Manitoba, whether it was a company or individual who was not interested in agriculture or farming, who lived in Winnipeg, domiciled in Winnipeg or Toronto, or Vancouver, or West Germany or Arabia. It didn't make any difference. It seemed to us at that time that the effect of their involvement was the same. If it was adverse, then it was adverse no matter who it was, whether it be a Canadian or a non-Canadian. And so the objective to be realized had to restrict both Canadians and non-Canadians. —(Interjection)— Non-resident farmers, that's right.

And so I think the legislation was not given a chance to work, Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons and it appears that this government wants it not to work. It is really not furthering the cause of that situation, of that legislation. It is not intent on rectifying the problem that I had just illustrated. It is indeed a status quo anti-legislation that is before us. And I think that's rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. It's rather unfortunate because more and more we are going to see undue land consolidation and out-migration from rural areas into the towns and cities because of it, and more and more we are going to see absentee landlords take hold of our agricultural land base. So we

are going to witness, in the future, a dramatic increase in rental payments flowing out of the countryside into the cities and into other jurisdictions. So that in essence there is going to be a cash outflow situation from the small towns and villages and, indeed, from the province, and indeed from the country, because of the modifications that have been introduced by this government, Mr. Speaker.

In looking at the objectives, and I'm going to repeat them for the record, Mr. Speaker. On Page 1 of the Minister's remarks he cites the objectives of the changes will be to place more stringent effective restrictions on the purchase of agricultural land by non-resident Canadians, and the freeing up or the making it available for all Canadians and the majority shareholders of Canadian corporations to purchase farm lands in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the legislation, it talks about greater restriction only in one area, and that is in the area of individual foreign ownership where the limitations are reduced to 20 acres. So it's legislation addressing itself against individuals who may not be resident Canadians. But if you look at the next paragraph — not on the next paragraph but on the same page, above that — Mr. Speaker, you notice that corporations, Canadian corporations, are exempt and therefore this legislation is for more corporate ownership of land in Canada and in Manitoba. The only qualification here is that the corporation must be majority-owned by resident Canadians, Mr. Speaker, which makes it possible for many people anywhere in the world to participate in land consolidation and ownership in this province through a Canadian company, as long as 51 percent of the shares are owned by Canadian residents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't preclude the possibility that someone from Germany, or Italy, or France, or anywhere in the world who wishes to participate in a Canadian company, from owning millions of acres of land as long as they don't own a majority of the shares of that company. So really this legislation isn't restrictive, Mr. Speaker, it merely favours corporations over individuals. And that's what we're dealing with, which is in keeping with Conservative principles and bias. I can appreciate that consistency, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's a tragedy for Canadians to find themselves in a position where revenues are going to flow out of this province into the hands of people outside of Manitoba, outside of our rural communities and into other provinces and other countries through rental fees on a large scale.

Now in explaining the bill, Mr. Speaker, on Page 2 of the Minister's remarks — and it's interesting because it indicates what I mentioned on introduction of this bill that we're onto another slippery slope, Mr. Speaker — I want to quote a paragraph in the middle of the second page, "In explaining the bill, I may just briefly state that it has appeared in the past that individuals who are non-resident Canadians and have been desirous of buying land in Manitoba have just used a multiple of names to purchase additional 160-acre packages which they are now allowed to buy." That's the way it's worded in any event.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you follow that through, just to show what nonsense that statement is, on the middle of the next page, I'm going to quote a paragraph in the middle of the third page, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister says, "The Farm Lands Protection Act has been in place and there have been very few non-farming Manitobans and Canadians that have actually purchased land and it is one of those things that is another restriction over them that is needless." Well, on Page 2, the Minister is saying that the restriction didn't work against foreigners because the restriction was 160 acres and all they had to do was gather together a dozen people, each of them would own 160 acres and they got around the legislation. That's what the Minister is saying. But on the next page, even though Canadians were allowed to own a section of land, he seems to say that that somehow was an undue restriction. Obviously, Canadians wouldn't know how to multiply their numbers and each own a section of land. Only the foreigners could do that according to this statement, Mr. Speaker. So it's not a credible presentation and it's not logical and it doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker. The Minister would do well to be more candid and simply tell us that Conservative philosophy is the marketplace and we want to put things back there and I would accept that as an honest statement of fact and philosophy. But that's not what he's doing. He's trying to colour the issue and he's doing a very poor job of it at that, Mr. Speaker.

He says, "The amendments will clearly state that we have tried to make it as easy as possible for the farm people who are desirous of continuing to own the farm land." Now, Mr. Speaker, this

legislation that was on the books was not against farm people. They were the only privileged group that were allowed to own unlimited acreages. There was no restriction on farm people and yet the Minister has the audacity to suggest that this somehow is going to ease the restrictions on farmers. Again, another aspect of his slippery type of approach in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. Bill 25, Bill 67, are very much characterized by that kind of commentary on the part of our Minister of Agriculture and it's not something that I think commends him at all, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very sad reflection on the way this Minister wants to handle his legislation and his programs in the Legislative Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I am going to indicate that we will be voting against the measure in principle and likewise with respect to the other bill which I don't intend to debate because as I understand it, it is a companion piece of legislation to this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes of the time of the House to indicate the position that our party, speaking for it, would like to take on this bill. One is because we have a very long historical interest in The Farm Land Protection Act, going back, I think, to the first resolution that was introduced in this Legislature about 1965 if I'm not mistaken, by a Liberal member of the Legislature, a resolution at that time, asking that action be taken in this area. And I think it was our party that persisted over a period of about 10 years as the problem began to grow and develop that finally brought the matter to a head and I believe it was about 1975, if I'm not mistaken, that a resolution was in fact passed by this House which led to the present legislation.

The reason for my speaking, Mr. Speaker, on this bill is to indicate that I intend to support it, simply for this reason, that the previous legislation didn't work. I don't know if this is much better but I know that the last one didn't work at all. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to go back to the well one more time and have another drink at it because I do think the issue to which the bill was intended is an important one and that the previous legislation had so many loopholes in it, so many ways to get around it that it was absolutely ineffective in dealing with the basic issue which is this: not to prevent people from buying land, but the issue was to prevent people buying land at highly inflated prices so that local people could no longer afford to farm. That was really the issue, I think, that we introduced in this House many years ago, that the problem with foreign ownership is not that we don't like someone from France, or Switzerland, or Britain, or Afghanistan, buying land in Manitoba. The issue is that in many cases the land that which is bought is bought at such an inflated price, far beyond the market value, that local residents, the local people who would like to also purchase land, to go into farming, find that they are simply out of the market, they simply can't compete with that kind of capital because there are large repositories of capital in foreign banks which simply are looking for a place to land and they make little relevance to the actual market conditions or the farming conditions; they simply want to invest because they assume that something can be done.

