

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 28 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. ACTING CLERK, G. Mackintosh: Your Committee met on Saturday, June 26, 1982 and heard representations with respect to the bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill (No. 57) - An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act.

Mr. Dick Martin - Manitoba Federation of Labour
Mr. John Huta - Injured Workers Association

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 57) - An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act. And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill (No. 58) - An Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act. And has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. J. STORIE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. ACTING CLERK: Your Committee met on Monday, June 28, 1982 and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill (No. 43) - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act. Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques.

Mr. Norm Harvey - Manitoba Association of School Trustees

Ms. Dorothy Young - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bill (No. 31) - The Child Custody Enforcement Act.

Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde.

Mr. Bill Riley - Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties

Bill (No. 53) - An Act to amend The Builders' Liens Act. Loi modifiant la Loi sur le privilège du constructeur.

Mr. Gervin L. Greasley - Winnipeg Construction Association

Your Committee has considered:

Bill (No. 36) - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act. And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report on the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. ACTING CLERK: Your Committee met on Thursday, June 24; Friday, June 25; and Saturday, June 26, 1982 and heard representations with respect to the following bill:

No. 21 - The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. Loi sur les Garderies d'Enfants.

Ms Georgia Cordes - Y.W.C.A. Mrs. Aleda Turnbull - Coalition on Daycare Mrs. Judy Olson - Central Region; Manitoba Child Care Association Mrs. Jan Lucas - Central Region; Manitoba Child Care Association Mrs. Ann Barr - Manitoba Association of Social Workers Ms Doris West - Manitoba Child Care Association Mr. Ross McIntosh - McCare Child Care Center Mrs. Carol Draper - Manitoba School Age Child Care Support Committee Mrs. Jacy Butchart and Ms Eleanor Medway - Parents Without Partners, Inc. Mrs. Norma McCormick - Private Citizen Mrs. Joanna Hayward - Private Citizen Mrs. Marilyn Bouw - Day Nursery Centre Mrs. Barbara Marguand - Family Services of Winnipeg Inc. Mr. Dick Martin and Ms Pauline Russell - The Manitoba Federation of Labour Mr. Laurie Todd - Earl Grey Lunch and After School Program, Inc. Mrs. Norma Buchan - Community Task Force Ms Fay Ferris - Wee World Daycare Mrs. Louisa Bormann - Private Citizen Mrs. Elaine Taylor - United Way Dr. Joel Kettner - Private Citizen Mrs. Donna McKay - Marriage Conciliation Services Ms Dorothy Kotler - Children's House Mr. Brian Proctor - Private Citizen Mrs. Maryann Haddad - Wild Honey Children's Centre Ms Laura Mills - Child Development Clinic Mrs. Sharlene Wiebe - Winkler Day Care Centre Ms Roberta Ellis - Manitoba Action Committee on the

Status of Women

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 21 - The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. Loi sur les Garderies d'Enfants. And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. I beg leave to table the Annual Report of The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act for the year ending March 31, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a request from the Member for St. Norbert, I beg leave to table the opinion of Professor Dale Gibson with respect to constitutional questions re Health and Post-Secondary Education Tax Levy Act. Bill 46.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are two members of the Salvation Army Centennial Congress, which is being held in Winnipeg this week. I present Birgitta Eld from Sweden and Margaret Blackburn from Ontario.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to table several reports.

First, the Preliminary Financial Report for the year ended March 31, 1982; and second, I'd like to table a report of amounts paid to Members of the Assembly as required under Section 66 of The Legislative Assembly Act. That's for the year ending March 31, 1982.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Acting First Minister.

I wonder, can the Acting First Minister of the House advise what plans she or her government have taken over the weekend to halt the practice of dumping milk in this province, which has been described over the weekend by one of the world's most famous figures, Mother Teresa of Calcutta, as terrible and one that they'll have to answer to God for. Can the Honourable First Minister advise what government is doing about that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the member opposite has been listening to the theme that's been spoken from this side for many many years. It has to do with orderly production and marketing of basic farm commodities.

Mr. Speaker, if there is not in place such a system to expect that dumping would be a practice by our government is really unrealistic. If there were a way to deliver that milk to the starving people in India, I would be not only the first in line to agree with it, I would be wondering why we hadn't agreed to it 25 years earlier.

But, Mr. Speaker, to give marketing boards a certain power, they deal with half the problem not the total problem. They don't control the total production. I think it is unfair to blame this government for not being able to solve all those problems that are made by the marketplace and by the nature of milk production immediately is quite unfair.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture I am sure can give a more up-to-the-minute comment on this problem.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Acting First Minister of this province trying to tell me that one of the food products in this province under the most severe control of any, that it is okay to dump it on the ground.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think I have said —(Interjection)— either the honourable members don't want an answer, or they wish to put their own frame on it. Mr. Speaker, all of us feel as citizens of this province that the dumping of any food product is very much not the way to handle the situation. Mr. Speaker, we are and we have attempted and are attempting to meet with the processors to see whether there is any additional capacity that milk can be used.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members may have a suggestion in terms of that but one has to look at what market that will displace, and whether or not that will only lead to the further deterioration of the marketplace insofar as adequate incomes to the farmers of this province.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I can assume from the remarks by the Honourable Acting First Minister

of the Province and the Minister of Agriculture that the practice of the Minister of Co-op Development has gone on in this Legislature since the creamery closed at Rosburn. The many questions I've raised time and time again, this government is not going to do anything and the practice will continue of dumping milk in this province.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, irrespective of what occurs with respect to MANCO we are not only very concerned, we have gone in with MANCO to review their entire operation to see whether or not there may be a way of reopening those plans in conjunction with their boards.

Mr. Speaker, the dumping of milk, as repulsive as it is, has gone on and has gone on widespread and the problem that MANCO has is not a new problem that is directly related to the situation. As I said last week on Friday, the problem this year has escalated over last year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that situation where MANCO, where there was over a-half-million litres of milk dumped last year, the problem is the same, the financial situation of that co-operative has escalated over the last number of years. If the members opposite, the Member for Roblin-Russell and his colleague for Arthur, showed any responsibility, they could have settled and dealt with this problem when it had been occurring and has been occurring over the last year or more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister of Agriculture, can the Minister of Agriculture confirm that Modern Dairies has for some time offered to take all this production, but has been refused to do so by the board, partly I suppose because Modern Dairies is tied up with Beatrice Foods, one of those evil multinational companies, but nonetheless would have provided an out for this milk to be turned into a useful food product, perhaps shipped as part of our foreign aid package to countries like India, etc., but could have, in fact, prevented the dumping of this food? My question to the Minister is, is he aware of an offer that Modern Dairies has made to take over the production and the milk that is being produced in that area for some time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I am advised that the capacity of the plants in Manitoba are near maximum. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member makes a point when he indicates that there may be a possibility of taking all the milk that may become available. What he didn't say was at what price or whether it would be for next to nothing, whether or not the taking of that milk at that price would lead to a deterioration in the marketplace and lower the incomes of the milk producers in this province and that is really part of the suggestion that he is making.

If he is making that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, let him get up and do so, and say, yes, we are prepared to take this milk at whatever price it is and we will lower the

income to producers in this province to a lower price. We will not meet their cost of production by allowing this milk to go on the marketplace. I, Mr. Speaker, do not subscribe to that in terms of having the producers of this province take a price for their milk at below their cost of production.

If there is a way of utilizing this milk, Mr. Speaker, the equipment and the shortage of equipment is here in this province. There should be, Mr. Speaker, adequate and additional drying capacity in order to facilitate the drying of the milk into powdered milk so it can be used wherever it is required; but to suggest that milk that is not pasteurized and has not been processed can go on the market at any place, I don't believe that it can be accommodated. Because can you just imagine if someone was to get ill from the milk that may be used without being pasteurized? — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur says oh, oh, oh. Mr. Speaker, I would not want to be the one to be responsible for allowing that to happen. I would want it to happen in a way that the milk could be used to the best use that can be put to it, whether it be for cheese or whether it be for powdered milk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some two months ago during Supply, during Estimates, this side of the House made known some of its concerns within the industry and the Minister of Agriculture at that time indicated that he was setting up a review. He also made mention of this dairy review here last week.

I'm wondering now if he could give us some indication; first of all, who's conducting it and what is the progress of supposedly that two-month review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the setup of that review has been undertaken. It is in the process of being jointly discussed with the Milk Producers' Marketing Board and the province, so that the review is a joint review between government and the industry.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, that seems to indicate in fact, nothing has been done for two months in this whole area, although we were promised that during those Estimates.

I'm wondering if in fact this review, whether it will be done in concert with the Manitoba Milk Producers' Marketing Board and if it is, will you also be reviewing the activities, the policies and the pricing policies of that Board in particular?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, those policies and issues dealing directly with the Board are being and should be monitored based on a number of, whether it be complaints or enquiries by the Natural Products Marketing Council and those would be an ongoing review.

MR. C. MANNESS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister give us some idea when this

report will be completed in fact and will it also be made public?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if it is a joint review, it of course ultimately would be made public; in what form it will be made will be a question that will be answered at the time when the review is complete.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Co-operative Development. Has the Minister received the report and recommendations from the committee investigating the closing of the two MANCO cheese plants at Pilot Mound and Rossburn?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the staff at Co-operative Development have met with the Board of MANCO just last week. I have not had a report as yet submitted to me. However, it is the first time that our staff had been invited to meet with the Board and to discuss with them ways, if there are any, to resolve the situation of overproduction of cheese at the present time. We will be continuing to work with them in that regard and whenever a plausible or feasible solution is found, certainly it will be dealt with and be put in place.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister either did not understand or wished to avoid my question. My question was specifically, has the Minister received a report from the one-man study group that he has established to look into the problems of MANCO at the two cheese plants - a study, I believe, undertaken by a Mr. Bob Perry. Has that man reported to the Minister?

