

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 6 May, 1981

Time — 2:00 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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I have a short statement to make at this time, and table copies with the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the week of May 3rd to the 9th of this year has been declared National Forest Week in Canada. The theme for 1981 is Forests Today, What Tomorrow. This emphasizes the fact that the point has been reached where careful management of Canada's forest resources is imperative if it is to satisfy future demands for forest products as well as other benefits.

In Manitoba the theme is Dutch Elm Disease. This disease of elms which was first recognized in the province some six years ago, poses a serious threat to our existing elm population. Recognizing the serious affect that the total loss of our elms would have on all of the residents in Manitoba the government is taking appropriate and effective action. During the past nine months it has implemented a Dutch Elm Disease Act and regulations and developed an expanded program covering cost-sharing agreements with urban and rural municipalities.

The tree that we are distributing here today is the Japanese Elm. It is a new shade tree which combines the characteristics of disease resistance and attractive crown form with sufficient hardiness for the cold and rigorous prairie climate. The Japanese selection was introduced at the Canada Agricultural Morden Research Station and has the desirable shade-tree qualities of a vase shaped crown and broad branching. It should be a suitable replacement for the disease susceptible American Elm that is so plentiful in urban plantings.

Mr. Speaker, if I may also take the occasion to introduce to honourable members of the House that

symbol of forest fire suppression, Smokey The Bear, that's joined us this afternoon. I'm sure honourable members (inaudible)

Mr. Speaker, for my second act . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report for the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources for the year ending March 31st, 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to table the annual report for the Legislative Library and the Provincial Archives for the calendar year 1980.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. I neglected to indicate the role that the Manitoba Forestry Association plays with respect to the week that we're honouring and I would just simply like to have it on record that we acknowledge the role of the Manitoba Forestry Association in this work.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can the Minister advise the House whether or not Manitoba Hydro is pursuing the questions that Aikins, MacAulay asked the Hydro to pursue with W. Steward Martin?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I haven't any further information that I can provide to the Leader of the Opposition on that matter.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I was unable to hear the Minister's response.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that I have no further information that I can impart to the member at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether the Minister of Labour considers it consistent with good industrial relations to have as a member of the Labour Board a gentleman who counsels employers belonging to his association on how to avoid the organization of employees within the establishments of these employers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I've heard reference to the situation that the Member for Inkster is alluding to. I have not read the documents myself.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in confirmation of a fairly well-publicized story both in the news media and in the Free Press and does not deny it, as a matter of fact it is confirmed by the individual involved, if the news stories are correct or even approaching accuracy, does the Minister consider that it would be advisable to examine whether it is conducive to good industrial relations to have a person who is counselling people on how to avoid trade unionism as a member of the Manitoba Labour Relations Board?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am going to review the documentation that's been alluded to. Secondly, I think it would be rather difficult, if not impossible, for any Labour Minister in any jurisdiction in this country to obtain people who were totally unbiased to sit on labour boards. Now it's the degree of the biasness and the alleged actions of a particular board member that is in question and is really behind what the Member for Inkster is asking, that's the underlying factor. Until I have an opportunity to review the documentation, that I understand has been distributed throughout various areas of the province, then I don't think I should be further commenting on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, entirely setting aside the question of bias, because I think that the Labour Board is composed of appointees by Labour who I would acknowledge are prejudiced in favour of the Labour people and employees by employers who are to take the employer position, is it not the position of the government as evidenced through The Labour Relations Act that whether or not an employer is biased he will not be involved in doing anything vis-a-vis his employees belonging to or not belonging to a trade union and that is the feature of this case that has to be looked into?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, that will certainly be taken into consideration when I review the documentation, Mr. Speaker. But society being what it is, and being in the business at one time myself of being a union organizer and have no shame of that history in my life at all, I don't recall and it's just from my own personal experiences, ever concerning myself what the heck a shift boss or a superintendent ever did say. Any area that we went into we were prepared to take on whatever circumstances were confronting us. We were there we felt for a good cause; we felt the employees were desirous of establishing a better way of life and that was the objective of us being in there on the same side or on the other side of the issue. I never asked an employer to roll over and just make way for me to come in. So it's a very delicate situation in this particular case. I want to have a look at the documentation that has been spread around and come to my conclusions after I've read it.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House. I apparently got lost in the forest here and forgot to introduce 17 students of Grade 8 standing from Gordon Bell High School, under the direction of Mr. Doug Taylor. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

We also have 70 students of Grade 9 standing from Pierre Radisson School, under the direction of Mr. Don Senchuk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Labour. Has the Minister been contacted by the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour with respect to the matter of the distribution of this 23-page document by the member of the Manitoba Labour Board, namely one Dario Perfumo? Has the Minister been contacted by the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour with regard to this matter?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that by reading a couple of clippings, that the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour is writing a letter. I understand within the last few minutes that the letter has arrived in the office. I have had no phone call, so I'd like to make that sort of contact clear, that that kind of contact hasn't been made, but I understand there now is a letter in my office from the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister in reply to the Honourable Member for Inkster said that he was going to examine the document and the legislation. Is the Minister telling us then that he is going to examine the document and the legislation to see if there has been a violation of the legislation by the distribution of this document to members of the Manitoba Hotel Association? Is the Minister going to determine whether a violation has been made and if so, what are his actions going to be?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be presumptuous of me to say what my actions will be until I've examined the documentation. I gave the Leader of the Progressive Party the assurance that I was prepared to examine that and not just prepared to — I was going to examine that literature that's been distributed and I'll come to my conclusions as to what should be rightfully done at that particular time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan with a final supplementary.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister, while he's ascertaining

the validity of this document, find out if this certain member or other members of the board have been distributing literature to other potential places where people may be organizing, because if one member of the board is doing it, there may be others. Could the Minister determine if there are others doing the same thing?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to go on a witch hunt in this situation. (Interjection)—Well, just if I can finish. You may find all members of the Labour Board in Manitoba at one time or another have commented on both labour and employer types; the one suggesting how to look after your own particular operation and the other may be distributing information as to how you can organize a particular plant.

I was interviewed last night by a gentleman and simply said what Perfumo and others should be saying if they damn well had a real good ship and shape and were providing good wages and good conditions of employment. During my years of organizing I found that hell of tough nut to crack. You just couldn't get through there. People are reasonably satisfied. But, Mr. Speaker, that hasn't been the history of our country. That's why you have a strong Labour movement presently today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. It refers to a question that I asked on the 30th of April and which he allegedly answered yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and if I may ask the question again and ask when I can expect an answer.

The question referred to back-pay for statutory holidays and I asked the Minister if he was going to introduce Legislation? Yesterday, he answered on a totally different matter. When can I expect an answer from the Minister on the question of back-pay for statutory holidays, please?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't recall. There was a two-part question. The first question was sometime ago and it related to a six month period of time, and that's the answer I gave yesterday that that six month period of time that the member has made reference to wasn't embodied in any legislation.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consult Hansard, where it clearly shows that I asked about six months for statutory holidays whereas he answered for vacation pay. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Labour Board has ruled that only six months back-pay for statutory holidays is permitted and the senior staff in his department have stated that this is indeed so, would the Minister consider bringing in Legislation referring to statutory holidays similar to that which is in place for vacation pay, back-pay, allowing it to be extended for a longer period of time?

**MR. MacMASTER:** On that particular point, Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the policy was three

months and that was extended to six months. The reason that it's held at a shorter period of time is to encourage employees to do something about what they feel is something inadequate.

It has been the decision of governments in our province for many many years that they didn't want that an open-ended situation, because there wouldn't be an incentive for individual workers to do something about a situation where they felt they'd been wrong.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with a final supplementary.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister then investigate the fact that people who are applying are being told it's owing to possible application of a Statute of Limitations of six months that enables employers to avoid paying or giving time off for statutory holidays, but then when the employer leaves, enables the employers to avoid such payments.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there's — and no disrespect to the questioner, but there's a little bit of confusion in the questioning. What I'll do is check Hansard and try and get back to the member a specific answer on her enquiry.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct this question to the Minister of Natural Resources. In light of the reported U.S. court ruling today dealing with the Garrison Diversion, could the Minister indicate whether he's had an opportunity to review that ruling in terms of the reports, and what action he intends to take as a result of this recent ruling in terms of Manitoba Government position?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I've asked departmental officials to undertake to review the court findings that took place this morning. Naturally, we in a general way, I suppose, are pleased with any delaying tactics that are employed.

It would appear that in this case the Audubon Society in the States met with some initial success, but my initial information is that the ruling will be further appealed, but that's something that my officials will be able to indicate to me more clearly within a day or two.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, can I suggest to the Minister and ask him whether he's prepared to reconsider their earlier position of not even considering having a group of Manitoba legislators and Ottawa MP's going to Washington to lobby with respect to this ruling now that it's possible that Congress will have to reconsider and bring it back to Congress and whether the Manitoba Government is prepared to reconsider its position and send a delegation to Washington with respect to the Garrison?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly not rule anything out at this point. Our advice continues

to be from External Affairs in Ottawa that they have the situation in hand and will be advising us if they believe that kind of a trip would be helpful and meaningful. The Federal Government has indicated their willingness to entertain a similar proposal that there might well be a joint visitation by federal and provincial political representations, if and when the External Affairs Department in Canada suggests that would be a worthwhile exercise to engage in.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the Minister specifically whether the Manitoba Government has put such a suggestion forward for consideration of the Canadian government with respect to representation made directly to Washington, whether the Manitoba Government has put that suggestion forward?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. George will recall that some short time ago, I believe a month or two, the Federal House did pass unanimously a resolution expressing their concern about the developments on the Garrison. It was within days of that resolution being passed that I contacted my counterpart, the Honourable Mr. Roberts in the Federal Government, indicating a willingness to be part of and to entertain the idea of that kind of a visit. The honourable member will recall the Prime Minister on the passage of that resolution indicated that he would be prepared to consider that kind of a visit.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Community Services. A few weeks ago in answer to a question that I asked when the Minister stated that he would investigate the soup line that the children were in and reports are now that this is increasing, getting longer, has the Minister anything to report? Is anything being done to make sure that the children of Manitoba are not left hungry?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the House that we have had ongoing reports from our Children's Aid Society and other agencies. I have assigned a person from our department to combine all of the reports and to meet with the various agencies to get to the bottom of this particular situation because we have conflicting reports from some agencies that indicate the food services are not growing in numbers in terms of children attending these locations, recognizing that there are new agencies becoming involved in this, either through funding of governments or through their own efforts. So that when any time you have services available, they naturally will grow if more people become involved in the service. Because of these conflicting reports, we have assigned an individual from our department to work with these agencies and to report to me. When