I remember this wintertime, Mr. Speaker, talking to a lawyer from a Toronto law firm which almost exclusively centres its practice upon selling farm land in Manitoba. And they never come out here, they don't visit. The lawyer sits in his Toronto office, he takes money coming in from the banks, coming in from foreign areas, simply arranges with another law firm here. They say, "What's on the market? They'll buy it." They say, "Well, you know, this is what the bargaining price is, is what's going on for auction." They say, "Offer \$200 or \$300 extra an acre or \$1,000 extra an acre," and as a result the marketplace gets highly distorted. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he told me, and the Minister of Agriculture may want to correct my figures, but by just doing some checking, I indicated that certain municipalities close to the City of Winnipeg, like LaBroquerie, over 50 percent of the land is now foreign-owned. That's a very substantial figure. I think it was around 50 to 60 percent is owned and most of it is absentee ownership. Some parts of it is not being worked at all, it's simply being held in escrow.

Now there are cases, as I understand it, in Manitoba where foreign owners will come and buy land in Manitoba, will invest a lot of money improving the lands, particularly Class 3 or 4 agricultural land; they will put a lot of money into upgrading it, bringing it into production, and I think that there is a fine line of how far you go in inhibiting or preventing that kind of useful investment because there's no question that we all, in effect, at one time were foreigners buying land or receiving land in this country and bringing it up to standard and bringing it into production. But when it does take place is that in many of these municipalities where you find that they're paying \$600, \$800

an acre for land they simply put it out of reach of young Manitobans who may want to go into the farming business.

What did appear to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the legislation that was passed previously provided absolutely no deterrent to that kind of activity. Certainly speaking to those people involved in that law firm, I think it was the Minister of Agriculture said, they knew all kinds of ways of getting through it, around it, under it, and over it. It was simply no impediment at all. It was more sort of simply something to give them a little bit more work and perhaps charge a little bit more fee but it certainly didn't in any way inhibit the acquisition of land by foreign corporate owners using the multiplication method that was described by the Minister of Agriculture.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply prepared to take a chance on this new legislation in the hope that it will work better than the last piece which didn't work at all. That may not be what is known as a highly enthusiastic endorsement for the legislation but, Mr. Speaker, it's about the best I can do.

I also wanted to bring to the Minister's attention, perhaps to the government's attention, an issue that runs alongside this one. It's one that has really come to my attention oh, in the last year, and I've done some checking on it in the last week or so, and that is the foreign ownership of urban land. I know that it may not be of direct interest to the Minister of Agriculture but this is the Act he's dealing with, Bills 67 and 68 and, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed some latitude, I'll deal with both bills at the same time just to deal with The Real Property Act.

But one of the things that struck me in my own constituency and in other areas of the downtown, is that a substantial number of the major real estate developments in the City of Winnipeg, mainly residential but also office, are owned by foreign owners whose only form of accountability to the Province of Manitoba is a mailing address somewhere in Monaco or Liechtenstein or San Marino or some place that can only be found in the Atlas of Europe. I mean, I don't know where these places are. I know they're somewhere over there, and all I have in my mind is funny little soldiers running around with pikes and helms or something defending that place.

But the fact of the matter is that the problem of foreign ownership of land is now becoming as serious in the urban areas as it is in the rural areas, and that the reason it is serious is because we are divorcing ownership from any sense of responsibility or accountability. All these large properties are being managed by a local manager who, when you go to him and say, "Hey, what about this tenant problem?", he says, "Gee, I can't do anything about it; I'll have to get in touch with the owner." And I said, "Well, where do you get in touch with the owner?" They said, "Well, here's the mailing address." And the mailing address is one of these funny little countries away over there or some British insurance company or something. And you say, "Well how do you hold them accountable for their actions?" Well, you don't, Mr. Speaker, there is simply no accountability. I would refer members, if they want to, once we get out of here, take on some interesting summer reading. There's a fascinating book out called *City for Sale* which is a study of real estate transactions going on in cities in Canada and it points out that Winnipeg, if you look at some of the major apartment blocks, which I will not name but I think many of them reside in my constituency, are now owned by these sort of absentee foreign owners who absolutely and completely refuse to have any, I think, any basic obligation. At least when the owners were here you could bargain, you could negotiate, you could talk, you could deal, you could try to work out, and there was a sense of local community affiliation. As far as these foreign owners are concerned, it's simply a cash flow situation and everything is geared according to what their accountants who work in some office in London, or Zurich, or New York, or some place, dictate to them.

So they have no sense of the responsibility that the property endows. I may be a old-fashioned in some ways, Mr. Speaker, but I've always assumed that property ownership had both rights and obligations to it. It had the property rights that one acquired under our legislation in terms of possession and in terms of use, also endowed one with certain obligations as to how you used that property for some sense of community interest. But when you have total absentee ownership with absolutely no connection, interest or affiliation with what that property endows, then you simply get total disinterest and indifference. That's one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we're having so many problems in the property field, is that we have increasing cases of large-scale absentee ownership.

I would simply ask, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Treasury Benches take that under advisement, particularly on the reporting scheme, because under the present legislation — and we have amendments to 68 Bill — in The Real Property Act at least if we were to put stricter obligations as to where one reports and the information that is required under The Real Property Act so that Land Titles would have a clear definition of who the actual owner is rather than a whole series of front dummy companies, then you might be able to at least get to the source of ownership and therefore begin to hold those owners in some way responsible and accountable for the way that they use their property. That, I suggest, Mr. Speaker — the Minister of Consumer Affairs is not in his seat at the present moment, but the numerous problems that he will run into in administering

things like the Landlord and Tenant - Act and The Rent Review Act are in a large part derived from that absentee ownership that we face in the City of Winnipeg and in other areas. So, I would say, Mr. Speaker, like many other things, that it is no longer an issue that is purely and simply one that poses a problem in rural Manitoba, it is now a problem that is faced in all parts of Manitoba, and in the urban areas as well, for the same kinds of reasons that they can often outbid and outpay, they simply become forms of investments, and there is absolutely no obligation attached to that property ownership.

So I would say in some ways, Mr. Speaker, it's a curious anomaly, in fact, that some of the conditions that we are now bringing in in Bill 67 in terms of protecting rural areas against the problems associated with foreign ownership, I think could equally, and should be equally applied to urban land ownership, and that we should see that there should be a parallel set of legislation dealing with that kind of ownership, and it might be a worthwhile agenda for next year's Legislature to take a look at that particular issue, because I think that many of the problems that have been identified in rural areas are now being similarly experienced in our urban areas.