HON. A. ADAM: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, when does the Minister expect that report to be issued and secondly, does the report have any stipulation that it is binding on MANCO, the findings of that report are binding on Manco or the government for that matter?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro.

Last fall, a decision was made by the Hydro Board to prepare Sundance for a possible construction of Limestone in 1982. Now that Alcan and the Power Grid will not be proceeded with, can the Minister say whether activity has ceased in the preparation of Sundance?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, there was a bit of preparatory work done to accommodate some upgrading at Henday and that was complementary to any type of work that might have taken place with Limestone, had Limestone been able to proceed this year. Work is still proceeding on the Henday Station, and there will have to be some staff housed at the Sundance townsite to accommodate that, and that will be continued until such time as the Henday Station is completed.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. Very little money was approved for the demothballing of Sundance last fall, however, in April of this year considerable money was needed to be provided in order to prepare Sundance for 1982 construction of Limestone. Can the Minister say approximately how much money has been spent in the preparation of Sundance?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. It was generally agreed between the three provinces involved with the Western Power Grid that funding would be done by the Alberta Heritage Fund, because if Ottawa was involved they would also want a piece of the pie; knowing this, why did the Minister go to Ottawa to seek funding for the Power Grid?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in my discussion with the other two Ministers when I specifically asked the question regarding financing, I was told quite categorically by both other Ministers that financing was something that would have to be discussed apart from the negotiations relating to the Western Inter-Tie, that they were not connected in any way, shape or form, and that financing was the responsibility of each province with respect to its own share of the Inter-Tie development and as result Manitoba was indeed required and is required if the project goes ahead to raise some 81 percent of the \$3.6 billion project, which is something in the order of \$2.8 billion.

In our discussions with the Federal Government, it was clearly understood that we were talking about only Manitoba's share, that this would not impinge at all on the negotiations and that understanding was clearly understood by both parties at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Is the Minister of Energy and Mines aware that discussions had taken place between the Manitoba Minister and the Alberta Minister about the possible financing of Manitoba's facilities for the Power Grid.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, when I in fact raised that with the other two Ministers, they had indicated that was a separate item, that as far as the

knowledge and information that I had been given it hadn't been discussed, and that was a completely separate question. The only item that I had factual knowledge of was the fact that the Alberta Treasurer had informed the Manitoba Finance Minister that Alberta was not going to make loans to other provinces out of the Heritage Fund anymore.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister confirming then, Mr. Speaker, that although the discussions did not take place within the context of the three provinces' negotiations, they did take place between Manitoba and Alberta?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in terms of any of the documentation that I have, there was no indication at all that there had been any discussion, there was nothing documented at all to indicate that had been discussed. I am not sure whether it had been discussed informally or otherwise, because certainly when I raised it with the Alberta Minister I was told quite clearly that was a separate item and that Manitoba was responsible for raising its own share.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Could the Minister of Urban Affairs indicate if he is supportive of the City of Winnipeg plans for improvements of the Salter Street bridge?

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

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The plans for improvements to the Salter Street Bridge are a matter that is within the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg and there has been no requests from the City of Winnipeg to the province for any assistance with respect to the City of Winnipeg plans for the Salter Street Bridge.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of that answer, and in view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg is developing some plans for that, is the Minister prepared to abide by the wishes of City Council if they desire to make some improvements in the next calendar year?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not certain what the question was. If I am prepared to abide by the decision of the City of Winnipeg with respect to that Bridge, the City of Winnipeg has jurisdiction with respect to that, so their decision is their decision.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to whether or not the Provincial Government will impose any conditions on the block funding grant or on the capital funding grants to the City of Winnipeg. Could the Minister indicate whether he is supportive of the relocation of the CP rail lines and yards, and if so, to what extent is the government prepared to fund the relocation?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the first part of the question, there has been no decisions made in regards to funding for the City of Winnipeg for the next year. The funds that have been approved for this year, with one condition attached with respect to the transit, are all that are in place for the present year and no decisions have been made with respect to financial assistance to the City of Winnipeg for the next year. Discussions will be ongoing with the City of Winnipeg on the form funding may take next year.

With respect to the second question, our government is prepared, if the City of Winnipeg and Federal Government are serious with respect to looking at the possibility of moving the rail yards out of the downtown of Winnipeg, that we will support those efforts by the city, but I might add it would take the will and determination not only of the City of Winnipeg and the province but indeed the Federal Government and the CPR railway.

In regards to any potential costs, I do not believe that there has been any definitive study done on the cost of rail relocation, nor the benefits that may arrive out of the rail yards being moved out of the City of Winnipeg. I would suggest that the first course of action would be to make those determinations, so the province, while supportive of that general position, will await some studies to see what the actual costs and benefits of such relocation would be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Highways and Transportation. My first question would be: Would it be possible for the Minister of Highways and Transportation to provide for the members a copy of this announcement made today in English as well as French. It would be most helpful if we could have it in both the English and French, preferably English so we could have an understanding of what it says?

The question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Gilson Report, which has been worked on over the last many weeks with the Federal Government negotiator and the farm community. Does the Minister of Highways and Transportation plan to ask for a meeting with the Gilson Committee and with the Federal Government to find out how they plan to proceed with the recommendations in this report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the government interfacing with the Gilson Committee, the Government of Canada has not authorized Dr. Gilson to meet with Provincial Governments, so that I would think that is not a probability. The Minister in charge of Transportation for Canada, of course, is someone that we will hopefully be meeting with fairly soon. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are discussions now under way as to the date for such a meeting to take place, but I don't believe we have any opportunity or latitude to take this matter up with Dr. Gilson.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Provincial Governments may not have been invited to participate with Dr. Gilson or in the review initially; however, that has not stopped the Minister from now requesting of the Federal Minister and Dr. Gilson to meet to discuss the recommendations, and that's really the point of information that I wanted, if he is prepared to do that, and when he plans to ask the Federal Government?

A further supplementary to the Minister of Highways and Transportation, Mr. Speaker. Does he plan to call the Crow Rate Resolution that's on the Order Paper to debate it further in this Session of the Legislative Session?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Arthur would appreciate that we all received the copies of the Gilson Report this morning, and I don't believe there has been ample opportunity for anyone to digest the contents of that study. It's obviously extremely technical and indeed, if the recommendations were to be followed, would impact very heavily on the Canadian economy, indeed the Western Canadian economy and the transportation system of the future. So to give a response to that at this point in time I think is premature; and as to what we intend to do with the resolution, that will be announced in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister advise the House what notice is being given to nonresident fishermen at tourist information booths as they come into Manitoba in order that they might be aware of the restriction placed upon fishing in Molson Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Since the Honourable Minister of Government Services is responsible for Transportation, some time ago we had questions to him on the disposition of the abandoned property that was previously used in rail line right-of-ways. I wonder if he could give the Legislature an up-to-date report on the standing of those particular applications for purchase of that land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have a list of names that have been approved or applicants that have been approved. The instructions did go out to the department to follow through with all applications pursuant to a policy guideline that was established some time ago by the previous administration, and I

presume that is taking place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. BLAKE: I just wonder, in view of that answer, if the Minister might look into that as the complaints coming to me are the fact that there are weed problems. Farmers have spent several thousand dollars levelling and preparing those beds now, and not only is there a weed problem, but it is noticeable lately that they've become a haven for various bugs and other insects that are being sprayed off the fields and they are living in the abandoned railways and that has to be controlled very very quickly. I wonder if he might look into it and see if he can expedite the matters so that those people receive title to that property.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by departmental officials that even though we have agreed to take over those properties from the CNR or the CPR, it will be some time before we indeed have title to those properties. It may be a year or two or three before the legal work is completed in order to make those transfers. So that while we may enter into agreements with potential owners, the Land Titles Office will not have had the applicants' applications processed for some considerable time into the future.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, then I wonder if the Minister could enter into an agreement with those applicants to give them some assurance that the money they're spending on that property is not going to be eventually a total loss to them, that they can legally go ahead and work that right-of-way and protect it as if it were their own.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is in fact the way it is being handled at the moment. All I'm indicating is that the railway system in its legal network is not in a position to accommodate quick transfers as the Member for Minnedosa would prefer, but rather their Legal Department is going to post these in the normal way. I presume they will not be adding to their staff numbers to give it any priority over their other legal matters, and I'm led to believe by departmental officials that process will indeed take some time.

MR. D. BLAKE: Just to make a final observation in view of those answers, Mr. Speaker, that three to six years doesn't appear to be a quick transfer of property title.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, who on many occasions in this House has indicated her support for and belief that it is the small businessmen that require the attention of government, and indeed is perhaps the way that development should take place in this province.