he has that information available, I'll make it available to the House.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister if he doesn't deem this to be an emergency. The Minister gave me exactly the same answer as he did about a month ago and if there is somebody that is kept hungry, that's a long time to wait. Does the Minister not consider that this is an emergency and something should be done, investigated immediately?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, it is being investigated.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in his report that most of these people in those children's lines are people that are on welfare or getting supplement welfare, does the Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Finance, intend to review the policy on the CRISP program where the people at the bottom of the ladder are given a certain amount of money only to have to see it taken away from them and charge us revenue? Could the Minister then take into consideration the possibility of reviewing with his colleagues that part of the policy in the CRISP program?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well that the CRISP program was a supplement for low-income families and not meant to be part of the welfare program. If the welfare rates are not adequate, then they will be revised. As indicated originally in this House, the welfare rates are always continuously being looked at and reviewed and in fact were increased by 10 percent in January for personal goods and for actual increases in rent, utilities and other items such as medical costs and dental costs. We pay the actual amount for that service, so in actual fact, they've had an increase of about 12 percent.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the indication was that the cause was poverty which I cannot understand because the instance of the example given of a refugee family of seven children and two people working on a minimum income, that particular family qualifies for CRISP for some \$2,100 a year, also qualifies for Family Allowance, for some federal allowance of some \$2,100 a year, giving that particular family an income of in the order \$18,000.00. So I don't believe that all the facts that are being in the particular report today are correct and this is why we're investigating the complete scene because on one hand they say poverty is a problem and on the other hand the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is saying that the children attending the lines are from welfare families.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface with a fourth . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave the House an explanation of the program which we understand and he hasn't answered my question. I'd like to repeat to the Minister, the fact is . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The fact that the Minister did not answer the question is not a matter that a member can dictate that he

answer a question. The Minister can choose to answer or not choose to answer.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that you're right; there's no doubt that I know that. I'm not dictating, but it might be that the Minister did not understand the question and if he did understand the question, is he allowed then to make a speech and not answer a question or just to refuse to answer the question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs concerning the public interest and concern about urea-formaldehyde as a substance used in the insulation of homes. The first question I'd like to ask him is whether this is the commonest form of foam insulation used in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister whether there is, in his judgment, a health danger in those homes that have been insulated with this material. I'd like to ask him whether he can indicate what advice he or his department is giving to calls and queries from the general public?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my department has been involved for quite some time with respect to the aftermath of the publicity that occurred when there was a ban on urea-formaldehyde foam late last year.

Extensive testing has been done. Inspectors, public health inspectors have been sent out to the various homes. Anyone who has called, who has urea-formaldehyde foam insulation in their home and is concerned about possible ill-effects, has been responded to by having an inspector come out.

In some cases recommendations for remedial actions have been brought forward. In other cases, recommendations for total replacement of the improperly installed foam have emanated from the inspection; in other cases the inspections have demonstrated that there's no presence of the urea or of the formaldehyde chemical in the air and so therefore no action has been recommended. But anytime that any concern has been expressed by a consumer who has this type of insulation in their home, I can assure the member that inspectors are sent out to check out the situation and ensure that there's no danger to those who live in the house.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister, in the event that replacement is warranted in the estimate of the citizen or in the estimate of the department examining that particular home, is there

a financial obligation on the part of the Federal Government and/or the Provincial Government to participate or cover the removal costs, especially in view of the fact that the Federal Government apparently stood behind and recommended this type of insulation in the first place.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in many cases the installer of the installation has voluntarily removed and replaced the insulation, but in other cases that matter is under review.

I know that the Attorney-General's Department, the RCMP, and my department are all involved in this and both levels of government are evaluating the situation to see what's the best method of handling the situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**HON. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose this question before the Orders of the Day to the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

My question relates to the Port of Churchill, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the negative attitude of the Federal Government, the Chairman of the National Harvest Board and some grain companies, I wonder if the Minister could indicate, in the way of information to this House, as to what this government is prepared to provide in assistance to the Port of Churchill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the province is concerned about some of the various statements that are rumoured as to the future operation of the Port of Churchill in that regard.

The Minister of Agriculture from the province, my colleague and myself initiated a meeting which will take place in Dauphin on June 3rd and 4th, including the Federal Minister of Transportation and the provincial representatives from Alberta and Saskatchewan, to better determine the future role of Churchill as not only a grain exporting port, but also a future in port use for other commodities as well. In that regard the province has probably been instrumental in getting that issue on the table and further discussions taken on it.

We have continued, Mr. Speaker, in our support of the Port of Churchill Development Board by a contribution along with the other two prairie provinces of some \$26,000 from the Province of Manitoba in the support of the operation of that Port of Churchill Development Board, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister.

In view of the fact that he has mentioned a meeting to be held on June 3rd and 4th, I wonder in view of the great future potentials for the Province of Manitoba, is there any indication that the use of the Port of Churchill will be discussed at the meetings that are going to be held with Federal people who should be interested in this matter.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we hope that to be part of the topics discussed, and I might add that

not only are the Provincial and Federal elected representatives to be at that meeting of June 3rd and 4th, but also the Hudson's Bay Route Association will be in attendance and the municipalities represented by the Hudson's Bay Route Association.

We're hopeful that we can have some very positive discussions and dispel some of the concerns and fears that the people of Churchill have about the future of their port and the importance of that port to the prairie provinces.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is the Minister of Labour and follows upon the questioning from the Member for Inkster and the Member for Logan earlier in the question period.

I'd ask the Minister of Labour, as he is going to have an opportunity I understand to address a seminar tomorrow, at which the paper that was presented by the Manitoba Hotel Association on How to Combat Union Organization in Manitoba Hotels will be discussed, is the Minister going to take that opportunity to disassociate himself very clearly and definitively from the type of anti-union and anti-workers' statements which are contained in this 23 page document, which was put out by the Manitoba Hotel Association in promotion of their May 7th Seminar?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the member I think was late getting in and hearing my answers. I said that I want to review that particular document and I'd give my opinions on it.

As to my participating at the conference that's being held by that particular group, the Hotel Association tomorrow, I will not be talking about labour relations in any way, shape or form. What I'll be advocating is better fire safety and training for personnel within the hotel industry in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I would certainly hope that the Minister, while talking about those important subjects, would as well explain to the participants that his government, and I hope his government does not condone statements such as, and I'm quoting directly from page 18 of the report: "Therefore the company will make every effort through supervisors and written communications to persuade employees not to sign with the union a statement which would appear to contradict The Labour Relations Act in respect to interference by an employer during an organizational drive".

Can we have some commitment from the Minister that he will address the important issues which he intended to address, but as well will clear the air on this document which is misleading and deceptive and could be considered by some to be in violation of The Labour Relations Act.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I've answered twice, I'll answer once more. I intend to review the document and I'll come to my own conclusions.

That's the first thing. The second thing that I said I'd be speaking about to the particular people of that conference was safety and safety training as it related to fires in hotels and I intend to do that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill, with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** Well then, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister has one of his representatives from the Labour Board in attendance at the seminar, and it's my understanding that representative will be conducting some seminars on labour legislation, can the Minister assure us that individual will take an opportunity to explain very fully to the participants that they, as employers, cannot by law attempt to influence an organizational drive by making statements such as the fact that a union will bring in high labour costs or labour disputes and bad feeling, or making statements that there will be moral breakdown because of a union coming into a plant; or making statements that, in fact, the promotional practises of the company will be unduly influenced by union. Is the Minister prepared to direct his own staff to make certain that the participants at that seminar understand very fully not only their rights but their responsibilities under the existing Manitoba Labour Relations Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the participants in the conference, I think, have their topics picked out for them. The particular document that the member is referring to, I said I would review. And I have to tell you Mr. Speaker, in my years of union organizing I don't remember ever crying, as I said before, about the actions of the employers. We went in and did a job and organized them if they needed organizing.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I had a question from the Member for Elmwood with regard to chromite mining; the question related as to whether or not the government had been approached to participate in such a mining venture? Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that neither the Mines Branch nor Manitoba Minerals Resources have been approached with regards to a venture in connection with either Dynamic Mining or any other large mining company.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Beginning on May 25th, the Canadian Transportation Commission will be holding hearings in Northern Manitoba and later in Winnipeg in regards to the discontinuation of some passenger train service in Northern Manitoba. I wonder if the Province of Manitoba will be making any presentations to this Commission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I trust the member is referring to the application by CN Rail? Is that correct? Yes, I've

had that matter referred to my transportation services group and they are currently seeing the nature of the application by CNR and will provide me with a recommendation.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he will be requesting that the service be continued in its present form? A number of the communities that would be affected if the discontinuation goes ahead would be communities that have no other transportation service except for air transportation service. So I would request that the Minister make a presentation on behalf of the residents of Northern Manitoba that could be negatively affected or will be negatively affected if this proposal goes ahead.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the Member for The Pas, that matter I referred, and I'm having information put together by the department and it certainly will be this government's intention, as it has been for the past three-and-a-half years, to assure that residents of Northern Manitoba have a fair and equitable access to transportation services. We have attempted to do that in methods of air transportation, in highway transportation, and rail transportation will be no exception.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer. I would just urge him to urge the Federal Government, the CN, and the federal agencies to do a better job of assisting northerners with transportation in the province as Manitoba has been able to do in three-and-a-half years of Conservative Government.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect that in our urgings to Canadian National Railroads that we will be more effective than the previous administration was in assuring that services there, as we were in jet-air transportation service to the City of Brandon, which was obtained by very firm and positive support by this government. We likewise will do the same for the residents of Northern Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. On March 27th, something over a month ago, he undertook to look into a matter which I raised dealing with compensation being paid by both Saskatchewan and Manitoba and an increase being of unequal rate of increase because of the practices of the two provinces. The Minister undertook to look into it and said, and I quote: "I'd be pleased to assist him on this." I wonder if he can now give me a response to the problem that was raised on behalf of a constituent?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I might be in error in not communicating with the Member for St. Johns as to what action I took, but we did eventually find out who the gentleman's doctor was, and from there the gentleman found out what benefits he was receiving, assured ourselves that they were