So, Mr. Speaker, without saying it, I would say that I have some concern about the bill in terms of the question of taking out the clauses of terms of absentee ownership in other parts of Canada, but I'm prepared to live with that and hope that the smaller property restrictions that have been imposed, to 20 acres, will attach the real problem, which is to get to the large scale foreign ownership using a multiplication ownership principle that is being employed. So, I will support this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to address myself to this bill for two reasons: one, with all respect to other members, honourable members who have spoken, I believe, that there is an element — I hope I'm not exaggerating it, I don't think I am — there is an element in this bill of sheer jingoism, having no relation to any economics whatsoever, and whenever I see that, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that it may be unpopular, and I have proved this by the hearings that we have had in the past, I intend to at least be a voice against it, that this bill is partially based on the fact that somebody thinks that he can make some miles out of saving that we're not going to let those Americans, or those Europeans, buy land in the Province of Manitoba. And when that happens, Mr. Speaker, and when it's not based on any rational, economic reason, I believe there is something that has to be said.

Now, the Member for Fort Rouge says that he believes there is a rational, economic reason, that it is a matter of keeping down the prices in the Province of Manitoba so that people can buy land. I respect his view in that regard, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think that it is valid. I do not believe that a foreigner will come into Manitoba and pay more for land than the market price. He may be one of those, when there is an abundance of purchasing power and a limited amount of land, who will cause that market price to go up, but just in the same way, Mr. Speaker, as any person not presently here will cause that price to go up, and therefore if we deal with the foreigner any different than we deal with the person in Toronto, then we are attaching something to this bill which smacks of a kind of narrow nationalism, Mr. Speaker, and is the kind of thing that will ultimately result in nothing but reprisals or Balkanization of that type of thing throughout the world.

I know that there are many Canadians who have bought land in the United States and in other parts of the States, that it is legal for them to do so, that I think that they consider this to be something which is very normal, but which they are now excluding. So, part of it, Mr. Speaker, and we saw it throughout the hearings that we held in Manitoba, and I went from place to place, and in each case, we asked, "What difference is there between a farmer in Noyes, Minnesota owning a section of land in Manitoba which he is not going to farm, or a farmer in Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, owning a section of land in Manitoba which he is not going to farm?"

Mr. Speaker, I think that I can say without fear of great contradiction — and the Member for Morris was there. I believe the Member for Lakeside was there, the House Leader and the Minister of Highways — that no one gave a satisfactory answer that was based in any respect on economics. The most satisfactory answer we got, Mr. Speaker, was given by Joe Borowski. And Joe Borowski said essentially what Pickersgill said, that a Canadian baby is worth more than any foreign baby. That was the answer on this question; there was no economic answer at all. And I wonder whether the Member for Morris — and I'm not certainly criticizing, I believe that I should be able to sell my home to an American who will pay me \$50,000 rather than to a Canadian who will pay me \$45,000.00. I do not believe that I should be prevented from selling my home for the highest price, and I don't think that the Member for Morris would have felt that he should be prevented from seeking to get the highest price for his piece of land, and restricted to selling it to a Canadian, unless, Mr. Speaker, unless we had some law which was designed to make sure that rural agricultural land in the Province of Manitoba was there for the benefit of, and utilized by people who were farming

the land in the Province of Manitoba. Now, that made sense, that made sense, Mr. Speaker, but then it didn't matter if they were a foreigner, it didn't matter if they were a Manitoban, and there was nothing in the previous legislation which would prevent a person from Italy who decided he wanted to be a farmer in the Province of Manitoba from buying two sections of land and coming here and farming it. That was available in the previous legislation.

There was an element, Mr. Speaker, of a distinction between a foreigner and a Canadian in our legislation, so we were not entirely without the description of what I've said before. There was in our legislation that a non-resident Canadian could own a section, a non-resident foreigner could own a quarter of a section, wasn't it? 120 acres, was that it? —(Interjection)— 160 acres.

So there was an element of distinction, but Mr. Speaker, the present Act really says that a foreigner, it says — it doesn't really mean it, because I'll deal with how they get out of it in a moment — it says a foreigner can't own more than 20 sections of land in the Province of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— 20 acres, Mr. Speaker. But it doesn't say that I cannot form a corporation, I as a foreigner, or that a foreigner could not form a corporation with the Member for Lakeside and myself, that we are two-thirds owners of it — that means that we have the majority of shares — but we have a shareholder's' agreement with our foreign partner that he will own all the land, and if we sell it, he will get the money. That we have a share — there is no doubt about the majority in the corporation, but the corporation binds itself by agreement with respect to facilitating ownership by a foreign person. I don't see that that is avoided in the Act, nor do I see, Mr. Chairman, how it ultimately can be avoided.

So let's address ourselves, and this is my real problem with the bill, and I want to address myself to the problem that was raised by the Member for Fort Rouge. What we are concerned with in this House, and what I've heard all rural organizations and farm groups coming to Committee saying that they are concerned with, is that it should be available, for a person wishing to get into agriculture, to be able to have land at reasonable prices and to be able to come into the business of farming without having to make an investment which reflects the kind of investment that's needed both for land and equipment at the present time, that that kind of investment at the present time makes it possible for farming to be conducted only by people who have already established themselves and can attract, or acquire more, and foreigners, people who have land from other places and can come into the Province of Manitoba and pay that kind of price.

So, Mr. Speaker, we try to address ourselves to that problem. We said the only way of making sure that there will be some land available for that element of the rural population that wishes to do this, is for the public to acquire a certain acreage of land, to make it available to those people who don't have that kind of an investment that they can make into farming, and to have that land available to him at rates which will enable him to farm and at rates which did not require him to make a huge investment in the purchase of land. And Mr. Speaker, we didn't say that that should be exclusively the case. As a matter of fact, we didn't even say that that should be primarily the case. To go further, Mr. Speaker, we said that that would involve a small percentage of people in the Province of Manitoba. And the Member for Lakeside, although I begged him to let me come to his constituency and debate with him at a platform in Lakeside so that all of the — in Woodlands, perhaps — that all of the balance of probabilities are on his side, that I would go into any farm community and deal with this question, and the farmers would agree with me. Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't go to Woodlands, but I did go into the Member's riding for Morden, and true, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't an assembly hall full of rural people, but there were decent rural people in that meeting. And I said, "Have any of you in this room any objection to the fact that the public owns some land which it would not acquire in any compulsory way from any farmer in the Province of Manitoba?" And there was not a single objection. I said, "Is there any objection to you if your neighbour decides he wants to rent from the public rather than renting from the former Member for Pembina, Mr. George Henderson?" And there wasn't a single, Mr. Speaker, objecting person. The program was entirely voluntary and yet demonstrably effective. And it got to the very subject that the Member for Fort Rouge was talking about. We could say with a certainty that there will be land available in our province which wouldn't necessarily inflate in value from the point of view of the resident farmer and that in a completely voluntary way, that land would be made available. In a completely voluntary way, it would be farmed by a person who wanted to do so and that it would not be a compulsion on anybody.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was asked a very pertinent question by the Member for Pembina when we were talking about commodity prices because I said that nobody knows actually which way is the best and there are arguments on the various sides of the question. The Member for Pembina said, "Given the fact that we don't know which way is best, don't you think that all ways should be available?" Am I being unfair with the question? I don't think so because, Mr. Speaker, it's in Hansard, it's in Hansard. He was saying, "Don't you think that a farmer should have a choice of doing one or the other?" And I said, Mr. Speaker, that my answer to that question was that I don't know how you can be both engaged in orderly marketing and at the same time suggest that there can