My question to the Minister is, would she use her influence with the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation that perhaps they

could back off a little bit on the heavy dose of advertising that is currently being carried on since November 17th in all rural newspapers and in the media, advertising of course a very good product, by the way, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation's general insurance policy? Mr. Speaker, I point out to the Minister that Autopac has some 700 agents of their own who are also engaged in this kind of advertising, which I don't object to, but is it really necessary for the Corporation to, as a corporate entity, engage in this kind of advertising in competition with the many small independent one-man, two-man, three-men insurance shops throughout rural Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the advertising that is being undertaken deals with the General Insurance Division. There is not advertising outside the year-end changes that have been authorized to be made with respect to the automobile insurance portion. There is no further advertising other than formative advertising for that portion of the Public Insurance Corporation. With respect to the General Insurance Division, Mr. Speaker, we do utilize regular agents to advertise their own insurance businesses, but as well the Corporation is in competition with other insurers for the general insurance business in this province and handles that on a competitive basis.

MR. H. ENNS: It's hardly necessary for the insurance to advertise their Autopac insurance. After all, we are all captive clients, but my question directly to him is and I repeat it, I do not object to an Autopac Insurance Agent who is handling general insurance from carrying on his advertising. We see that throughout the papers - many of the 700 agents do that - but is it necessary on top of that, for the parent corporation to carry on the kind of active advertising. You know, sometimes you hear of this kind of a disdain for this kind of advertising. I can remember them telling Alcan they didn't like their kind of corporate advertising a little while ago. Now, this is direct competition with my little insurance agent in Woodlands, in Teulon, in Stonewall and I don't think it's necessary, Mr. Speaker, and it was a Ministerial direction by the previous administration that prevented it.

My question to the Minister is: Will the Minister consider giving the corporation a direction, as it received in October of 1977, to cease and desist from this kind of advertising?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary to the member's comments, the corporation is not competing with any of those agents. In fact, that advertising for those agents who are doing marketing for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation are those very agents who will benefit from this advertising in the hopeful increased business that they will attain. So rather than in fact, as the member suggests, compete with individual agents, Mr. Speaker, that advertis-

ing is there to promote those agents who are agents for Autopac in the general insurance business and because the corporation does deal through an agency force, those agents, if there is increased business to be had, will handle that business on the basis of their advertising and the corporation's advertising.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister knows better. I will quote directly from the ad. "When it comes to protection for your farm, when it comes to protection for your buildings, enquire about our Agropac from Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. We understand your needs. We have the coverage you want." This is a general advertising request which all other general insurance agents provide - Royal Insurance, Wawanesa, Portage la Prairie - and I'm simply saying, is it necessary for the corporation to advertise in this way?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member in his aftermath of his supposed question indicates that other companies pay taxes in this province. I want to tell the Honourable Member for Lakeside that Autopac pays full taxes in the Province of Manitoba from all their operations, whether it be the premium tax, whether it be property tax, whether it be corporate tax, payroll tax, Mr. Speaker; they pay all the taxes in the Province of Manitoba.

The advertising, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of policy, the corporation does its business through a network of agents in the Province of Manitoba. The agents who are agents under the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation will gain business if this advertising is successful and hopefully the agents will also gain from the commissions that they receive in the selling business.

I am sure that there are other and I know of other - if the honourable member wants me to bring in other advertising from other companies in the general insurance field I will do so for him, because there is other advertising going on. The market is competitive, the insurance field is competitive, there is advertising going on and there will be advertising to promote the product that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation in the general insurance field, in the competitive field, is in the marketplace and is actively involved in it.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister in charge of the Environment. Can the Honourable Minister for the Environment tell us when we're going to get the medical report on that dove or pigeon that was brought in for his examination. Is the autopsy or the veterinary report tied up with some bureaucrats or when can we expect the report, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, I'm pleased to inform the member opposite that the report on the pigeon should be in his hands very soon.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the word "soon" is not described that well in my books. Can the Minister give the House assurance we'll have it before we prorogue?

HON. J. COWAN: I can certainly give the member opposite the assurance that I will attempt to have it in his hands as soon as it's possible and if that is before we prorogue, then in fact he will have it by that date. If not, I will get it to him soon afterwards.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise what the problems were that took this long delay for us to gain this information about that unfortunate bird.

HON. J. COWAN: We on this side, and especially the Environmental Management Division, have been attempting to deal with some serious concerns and certainly not to take away from the seriousness of the concern which the member had brought forward when he tabled the pigeon in the House. I can assure him that we've had some immediate problems which have taken up a bit of our time.

In the meanwhile, the report should be in a form which can be transmitted to him in the near future. I can assure him that I will get it to him when it is in that completed form, but certainly I hope he is aware that the Environmental Management Division has been very very busy in dealing with some other serious concerns as well in attempting to provide an overall thrust which protects the environmental integrity of this province. I certainly want to get back to him on the pigeon as soon as possible, but I'm afraid he'll just have to wait a bit more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Government Services. As I went out of the building last week, I encountered a rather pathetic situation of a pigeon being able to gain only partial flight when attempting to reach its perch on the top of the building, getting halfway up and then falling back to the concrete again.

My specific question is for the Minister of Government Services. Is his department poisoning pigeons around the Legislative Building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any chemical or poison, as the member alleges, that might have been used or is being used by the Department. On inquiry to a similar question about two or three months ago, the report was that we were not using anything of that sort, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

Earlier this Session, I'd asked him about the expected length of stay of the member of the Attorney-General's Department who had been posted to Washington. Can he now confirm that one Mr. Dirk Blevins is only expected to stay there until June 30th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm the precise date for Mr. Blevins in the Embassy's Office because Mr. Blevins will be there as need is indicated and I'm not sure just what that will involve. We are not certain of the timing of votes in Congress and I haven't had a report from our solicitors in Washington or Mr. Blevins as to when those are expected. We had anticipated those votes might come next month. We are not certain of that. When we are advised of that, then we'll better know when we will be employing the solicitor there in Washington and Mr. Blevins for further preparatory work.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have Chief Louis Stevenson, his councillors and staff. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE CHANGES

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Business of the House, let me first of all outline how I propose to proceed this afternoon. I propose to call second reading on Bill No. 52, then the adjourned debates on second readings with respect to Bills 34 and 62. Those are the private bill and the public bill by the Member for St. Norbert, and laterally towards the end of the day, adjourned debates on third reading if we make it that far.

Further, with respect to the Business of the House, I would like to announce some committee changes. By agreement with the House Leader of the Opposition, I propose to call the Municipal Affairs Committee to meet this evening, and in a minute I will make a motion to effect that change and following that I will announce some committee changes. Well, I will announce the committee changes now while I am speaking to the matter.

For Law Amendments, the Minister of Northern Affairs will substitute for the Member for Dauphin; the Member for Thompson will substitute for the Member for Gimli; and the Minister of Health will substitute for the Member for Springfield. That's with respect to Law Amendments.

With respect then to the proposed meeting of the Committee on Municipal Affairs for this evening, I am

not sure of the exact wording of the motion, but I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the Committee on Municipal Affairs meet this evening at 8 p.m. - I don't think there was a scheduled meeting for Municipal Affairs. We had one and we struck it off and put the bills into Law Amendments - and to consider Bills 50, 32 and 33.

With respect to the further Business of the House, I would like to announce that I propose a meeting of the House for tomorrow morning and afternoon; in the morning if it works out that way, I would like to be able to introduce Ways and Means and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be better if you dealt with the motion to withdraw those three bills from the Law Amendments Committee and refer them to the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Clerk will give me the wording of the motion, I will put it to the House.
The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bills 32, 33 and 50 presently before Law Amendments be transferred from Law Amendments to the Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was proposing that the House meet tomorrow morning and afternoon. I would hope that we might consider moving into Ways and Means during the morning Session and see how far we get; and that I will announce now, because I'm sure it will be necessary, a meeting of Law Amendments for Tuesday evening at 8:00 p.m.

I will make no further announcements, but project the possibility of committees on Wednesday morning and the House Wednesday afternoon and evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the uncertainty about finishing Law Amendments tonight and Municipal Affairs tonight, would the Government House Leader not be in a better position to call those committees for tomorrow morning rather than call two sittings of the House tomorrow?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I accept that suggestion. I was trying to accommodate the schedule of the Minister of Finance, but that will work out if we do it that way; so Municipal Affairs and Law Amendments to continue if necessary tomorrow morning, and the House to meet tomorrow afternoon and evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

HON. B. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make several changes on the Municipal Affairs Committee. The Member for Roblin-Russell for the Member for Emerson; and the Member for Minnedosa for the Member for St. Norbert.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in line with the announcement just made, would you please call the Second Reading on Bill No. 52?

SECOND READING - BILL NO. 52 THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 52., An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I have previously given the Member for St. Norbert, the person who was previously the Minister in charge of the Liquor Control Commission, a list of the proposed amendments, so I will be brief in my introductory remarks today.

These are really minor amendments and I do not propose to address any of the major concerns raised by the Michener Commission, those really requiring more time.

The amendments now proposed reflect some of the priorities of the Commission. Because we have given other matters more urgent priority, we have not had an opportunity to consider all of the findings and recommendations sent out in the report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Liquor Control, the Michener Report which was delivered to my predecessor, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, in April of 1981.

The amendments here will permit, for example, the establishment of a duty free liquor store at border points between Manitoba and the United States. In fact, as was previously announced in the House, applications are being received federally for that store, and this amendment will permit a land based duty free store.

Further, an applicant under the proposed amendments will be permitted to appeal a recommendation of the Licensing Board to the Liquor Control Commission. Appeals will be heard in public and the appellant will be permitted to be represented by counsel and to call witnesses and submit relevant evidence.