appropriate and the maximum that was available to him; notified him of that, and I thought I had communicated that action we had taken to the Member for St. Johns. If I haven't, I assure him I will.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, assuring the Minister that he did not and accepting the fact that he will, would he also reconcile the difference in policy as between the Saskatchewan Government and the Manitoba Government indicating apparently that the Manitoba Government compensation is recalculated every two years, I think, is what he told us. That means then that there is a substantial drop in real dollars in view of the fact that inflation is not taken into account. Could he reconcile that policy and justify it if he can?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, we haven't changed the policy at all that's been in place in Manitoba again for X number of years — I don't know how many that is — where it's reviewed every third year, I believe. The pension benefits brought up at that particular time, that's still the policy of our government as has been the policy of past governments of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final supplementary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the unprecedented inflation rates we've been going through in the last couple of years, surely the Minister would agree that there is important need for a reconsideration of a policy in the light of what is going on today, not X years ago, and that people who are suffering from the fact that their compensation is much more limited than the inflation spiral, that that policy could not only be reviewed but changed so as to be of more assistance to people who are in receipt of compensation. Would he not undertake to reconsider the policy now and make the changes that would be up-to-date with existing problems?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to change the policy that's been in place over the many years in Manitoba. We're certainly prepared to give consideration to upping the benefits in this particular calendar year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

**MR. WALLY J. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder, can I have leave of the House to make a non-political announcement? (Agreed)

Mr. Speaker, today, a long time personal friend of mine and a constituent of you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Martha Lewis, who is in the Personal Care Home in Russell, will be celebrating her 101st birthday. On Monday the 24th of April, her husband, Albert E. Lewis, will be celebrating his 100th birthday amongst their wealth of friends and neighbours at that same personal care home.

Mr. Speaker, I know all the Members of the Assembly and I am sure all the citizens of the province will join me today in extending happy birthday greetings to this couple and our sincerest best wishes as well.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope as well that the Most High will continue to rain as many blessings down on this very special couple of Manitoba citizens, great Canadians, who both enjoy reasonably good health, even though their eyesight is quite limited, but they do enjoy good health and I think it's a benchmark for the province. I have never heard of a couple, a husband and wife both reaching 100 years, so it's a special day and I hope that it will go into the records.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Time for question period having expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could firstly indicate that the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations to which Bill No. 10, The Builders Lien Act has been referred will meet on Monday, May 11th, at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, I had indicated to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I was prepared to call the constitutional resolution in the name of the First Minister on Friday, but in order to accommodate both the First Minister and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I will not call it until Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call Second Reading of Bill Nos. 51 and 58 and then Adjourned Debates on Second Reading from Bill No. 12 to Bill No. 56?

### SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 51 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FIRES PREVENTION ACT

**MR. MacMASTER** presented Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the present Fires Prevention Act is found to deficient in that there have been difficulties in interpretations due to the lack of proper definitions and there have also been problems as to the authority granted under the act.

For instance at the present time the Fire Commissioner lacks needed authority with respect to the storage, use and handling of dangerous goods. Also the authority of the Fire Commissioner and his staff to enter buildings, order buildings closed and to remove evidence which during the course of an investigation must be clearly defined.

The act currently carries no provision allowing for the issuance of improvement orders respecting maintenance or repair of exits from buildings, or respecting fire detection or protection systems and this is a desirable provision.

New provisions are proposed for setting out penalties for persons who obstruct or hinder fire authorities in the course of their duties and allowing

for enforcements of the Manitoba Fire Code as a regulation under the act.

Another new section is being recommended giving the Fire Commissioner the same authority in non-wooded districts as the Provincial Forester has in wooded districts. For example, in the case of a grass or bush fire the Fire Commissioner would be able to commandeer vehicles or marshal other resources as he sees fit to combat the emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Fires Prevention Act with correct definitions would correct deficiencies in the act and generally make it more effective. I trust the bill will receive concurrence of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

#### BILL NO. 58 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur)** presented Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Agricultural Lands Protection Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to give a brief explanation of the proposed amendments. I would first of all like to start off by indicating to members of the House that in the last amendment in 1978 we indicated at that particular time that seeing it was new act brought forward by the last administration that we made some changes and were prepared to further see the working of the act and are now proceeding to make those changes.

Over the past year the Manitoba Agricultural Lands Protection Board has undertaken a thorough examination of the farmland purchases in Manitoba. As a result of its findings, along with the concerns expressed by other farm organizations, the board has recommended to me that the various ways in which The Agricultural Lands Protection Act might be improved to allow the board to administer more effectively control over any possible future farmland purchases by foreign interests. The act in its present form clearly limits the amount of farmland a foreigner can purchase to 20 acres. In fact, the spirit of the legislation appears to have been upheld to a large degree with the board having recorded a small number of individual purchases which have been made by foreign investors and which the board is now dealing with. Where the act has fallen short, however, is where foreign interests have formed Canadian corporations with Canadians as majority shareholders who are used only to purchase land, while the effective control has remained with the foreign interests. The incidence of this is very small, however to ensure that the agricultural farmland remains in the hands of those who choose to live here, we are proposing some amendments to the existing Agricultural Lands Protection Act.



Bill No. 58, which I am proposing, will be to strengthen the act in three main areas. First of all, by better defining the effective control of ineligible persons for a foreign controlled corporations, which will give the board a broader base from which to define foreign interests and to limit their purchases to 20 acres.

Further, by requiring that certain corporations file an annual statement to determine the extent to which they may be foreign controlled and by enabling The Agricultural Lands Protection Board to order persons or corporations to divest of their land if the board is satisfied that effective control of the investment is in the hands of foreigners.

We also propose to increase the fines that may be imposed under the act. For those who do not comply with the regulation, we propose the fine be increased to maximum of \$5,000 from the current maximum of \$500.00. In the event that a summary conviction takes place we propose the fine be increased to a maximum of \$50,000 from the current maximum of \$15,000.00.

Over the past year this government has taken other steps to aid in the administration of the act. Firstly, The Citizenship Act of Canada has been proclaimed in Manitoba, which will provide for a broader legal base against which The Manitoba Act may be applied. The second thing we have done has been to employ an investigator who will continue to study corporate purchases at length so that the board on behalf of the government is able to more effectively deal with foreign investors who wish to purchase agricultural land in Manitoba.

As I noted earlier, Mr. Speaker, the proportion of corporate purchases with foreign interests is very small, about 4 percent in each of the last two years compared to 96 percent of the land transactions that have been undertaken by individual farmers and family-farm corporations that have been established by resident Manitobans. Bill 58 will not create, or I would suggest, will not create any hardships for these kinds of farmers who may wish to purchase more land. These people, Mr. Speaker, form the basis for our agricultural industry which is the true backbone of our economy in Manitoba. The government supports the continuation and growth of the family farm. Through programs like those offered by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, we will continue to make the money available to Manitobans who wish to farm. Neither will Bill 58 impose any restrictions on those new immigrants with landed immigrant status who have elected to come to Manitoba to live and farm.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, in this House, on the issue of farmland protection, we are not restricting our fellow Canadians or former Manitobans who are now living elsewhere from buying and owning Manitoba farmland. In making this decision I believe we are preserving the basic right of all Canadians to have a stake or a share in their country. If you were to look at the other jurisdictions, particularly in our neighbour to the west, Mr. Speaker, where their farmland protection policy . . . for example, a native of Saskatchewan who is now residing in Manitoba would be considered a foreign interest and could be asked to divest of his land in that particular province. Such a policy, I believe, only serves to further divide

Canadians and also removes the rights and freedoms of that province's citizens which other Canadians can still enjoy.

Let me reiterate that in proposing Bill 58 it is our plan to restrict only those foreign investors who have no intent of making Canada their new place or their new home.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore would recommend to the House Bill No. 58, to amend The Agricultural Lands Protection Act. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct some attention to this legislation which is the last in a series of futile attempts to benefit the people of the Province of Manitoba by identifying the problem as the foreign ownership of land. It's significant, Mr. Speaker, that when this committee that first looked into the question, went throughout this province and asked the rural people of our province what the problem was, there wasn't, Mr. Speaker, to my recollection a single person in the Province of Manitoba who could show that there any distinction between a person living in Cape Breton and residing there, owning land in the Province of Manitoba, and a person living in Pembina, North Dakota, living in and residing in Pembina, owning land in the Province of Manitoba.

The sole distinction, Mr. Speaker, was the one that was advanced by the former Member for Churchill, Mr. Borowski, and this I tie him to the former Minister of Transport, Mr. Pickersgill, who said that any Canadian is better than any foreigner. Mr. Pickersgill didn't say it in those terms, he said that any Canadian baby is better than a foreign baby. But as to its effect on the finances of the country, as to its effect on agriculture, as to its effect on the problems now facing the agricultural farmer, Mr. Speaker, nobody was able to indicate that was the problem. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the rural population was even more intelligent than I am now giving them credit for. They not only didn't indicate that this was the problem but they also indicated positively that the problem was whether the person who owned the land was residing on the land and cultivating the land, whether he in fact was the farmer who was dealing with that land. Mr. Speaker, that indeed was a proper identification of the problem. Does the person who happens to be living on the land have a stake in it and is that land available for people who want to farm land in the Province of Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, there have been those Manitobans who are in favour of this type of jingoistic legislation who have thrown out the possibility — what if all of the land in the Province of Manitoba was owned by Germans, by German corporations in Germany? Of course, Mr. Speaker, that would be a horrendous result and I would agree that it would be a horrendous result but would the people asking that question be any more satisfied if all of the land in the Province of Manitoba was owned by a corporation that had its head office and all of whose people resided in the Province of Alberta? Would that make any difference, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the opportunities available for citizens of this province who want to engage in farming and who want to enjoy a living from their farming operations?