be a separate market available. But if someone could show me how that could work out, I would be willing to look at it. But in this respect, Mr. Speaker, don't you think that both ways should be available, that one has more freedom, not less freedom, when he is free to make that choice? Because on the basis of them making that choice, Mr. Speaker, how does one destroy freedom? If there is no public land available to the Province of Manitoba for a young farmer to rent from the public, how has rural Manitoba become more free by the elimination of one of the choices?

Mr. Speaker, there is, in one of Ibsen's plays a very profound statement on the subject. It's a play and I'm sorry that I can't give you at this point the name of the particular play but I remember the incident very well. A man and his wife were living together and her old boyfriend comes back, her old boyfriend. —(Interjection)— Well, it's perfectly all right. And she feels very much confused as to whether she would be drawn to this fellow or not and her husband, of course, is very very, at the beginning, very very certain that he would not . . . She asked for freedom to do what she wants, and the husband said, "No, you are to stay with me," and she continued. —(Interjection)— No, it's not Hedda Gabler, no. It's not Hedda Gabler, no, definitely not that one. I'll get the play tomorrow but it's not Hedda Gabler. —(Interjection)— No.

Mr. Speaker, she demanded that he give her the freedom to decide and he said that he wouldn't and as long as he wasn't going to give her that freedom to decide, she was sure that she was going to run away. Finally, at the very end, he released her and, Mr. Speaker, she stayed, she stayed. But the essence of the play was that freedom exists only when you can make the choice and that as long as that choice was not available, there was no freedom.

Now what we did in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is merely provided a choice, and we got to this problem because this bill, restrictions on purchasing land, are not going to change anything. You're going to have lawyers who will find ways out of these restrictions and find ways out of the next restrictions you enact and you're going to be no further than you were before. You will be in exactly the same position. The best guarantee that land will be available to young farmers wishing to farm the land on the basis that they can afford it is to make it available, make it available, Mr. Speaker. And the only way to make it available is to have some, and the only way to have some is to own it. No, we don't have to buy it. The fact is that 75 percent of the land in the Province of Manitoba is now communistically owned, as my Conservative friends would have. It's owned by the people of this province which means that we all own it. If you really believed in ownership, if you really believed in ownership, and that it's a wonderful thing for people to have pride in ownership, you would make it possible by restricting yourselves to private ownership of land and trying to make restrictions with regard to foreigners, you are ensuring that there will be less and less ownership in the Province of Manitoba, not more and more. Because, Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to everybody in this room that not everybody can own an individual title. If that was so, Mr. Speaker, and if we really believed in private ownership of land and that everybody should own it, we would have a million titles divided up amongst the people of the Province of Manitoba and everybody would be an owner. But my honourable friends know that that wouldn't last; it wouldn't last at all. The very process would be how fast can somebody get the one-millionth of the property that somebody else has. And before you know it, there would be less owners and still less owners, and what we have seen with regard to rural depopulation is that there have been still less owners.

So if the honourable members on the other side really believed in private ownership of land, they would see to it that as many private people owned land in the Province of Manitoba as is possible, and the ultimate, if that was their objective, which I concede that it isn't, is that if we all owned everything, then we would be equal private owners of all of the property in the Province of Manitoba. That's not what my honourable friends want. Nor has anybody on this side suggested that kind of solution. But what we have suggested is if there is a problem, direct yourself to the problem. I'll accept my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge's definition of the problem, that there should be land available for young farmers to be able to move into the area of agricultural production, to find an avenue to it. Mr. Speaker, this bill won't achieve that. This bill, at best, will result in a whole series of new subterfuges. And, Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to blame the Conservative Party entirely for this because all political parties have engaged in this exercise. We did it to the extent of 120 acres as against 640; or 160 as against 640; and non-residents immediately said, "How do we get around that situation?"\$

The Land Ownership Bill, the one that we passed, was a compromise which is usually a problem and was not, in my humble opinion, the most important element of our land program. The most important element of our land program, the one that worked, demonstrably worked, Mr. Speaker, which nobody can say that people got around it, nobody can say it didn't have exactly the effects that it was alleged to have had, was the Land Acquisition Program, the Land Lease Program, . . . and that Land Lease Program did what the Member for Fort Rouge wanted it to do. I think it had a useful result and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I was very much in favour of it.

I am concerned with this legislation for the two reasons that I am giving: One, and I won't accuse any individuals or even try to make a very hard point about it but, Mr. Speaker, there is in my

humble and respectful opinion, an element of jingoism in it, and there are members on the other side of the House who know it and who are probably just as unsympathetic with it as I am.

Secondly, it won't result in the objectives that the Minister has set for it. I don't make that as a terrible criticism. I think we tried. I don't know whether we would have got better results than the Minister is going to get. The Member for Fort Rouge said that it didn't work; maybe he's right. And the fact that ours didn't work doesn't make me a proponent of yours that won't work either.

But thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and most importantly, that there is a way to do this, that this way has been demonstrated, that this way will increase the freedom of the agricultural population of the Province of Manitoba; that the Conservative Party, true to form, has decided to restrict the freedom of the agricultural population in the Province of Manitoba, and I reject entirely the notion proposed by the Member for Morris, the House Leader, that the concepts of freedom and liberty are more properly expressed by the members on that side of the House than on this side of the House. I could go into 14 years of legislation, Mr. Speaker — well, not quite, 12 years of legislation, 1966 to 1978 — and deal with those questions on which the Conservative Party have demonstrably shown themselves to be on the side of restriction and repression; whether it comes to the laws with regard to the consumption of alcohol; whether it comes to the laws with regard to the restriction of those things that a person can read, can see, or can hear; whether it comes, Mr. Speaker, to the laws with respect to the right of a man to decide whether he will or will not work; whether it comes to the laws which will decide whether a man will or will not be permitted to walk down the street supporting his position, Mr. Speaker; in each case the Conservative Party has come down on the side of restriction and the New Democratic Party have come down on the side of freedom and liberty.

And, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— that is correct, that is correct, that is correct. In all cases, Mr. Speaker, in all cases, and that is still the case, that is still the direction which the Conservative Party is going under the guise —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, you know the Christian traditions, I am sure, are much more soundly based, much more soundly based than the notion that they will fall apart when the Member for Lakeside and the members on that side of the House fail to bring in a law saying that they're going to put people into jail if they look at what the Member for Lakeside or the other members consider to be an unhealthy film. I have much more confidence in the principles of Christianity than has my honourable friend and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I have been content to say that free human beings will not result in smut. What we know is that restricted human beings have resulted in smut. Every attempt to control pornography by restriction has not controlled pornography. It has raised the price of pornography and has raised, Mr. Speaker, the evils of pornography. In all of the years that you had censorship, in all of the years that you had censorship, the price of pornography was very high. It could be bought readily. It was viewed by the pillars of society within the confines of sellers and other places and then if some poor fellow went to see a movie at Rosie's Place on Portage Avenue, she was put in jail by the very society that was hypocritical enough to engage in these practices themselves. That's what happened with these so-called Christian laws, which are not Christian laws. I have much more respect for Christianity than has my honourable friend.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this bill is another example, this bill is based on trying to solve this situation by restrictions in land buying. You won't solve it in that way. If you want to solve the problem of the young farmer entering into the area of agricultural then, Mr. Speaker, you have to solve it by making land available to that young farmer, making the entire public making that land available, at his option, with no compulsion, with no expropriation, with no laws requiring either a person to buy or to sell one acre of land to the state. And that, Mr. Speaker, would do it within the ambit of the freedom that my honourable friends always like to talk about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on speaking on Bill 67, the Agricultural Lands Protection Act, the Member for Inkster once again gives his definition of freedom and tells us how the state ownership of the main resource that we have in Manitoba as being free to all of Manitobans to do with what they feel is so important. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when he brings in the Land Lease Program, when he suggests that that offered the individuals an opportunity to lease land from the government, Mr. Speaker, I have to take the opposite position. I would say that state ownership and government control completely removes the freedom of the farm people to transfer from one another, to invest in something that is not only an economic but something that is bred in all of Manitoba farm people.

When we refer to agricultural lands specifically, farm land in rural Manitoba, many times we have heard people speak and refer to a certain farm by the name of the individuals who have farmed

there for many centuries. That, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of. I am very proud of hearing farms that are referred to as the Enns Farm, or the Uskiw Farm, possibly, but people had some pride, Mr. Speaker, in what they worked on and that was their farms. If they grew 30 bushels to the acre of wheat, then that 30-bushel to the acre of wheat was theirs. They did not have companion programs such as was introduced by the last administration, not only to guarantee the livestock prices at 48 cents a pound and put a floor on them, but also put a ceiling on them at 48 cents a pound and limit the income for the farmers. That's the kind of freedom they want across the way. Mr. Speaker, those are the things that we are going to take away from the farm people, the state controlled freedom that they are referring to. We are going back to where people can control their own affairs, their own destiny, and sell their land to whom they want and rent to whom they want, whether they be living in Brandon, Winnipeg or in any part of Canada. That's a basic right and a freedom. My ancestors came to this province from Ontario and if there had been restrictions such as the members opposite wish, there wouldn't have been a lot of people here to help guide the province such as we're trying to do today. I think we have to get back to some basics with the farm people. They are proud to own it themselves, not to have the state own it.

Can you imagine, with the ratio of help that the Department of Agriculture was employing, that there was one person for every eight farmers in Manitoba under the last administration? If that isn't direct control or intent to control farmers, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't a direct control or method to try and control agricultural land with the livestock and the farm bill, the Land Lease Program, then I don't know what is. And, Mr. Speaker, it is our intent to change some of those things, some of those things which we have introduced in Bill 67 with the release of some individuals, whether they be involved in another business and have sons farming and want to invest in it, they have the right and the freedom to do it. I am fully in support of family farms. I do not think that this legislation will cause anyone any problems. I think that if the government of the last administration had been sincere they'd have had a land-lending program to lend farmers money, so they themselves could have owned the land.

What would farm people retire on today — who want to retire — if they hadn't owned their land? That is their savings. Farmers who have enjoyed the appreciated value of land, are now being able to enjoy retirement. They don't have to depend on government owned, low-cost housing. They are able to buy themselves a home and a house which they're proud of, and I'm proud to be able to support the fact that we can now go back to assisting those individuals to sell to whom they want and not be competing. Yes, Mr. Speaker, competing against who? Their own tax money, when it came to buying land.

I would say, in several cases, Mr. Speaker, that many agricultural people have brought it to my attention, that when trying to purchase land, that they were, in fact, competing against the MACC Land Purchaser for the Government of Manitoba, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the true fact of the matter; that they were one of the biggest competitors in the purchase of land in rural Manitoba.

I would very much like to see the Meer for Inkster come out into the Arthur constituency, and have a general discussion or debate on the state ownership of land — I would welcome that very much — and I would think that he would find such opposition to it, that he would have a hard time finding individuals who would come out in support of that kind of a proposal. And he says that we have 75 percent of the land already owned in Manitoba by the government, which is true. There is a lot of Crown land owned, Crown land that should be developed by the government, and made available to those individuals who want to buy and purchase their land to be able to have their own future business in agriculture. And it is our intent, Mr. Speaker, to work towards that end.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk of restrictions on individuals and how we should make available to them government services, if we were to look at the farms in rural Manitoba that were to be owned by government — if government were to own all the farms and they were to be treated and maintained' such as the government of the last eight years maintained the roads — you could rest assured that the production off of those farms wouldn't be very great.

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the Minister would submit to a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DOWNEY: At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish my remarks and then submit to a question.

As far as the restricting land for foreign investment, I think it is a very important thing that we do take a look at the individuals who are desirous of moving to Canada and to Manitoba to become part of the farm business, or to own land or to become part of our province's farming community. I think that it's important that they have the opportunity to come and become a part of what I consider the most important industry in the Province of Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, when introducing this, I think we have looked very carefully at it so the individuals who are desirous of coming to this

country and becoming a part of the farm business, that we have dealt with that.