The proposed amendment to Section 61(1) of the Act will permit the consumption of liquor other than in a private residence or in accordance with the licence or permit issued under the Act in very restricted circumstances. This, Sir, is intended to bring the law in conformity with practice. For example, it is presently unlawful for anyone hosting a luncheon on business or institutional premises to serve wine with the luncheon; yet this practice is widespread.

The amendments further will authorize the sale of

liquor by the bottle by hotels to bonafide registered guests for consumption in the guest room of the hotel only. Hotels may install, as is the practice elsewhere, self-serve liquor units in any guest room in a hotel.

There are other minor amendments which I hope to consider constructively in Committee on a clause-by-clause basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have probably a small concern on the basis of maybe an ignorance of the law or the regulations. I'm not too sure where the law stands and the power that exists at the present time with what is considered to be an interdict. I know there are certain people that by certain actions are prevented from purchasing liquor in government liquor stores, they're prevented from purchasing alcoholic beverages in dining rooms and lounges and bars, but does that apply to a hotel room? If it does, are the various hotels and motels, which may not be familiar with the law, are they going to be provided with a list of the interdicts in the province and does that prevent that person then from obtaining a hotel room?

I would be very concerned if it prevented a person from getting a hotel room, but at the same time if that hotel room just happened to be one that was equipped with an automatic dispenser - now I don't believe there are going to be too many hotel rooms with these automatic dispensers, but we are giving them permission to put them in - would it run in contravention of the intention of prohibiting certain people from purchasing liquor?

I ask the Attorney-General these questions because they are questions that have bothered me a little bit. I know that society can in criminal actions prevent and curtail the activities of certain individuals who have been found in contravention of the law, and I know that we have in the past curtailed some activities with respect to the use of liquor of certain individuals in society for various lengths of time. I just ask the Attorney-General at this time if that had been considered at all when they were making the proposed changes in The Liquor Control Act at this time?

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, obviously there are a number of questions that may be raised with respect to specific sections and the implications of same, but those perhaps could be best answered in detail in Committee, and I believe we are prepared to allow the bill to proceed to Committee at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly with respect to the question raised by the Member for Virden, the whole question of interdiction is under review and I would like to consider that at greater length and report to the House on that at the next Session.

It's my information that the interdicted list, which is

reviewed almost every meeting of the Commission - some people are put on, some people are taken off - is, when persons are interdicted, distributed to hotels in the area where the person lives so that one will assume that the hotel, particularly of course in a smaller municipality, village or smaller area, will have the list of any person interdicted and would not, should they have one of these automatic vending units - they're small units in a hotel room - register an interdicted person in such a room.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you now call all of the adjourned debates on second readings in the order in which they are listed in the Order Paper.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Commencing with Bill 30. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 30, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 45, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 46, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

BILL 54 - THE FARMLANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 54, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn this debate for my leader to speak on at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments about this bill, The Farmlands Ownership Act, even though we have had notice now from the Government House Leader that the bill will be allowed, I believe, to die on the Order Paper, and will be reconsidered over the intervening months before the next Session. May I say, Sir, that I think that was wise on the part of the government to take that action because there is a fair amount of remedial work that has to be done to this bill if it is to reappear in a form that would not be offensive to the long history of this province with respect to land ownership and the freedom of individuals, both in Manitoba and in the rest of Canada, to participate in that land ownership.

There is after all, Sir, in terms of property rights nothing more fundamental to the individual than the

freedom and the manner in which the state interferes with the basic right of citizens to own and dispose of property.

Back in 1977, I had the opportunity to speak to the forerunner of this bill, which was brought in by the then Minister of Agriculture, now the Minister of Transportation, the Member for Lac du Bonnet. We had a good wide-ranging debate at that time on the bill and it is not my intent, Sir, on this occasion, as we draw near the conclusion of the Session, to rehearse all of the arguments that were used in that debate; but for those who are interested in reading some of the exchange of opinion at that time, which I still think is valuable, I would refer them to Hansard of 1977, in particular the pages wherein the Minister and others in the then Opposition had the opportunity to respond to the bill as it was then drawn.

As I read parts of that debate, Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of speaking to Bill 54, I found that it was apparent again that our friends opposite, now that they have resumed temporarily the trusteeship of government responsibility, have really not learned too much, because they are repeating a number of the initial errors that they made in the drafting of the first bill; errors, a large number of which were corrected at the Committee Stage in 1977 and some of which we had to correct between the years 1977 and 1981 when our party had responsibility for such matters.

I've used the expression before, Sir, I use it again, that our honourable friends across the way do in many respects when it comes to matters that affect private property, individual freedoms and so on, exhibit that kind of a centralizing tendency which tends to overrun and to override the right of choice of the individual to do certain things that have been taken as part of our heritage as being free, as part of his birthright as a free citizen.

As you've heard me say before, Sir, my honourable friends do on occasion remind me of the Bourbons; they learn nothing and they forget nothing. So that when you come to deal with a bill like this, you find that of necessity you're repeating a number of the same arguments that had to be made back in 1977 because, of course, they're taking another run at some of their favourite ideological hang-ups that really have no place in legislation of this kind.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nonresident foreign ownership is at issue in this bill as it was in 1977. I believe that the vast majority of people in Manitoba, including our party, want to see legislation that is as effective as legislation can be to prevent the wholesale alienation of farm property in Manitoba to nonresident, that is non-Canadian corporations and to the extent that there are sections in the bill that attempt to deal with this matter, then I think that we are ad idem in terms of wanting to work toward a better form of tightening up of the legislation than perhaps exists at the present time.

Having said that, Sir, I say immediately that there is no legislation that has ever been written that will be totally successful in preventing foreign owners from buying farmland in Manitoba unless that legislation is made so excessive in terms of its intrusions upon the individual rights of residents and fellow Canadians in Canada as to be unacceptable. So one has to say that in the interests of preserving freedom in this province,

and indeed in this country, we perhaps will have to accept a certain amount of circumvention of this law which good lawyers in this province and in other parts of the country will try their best to circumvent because that is part of the reason that they are in business, to give advice to clients who say look, the law says so and so, is there any way that properly, while still being legal, I can avoid that section of the law? Punitive laws of this nature are treated by many people in the public very much as income tax laws are, that there is nothing illegal, immoral or unethical whatsoever about trying to find one's way around it provided that is done within the law.

So, Mr. Speaker, nonresident foreign ownership is not really something that we have at issue with our honourable friends. The approach to tightening up the legislation that presently exists is where we differ.

They come at it, as we will be able to see in a few short moments, from the standpoint of prohibiting all farm ownership of farmland in Manitoba, except 10 acres or less, to all people and then making exceptions to that general prohibition. That is not the way we would come at the problem. That is not the way we think the people of Manitoba would want to see the problem dealt with. Rather, I would prefer during this period that the members opposite have given themselves to reflect upon this legislation, I would prefer to see them work with Legislative Counsel or with their own outside counsel from the standpoint of tightening up the existing Act which comes at the land ownership problem from a different perspective. It comes at the problem from the perspective of not denying the right of ownership to all people and then making exceptions; it comes at it from the perspective of saying that land ownership is a right that all Manitobans and all Canadians have come to expect in this country.

How then do we prevent the abuse of that right by foreign purchasers who are coming in, sometimes using Manitoba and/or Canadian companies or individuals as a front for their purchase of land and tightening up the legislation accordingly so as not to be offensive to the basic right of the individual Manitoban and the individual Canadian to acquire land, to alienate land, to do those things that are part of the birthright of free people in this country?

Mr. Speaker, I reflect upon another topic related to foreign land ownership which of course to me always seems somewhat ironic. It was ironic in 1977, it's ironic today that this Legislature solemnly must give consideration to a law restricting foreign ownership of land in our province, because foreign money is being driven out of Europe largely by the existence of or the fear of the existence of the coming into power of governments which hold very similar points of view to the government opposite. I've always thought that there was a certain amount of irony, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that Italian money, West Germany money, French money was escaping from the continent of Europe because of the fears of left-wing governments in that country and then coming over to Manitoba which temporarily has another left-wing government and forcing that left-wing government to legislate against the natural desires of people to preserve their capital and to find it located in a safer locus than it was in Europe.

So my honourable friends when they figure their way out of that conundrum as to how their particular ideology scares money away from Europe, and then how they must enact laws here in Manitoba to prevent that money from coming into Manitoba, they will realize that there's something basically wrong with their ideology; that they perhaps should be working at rather more assiduously than they have been in correcting some of the sins of omission and commission that caused that ironic situation to come about.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, the situation in 1982 is a bit brighter in one respect to the extent that if there is any foreign money coming into Manitoba for the purchase of farmland, at least it's not flying over Manitoba and going out to B.C. and Alberta today as it was in '77 when we had the invidious succession duty and gift tax law in Manitoba, so that many farmers sold their farms in Manitoba for good prices, and the money never hit a bank in Manitoba because they had already moved their estates out of this province to avoid another socialist tax, which we had to repeal and we were happy to repeal in the late fall of 1977, and which even my honourable friends have had the wisdom not to reimpose upon the farm community and the small business community in this province.

So, even in the course of time we see small improvements take place in the foreign land ownership to the extent that there is still foreign money able to seep through into Manitoba for the purchase of land, at least we have some better guarantee today that money is staying in the province than was the case in 1977 when most of it went into bank accounts or into investments in some province other than Manitoba where there wasn't that kind of invidious socialist tax on the people.