Mr. Speaker, as long as we try to solve that problem through this type of legislation — and I blame the previous government, the New Democratic Party government, just as I blame the Conservative government — we will be doomed to failure because this legislation will not solve that problem. (Interjection)

The Member for Roblin is nodding his head up and down. I don't know if he's agreeing. If he's agreeing with me, I want to be very careful as to what I'm saying. Even though he agrees with me, Mr. Speaker, I still think that I am right. I know that is a very unusual circumstance but nevertheless, we have been preoccupied for five years trying to convince the farmers in the Province of Manitoba that their problem stemmed from foreign ownership of Manitoba land. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister has indicated that the percentage of land owned in the Province of Manitoba by any persons outside of the province which includes people from other parts of Canada, which includes people from the old country, from Europe, would perhaps be 3 percent and I think that figure may be high. The Minister, he's saying perhaps 4, but that includes all outside of the province-owned land.

Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable members to know that they were making a fuss out of the fact that less than 3 percent, far less than 3 percent, of the land owned in the Province of Manitoba in the years of the New Democratic Party government, was going to be owned publicly so that it could be made available to farmers in the Province of Manitoba as a guarantee, Mr. Speaker, as a guarantee. (Interjection)— The honourable member says that I would like to have it all.

I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions that the history of this country, and it's stated in the New Democratic Party report, acknowledges that the basic form of farming in this country, is, continues to be, and will be, owner-occupied land. There is absolutely no doubt about that and I favour that, Mr. Speaker. But favouring it doesn't mean that I say there should be no option available, and I have spoken — by the way, the honourable members talk as if you mention this to the rural people, they will throw you out on your ear — I have now attended several rural meetings and discussed the very question and said, will it be damaging to the farmer in the Province of Manitoba if he has the option of living on land which he does not own and will therefore not make the investment and the capital gain that will accrue and lived on his income rather than sunk it into the farm. And they say provided it was optional, provided no one forced it on me, provided no one forced me to sell my land, it would be an additional freedom, it would not be a reduction in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister, when he brings in this bill is engaging in jingoism because it in no way will solve the problem of the agricultural population of this province. It in no way will do that, but it does, Mr. Speaker, lend a little bit of enthusiasm to those people who say, we are going to get the foreigners. They forget, Mr. Speaker, that a Canadian can own property in the United States, and that restriction has never been made. I believe that Canadians can own property in many other countries, and that restriction has not been made. But if everybody

follows this rule, Mr. Speaker, what we will do is have each country saying that foreign nationals can not own property, and that will not make a better place to live in it, it will make the world a worst place to live in. But Minister after Minister has been determined to come in with this kind of legislation saying we are going to prevent foreign ownership of land.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem with regard to ownership of land, but the members on the other side refuse to acknowledge that a Manitoban owning land in this province, who lives in Winnipeg, and who owns several sections of land in Russell is just as much of a problem vis-a-vis the ownership of that land and its utilization as is a person living in Minneapolis and owning land in Russell farmed by a farmer in Russell, Manitoba.

They refuse to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that can happen even if it's a Winnipegger, even it happens to be someone who used to be in the country, because you are still talking about tenant land use. You are still talking about land which is not being cultivated by the person who is on it. It is just the same problem if the man lives in Toronto and owns land in the Province of Manitoba or as people who want to use scare tactics, they say owns all of Manitoba. It's just the same problem if he lives in Britain. What you are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is people who are absentee landlords, and an absentee landlord can be a Manitoban, he can be a Winnipegger, he can be a Torontonian and he can be a foreign owner, and that indeed, Mr. Speaker, is a problem that has to be dealt with by the people of the Province of Manitoba. Not by restrictions, Mr. Speaker, but by making sure that there is land available within the province to those people who want to farm it, and available, Mr. Speaker, not at exorbitant costs.

One of the favourite statements now is that Manitobans can't compete for the price of land that foreigners are willing to pay. Well, what are you doing, Mr. Speaker? Are you telling a farmer that he cannot get the best price for his land, that you are going to restrict the buying of land to people who are Manitobans? Why not restrict it, Mr. Speaker, to the people who are poor and that will depress the price of land further and cause people not to be able to sell their land?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that foreigners are going to pay \$500 an acre for land that is worth \$400 an acre. They are going to compete on the same basis for the land and there will be no change, Mr. Speaker, after this legislation is passed. The Minister will probably be faced with the same thing that he was faced with in the past, that every time you make a restriction, there are people who try to guide themselves in accordance with the law and do around the restriction what the restriction was designed to prevent. I don't know whether that will happen or it will not happen. All I am certain of, Mr. Speaker, is that if you eliminate every foreign buyer from this province, you will not have made life any the easier for the agricultural population; not at all, not one iota, because that is not their problem, Mr. Speaker.

At the present time, the basic problem with the agricultural population is that they may own a million dollars worth of land because of the enhanced value of land; that if that money was in the bank it would

produce a minimum of 20 percent interest without lifting a finger —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, not the bank, if it was put into very good securities now which can realize approximately 18 percent — first mortgages are going to be 18 percent, so I said \$180,000 on a million, I'm not far wrong, \$180,000 on a million — and a \$180,000 could be earned on the value of that land without lifting a finger and the farmer is not earning \$180,000.00. He is not earning anything like that, so he is sitting on assets of that value which if they were interest bearing would give him that kind of income, Mr. Speaker, and he's not earning it. If he has to buy the land and if a person had to buy a section of land now that was worth a half-a-million dollars, and that's not a big figure, and if he had to amortize his interest on that, that means, Mr. Speaker, he has to earn \$90,000 before he makes a penny. That's the problem. That is the huge problem with regard to land ownership, not the fact that there are foreign buyers, not the fact there are foreign holders, but that the interest that it costs to buy the land, or the interest that you have to realize in order to sit on a million dollars worth of assets far exceeds the moneys that can be earned on farm land, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, we say, and we have said that there should be an option; that the farmer who has complained, and rightly complained that he is living poor and dying rich should have the option of living a little richer and dying a little poorer, and not having all of his assets invested in land and have the right to live on the income that he is earning, rather than be putting it into interest payments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister answers that problem by bringing in, what he thinks, is a piece of legislation that nobody complain against. Why? Because we're going to get that foreigner, we're not going to let him own land in the Province of Manitoba and he thinks that the citizens of Manitoba can be rallied, just as the New Democrats did.

Mr. Speaker, they are to be faulted in exactly the same way, because they agreed that there is no difference, but they said, this is popular because the citizens want to get the foreigner and that's why that kind of legislation was passed and I never ever, Mr. Speaker, I spoke in this House, saying the same things then as I am saying now and I'm saying that this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it will be passed; it probably will not meet with much resistance. It will have, eventually, after you cover up every loophole that somebody is able to find, some restriction on somebody in Italy owning a piece of land in the Province of Manitoba.

It will be in no way restricted of Toronto owning as much land in the Province of Manitoba as they want to. It will be in no way restrictive to people in British Columbia owning as much land in the province as they want to and those people owning the land has exactly the same effect on the Manitoba farmer as Europeans owning the land, and until the Minister, Mr. Speaker, faces the real problem, namely, the availability of land at rates that make it possible to engage in farming, without being overburdened by either interest charges which are enormous now if you buy the land on mortgage, or in the alternative, if the land is paid for, by having millions of dollars invested and some do, Mr. Speaker, I'm not exaggerating.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the amount of money that the farmer has now got invested in his land, if turned into investment dollars, will produce more revenue without him lifting a finger, than he can by owning it and farming it and that's the problem and that problem, Mr. Speaker, will not be dealt with by saying, we're going to get those Italians. That's all that the Minister is doing and it is a very very futile and ill-advised effort, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In hearing the Minister of Agriculture today present the Bill 58 for second reading, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the present government at last is coming around to realizing or at least admitting, that there have been some problems with the changes that they proposed several years ago. I mean he still, the Minister in bringing in these amendments, still indicates that basically there's no problem and what we brought in a few years ago, it was good legislation, there are no problems, but yet since the people have been agitating and saying that there's been a lot of purchasers to non-farming interests and in their legislation, it deals strictly, primarily with foreigners, Mr. Speaker, unlike our legislation, they have singled out the foreign interests, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that it's a cosmetic approach, to say the least, if one would analyze this legislation and you had — I almost put it at zero, in terms of doing something, but if you had nothing before, this is a little bit better than nothing, in terms of improvements with respect to the agricultural lands protection legislation, Mr. Speaker. That's how one can categorize this in terms of relationship to the other legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister outlined the problems with the legislation of having foreign interests set up Canadian corporations and have come into this province, really illegally by putting money up front, Mr. Speaker. This will not really curtail that kind of movement, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is and will be circumvented and it is at best, window dressing, Mr. Speaker, at best it's window dressing.

The Minister realizes that the issue of non-farming purchases, and you see the difference between the Conservatives and the New Democrats and I believe the Member for Inkster forgot that, where he indicated that New Democrats were passing legislation just against foreign interests. Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party, when it brought its legislation in, it dealt with non-farming interests. Absentee ownership, Mr. Speaker, whether the corporation was Canadian, whether it was foreign, it mattered not to us, Mr. Speaker. We treated everyone alike. What we said was that anyone who wished to come to Manitoba and was prepared to farm Manitoba farmlands, they were eligible to do it, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation clearly goes against the grain of having farmers, citizens, whether they be from Manitoba, elsewhere, it clearly, clearly sets out a complete different approach, Mr. Speaker. It puts the foreigners, and who are the foreigners, Mr. Speaker. I venture to say that all of us in this room are foreigners, so now we are legislating against foreigners, Mr. Speaker, that's what we are really

doing, against foreigners, Mr. Speaker. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture can agitate all he wants from his seat; he will have his opportunity when the bill goes to committee or when he closes second reading.