We have also dealt with the people who have purchased land, have had the availability of cash or monetary funds to buy land in Manitoba, and not have to live in the province. I think that it would be very desirable if all the farms in Manitoba did have people living on them. I think that farm people are very competitive, they are very efficient operators, and given the markets and given the climate in which they can work and produce to maintain efficient operations, that we will not be bothered with individuals who are not farming. I think that some of our most prosperous business people in Manitoba today, in western Canada, are farm people. There are certain people within the farm community who do need assistance to start farming or to get into the industry, but I would think, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the rural part of Manitoba today, with the crops that are in the fields, at the values of the farms that they are living on, and the price of livestock, that agriculture does have a good opportunity to go ahead and expand and grow, and I think that some of the people in the agricultural community today can stand competition from off the farm. And I would just like to say that the best situation would be to have one individual family farm living on each section of land. It is probably impossible to see that happen, but I think the individuals today, if we can carry on with our policies and programs, we will encourage the growth of the family farm and not encourage large corporations to take over the agricultural land. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it has not been a situation that has happened in the past. I think we have had very few off-farm corporations purchasing land, that the records bear me out.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding with the bill that is before us, the amendments that we have to The Agriculture Lands Protection Act, I think that it will accomplish the restricting of further purchase of land by non-resident Canadians, and that it will enable the Manitobans, and all the Canadians, an opportunity to work together. We hope that they are not divided by legislation, that they work together as a community, as an agricultural community, and as one country. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a question.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now prepared to answer one question? Yes.

Is the Minister aware, and I raise this only because he alluded to it in his speech, about the way in which the previous administration maintained the highways over several years? Is he aware, and I have the estimates before me, that there is a reduction of maintenance moneys in this year's budget, if you take inflation factors into account, over last year? That the increase in this year's is only five percent, the increase the previous two years was thirteen percent? Is he aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I want to point out to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that questions can only be for seeking of information pertinent to the speech made by the Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Just in case it slipped your mind, Sir, the member alluded to the highways' program, and that's the reason why I put that question to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Question on second reading of Bill No. 67.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. USKIW: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is second reading on Bill No. 67. All those in favour of the motion please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Anderson, Axworthy, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Spivak, Steen, Wilson.

NAYS: Messrs. Boyce, Corrin, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Miller, Pawley, Schreyer, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 31, Nays 14.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

BILL NO. 68 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I was most intrigued by the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture in closing debate on Bill 67, where he didn't deal with the critique of his bill, but rather went on in a great deal of harrangue about other matters, namely whether or not the state should own the land in Manitoba, as if to suggest that there is sort of some pretence on the part of some people, somewhere, that some people are suggesting that that be the case. And, of course, he's alluding, Mr. Speaker, to the Land-Lease Program, wherein it was possible for people who were not in a position to arrange for mortgage financing were provided with another option — the option of leasing land through the Crown, with very abundant provisions within that legislation, Mr. Speaker, for those people to become eventual owners. And so, Mr. Speaker, I could not resist dealing with that particular aspect of his comments, in this companion piece of legislation having to do with farmland ownership laws in Manitoba.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister and this government is not prepared to address itself to the problem of those numbers of people in society that wish to be agriculturalists, but who are not in a financial position to get a start, and therefore there has been demonstrated in the past, and continues to be demonstrated today, the need for some means to accommodate that particular group of people. And these are people who may have been born and raised on farms in Manitoba, or elsewhere, but certainly in Manitoba, whose parents are not in a position to allocate to them land resources, or financial resources, but who have the training, who have the know-how, but somehow lack the ability to raise mortgage funds. Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to draw on mortgage funds, you usually have to be in a position of financial security to begin with. You have to have some assets that can be chatted in favour of whoever is providing those mortgage funds, whether it's a provincial government institution or a national one under FCC, or even the private sector for that matter. You have to have money to be able to borrow some money, Mr. Speaker, and that's the truth that doesn't deal with the problem of that group who wish to undertake a career in agriculture but are not in a position to raise funds.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is wrong when he suggests that the motivation of the previous government was the state ownership of land as opposed to the desire to allow young people to have the same opportunity to become agriculturalists even though they didn't have money, as did those who had some financial resources or who had parental backing, Mr. Speaker. And that's mostly the situation.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, in the course of administering that particular Act, many discussions with some of my friends' friends, Mr. Speaker, people from the Brandon area, from the constituency of Arthur, by the way, who were not New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, who were card-carrying Conservative people, who thought that that was a very well thought out program and would serve that particular purpose very well, Mr. Speaker. I can cite, Mr. Speaker, examples, case file examples, people who are still on contract with the Government of Manitoba, of individuals who have had thousands of acres of land of their own but who encouraged their sons and their sons-in-law and so on, to enter this program as a first step, a first means of entering the industry. And they thought this was a very good approach. It had nothing to do with ideology. They said to me, Mr. Speaker, that it made good business sense, from their point of view, to get their young people started in that way and it would give them, of course, an opportunity to prove their abilities and certainly after they have done that, Mr. Speaker, they would be in a position to acquire those lands that they were holding under a lease agreement.

So it is not state ownership that we are dealing with at all, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture would like to expound and as members opposite attempted to convince the people of Manitoba for so long, but rather a greater freedom of choice, and again we are dealing with the question of freedoms here, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Inkster dealt at some length with the question of freedom and how it is that the Conservative Party of Manitoba always comes down on the side of restriction and the NDP has always come down on the side of freedom. —(Interjection)— Yes, yes, and this, Mr. Speaker, is a good example, because their definition of freedom is very much dependent on the size of one's pocketbook, Mr. Speaker, and everyone knows

that that is the greatest restriction, the lack of funds is the greatest restriction of one's freedom, Mr. Speaker. The more wealth you have, the more money you have, the more opportunities present themselves to you, Mr. Speaker, and the reverse is the case if you don't have funds to begin with.