Mr. Speaker, we find as well that the other problem that we have with respect to this bill, because it deals, as did the bill in 1977, first proffered by honourable members opposite, the other part of it in which we find ourselves at disagreement with our honourable friends is the restriction that is placed upon other Canadians, other nonresidents of Manitoba, as my honourable friends did back in 1977. We have the same problem as we had with their initial draft legislation in 1977 in that they had thrown too wide a net in their single-minded desire to prevent foreign ownership, which we join. They had thrown too wide a net and have really sacrificed a fair amount of the individual right of choice, not only of Manitobans but indeed of Canadians generally in order to achieve their desire to blot out all foreign ownership in Manitoba.

On the restrictions against Canadian and Canadians, that is individual Canadians nonresident in Manitoba and Canadian corporations of a nonfarming nature, we detect the same kind of malice, the same kind of envy, the same kind of old and creaking shibboleths of socialism in this bill that we saw on the '77 bill, and quite frankly what they must do over the intersessional adjournment and what we must help them to do is to expunge that kind of narrow mean outlook, which is offensive to freedom, from this legislation and get back on track so that we do as little violation to the right of choice of the individual Canadian or individual Manitoban as is possible.

We hear a great amount from the Minister of Agriculture, railing away about absentee landlords. Now,

Mr. Speaker, I know that makes good sloganeering material when you're on a platform somewhere where people aren't doing too much thinking for themselves, but it has a certain malevolence to it, Mr. Speaker, that really we have to identify and we have to put and categorize in its place. Malevolent sloganeering of the left is really no answer to a problem that exists in a real manner in this province and in other provinces and must be dealt with, I would suggest, Sir, with a minimum of ideological backtacking, but with a fair amount of commonsense pragmatism and respect for the basic individual right about which I have spoken and will speak much more during the course of these comments.

There is almost, Sir, an implied disdain and a form of niggling contempt against otherwise innocent Canadians in other parts of our country, who by reason of their own determination of investment or who by reason even of inheritance or by reason of participating in an investment in this province which may have ties that are noncommercial, may have ties related to the kind of investment that a person would want to make because his uncle may have homesteaded a particular farm and so on, and he wants to keep that farm in the family's names. There are many many kinds of so-called absentee ownerships that are beneficial for the people of Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Speaker, for instance, of a number of the nonprofit humanitarian wildlife organizations that exist in our province which happen to own land. I think, for instance, Sir, of an organization such as Ducks Unlimited, which doesn't make a habit of going out to buy land, but which does works of maintenance of waterfowl habitat throughout this province and has spent tens of millions of dollars of money in this province. Money, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that was raised 99 percent in the United States and has gone into different projects in this province of benefit to the waterfowl resource. Now from time to time that organization will have to take occasionally title to some farmland in Manitoba. Under this Act, they are automatically prohibited as the Act is presently drawn, although I know that the Minister will say immediately, awe, but realizing how good these people are, the board of course would exempt them immediately.

Mr. Speaker, people and organizations working on projects that are in the public interest should not be dependent upon the whim or the casual fiat of some appointed board of this government merely because they want to have a section in the Act which prohibits outright all ownership by nonresidents or by nonfarming corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister across the way says quite rightly, what's wrong with long-term leases? Nothing is wrong with long-term leases, nothing's wrong with them at all. In fact, that organization prefers to enter into that kind of an arrangement. If time permitted I could cite many other wildlife organizations in Manitoba who do hold farmland. They are privately funded, sometimes even funded with assistance from the taxpayers of Manitoba. They hold land and under this Act they will be prohibited. Unless they get this fiat from the board, they'll be prohibited from acquiring any further land, and that, Sir, is not in the public interest in any way, shape or form. Nor is it in the public interest that individuals who have perfectly good rea-

sons that are not related at all to speculation in land, but who have perfectly good family reasons or other reasons for wanting to retain ownership in land should be able to do so in Manitoba, even though they may happen for the time to live in Regina, or to live in Newfoundland or to live in British Columbia.

I have never thought, Mr. Speaker, that a Manitoban who left this province to live either temporarily or permanently in some other part of the country, all of a sudden became a second class citizen by reason of that movement. That happens, Mr. Speaker, in the natural course of free movement in our society. Thank God we've got a free society where people are free in this country, and I know this country is now rare in this freedom, where they can move from job to job or they can move from Manitoba and retire in British Columbia or retire in Florida if they want without inhibiting their landholdings here, or without somehow or other putting into jeopardy the natural desire that they may have to augment an existing holding or whatever, and that the locus of their residence should have very little to do with their right, which is almost an inalienable right and should be an inalienable right according to our history, to own land. That's a fundamental freedom that Canadians have always enjoyed.

Now I know that quickly the Minister of Agriculture is going to say, ah, but if you're a Prince Edward Islander the law was passed down there prohibiting nonresidents from owning land and we know why that law was passed. Prince Edward Island could be conveniently floated, Mr. Speaker, in the bottom end of Lake Winnipeg and by the time the Prince Edward Island people, with their peculiar history from the 19th century where the land was in an absentee ownership situation that was entirely different from anything that has occurred in practically any other part of Canada, they have a particular outlook with respect to the alienation of recreational lands and farmlands that is peculiar to their background and to their history; and I know that and I'm not going to take the time to expound upon it because in the Charter of Rights, Mr. Speaker, that was passed by the Parliament of Canada, some specific exception was made to take account of laws such as that of Prince Edward Island because of the particular feeling that the islanders have with respect to alienation of land to nonresidents; but down there of course, most of the land that they're concerned about is recreational land and what they were concerned about of course, when they passed the Bill some good number of years ago, was the amazing influx of citizens from the United States coming to that gorgeous little gem of an island in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and finding it to be such a gem and buying property there from willing farmers and others to the point where they had themselves a man or should we say a person-size problem before too many years had elapsed.

So we can always find the justifications, Mr. Speaker, for some form of prohibition upon foreign ownership. What we have to be concerned about in this Legislature and this law is finding a form of prohibition against foreign ownership which is in keeping with our tradition and which does as little as possible to inhibit the inalienable right of a Manitoban and a Canadian to own and to alienate land in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has a number of major defects,

major uncertainties. I think a number that I have mentioned already are violations of our heritage of freedom. While it's not my purpose to go on endlessly about these, I do think that perhaps it would be of some benefit to members opposite if I pointed out in a preliminary way some of the objections that we see on the surface, some that I think are capable of cure, and also by expressing to honourable members opposite the thought that perhaps when they do go back to the drawing board with this bill, they should take a look at the existing bill that is in place, that has been worked upon by a number of governments or two governments at least over the years, and that perhaps it would be more fertile ground for the government to look at that bill rather than trying to reinvent the wheel and start with a new bill which contains as many vexatious provisions as the bill about which we are speaking today.

Mr. Speaker, I said in 1977 and I say again today, that this Bill is replete with the theme of social overmanagement and of social engineering which, while it may be dear to the hearts of some members opposite, really has no part in legislation of this sort which goes to the fundamental right of our citizens. There may well be some people opposite, Sir, who favour this kind of social overmanagement or social engineering, but these things they must remember are inimical to free choice and thereby to individual rights and freedom and they have to be expunged from the bill if it's going to be universally and generally acceptable by all people in this province and particularly by our farm community who are the ones who look upon legislation of this kind with a great deal of care and concern, because while the farm community generally wants to see reasonable barriers put in place with respect to foreign land ownership one must always remember the other side of the coin. That is that there is still a substantial number of people in the farm community who say, "Why should the Legislature of Manitoba restrict my right to sell my land at the best price that I can get on the open market?" Mr. Speaker, while the numbers count that you can obtain on that, which show that there would be many many more who would say I'm prepared to have the state interfere to that extent, still there is a sizable group of people who say, I don't think that it's fair that five years ago my neighbour could sell to anybody that he saw fit to sell to and today the state is saying that I can only sell to a limited market in order to preserve ownership of land within the Province of Manitoba.

Now, you may not agree with that proposition, Sir, and I could argue either side of that proposition as I'm sure you could, but we must be aware of the fact that there is still a sizable body of opinion in our province which regards any inhibition upon the right of a farmer to alienate his land as being something that is contrary to his individual freedom in this province. I can understand that point of view very, very carefully.

A former Premier of this province once said to me, and said to anyone within his hearing with respect to this business of alienation of land that there sometimes is a tendency on the part of some people, and we all know people of this kind, to prefer to have the state intervene to set up a rule which they could enforce themselves if they merely said, "I will not sell to a foreign owner," because in a free society the individ-

ual landowner has that freedom. He has the freedom to sell. He has the freedom not to sell. He has the freedom to sell it to the highest bidder. He has the freedom to say I'm not going to sell to the highest bidder at all. I'm going to sell to my neighbour's son because I think it's important that family stay in the community. I know farmers who have made that decision.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you get down to the point, I commend the words and I don't mind identifying of former Premier Douglas L. Campbell who has been heard to say: remember when the state interferes, sometimes citizens want that to happen so that they don't have to make a decision themselves. That happens with respect to sales of land not only to foreign purchasers, but sales of lands sometimes to colonies, Hutterite colonies in Manitoba and to other groups that some of the neighbours of the individual farmer may or may not necessarily agree with. Yet there is always a certain element in our society who are prepared to say if the state erects that rule, I'll obey it, but if the state doesn't erect that rule, why, I've got a tough decision to make and I don't know which way I'm going to go on that decision.