Mr. Speaker, absentee ownership of land threatens the security of tenure of the farm operator and, Mr. Speaker, that's really what we should be getting at, not trying to discriminate against one segment of the population versus another, Mr. Speaker. That's really what this legislation brings about.

We have had the incidence of farm corporations and the Minister admitted it, but he said it was a very small incidence. Mr. Speaker, if it was a very small incidence that we had foreign interests setting up Canadian corporations and purchasing Manitoba farmland, then why are we bringing in these amendments. For what reason are we bringing in the amendments to the bill right now, Mr. Speaker? You know, if there is no problem, then why are we bringing in this measure at this point in time. What has changed, Mr. Speaker?

The Minister said that in the last three years and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but he indicated that only 3,000 acres of farmland were purchased by non-Canadian interests, who might be ineligible under the legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the present legislation clearly, clearly indicates that what was going on in terms of the loaning of money or advancing of funds, is legal, Mr. Speaker, that that will continue. What really, Mr. Speaker, should be done is there should be some effective measures brought in and the government has had several years in which to deal with the issue of non-owner-operator's absentee ownership of farmland in Manitoba, but they haven't done that. They've singled one segment of the population, the foreign investor, from purchasing farmland, Mr. Speaker.

I don't believe that it makes much difference whether the corporation is based in Toronto, in Tuxedo, or in Zurich, whether it makes much difference where the money comes from, if the purchase of farmland results in a vacating of citizens from rural Manitoba. That's what we're really talking about, Mr. Speaker, that's really what we're about. Are we going to continue to depopulate rural Manitoba at a more and an increased escalating rate, especially now with the prices of land?

Mr. Speaker, what's happening in rural Manitoba today? You have had the exorbitantly high interest rates that farmers have had to face in the last three years, Mr. Speaker, and what we are getting is more and more farmers are put in the position that they're going to have to sell off some of their assets to continue farming, Mr. Speaker. Because of the imput costs, the high interest rates, many farmers do not have the cash flow to carry on their seeding, Mr. Speaker. The members on the opposite side, some of whom are shaking their heads in the negative, well, Mr. Speaker, there are many farmers who will have to sell land in order to raise capital to put in their crops this year because of the financial hardships that they have been placed in with the drought and with the interest rates and with the general economic decline in terms of farm income.

Well, even the Minister of Agriculture who tried to fudge the income statistics of Manitoba farmers last year, now maybe is prepared to back off his

statistics and indicate and at least acknowledge that net income of farmers in Manitoba has been and is continuing to decline over the last numbers of years and with the only way that some farmers will be able to survive, Mr. Speaker, will be to sell off some of their farmland. But what do we want in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? Do we want a rural Manitoba, a consolidation as one would put a nice word on it, farms to get larger and larger and larger tracts of land operated by interests, not related to rural Manitoba at all. There will be a hired hand or someone who has maybe sold out now will manage the operations of the large holdings of land and what relationship does that farmstead have to the rural way of life, Mr. Speaker?

You know, we're really leading ourselves into a sense of false security that this legislation is going to do something. It will not do anything, Mr. Speaker, it will do very little. The members on the government side will be able to go around and say, look, we've strengthened the legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was effective legislation on the books. They didn't give it a chance to operate. The thrust of the now Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition when this legislation was being debated, is that he wanted corporations to be treated the same as individuals, that the penalties for corporations were too high; that he wanted the same flexibility for corporations as it was for individuals, so they changed the legislation. They changed the legislation and allowed paper to be moved about and effective ownership to be removed from owner-operators to paper, actually, Mr. Speaker, to nonentities in Manitoba and that's really the basic difference between our position and the Conservatives, that we say that farmland in Manitoba should effectively be owned and operated by residents living on the farmland. That should be the main thrust of the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

There should be an option. You know, the Minister of Corrections, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Corrections talks about state ownership. You know, what we have here now, what's happening now in the last few years and is escalating, Mr. Speaker, is the very very same thing that the members have agitated in rural Manitoba about the government buying up all the land. It's happened, Mr. Speaker, the ownership of farmland is on a steady incline that more and more farmland in Manitoba is being purchased by non-farming interests. Whether you call it state ownership, Mr. Speaker, call it whatever name you want to put on it, the fact of the matter is that farmers today are not the masters of their own destiny in terms of operating their farms.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture could have, for example, said that we are going to prevent corporate farming in the Province of Manitoba by the intrusion of Carghill Grain into the hog industry. Has he done anything? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, we just can't touch the competitive nature of our agricultural society so we will allow Carghill Grain into the farming industry. There is no problem, they are not causing any problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— now the Member for Emerson talks about how I feel about the legislation. I say this legislation is ineffective. If you really want to do a job, you tighten up the legislation to really deal with the problem. You will not deal with

the problem, Mr. Speaker, there will be loopholes. As I said, when you allow the corporations to have the same latitude as individuals, Mr. Speaker, you will always have loopholes in the legislation. There is no way that you can deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the present government, although they are philosophically hung up on the matter of corporations owning farmland in the Province of Manitoba, we would hope that they would reconsider their position and strengthen this legislation, not to discriminate solely against foreigners, but, Mr. Speaker, to —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, against everybody. Do they want farmland in Manitoba to be owned and operated by resident farmers? That's been our position, that's been the thrust of our legislation. You changed all of that. That's fair ball, but at least recognize that this legislation will do nothing or very little to say the least in terms of curbing the purchase of farmlands by none farming interests, and that's what we are really talking about, Mr. Speaker, because if you are indicating that farming interests should be the mainstay of our agricultural sector in the Province of Manitoba, then this legislation doesn't do anything because there will be loopholes and there will be ways of getting around this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture cannot go to rural Manitoba and now say that he's plugged all the loopholes, because he has gone out and said only 3,000 acres were bought by foreign corporations which we are investigating. I think he made that statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, that outside the act, that's the statement he made or at least he is quoted in the paper, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got the — or maybe I have the statements that the Minister has made, and he spoke about only 3,000 acres. If that's all that was purchased by foreign owners, Mr. Speaker, then I think the Minister in terms of his involvement in the legislation where now he is removing himself from being involved in the legislation and passing the authority clearly to the Farm Lands Protection Board.

He basically, I think, has been uninformed as to what his involvement and his thrust will be, but it was his leader, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's the dilemma they're in, the Premier of this province wanted this kind of a thrust in terms of legislation. Whether we want to talk about farmers owning farmland or whether we are going to say that any corporate interests in this country will be able to own farmland other than farmer owned corporations, then we've got that kind of legislation, and don't think that you have plugged the loopholes with the amendments that you have presented here, because certainly you have not, and this legislation will not do very much because the purchases will continue and there will be deal after deal being made.

I mean if you go to any region of the province, even the Interlake where farmland has been generally held to be, in some areas, of a lower quality of farmland. The Minister of Agriculture shakes his head no. In some areas in the Interlake the land is fairly rocky, classed fair in the F and G category, Mr. Speaker, and we have had purchases there of non-resident owner operators. The investment is there, farmlands have been sold out. You go into the eastern part of the province, you go into the Minister's own area, into the Virden area, you go into

the south-east portion of Manitoba, I imagine in around the Steinbach area, Mr. Speaker — everyone one of us, every rural member, I'm sure, if he's spoken to his local municipal council or his neighbours, will be able to come up with examples of farm sales being made, legally under the legislation by corporations or citizens who are fronted through corporations who are not going to operate that farmland, and that's fine, Mr. Speaker.

Let the Conservatives at least be clear that farmland in Manitoba is open, is fair game to anyone at all, whether it be a corporation from Toronto, Winnipeg. The only ones we will now try and control is the person coming in. Mr. Speaker, we didn't discriminate against anyone. We said that if anyone wanted to come to Manitoba and farm farmland they were welcome, but they had to become an owner-operator. Bring back that provision, Mr. Speaker, and I think you would find greater support for this legislation in terms of what it will do because you are creating an absentee landlord situation.

The Minister of Corrections spoke about state ownership. You are creating an ownership of absentee landlords, completely; that's what this legislation will do, Mr. Speaker. That's in effect what this legislation will do, is create an absentee landlord situation within the Province of Manitoba and it's gone a long way now, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Agriculture has had his head in the sand, Mr. Speaker, for three years, and he's had to be pressured from every angle to deal with the situation of farmland ownership in the province. He even now, when he introduces the legislation says, look there's really no problem, but we are bringing the legislation in any event. Now if there is no problem or hasn't been a problem, why have you brought this legislation in? There is really no problem, you have indicated that. We'll accept you for your word, but then go talk to the farmers in Manitoba. Go and look at all the transactions that have been made, Mr. Speaker.

So we tell the Minister that it's better than nothing and, Mr. Speaker, we will see what amendments the Minister proposes to bring into shore up this legislation if he is going to make it more effective. This legislation needs strengthening if you really mean what you say, but, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the Conservatives want any more than window dressing in terms of their philosophical approach to farmland and the farming industry in the province of Manitoba.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some contribution to this debate in recognition at least of the fact that it was indeed the previous administration and the Department which I was responsible for at that time that had originated the first laws that were restricting the ownership of farmland to owner-operators of that farmland.

Mr. Speaker, the government perhaps is unwilling to recognize the difference between the legislation that was then on the books and the legislation that is on the books now pursuant to the amendments of the last couple of years, or perhaps they are unwilling to engage in the dialogue or debate as to the real impact of those changes and the real

difference that has taken place in the application of that law.

I have always had a difficult time in trying to adjudicate in my own mind, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is a role to be played by the public through legislation on the question of interference in the marketing of land, and I say that because I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that farmers generally have been subjected willingly and unwillingly to the vagaries of the world market system in the production and the sale of their commodities. There can be a case made, Mr. Speaker, if one wants to make it for the argument that there ought to be no legislation in this respect; that since agricultural producers are subject to the market conditions of the world throughout their productive years, that we should not take away from them that one option and that one buyer, that buyer being in the marketplace economy no matter where that buyer comes from at a time when they want to retire and when they also want to maximize the market value of their assets. I think an argument can be made for that and I know that when we brought in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, it was difficult for me not to recognize those realities.