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, they believe in greater freedoms, but only for the few, the financially elite of the community who are never never satisfied with their lot, perhaps, some of them aren't, Mr. Speaker, but would rather want to consolidate greater and greater amounts of land, assets, financial resources, whatever. Never satisfied. And I suppose that is reasonable because if a person becomes satisfied, one starts to go the other direction. But at the same time, we shouldn't let those pressures deny the legitimate needs of other Manitoba citizens who may not find themselves in that fortunate position and who have to have a beginning somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, it is strange that in so short a period of time that we have forgotten that the whole of our agricultural industry in western Canada was founded on government providing a land base to provide people with a beginning, a farming beginning, when they launched The Homestead Act many many years ago' Mr. Speaker. It was a Government Act that brought that into being and we have now found ourselves in a situation where we are not prepared anymore, at least according to this government, to provide the same opportunity for young people here today that we were prepared to provide for potential farming people of that period in our history. And I think that is a sad reflection on ourselves, Mr. Speaker, because many of us are descendents of the original homesteaders. In fact, anyone who presumes to be a farmer in this country today is probably, or most of them are probably descendents of the homesteaders of the past and to think that we have forgotten that bit of history, Manitoba history, Canadian history, and are prepared to ignore those very reasonable needs of many of our young people throughout rural Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, those are all my comments on this legislation. We will oppose this bill as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on Bill 68, a companion bill to The Farm Lands Protection Act, it is a bill to further clarify the individuals who are desirous of buying for land and for them to declare their addresses of their companies and the principal officers and the individuals involved.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet would like to further go back to the freedom issue of ownership of land and state control of farmers in Manitoba, and I just would like to comment briefly that if the intent of the last administration, when introducing their Land Lease Program, was that they would buy a farm to lease to a young individual in Manitoba, that in the initial stages they would never have the opportunity to purchase or buy that farm, I call that far from being free to do anything and that's complete domination by the State. That, Mr. Speaker, was the program in the beginning stages of the Land Lease Program and it took several years for them to realize the unpopularity of the particular aspect of it. I would say that probably after . . . making it available for individuals was a step in the right direction. However, I feel that if the government were sincere, that the proper approach would be to make financing available for individuals to purchase a land base. I do not think that if an administration is sincere, that they would introduce a program that would, after the program had given support to a segment of the industry such as the livestock producers, that after the individuals involved in that industry saw the light of day, that they would penalize them by making them pay funds back to the government. That, Mr. Speaker, was a program which I would say would have the reverse effect on making it available for young people to enter into farming and sustain themselves in the business.

So I will not continue to speak any longer, Mr. Speaker. Bill 68 is a companion bill to 67 and I would like to close debate on it at this time.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, could we just have it recorded as the same division as on Bill 67?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Will you call Bill 34, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 34 — AN ACT TO EXEMPT THE OO-ZA-WE-KWUN CENTRE

Monday, July 17, 1978

from certain provisions of the liquor control act

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is too much that can be said. We dislike the fact that bills of this nature are proposed on a patchwork basis. We do feel it would be much better if there was an overall change to The Liquor Control Commission Act which would deal with matters such as this so that we are not dealing with each individual instance in a piecemeal fashion.

However, a couple of years ago, through Statute Law Amendments, we did deal with a change insofar as Gimli is concerned, so that I think there is some precedent established, although I must say it was done through a Government Bill rather than through a Private Member's Bill. I see no basic objection to what the Member for Virden is proposing. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would, for my part anyway, concur with it proceeding on its way to Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would concur with my colleague. I have no objections to the bill proceeding, but I do have a question and maybe the Honourable Member for Virden, if he will be closing debate on the matter, can clarify the situation, and that is, recently there have been reports in the newspapers that the centre may be closed down by the Federal Government. As we know, the Federal Government has been supportive of this centre as an employment training centre and there are some various industries there but there have been reports in the news media to the effect that this centre could be closed. This is not idle speculation, Mr. Speaker, but a statement that seemed to carry some weight, that the future indeed may be rather uncertain. While I hope that that does not come to pass, I wonder whether we are passing some legislation here to exempt a particular centre from provisions of The Liquor Control Act, and that centre may not be in existence a few months from now. So I wonder if the Honourable Member for Virden could clarify that matter. Maybe he has some additional information. But I think he may have read those reports, as I have, that there is some concern by the Federal Government about continuing to fund this centre because it is, I gather, a very expensive operation and there is some thought of cutting back spending in this particular area.

But on principle, Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the bill. I support my friend, the MLA for Virden, in this particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support that I am getting from the opposition ranks and one feels pretty good. While I did compare this, and we had quite a time finding the one that was a comparable one for Gimli, it did come in the Minister's Bill 88 last year, and if we had had some regulations going through at this time we could have tied this thing in, but as my Ministers didn't have anything like that in the program, therefore we had to go it sort of alone. The problem was, one of the problems that I ran into, unknown to me and maybe the people who had presented it to me, that Daly Municipality — when the vote was taken some years ago, Oo-Za-We-Kwun was certainly a federal base and had no control nor did the municipality have any control over it and its liquor laws, with the result that on contacting that municipality and talking to all their councillors, everyone agreed that they had no objections and I'll read the resolution from the last Daly Municipality meeting:

"WHEREAS the Rural Municipality of Daly in Manitoba is aware of a bill to be introduced at the 1978 Session of the Legislature of Manitoba to exempt Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated from provisions of Clause 111(4)(f) of The Liquor Control Act; and

"WHEREAS the Council of the Rural Municipality of Daly has no objection to that Centre applying for and holding a Club Licence under the said Act;

"THEREFORE be it resolved, and it is hereby resolved that the Council of the Rural Municipality of Daly duly assembled has no objection to the Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated applying for and holding a Club Licence under The Liquor Control Act, from the exemption of the centre from Clause 111(4)(f) of that Act.

Dated at the Town of Rivers of Manitoba this 11th day of July, 1978." The Reeve has signed it, Albert Chapman, Councillors Clifford Bromley, Edward Wolfe, Douglas Younger, Roy Adams, Dave

Ross, John Treloar, and with a following letter from the Secretary-Treasurer under the stamp of the Municipality, "I, John Archibald, Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Daly, do hereby certify that the attached resolution is true and correct, a copy of Resolution 3 passed at a regular meeting of the Council of the Rural Municipality of Daly, this 11th day of July, 1978."

Mr. Speaker, in answering the Honourable Member for Brandon East, as he must appreciate, this is a federal matter. I know there is some question as to the Indian Park of the Oo-Za-We-Kwun base but it probably won't affect the Edson Trailer and the other three major plants that are operating out of there and probably it's just a typing of the bill on the part of Ottawa. And I would hope with the success, the employment that that has proven, that there will be no real threat even though they — I guess, we have had to do it here in Manitoba — look at the dollar cost of things and cut down and they're not cutting down but they're saying no more addition to the budget as the next year will unfold. So with that, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I have this pass onto the committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you call Bill 55, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 55 — AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF INGIBJORG ELIZABETH ALDA HAWES

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 55, Second reading, An Act for the Relief of Ingibjorg Elizabeth Alda Hawes. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was approached to present this bill to the Legislature. I did so with a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has this bill been presented for second reading?

MR. BLAKE: I'm sure I've done that already.

A MEMBER: It's still in your name you couldn't have.