So we should always remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are being called upon in legislation of this sort to substitute our collective governmental determination to a problem which heretofore has been an individual's problem and to the largest measure possible should remain the decision of the individual, and how you balance the maintenance of that individual decision along with the general desire to indicate a disdain for foreign ownership of farmland in the province is the real problem that you face in legislation of this kind.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture spoke at length during his comments about these prohibitions being necessary because they were all justified under the umbrella of controlling speculation. Speculation, I know is a word of opprobrium to many of the honourable members opposite, but he tied into that. He said, "We want to control speculation and preserve the family farm." Mr. Speaker, I don't know anybody in Manitoba who doesn't want to preserve the family farm. I've never run into anybody who said I want to ruin all the family farms and permit them to be sold. I only know of people who want to preserve the family farm in Manitoba, but I also know of a fair number of people - I've mentioned this before, Mr. Speaker - who are prepared to say if the price is right, I am prepared to sell my family farm to perhaps a non-farm corporation, because I can see the work they're going to do is not anything that is offensive to me or the future of agriculture in Manitoba or indeed to the public interest, and why shouldn't I have that right.

So again, I point out the problem that you begin to face in this kind of legislation and how very very carefully the Legislature must intervene. It's very much like a very very delicate brain operation, and we are the ones in this House who hold the scalpel, and we must make sure that we very very carefully do these excisions that we want to do without damaging the basic fundamental freedom of the people of Manitoba and indeed the people of Canada to own land in this province.

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes when you

take the rather coarse approach that this bill takes, the rather blundering ahead and say, well, we'll just prohibit everything and let the devil take the hindmost; that is, when the disease that you're attempting to cure, that the remedy for the disease you're attempting to cure becomes worse sometimes than the disease. That's the other danger that we have to be constantly aware of in legislation of this kind.

It think it is axiomatic that a bill of this kind is going to cut off a certain amount of the flow of capital into the farm community in Manitoba largely because of the unnatural restrictions that are placed in this draft upon nonresident Manitobans buying farmland. We've agreed that if we can turn down the tap more by the legislative process on foreign ownership that's desirable, and we're prepared to accept, I believe the farm community is prepared to accept the fact that will result in less capital flowing into our province by virtue of these purchases. But when you cast your net to exclude all nonresident purchasers and nonfarm corporations of Canadian origin, then, Mr. Speaker, you're giving the wheel three or four full revolutions in terms of the amount of potential capital that is going to be denied to farmers in Manitoba and the amount of potential capital flowing into our province, which by the way is sorely needed if the farm community is to have the kind of cash flow that has been normal and regular.

So I say again, one of the dangers we have to worry about and to work against in legislation of this kind is not to so cut out the capital investment in our farm community, that we're doing them a greater disservice by this kind of legislation than the legislation is worth.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred in the course of his remarks to some statistical breakdowns that he had, and he may - I was not here at the time he spoke, I am asking him now if he has those statistics in tabular form if he could distribute them to the members of the House if not before prorogation, certainly as soon after as possible, so that we'll all be working from a common basis of statistical fact.

He will find that the Minister of Transportation back in 1977, when he was Minister of Agriculture, did distribute that kind of information and we were all working then from a pretty much common basis of statistical fact as; for example, how many farms there are in Manitoba, how many are deemed to be owned by foreign corporations, how many are owned by so-called absentee landlords? Then we will have a finer definition of what either the Minister or the statisticians mean by an absentee landlord. Getting around to repeat the point I made before, not all absentee landlords are bad just because they're absentee. There may be some good reason for people, who live outside of the province, holding land and wanting to augment their holdings of land whilst they're living outside of the province. One can think of hundreds of individual examples that I won't burden the House with at this particular moment.

We want to know, and I think it's fundamentally important for all members of the House to have his information, how much of the land in Manitoba is owned according to the various categories? For instance, this is I'm sure readily available through the Assessment Department of the Department of Municipal Affairs, how much land in Manitoba is owned by

legitimately foreign corporations that we can deduce to being foreign corporations? How much land in Manitoba - we had the figure I think back in 1977 - is owned by farm corporations in Manitoba; that is, individual family farm corporations? How much is owned by the Hutterian Society in Manitoba because they are a legitimate farm corporation in Manitoba; that kind of breakdown so that we know in a categorized way what kind of a problem we're dealing with? I say that kind of information is important because it reminds me of the figures that were used by the seatmate of the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Transport back in 1977, and I was refreshing my memory on these figures the other day by rereading the debates when I believe he said at that time that there was something like 91 percent of the farms in Manitoba in 1977 were owned and operated by the owners. What we were working at in terms of the '77 legislation was something like about 4 to 5 percent of the farms that at that time were deemed to have been alienated to foreign corporations and the figures were still growing. I daresay that the figures, even with the legislation in place, that those figures have increased. Well, if they've grown from 5 percent upwards, how much upwards? The Minister used, for instance, a figure of 250,000 acres of land I believe he said that had been alienated in the last four years to, I presume, identified foreign corporations.

Well now, let's get at the methodology that was used for the identification of these companies. Are they all legitimate foreign corporations? Is there anything wrong, Mr. Speaker, with a family farm corporation - and we will come to some of these definitions a little bit later - that has three of the voting members who are nonresident and perhaps not engaged in the physical act of farming, is there anything wrong with that kind of a group holding land in Manitoba? Are these the kinds of corporations we're talking about or what? —(Interjection)— Quite legitimately, if there are Canadian citizens being used as fronts for foreign corporations, let's identify them because the administrator under the previous Farmland Ownership Act had that power of public identification and utilized it wherever he could under the weaponry that was given to him by this Legislature. It's not a question of trying to protect any group or anything of that sort at all. Let's get it all out on the table so that we know who we are talking about, what kinds of acreages they represent in Manitoba and whether or not this, in the concerted wisdom of this House, represents a current threat.

You can talk to members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who represent farm communities in Manitoba and who will tell you that farm ownership, foreign land purchases in their constituency, are a problem. Let no one try to say after my intervention in the debate that we're not seized of the seriousness of the problem in certain areas of course, and I can identify the Member for Morris as being one member who can tell you that in his constituency there's been a fair amount of foreign land purchase. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of information we want to look at on a municipality-by-municipality or on a regional basis to see what kind of land is involved, because the Member for Lakeside can tell you that 1,000 acres of land in certain parts of the Interlake, which is represented by the Minister himself, are somewhat different from

1,000 acres of land on the Portage plains or in the Morris constituency. So all of these factors have to be taken into account when one is trying to assess the degree and the reality of the problem that we face in this province. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to have had, from his seat at least, the acknowledgement by the Minister of Agriculture that he will attempt to get us those statistics in as refined a form as possible in order that we may be working from a similar statistical background as we come to deal with the problem.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to deal any more with the words that were used by the Minister of Agriculture on absentee ownership. I say to him again that it made for interesting reading in his speech. He will be the first to realize that, as a term of opprobrium, it's one that can be used in a dandy way. Let's get the facts out and we'll find out how many real absentee landlords we have and how serious the problem is.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the Act for a few minutes. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not disputing any of my honourable friend's figures, I merely say that we all should be working from that same common basis, and let's see the updated figures from 1977 that we were working from at that time. If the 91 percent owning and operating their farms, if that figure has been reduced, let's find out what the figure is. Is it 85 percent today or whatever? Because I make the observation, Sir, that the onus is on him who wants to impinge upon our fundamental freedom to prove that such an impingement is necessary in the public interest. That derives from the fact that was mentioned in the '77 debate, and I mention it again here, that our province started out essentially in 1870, except for some fringe settlements along the Red River and here in Winnipeg and so on. As with a large amount, the vast majority of the land in this province being owned by three groups: the Crown, the Hudson's Bay Company and later, the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Since that time the Crown still remains the largest landowner by far in Manitoba. A large amount of it, of course, is not agricultural land; a large amount of it is Precambrian in the north of our province. But in the south, in the agricultural zones of Manitoba, most of that land has been alienated since 1870 with the result that these statistics of 1977 were, I think, illuminating; that under the free market system, 91 percent of the farmers in Manitoba owned and operated their own farms. That to me seemed then and it seems today to be a pretty good recommendation for the open-market system because there had been that amount of diffusion of ownership from three central authorities out to 91 percent of the farmers in Manitoba. That to me, Mr. Speaker, as an enemy of centralism in whatever form, was a pretty good markup for the open-market system. —(Interjection)— Now, the Minister says, it's being contracted a bit.

Well, let's find out how much it's being contracted, by whom, for what purpose and to what extent this reflects changes in technology, large farming techniques that are used now whereby the average size of the farm - when my honourable friend's forebearers came here and when my forebearers came here, you could make a pretty decent living on a-quarter section, but you can't make a pretty decent living on a-quarter section any more, ergo, you've got fewer farmers farming larger tracts of land today. That

hasn't got anything to do with centralization; it doesn't have anything to do with my honourable friend's ideology or my ideology. It has everything to do with our farmers in this province being amongst the most productive of any farmers on the face of the earth because they are the most efficient of any farmers on the face of the earth along with the farmers of Saskatchewan, even though the numbers have been diminishing by natural forces over the years in response both to economic, to technological and to social conditions.