On the other side of the question, of course, was the concern at that time, and that is the concern that we yielded to, the concern that new young farmers and potential farmers were in an impossible position to acquire land in competition with people who were not buying land for the purpose of making a living, Mr. Speaker, from that land but rather as a medium or long-term speculative investment.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the land values throughout the world you will appreciate the point that I am making here. In Europe, it is not uncommon to realize values of \$5,000 an acre for land, values of \$15,000 an acre for farmland, of \$25,000 an acre for farmland. In the United States you will see values approaching \$3,000 or \$4,000 or \$5,000 an acre depending on location on so on. In Manitoba, of course, you have variations, in Canada you have variations. So if you look at the prairie region, a large land area, that wants to look ahead at what those land values are going to be in the next decade or two, I think one concludes that in the long run there is only one direction that land values will take and that is they will continue to escalate in value. That has been the history of land marketing throughout the whole of the world, excepting of course in countries where land is publicly owned and where it is not the jurisdiction of the private sector, and we are not talking about that, Mr. Speaker. But certainly where we are involved in private ownership of land, it seems to me that one has to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of interfering in the way in which that land can be held by individuals. One of the other considerations, of course, of our government was the fact that no matter what kind of legislation that one placed on the books in respect to ownership rights, that still was not going to solve the problem of potential farmers, young people, who had no means of financing their way into agriculture, and so we really brought in at that time a package which included the lease option for those that were not able to finance a purchase of a farm or were unable to arrange for mortgage money in order that they can become owners on Day One.

So, it was really a combination of things that we were concerned about at that time and the primary

concern, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, was the idea that young people should have been given an opportunity whether they had cash or didn't have cash, that somehow we wanted to equalize those opportunities in order to give young people a greater freedom of choice in that decision.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the changes that were made by this Government in the last series of amendments, you know, there's no question that one has to conclude, and I'm sure the Minister will have to admit, that in effect those changes loosened up the then existing legislation, because once you permit absentee corporate ownership of property, you've really thrown it wide open. The legislation merely tends to frustrate the purchases of land but does not prevent those purchases even though it may be implied that that is the intent, that the intent is prevention.

All of these regulations and laws that are being placed on the books of this province, Mr. Speaker, are merely creating work for the legal profession. That's basically what is taking place. I'm sure that after these amendments are passed, Mr. Speaker, that what you will have is a further enhancement of that process where it is only the lawyers that will benefit from this piece of legislation because they will have to find other avenues of getting around the new provisions, and the avenues are there, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of finding them and putting them in place in each transaction in order to circumvent what is claimed to be the intent of this legislation. But what is known by members opposite is that it is not going to work and they know that it is not going to work, but they are drawn into a position of trying to appear or wanting to appear to do something, yet, Mr. Speaker, not wanting to truly interfere. They want the image of doing something to satisfy the concerns of those people who claim that they cannot compete in the marketplace for the ownership of property.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I will admit to the members opposite that experience is a great thing, Mr. Speaker, and I try to put in balance, Mr. Speaker, I try to put in balance here today the duality of concern, one on each side, and they are both legitimate, Mr. Speaker. Both of those concerns are legitimate. I appreciate the dilemma of my friends opposite. I'm not taking anything away from them in that respect, because it is a problem. It is a problem of politics, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite wish to be re-elected. They know that there is a significant group of people out in the countryside that are concerned about unbridled ownership or acquisition of properties from people outside of this country. They also know there is a concern on the part of vendors or owners of property who want the highest price when they want to sell out, and somehow they are trying to ride the rail here or the tight wire in such a way that they might win the support of both of those groups who have opposing interests. I don't think it's going to work, Mr. Speaker. I have no confidence at all in this legislation doing anymore than did the legislation to date. It is doing less than it was doing a few years ago and it will continue to do less, Mr. Speaker, because there is no intent, there is no real intent to do anything about it.

Now, I don't believe that tightening up the legislation completely will indeed solve the problems

of that concern, the concern of young people wanting to get into agriculture, because even without the competition for land from foreign sources, the competition is keen within this country, Mr. Speaker. People who are already large land owners are in a much stronger position to bid up the values of their neighbouring properties than a newcomer into the industry, and that process has always been there and will continue to be there. Therefore, although it may satisfy some people that something is being attempted here to alleviate a problem, but in effect, Mr. Speaker, it is nothing more than a cosmetic piece of legislation, and that we are not going to see any diminution of activity in respect to buyers from anywhere in the globe within the Province of Manitoba pursuant to the passage of these amendments.

If the Government wants to do something, Mr. Speaker, there are avenues open and I suspect that the avenues that can best be used are avenues of taxation to deal with those kinds of questions. That is always respected, Mr. Speaker, by all people, the penalty costs of doing things. If there's a true intent to oppose the acquisition of land by non-Canadians, the tax system probably is the easiest mechanism to employ to achieve it fully. Because they are not taking that option it indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are terribly serious.

You know, if you read the bill, there's a section in the bill that deals with the question of repossession pursuant to a loan, a realization of security, acquisition of land by realization of security. Here is the scenario that I know cannot be challenged, Mr. Speaker. Let's assume the Minister of Agriculture wants to sell his farm to a prospective buyer from somewhere outside of this country, and let's assume that they have struck an agreement as to price, terms, etc., but, you know, the law says that that person is ineligible to purchase that farm, so the Minister will enter into a loan agreement with this buyer for a time period and, of course, he intends to default on that loan. He intends not to pay back that money. So, Mr. Speaker, the buyer is in the position of having to realize on his security — it's a mortgage arrangement — so the buyer has to repossess, Mr. Speaker. The buyer has to repossess the Minister's farm and then the Minister in his Act, on Page 4, says that he must dispose of that asset within 2 years after he acquires it as a realization of security. Well, Mr. Speaker, that buyer doesn't want to keep it anyway. The original intent was to buy it for speculative reasons and therefore if it was a 10-year lapse or a 5-year lapse and the property values have doubled in the meantime, that buyer has realized fully on his intentions. The Minister has sold his property at a price beyond what he could have received perhaps in the local area. They are both winners. They are both winners, Mr. Speaker, and they have beaten the system.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come down, back to the very point that I made earlier, and that is if you were truly serious and in earnest in this issue, the only real way of preventing foreign acquisition of Manitoba farmland would be, Mr. Speaker, to use the Minister of Finance as the vehicle and the tool in order to tax away the gains that could be made by such transactions. That would be the only effective control that is possible, Mr. Speaker. So while I'm not

suggesting to the Minister that he isn't making an effort for the desired purpose, Mr. Speaker, I say to him that the effort is weak and is cosmetic and we don't expect much to come of it.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Radisson):** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing Debate.

Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that Debate be adjourned.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just want to make a few comments here. Listening to the Leader of the Progressives, the Member for St. George and the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I felt that I'd like to add a few comments to that.

It's very interesting that within the last six months the Leader of the Opposition was roaming around the countryside and accusing the present government of having changed The Farmlands Protection Act in such a way that it was hindering the farmers from buying land, it was driving up the price of land and that brought to mind when the previous administration was buying up farmlands throughout the province and were paying substantially more money than the people were paying at that time locally, and the concern that was expressed, the reason why the Act had to come in was in order to be able to give young farmers a chance to buy land. By allowing foreign money to come in, it was driving the price up. Then the Government of the Day turned around and proceeded to buy at a higher price than it was trading for on the market.

**MR. URUSKI:** What have you sold that land for? Look at what you've sold it for.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Well, first of all, it was never the intention of this Government to get into the land buying business and to make profit or not to make profit. We've always maintained that this should be the private individual's prerogative. Ironically, the intention of the Bill that was presented at that time has not fully worked. Even to this day it is not working properly. The Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated there's a two-sided sword to some degree; there's the side of the vendor who is selling and would like to sell for the best dollar available.

What concerns me is that some of these statements made were, for example, how do you control who's going to buy it? Now, we say foreigners should not own land. The Member for Inkster was saying corporations shouldn't own it or throw it wide open and indicated that possibly people from the city shouldn't own it, because it would be destroying the intent of farmers. The Member for St. George shakes his head. He indicated before that farmer-owned operators should only own farmland. Then we should take it one-step further, possibly, and then we should say to the city people, they cannot buy farmland, but we should also say that the farmers cannot buy property in the city, because they're driving the price up. We're

talking of two classes of citizens. I don't know how you could justify that. If city people cannot buy farmland, why should farmers be allowed to buy homes in the city, the same effect. We're talking of establishing two classes of citizens.

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, that I think in my constituency I probably have more foreign-owned land, at the present time. It was initially bought in the more marginal lands, as well as the Red River Valley. I checked the other day and in spite of the fact that foreigners bought it they haven't moved out one acre yet, it's still all there. What has happened is that farmers that sold to the foreigners, that foreign investment came in, they paid big dollars for the land. The farmers leased it back on a good arrangement capitalizing on some of these things. I'm saying that some of the intentions that initially motivated the bringing in of the bill under the previous administration have not worked. What we're doing at the present time, we're trying to tidy up some of the loopholes that are there. The concern I have is the restriction part that was mentioned by the members opposite. Finally it will be to the point where when I sell my land, government will be telling me who I can sell it to and for what price.

**A MEMBER:** Aren't you doing that?

**MR. DRIEDGER:** No, we're not doing that.

**A MEMBER:** You're not? If you're not, what are you doing? Come on, you got to have permission of the board . . .

**MR. DRIEDGER:** This kind of a restriction; how far do you take it? As I indicated before, you were in a sense suggesting that we're establishing two classes of citizens. City people cannot mess in the country; country people cannot mess in the city — that's the next step. Where do you stop with this thing? Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring up some of these concerns and from the farmers point of view. For example, let's say as a farmer I've been working on the farm for 30 or 40 years, I want to sell my property . . .