MR. BLAKE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa) presented Bill No. 55, An Act for the Relief of Ingibjorg Elizabeth Alda Hawes, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I agreed to present this petition with a personal knowledge of the people involved and the circumstances that have led to this most unfortunate situation.

Mrs. Hawes is a long-time resident of the Selkirk area where I was employed for many years. Her husband has become known in that area as Mr. Legion. He's been secretary of the branch there for some 25 years I suppose. Mrs. Hawes is a nurse, she has worked for the past 14 or 15 years at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre, working a night shift from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., raising a family of six children and educating her children all in that particular area.

On Sunday, the 5th day of December, 1974, she was a passenger in a car that was in an accident in the Lockport area and Mrs. Hawes was severely injured in that accident, suffering multiple fractures to the pelvis and fracture of the right femur, multiple rib fractures with tearing of the lung, pneumothorax and permanent damage to her right hip which causes her to walk with a limp and she's using a cane to this day and will probably require a right hip joint before too long. She was able to return to work in 1975 but suffered loss of income throughout that whole period and, as I say, today still walks with some difficulty, using a cane.

Mrs. Hawes, of course, was unaware of the limitations of two years in the commencement of an action to the insurance corporation, and naturally with her being hospitalized they obtained the services of a solicitor, and after she was out of hospital they attended at the offices on several occasions — there's a list in my notes, Mr. Speaker, of the reports that were provided to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation on January 2, 1975. There is a physician's report to the Manitoba

Monday, July 17, 1978

Public Insurance Corporation. On January 6th, there is an application from Alda Hawes for accident benefits. A report on February 21st, 1975; April 10, 1975; April 29, 1975; — these are all medical reports — May 16, 1975; December, 1975; January, 1976; February, 1976; February 24, 1976; and in August, the previous August, Mrs. Hawes completed a form provided by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation containing the following authorization: "I hereby authorize the release to my insurer of any information requested in support of my claim."

Her and her husband attended at the offices of the adjuster of the Public Insurance Corporation. She was advised that there had never been any dispute to the liability and she fully believed that everything was in order. She had completed innumerable forms and documents in support of her claim and, as a matter of fact, was paid by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the sum of \$1,996.41, representing the no-fault benefits to which she was entitled. There have been death benefits paid on behalf of one of the passengers in the other vehicle and the driver of the particular car in which Mrs. Hawes was injured in has also received some benefits under the claim.

Mrs. Hawes, throughout the trauma of this experience, is under the care of a psychiatrist, Dr. Pearson, in the Town of Selkirk, and has been aggravated by periods of depression and periods of worry in the concern that there may be some difficulty in her claim, and, of course, having realized just recently that the limitations had passed and the Public Insurance Corporation had denied liability of her claim. 8

It seems, Mr. Speaker, as I say, in knowing the modest circumstances that the family is in and the fact that there is really no dispute in the case, the people in the Insurance Corporation admit that there is a claim and a substantial one. However, the technicality is there that the Statement of Claim wasn't filed within the Statutes of Limitations and the bill is being brought in, Mr. Speaker, to provide some assistance to this family or particularly to Mrs. Hawes to obtain some just settlement of her claim.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am interrupting procedures unless . . .

MR. BLAKE: Yes, I'll only be another minute or two, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have leave to complete? (Leave)

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, gentlemen. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that this claim will be denied on a technicality and it's most unfortunate because the woman has been permanently disabled and it's really a most unfortunate situation. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that possibly there should be some legal action, I suppose, taken against the lawyer but when you consider a family of modest means such as they are, how do you go about suing a lawyer and winning unless you've got a million behind you.

A MEMBER: It's pretty hard.

MR. BLAKE: It's a very very difficult case and I feel a severe injustice, where here is a lady that has been crippled for the rest of her normal life, the claim is there, there is no question about it and on the point of a technicality, she may be denied proper compensation for the agony and the injuries that she has sustained.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to present the bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to just make a short statement to the House. (Leave)

Mr. Speaker, the law firm which I am associated with has now carriage of this case and has had since April of this year, taking over the case from the former solicitor and as such, I may have a direct or indirect interest financially in the outcome of this matter, I would like to indicate clearly to the House that I would not participate in the vote nor will I be making a speech in support or in opposition to the bill of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may have leave of the House just for one comment, to indicate that I was prepared to support the bill that the honourable member introduced because I feel that the case has justice. I would simply remind him that last year when I brought in a similar bill, the same circumstances, he voted against that bill and the bill failed on the basis of a tie vote. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he should recognize that perhaps what's fair is fair.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, by leave just a few words. (Leave) Mr. Speaker, in seconding this bill, this issue that is coming to the House is, of course, an issue for the courts to hear a presentation, a motion by the lady in question to have her case heard. Whether or not the court will grant leave is another matter.

This case, of course, brings to mind the real move that should be made by this Legislature, is to move the Insurance Corporation into a totally no-fault system of insurance and that is really at the nub of cases like this. They will keep coming up in the future when lawyers, who are human beings, will be making mistakes and in this case this mistake is a very severe one in the case of the lady in question. I would hope that the government from time to time when they hear these cases will certainly try and move the entire insurance portfolio into a totally no-fault system thus relieving the matters of having to go to litigation and be settled on a compensation basis based on earnings and salary without the need of litigation.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this type of bill has come up on numerous occasions and on each occasion when it's come up I've indicated that I would not want to legislate for one person. Why does not somebody, why does not the government, if they feel that this kind of thing is necessary, pass a law that the limitation period will not apply when there is a mistake by a lawyer and the person wants to take a case? Why do we have a limitation period? There is a law which doesn't require statute legislation which says that where a person has slept on their rights they will not be permitted to sue. But when you have a law which says that there is a limitation period, then it seems to me that the Member for Fort Rouge had a very strong point. Why is that law . . . and he's voting for it, he's voting for it.

A MEMBER: The whole caucus voted . . .

MR. GREEN: Did they all vote against it?

A MEMBER: That whole caucus voted . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I fall prey to being attacked by my learned friend, the Minister of Education, and by the First Minister, because I will be consistent. If this is just, it is just for all the citizens of the Province of Manitoba and not the one citizen to whom it applies.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being later than 5:30, and before the House is adjourned may I seek the advice of the Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Tonight the Committee on Agriculture will be meeting as well as the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

Tomorrow morning the House will meet and it is my intention to have the House sitting and then adjourning for committee meetings as is necessary and then perhaps returning to the House if work of a particular committee is co sitting. —(Interjection)— leted. So that we will be sitting, the House will be Yes.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would clarify which bills we're dealing with tonight in Agriculture Committee.

MR. JORGENSEN: The three bills, Bills No. 25, 67 and 68, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Tuesday) .