The large movement of people off the farm and from small communities into the larger communities, as I mentioned back in the '77 debate, the then First Minister, Mr. Schreyer, and I are two examples of people who had moved from farming communities into the big City of Winnipeg and we're now making our lives and our way in the city. We were representative at that time of tens of thousands of Manitobans and that particular social movement continues today, regrettably, but it continues today. So let's identify the extent to which natural, social, economic, technological and agricultural farming techniques have contributed to some of the lessening of the number of so-called family farms and the extent to which foreign intrusion by way of foreign ownership is contributed because there will be a balancing off between the two.

Mr. Speaker, a few comments on this bill before I take my seat. The definition of farmland in the bill - I offer these comments if I may say so, Sir, with the usual edge that I'm able to put on comments of this sort, but also in the hope that they will offer the Minister of Agriculture and his draftsmen some areas or points of takeoff for sections of the bill that have to be reviewed again. I believe, Sir, that the definition of farmland is far too broad. It could under its present terms - I'm being very brief and I'm not trying to be exhaustive in all of the comments that I make or of all of the sections, I'll try to boil them down in the interests of time - it could include recreational land; it could include subdivision land. It could include land that is capable of being used for commercial uses; for nonfarm corporations should be able to buy it on the outskirts of a community, whether it's my constituency of Charleswood or the honourable member's constituency or whatever. I know he's going to say that the bill permits the board established under this Act to make these kinds of exceptions. I say, Sir, that this is too important to leave to the whim of a board, and I say without being too argumentative about it that my honourable friend's point of view and the point of view that is held, I think certainly sincerely, I think wrong headedly, by him and by a number of his colleagues that ownership is not all that important to farm production. I think that some of the people that will be appointed to this board will necessarily reflect that kind of a point of view. I think that the government is perfectly entitled to appoint people to its boards who tend to reflect the philosophy or the ideology, as the case may be, of the Government of the Day. So I'm not finding fault with that as a matter of patronage or anything of that sort at all; that will happen. That being the case, the less we can leave to the individual discretion of boards of that nature, whether appointed by a Tory Government or by an NDP Government or a Liberal or whatever, the less we can leave to their

discretion, the better, and the more there should be in the Act because the law, if nothing else, should be certain. The less you can leave to administrative determinations by boards, whether in this field or in any other field of legislation, the better.

Now that's a fundamental principle that, I think, comes to mind when one looks at the definition of farmland, when one realizes that there could be perfectly legitimate situations where a nonfarm corporation - let's use for example, the Hudson's Bay Company, which has been here from time immemorial wants to engage upon some warehouse expansion on the edge of Winnipeg, why shouldn't they be able to do so?

The Minister wants a question? Fine.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Storie: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification from the Leader of the Opposition. Would the Leader of the Opposition - I presume he does not oppose the board being able to have the power to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations to exempt areas which he or the government or members in the House today may not not envisage, but should legitimately be allowed, provided that the spirit and the intent of the Act would not be violated. He wouldn't disagree with that approach, would he?

HON. S. LYON: As an approach, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would be able in the legislation to be as precise as we can, realizing that we can't envision all of the circumstances that will arise, but to be as precise as we can to put into legislation all of the exceptions that we can think of and leave as very little to regulation as possible, because the more you leave to regulation, the more you're leaving to the individual whim or discretion of the board. As I've said before to repeat myself, whether it's a Tory-appointed board or an NDP-appointed board, the minute you start to leave that discretion, the minute then you are going to have lawyers, accountants and others saying, we don't know, Mr. Hudson Bay, whether you can buy that land. We think common sense would indicate that you should be able to. So the Act really should reflect the fact that there are going to be situations in marginal urban and farm areas in our province where what is currently in farmland is going to be required for light industrial, heavy industrial, commercial or other purposes. That's a natural fact of life. It's been going on in our province for well over 100 years. That has to be part of this Act, so that otherwise land that comes under the definition of being farmland can be alienated to a nonfarm corporation for the establishment, for instance, of an Alcan smelter in some part of our province. So there we are, Mr. Speaker. I think the point is apparent to the Minister. It's apparent to me. Why don't we put that in? We can envisage that in the legislation.

The definition of farmer, Mr. Speaker, certainly needs refinement. I bidle, I must say, at the description in a piece of legislation that I'm asked to pass in this House which uses these words. Farmer means a resident: (1) who receives a significant portion of his

income either directly or indirectly from his occupation of farming; and (2) who spends a significant portion of his time actively engaged in farming; but no person shall be considered to be actively engaged in farming who does not participate in: (a) the management decisions involved in the operation of a farm; and (b) the physical labour required in carrying out such operations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the minute I read that section, I'm sure that the productive mind of the Minister of Agriculture and many of my honourable friends opposite will say well, you know, why did we do that because I can think of situations - we'll say the Minister of Cultural Affairs, where somebody is an active farmer, but he isn't physically engaged in the work of the farm because he's disabled. And why is a disabled person all of a sudden made a second-class citizen in the definition of a farmer under this legislation?

I know of many farmers who had forms of disability. They had to have their sons, they had to have their daughters in some cases or hired people come onto the farm to help them. Boy, I want to tell you, there was no question then or today who was running that farm. The fact that he or she was in a wheelchair and couldn't get out there to do the fencing or replacing the fence posts or get onto the mower and do the haying or any of that, there was no question of who was running the farm. We shouldn't let anybody's physical disability, which obviously prevents him or her from taking part in that rather invidious term "physical labour" required in carrying out such operations; we shouldn't let that become part of our thinking and part of our legislation in this province.

It has, if I may say so without trying to be offensive to my honourable friends opposite, that tinge of Maoism to it that we find in China. It's a practice that some people would argue as being not too bad, but it's something that's really contrary to a free society where all of the white collar workers are sent out for six or eight months to hoe potatoes or to plant rice or some such thing so that they'll get a little dirt under their fingernails and so on. —(Interjection)— Well no, that doesn't hurt anybody, but in a free society, you're not forced to do it; that's the difference. Under this legislation, we're saying to somebody, in effect, that if you don't get out there and kick the rumps of a couple of cattle, you're really not a farmer because that is a conjunctive condition. It's an "and"; it's not an "or."

My honourable friends, I think, without my using any more examples, will realize that's bad drafting. It's bad thinking, first of all, and then to allow bad thinking to appear is bad draftsmanship and bad review. I say that from the standpoint of having been the head of a government that did some bad drafting and no thinking from time to time in some of its legislation which we had then the alertness and the quickness to withdraw and say that's damn foolishness.

I say to my honourable friends that the first thing they should say here is that this is damn foolishness and it should be withdrawn because it doesn't make any sense to have this kind of a restriction applying first of all to residents of Manitoba. I can see what they're getting at. Their view is away down the line to that nonresident owner living in Verona and they're saying, well, he isn't going to be physically working the farm, so we can put that restriction in the Act. But

what about the man in Manitoba who is dependent upon this definition of farmer over and above his being a resident of the province or he may be somebody who's decided to retire and he hasn't farmed for the requisite 10 years? He can be hurt by this definition and we've got to be careful that he isn't hurt by this definition. Well, Mr. Speaker, again I'm not going to work that one over and to use all of the marvellous examples that quickly come to mind as to how that is an offensive section.

Mr. Speaker, Section 1(3) and I'm running over these very quickly. Retired farmer - I find this section invidious. Retired farmer means a natural person who has been a farmer for a period of at least 10 years and who has retired from farming, all of which is defined in the Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have to start defining legislatively what a retired farmer is. I think there's a more productive way to come at this bill than trying to categorize residents of Manitoba as to whether they're retired farmers or whether they physically work on the farm and all of that kind of bureaucratic claptrap, and that's really what it is, that we should not as 57 members permit to go into a piece of legislation over which we have control in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Section 1(3) has a number of other sections. I read this one and my honourable friend has a quick and absorptive mind. I suggest that you would have to have three Philadelphia lawyers to figure this one out, Section 1(3), for the purposes of this Act: (a) where a corporation is controlled in fact by persons who are not farmers, the resident spouses of farmers or the resident children of farmers or any combination thereof and is also controlled in fact by farmers, the resident spouses of farmers or the resident children of farmers or any combination thereof, that corporation shall be conclusively deemed to be controlled in fact by those persons who are not farmers, the resident spouses of farmers or the resident children of farmers or any combination thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were back in the practice of law, I think it would take an opinion twice as long and probably three times as expensive as the Attorney-General paid to the Professor of Law the other day to get his opinion on the Constitution. I haven't the slightest idea what that section means, I doubt if the draftsman has, I know darn well that the Minister doesn't, and I am sure that the Attorney-General would have difficulty coming to grips with that as well.

1(3)(d), the holding of any partial interest in farmland, whether or not jointly or in common with another, is conclusively deemed to be the holding of the whole of such interest in the farmland. Why? I really don't know how that kind of thinking creeps into legislation of this sort except the general prohibition we've talked about, and I'm not going to expound upon that except to read it into the record for the sake of history. The general prohibition, Section 2, "except as may be otherwise permitted by or pursuant to this Act or the regulations, no persons shall directly or indirectly take, acquire, receive or hold an interest in farmland which would result in that person having directly or indirectly interest in farmland that exceed 10 acres in the aggregate."

Well, that's the whole thrust of the Act there, we've talked about that before, Mr. Speaker, that is what is fundamentally wrong with the Act, and that is the first

area of repair that my honourable friends opposite must make; first to their thinking, second to their drafting. They've got to bring their thinking around to the fact that this is a free province with individuals heretofore being able freely to make the decision that they will buy land. Once you come around to that point on the compass it's much easier to draft a section that is going to be in consonance with the heritage that we have in this province.