**A MEMBER:** Are you that old?

**MR. DRIEDGER:** When I get to be that age, I want to sell my property and here I have government controls all over the place if we followed your thinking. (Interjection)— The Member for St. George took it even further, much further, and this is why I'm concerned. I like to have the freedom of selling to whom I want, to whom I make arrangements, for whatever dollar. (Interjection)— The members opposite forget that they initially brought in this bill.

The other concern, for example, that some of the farmers have — by the time they have a once in a lifetime sale, they worked hard all their life, they finally sell their farm, and if we follow this kind of thinking through at a price dictated by government to whom they could sell, then we turn around from the Federal Government and we nail them with capital gains tax to boot yet.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few of these comments and concerns that there are two sides to the story and I think what the Minister of Agriculture

at the present time is trying to do is tidy up the thing and compromise to some degree a situation that didn't work under your administration when you brought it in. When the Leader of the Opposition runs around and says that we have changed the rules to such a degree that young farmers cannot buy land, I have to say that's utter nonsense. Because farmers right now trading among themselves are trading at a better price than they did before the legislation came in. I have cases right now of a quarter section sold for \$800 in my area. The Member for Rhineland's area they are selling up to \$1,200, \$2,000.00. I mean, that part is not the intention that initially provoked this bill and has not worked. (Interjection)— These are not foreigners, no.

The same thing with corporations. I got the impression from the Member for St. George that he would like to restrict corporation buying as well. (Interjection)— Farm corporations? Well, this is what we're talking about. We have all kinds of corporations.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to say that if the members opposite feel that this legislation is not going far enough, they have not really indicated how far they are prepared to go with it. I'd like to debate that at some future time with them. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER, Harry E. Graham:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to discuss some of the points raised by the Member for Emerson. When he attempted to indicate that it was just as logical to prevent — what did he say — city folk moving on to farms and at the same time his next step was country folk moving into the city. I called out from my seat something to the effect that it was a non-sensible argument and I wanted to explain why I thought so. I am under the impression that farming is a way of life and it's a business. My impression is and, you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to know much about life in the rural parts of this country but I have acquired through many years a great deal of respect for those people who are dedicated to working the land, to making food grow, to feeding the world, and all part of a way of life which they feel is so healthy and which I believe is a very healthy, not only physically, but mentally a healthy way of life. That's why I say my impression is that farming is a way of life. Not living on a farm or not living in a city as a residence but being involved with the land, with the productivity of the land, with planting seeds, seeing products grow and knowing that there is a demand for them.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning I was speaking to somebody and decrying the fact that part of the process of the business side of farming has become what they call product management, I think. It's got a fancy name but what it means is let's stop producing food so as to maintain a higher level of price. Somebody surely can supply management. Somebody mentioned that word and I thank him for giving it to me. I deplore it, Mr. Speaker, when I learn that there is a decision to cut down on the production of eggs which I believe is currently being done. I think it's a pity when millions and millions of people are starving for the supply-management



people and I think that they cut across all over the country, and I think it's a pity. That's why I think that it intrudes on the way of life as I used to visualize it and the farmers I knew. I suppose I knew more farmers as clients than in any other way to know that they had a love for the work they were doing that related to what motivated them. I don't think it was money, really, because I remember the astonishment I had when I was dealing with a husband and wife separation where the value of the farm was set at such a high value that I couldn't see its relationship to the revenue produced from the farm. I had difficulty believing that this farmer was prepared to work as hard as he did and receive a revenue which as I recall it was less than he would have received had he sold his farm and invested in Manitoba bonds and clipped coupons. I couldn't understand it as a lawyer practising in the city that this person chose to keep his land, to work as hard as he did and he worked very hard during the season that he was producing, when he knew and tried to convince me that he could sell the land for enough to produce the same income clipping coupons.

So I say that I recognize that farming has been a way of life and I recognize with procedures like supply and management, and the whole agrobusiness aspect as becoming more of a business than a way of life and for those to whom farming was important, I have to deplore the fact that it is becoming more of a business than a way of life.

Now if a person chooses to live on a farm and not work the farm, then I don't think it's any longer a way of life and that person could choose to live in a village or a town and the City of Winnipeg, that to me is no longer part of the life of being a farmer. That's why I thought it was nonsense for the Member for Emerson to try to relate and find a logical analogy between saying you can't own farmland unless you farm it and saying you can't live in the city because you come in from the country. That's crazy, Mr. Speaker. To suggest that is just ridiculous and that's why I responded to the member the way I did. But then he went on to say and he said, I worked on a farm 30 or 40 years — these aren't these his words but he said in effect — I want the fruits of labour so I could sell the farm to anyone I like. Really, he didn't mean to anyone I like. He really meant for any price I can get, which meant he wants no restrictions on his being able to sell it at the best price. That's what he meant and so obviously he meant it that I don't even have to ask him to confirm it, because to sell and walk away I don't think anybody cares very much as to who bought it as long you get the right price.

However, some people may say and I've seen this happen in many cases with many kinds of trading of articles like a plant or pets, I will only sell my pet or my plant to someone that I know will look after it. Then it matters who buys it; then one is concerned about the husbandry of what one sells and says regardless of the price.

Mr. Speaker, there is an analogy I'd like to make which I think is valid. A friend whom I knew, a wealthy person, told me that his hobby was violin and he became awfully good at playing the violin but it was still a hobby and he started looking for a new violin and he found the Stradivarius. I think he said the price was \$10,000 and he could afford it, but the

person who was selling it was very cool when he approached him to want to buy it, to negotiate a price, and he said he just couldn't get to talking to this person about a price for it. He kept coming back and the seller would say, well, how would you like to play it for a while, just right here, play it? He said it was about the sixth or seventh visit that the person selling the Stradivarius said to him, I'm prepared to sell it to you now because I know that you love the violin, that you respect it, that you will take care of it and that you will see to it that a violin that was, I suppose, 200 or 300 years old, will continue to live and will be used by future generations. I understand that but that is not, I believe, what the Member for Emerson meant when he said I want to be free to sell it to whomever I wish, because if he did, then surely he would want to be very very selective as to who buys it. But if he wants that freedom, why is he supporting a bill which tightens up something which he's opposed to, because the bill is supposed to be tightening up an Act which has a principle in it that is very selective which denies certain people and corporations the right to buy? If the member believes in what he said, then what's he doing supporting a bill which does nothing but tighten up; a bill to which I believe in principle he ought to be opposed and I think he is opposed if he means what he said?

Mr. Speaker, I want to back to the debates that took place years back and I don't recall that I participated in them at all. But we said that we felt that the desire to have people living in the environment that they wanted to live in, people who wanted to live on farms, people that wanted to work in that way of life, should have the right to do so rather than have their land gobbled up and removed both from farming and removed from the community so that we have massive tracts of land that are being exploited to the fullest extent in order to produce the food which is essential in this time. We said there has to be some way in which there is a restraint on the use of the land and for whom the land is used. We came up with a proposal which was that we want the people who work the land, to own the land.

Now the member who is supporting this legislation, obviously the Member for Emerson, he wants the land to be kept for whom, for Canadians, or landed immigrants? He will not agree that he should be able to sell his land to some person who lives outside of Canada, but he will say you can't buy it if you live outside of Canada, you can buy it if you live within Canada, and that to me is a real contradiction. I think he should be talking against the entire legislation that this bill purports to improve or to tighten up, but instead of that, he's giving the complete laissez-faire attitude which I somehow believe, Mr. Speaker, is that shared by other members of this caucus. Yet for some reason, they are promoting the legislation that the Minister of Agriculture seems to feel is right for the people of Canada and, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to restrict, prevent people from buying land. (Interjection)— You see, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Member for Rock Lake how foolish his argument now is. He says, it's your legislation in the first place. He's been in the government side for three-and-one-half plus years and he's still talking about NDP legislation as if he's married to it, as if he doesn't have the guts to eliminate it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If honourable members wish to make any comments in the House, I hope they would direct their remarks to the Chair, when they have been recognized and that way, we may proceed with the debate in the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I very often appreciate your assistance when I have problems in the House, but I had no problem now. I invited by gesture the Member for Rock Lake to make clear what he was saying because I didn't hear it and now that I heard him say it, I hope I put on record what he said, because I know I'm responding to it. Yes, he said, it's your legislation. So what? It's now your legislation, after three-and-one-half years in government, every bill that's in the statute books is a bill belonging and the responsibility of the Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba.

So don't try and slough it off by saying it's your legislation. Our legislation I approved of. Your legislation is just a half step in that direction, but you changed it, why didn't you eliminate it if the Member for Emerson was around and I know he was. Why didn't he, in caucus, have it eliminated? — (Interjection)— I think the Minister for Agriculture said he wasn't persuasive.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. I recognize the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggestion that when you want to limit the ownership of productive agricultural land, that by the same token you may want to prevent a farmer from living in the city and owning land in the city, that's really — (Interjection)— it's not only apples and oranges, it's a foolish analogy and again, his desire to sell land to whomever he wishes, is contrary to the principles of the legislation we now have, for which he is one member who is responsible.

I would guess, Mr. Speaker, and I have no recollection of it, nor have I bothered to look it up, I would guess that when in 1978 the Conservatives brought in a change in the legislation, I would guess that I voted against the change. I don't remember, but surely the Member for Emerson should have been screaming out loud saying, your amendment is doing nothing to assist me in my guiding light, my principle of wanting to sell land to whomever I please, because he can't do it. Sorry, sorry, you can't do it, much as he would like to do it; he can't do it by the present law, by the present Conservative law, by the law that is being administered by his Minister of Agriculture and is one which he could have had an impact on and obviously didn't.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're involved in a philosophic debate, which carries in it real legislation, but there is a difference. The difference appears to be that a foreigner should not be allowed to come in and buy agricultural land — that's one aspect, in general principles and the other is; that a person or agricultural corporation which is not prepared to farm the land, should not own it, and there is a difference. The member was confused when he thought that the proposal that we had endorsed was one that denied any corporation, including an agricultural corporation, from owning land. That's not

correct. We recognize the anomaly created by tax benefits and income tax structures and tax planning, that created the advisability, in the minds of farmers, of agricultural people, having to have corporations. I don't think it ever made sense, except from the income tax standpoint. But now that it has been done, we recognize as done, there is certainly no objection that I'm aware of, to a truly agricultural corporation owning land, providing it's people, are people who are working the land. I think that's the real difference and when you talk about a way of life for a farmer as the way I described my view of it, I think we come an awful lot closer to recognizing a way of life and an ideal and an objective, than the Member for Emerson does.

He says, I want to sell to anybody. I'll sell to — I suppose he'd even sell to the Russians and let them own his farm, because they pay him more. He might do that, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— pardon? — yes, and he might sell to communists, Mr. Speaker, even though he hates them, because he'll get a better price, and once you lay down the rules and since they have the rules and since he wants complete freedom, I would think he would sell to a communist. As a matter of fact, he probably wouldn't inquire behind the corporation that is doing the buying, lest he find out they are communists and maybe he wouldn't sleep one or nights while he's counting his dividends.

So let's make it clear that communists who live in the farthest reaches of Canada would be entitled to buy his land under this legislation. That's right, under this legislation, the communists he hates, could buy the land, but I gather that somebody which was mentioned, somebody in North Dakota couldn't buy the land, even though he may be across the border from him.

It was pointed out to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's a sentence worth reading in a book, "Beyond the Harvest, Canadian Grain of the Crossroads," written by Barry Wilson. On page 97 he talks about "Agricultural Minister Downey, who remained adamant that purchases by absentee Canadians should not be restricted. In that political climate, the University of Manitoba's Darryl Kraft, predicts absentee non-Manitoban land ownership will increase by approximately 5 percent annually during the decade adding another one million acres to the total. That would raise the ratio of privately-owned Manitoba land in non-resident hands, to almost 18 percent."

Well, is that where the Member for Emerson wants to see the agricultural base of this province move? Is he prepared to sell out the resources of Manitoba in this direction so that almost 18 percent of Manitoba land, privately-owned would be in non-resident hands? But he's got his own Minister, who's trying so hard to save the land and he's fighting him and I don't know now whether the Minister has to persuade the Member for Emerson or the Member for Emerson has to persuade the Minister, but I have to tell them both . . . you know, the Minister indicates by nodding that he's more adamant, as has been described here that he is, that the Member for Emerson may have a tough job. But I want to tell the members that it appears to me that there's a contradiction in their own approaches as to the philosophy behind the bill before us and the

legislation it purports to amend and that to me is somewhat peculiar.

Fellows, you talk about divisions, you've got divisions right there. Why don't you thrash it out in your caucus room. Why don't you show that you have some sense of understanding as to what you're working, rather than this division that becomes so apparent on the government side, a government that is designed to govern, that presumably has not only the power and the authority, but also the ability to govern and you're split and that means that your arguments are difficult and divisive. I don't know what that means as to the leadership that you have; it may be a difficult problem that you face. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it would be helpful if the members could get together and give us a Conservative philosophy; when I say Conservative, I of course mean, both progressive and capitalized Progressive Conservatives, so we understand what you're about. The conservative, small "c" conservative philosophy we can recognize, but the Progressive Conservative approach is very difficult to follow, when one listens to what I think, are contradictory statements made by members of this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I didn't even know this bill was coming up, I'm glad that I was able to hear the Member for Emerson and I did hear speakers who spoke earlier today. You see, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get the Minister of Agriculture to make his comment loudly enough so I could respond, but the better part of valour was —(Interjection)— I assure the Minister that he won't make a speech today on this bill. He should know that and just relax, because he won't.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that in the interval, until this bill is again discussed, that the Member for Emerson and any others of his party who believe as he does, will get together with the Minister of Agriculture, in caucus or otherwise, formally or informally, it's not my concern, and try to designate some person in caucus other than those who've already spoken, to get up and to tell us just what is the Progressive Conservative view on land ownership of agricultural land, so that we at least are facing one argument and one philosophy and one approach. For me it would be very helpful, I would like to see that happen and since we only have five minutes to go, maybe somebody can in five minutes, reconcile what I think are differences in approach and philosophy, so that we can understand.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude in saying that I think it's very healthy that we should be able to debate differences of philosophy rather than vituperation and attack. That's one reason why I enjoyed listening to the debate on this bill. I admit that I used the word stupid and I think, crazy and I certainly did not mean that as indicating any of the members present. I did suggest and I guess I believe, that the arguments that were presented were such and I would not like to think that anyone took it personally, that when I reacted to an argument presented as being stupid, that I did not mean the individual, I meant the argument itself. I hope it is accepted in that light, because I do respect and I do enjoy debates that deal with a difference of approach and difference in philosophy, where we can really show where we differ, as between political parties, so

that our electorate will know how they select, how they pick the people whom they wish to represent them, and on that basis I am looking forward to hearing that reconciliation of the two points of view that I think I discerned between the Minister and the Member for Emerson.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the Member for St. Johns in his efforts to attempt to create the impression that somehow or other there was a great split on this side of the House with respect to this legislation.

Now it comes as rather amusing when you consider the vituperation, the invective, and the arguments that were hurled across the front benches when my honourable friend was on this side of the House between himself and the former Member for Thompson, the Minister of Highways; between the Member for Inkster and the Member for St. Boniface, who are now soul mates on the that side of the House. The arguments and the insults that were hurled at one another and that was supposed to be a government that knew its direction. To have listened to them in those days, those halcyon days when they enjoyed getting together, never in caucus, because as one of their members remarked to me once, "Why there isn't two fellows on that side of the House that talk to each other, so what's the point of having caucuses."

Mr. Speaker, that came to me as somewhat amusing and an effort on the part of the Member for St. Johns to try and fill as much time as he possibly could before 4:30. He frankly admitted, Mr. Speaker, that it was their intention to insure that the bill wouldn't pass this afternoon, and that shouldn't come as any great surprise. I would have been a little bit disappointed myself had a bill of this nature been . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Minister is suggesting that there is some plan to prevent this matter coming to a vote. It's not necessarily a plan. When I rose to speak, I rose after the Member for Logan indicated that he wanted to adjourn debate, so that it was clear to me that he wanted to adjourn debate and on that basis I could assure him that there was going to be a motion to adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The interruption by the Honourable Member for St. John was an interruption, it was not a matter of privilege.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I was going to point that out myself, I was going to spare you the trouble, Mr. Speaker, of pointing that out by remarking myself that the interjection by the Member for St. Johns was out of order, as I am sure he knew, because there is only one kind of an interjection that is permitted during the course of debate, when a member rises, and that is to ask permission to ask a question. He failed to do that. My honourable friend

did not raise on point of privilege, nor did he have a point of order.

I knew that the Member for Logan was on his feet

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 4:30, when this subject matter next comes up the Honourable Minister will have 37 minutes.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now in Private Members' Hour. Having no Orders for Return or Address for Papers we move into resolutions. Resolution No. 10, the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the amendment by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

#### RES. NO. 10 — CHILD CARE PROGRAM WITHIN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to the original resolution and generally supportive of the amendment, although I do have a couple of qualifications and reservations even on the amendment. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I thought the speech by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in presenting his amendment is the best speech I've ever heard him make and having heard him make quite a lot of speeches — I think I'm embarrassing him with his caucus, it apparently isn't acceptable to pay a compliment to somebody on the other side of the House in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's regrettable. I think it is regrettable that apparently it's suspect when we compliment one another on speeches or on presentations and perhaps this place would be a better place if people would take the time to express appreciation of something that a member of another party does instead of always, just as a matter of principle, being opposed to anything that is suggested by another person. So, I am sorry, if I have embarrassed the Member for Crescentwood in the eyes of his colleagues and I'll try to make up for that by making a few criticisms of his amendment.

Even the amended resolution, Mr. Speaker, has critical overtones of the day care system, which I think are unnecessary and in fact overreaching. The amendment left in the second WHEREAS of the original resolution referring to the danger of developing into over professionalized service. Over professionalized is one of those phrases which is intended to present a particular point of view which is critical of the status quo. I think it would have been better to point out the fact of the need for trained personnel in daycare, which really perhaps could be called in a negative sense professionalized or even over-professionalized, but I do think it's important that the people with whom we are leaving our small children and our school aged children in lunch and after-school programs should be people who maintain professional standards and people who are properly trained to look after young children. So that was a concern of mine.

The resolution, in fact, was suggesting that the children should be put into a professional school

system, a professionalized school system, at the same time as it was deploring the possibility of a professional day care system, so I found that the original resolution was contradictory in that sense, but of course that was in part remedied by the amendment.

I felt that in the amendment the substitution of the word "reasonable" for "universal" was rather judgmental and unnecessary. I don't think that was necessary. I think that we should all acknowledge the importance of having adequate day care available for the children who need it, for the children whose parents for one reason or another cannot look after them at home or for one reason or another do not want to look after them at home. I suggest that it's a much healthier atmosphere for our children to be raised in through their school years in an atmosphere where there are standards maintained and where there is trained personnel to look after the children.

I was very concerned over the apparent intention of the original resolution to have the children looked after by apparently dozens of elementary school children. I didn't feel that was at all an appropriate or a desirable suggestion even in a pilot project. There would be all kinds of nuances introduced into the children's lives, which in some cases would be pleasant, in other cases would be very unpleasant for the children. We would have children of Grade VI, we'll say, Standing, who would be in a position and children of that age are not always kind and they would be in a position to select and approve and give advancement, social advancement to those children who were cute or desirable or not handicapped, sometimes their process of selection may not be the most desirable kind and even in a pilot project there could be untold damage done to the emotional health, the psyche of the young children, who would be the participating involuntarily in the program as suggested in the original resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the amended resolution, which I presume will pass, even though I have those minor reservations that I wanted to put on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that there may be a disposition to call it 5:30 at this time, if that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there agreement then to leave this resolution standing open? (Agreed)

Is there agreement to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

The hour being 5:30, the House will accordingly adjourn, and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow (Thursday).