Section 4, Mr. Speaker, at first blush, and I don't attempt to make interpretations that are meant to be written in stone or anything of that sort, does appear to have a retroactive clause in it because my honourable friend in that section refers to the first day of April 1977, "land that was not owned or acquired prior to the first day of April 1977," which would appear to indicate that they're trying to make some of the amendments that were made to The Farmland Protection Act during the period '77 to '81 inoperative insofar as it refers to certain categories of landowners in Manitoba. Again, that is not good, that leads to uncertainty and I remind my honourable friend of the old legal axiom, that it's better to have a bad law that is certain than to have a so-called good law that is uncertain because uncertainty is one of the cancers of the law. You've got to rid the law of uncertainty as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that Section 5 needs to be broadened. We were talking earlier about the corporation that wants to buy land for a purpose that is in the public interest and can't do it without the fiat of the board. The exception that is made in Section 5 of course should be extended to include nonfarm corporations and others that are buying land for the prosecution of the purposes of their business, because you can't say, and this analogy has been used before, you can't adopt the rather ostrich view that all corporations are bad. If corporations are bad, as I've said before, then abolish them under The Companies Act, but don't say that corporations which hold a provincial charter and have aims and objects that are not inconsistent with the public interest are not able to enjoy the right to hold land. Why not? Because if they can't hold land they're being denied one of the fundamental freedoms that any group, any partnership or any other group, has in this province. So let's not apply this blanket indictment to all corporations. Let's make sure that we acknowledge that corporations, co-operatives, other free associations of people that are made quite legally in this province have the right to own land, and let's not try to categorize them as some form of third or fourth class citizen.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that Section 6 is a dangerous section. The Minister has referred to it earlier. I think we should put as much as possible in the Act itself.

The snooper section, the so-called Section 7(2) is the super snooper section, but some determination, some powers of review of books and material are required, but let's make them as reasonable as possible. I don't like to pick up the Toronto Globe and Mail and read in the Toronto Globe and Mail that the Legislature of Manitoba doesn't care much about freedom when it brings in a bill such as The Payroll Tax Act, and I dare say that if the Globe or the Free Press took a closer look at this bill they could write a few dandies about the snooper clauses in here. Let's make sure

that we keep our eye on the main factor in land ownership which is the right of the individual to own land with a minimum of intrusion from the state. If there's a minimum of intrusion from the state, then there's a minimum necessity for this kind of snooper clause that we see in here.

The special exemption exceptions for inheritance, I think my honourable friends were trying to exempt all inheritances from the provisions of the Act, but if they look at Section 10 they'll find out that I don't think they've quite done it. There's an ambiguity there, and draftsmen - I don't pretend to be a draftsman, but draftsmen might say that if Section 8 said "notwithstanding any other provision of this Act a natural person wherever resident may take, acquire, receive or hold an interest in farmland by devise or on an intestacy or by right of survivorship," then I think that could be overcome. That's a drafting problem. I think my honourable friends really did intend that any person who took by way of a devise or a bequest would be able to hold that land. I don't think they've accomplished their purpose under the Act as it's presently drawn. Retired farmer and so on, chief executive officer, there are comments that could be made on each of these sections, Mr. Speaker, but as I say in the interests of time, I'm going to abridge those detailed comments because my honourable friends will be looking at each of these sections I hope extremely carefully.

"Police to be present in the event of a search," well that just goes to show, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the powers of entry and the powers of search given to the officers under this Act perhaps go a little bit further than they need. The onus section, Section 18 is a dangerous section. I know that it is difficult always, when all of the knowledge or most of the knowledge with respect to the method or purpose of an acquisition is in the possession of one individual, for a board trying to administer an Act like this to be seized of that information without the full co-operation of the individual in question. The tendency then of the bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, is to say, well, let's reverse the onus, and that makes the bureaucracy feel good, but it's harmful - and I don't care what government does it, our government or the Government of Ontario, or the NDP Government of Manitoba at the present time - when you reverse the onus you're striking at some aspect of freedom in our province. I don't care what the draftsman said about having to have a reverse onus section in this bill, Mr. Speaker, it's bad from a standpoint of public policy and it should be avoided wherever necessary.

Section 19 also has some dangerous provisions, "the production inspection of all or any books, documents, papers, correspondence and so on." My honourable friend may say, well those sections were just a repeat from the old Act. They seem to me to be a little bit tougher than what was in the old Act, but remember again that the privacy of the individual is what is forfeited when you're putting that kind of legislation in place.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that my general observation about this bill is that too many of the vast prohibitions that were apparent in the first bill brought forward by the then Minister of Agriculture in the spring of 1977 reappear in this bill. There is too much

social management in it; there is too much social engineering in it. There is too much power for a politically appointed board, Mr. Speaker, to be making discretionary decisions which should be as much as possible enshrined in the legislation so that the board is given full direction as to what its power is. I do not believe that we should be, by way of regulation passed by the Lieutenant-Government-in-Council, making exceptions or broad exemptions to this Act without the Legislature approving of those exceptions or broad exemptions. I know that there has to be some flexibility for the board to be allowed a certain amount of discretion, but not on fundamentals as to who may or may not own land.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of private ownership is one of our great common law freedoms - to repeat myself - that we have had since time immemorial in this province. It's what brought most of our settlers here. It's what resulted in that great 91 percent diffusion of land ownership out to the farmers as was presented by the figures of the then Minister of Agriculture back in June of 1977.

It is our duty to protect that freedom and hence, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to table today - and I'm not going to introduce it this Session - a copy of a bill that it would be our intention to bring in as a private bill at the next Session of the Legislature, a bill that I think should be complementary to any land legislation that is considered by this Legislature of Manitoba. It's a bill entitled, An Act Respecting the Right of Individuals to Own Property in Manitoba.

It's a short bill, so I'll read it into the record, Mr. Speaker, and table a copy of it:

WHEREAS citizens of Manitoba have since Confederation had the right to pursue a livelihood and own property; and

WHEREAS citizens of a country are free and secure collectively, only insofar as they are free and secure individually;

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly, enacts as follows:

(1) Right to ownership of property - every person has the right to own properties subject only to such restrictions and limitations as are enacted by an Act of the Legislature or an Act of Parliament.

(2) The right to use and enjoyment of property - every owner of property has the right to the use and enjoyment thereof subject only to such restrictions and limitations thereon as may be enacted by an Act of the Legislature or an Act of Parliament.

(3) The right to compensation and to fair hearing - a person who under an Act of the Legislature is deprived of property is entitled to compensation therefore and to a fair hearing to determine the amount of such compensation.

(4) This Act supersedes others - where a provision of any other Act of the Legislature conflicts with or is repugnant to any provision of this Act, the provision of this Act supersedes and overrules the provision of the other Act. Commencement of this Act comes into force on the day it receives the Royal Assent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I put this bill on the Table of the House. I don't intend to introduce it because my honourable friends, I think, have shown commendable understanding in withdrawing as they are their farm ownership legislation. But I think that whilst they are

considering the sections of the farm ownership legislation, they should keep this kind of a bill constantly in mind as the basis and the foundation upon which our society, our political existence in this province as individuals and as a collective society has been built.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the government displaying that kind of flexibility that is necessary when you come to consider legislation of this nature which does inhibit the age-old right of individual citizens of our country and of our province to hold land and to alienate that land.

I hope that the suggestions that I have made today have been taken in that spirit of flexibility, and we look forward to hearing from the Minister with respect to the statistical base upon which he draws some of the conclusions that he enunciated in his speech. We look forward as well to working co-operatively with the government in the development of legislation with respect to foreign land ownership in Manitoba, which will serve as much as possible to inhibit that kind of land purchase in Manitoba, but at the same time equally will not intrude fundamentally upon the right of the individual Manitoban to own and to alienate land in this province.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 64, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Would you please call the second reading on the Private Bill No. 34, standing in the name for the Member for Lakeside?

BILL NO. 34 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE MENNO SIMONS COLLEGE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Bill No. 34, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to add a few comments to this bill at this particular time; firstly, to indicate that I have no objection to seeing it move forward through to Committee and for eventual passage. It'll be interesting to know at Committee what further representation will be made by the Mennonite community at large with respect to this bill. There are, of course, certain concerns that the community that is sponsoring this bill has and as a member of that community, I have no hesitation in expressing them. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret and it's certainly not unique to the Mennonite community who support numerous educational facilities and undertakings wherever they are located. It's, if I may say so with some modest pride, somehow marked within the Mennonite community that prides itself in having always paid a great

deal of attention to education: education of a religious nature; education of a secular nature and throughout the history of the Mennonite community, both in this country and in the countries that they have come from. In my case and in the case of most of the Mennonite community in Manitoba, the country that I'm referring to, of course, is the Soviet Union and I refer to the some 150 years that the Mennonite community spent in that country.

During that period of time of the Mennonite history, they established very substantial, very solid educational facilities that looked to the educational requirements of their community and indeed I would suspect, although to a more limited extent certainly than is the case here in this country where assimilation has taken a far bigger role, but certainly to the immediate educational requirements in terms of teachers, doctors and so forth to serve the Mennonite communities in the years gone by.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to have had some greater indication from that community that I just referred to as to their general support and the overall wishes of that community. I suspect that we may be hearing some of that at the Committee Stage.

There is, I think, a constant concern by those who have worked diligently and very hard to sustain those educational facilities now in place. I can refer to them by name. The earliest one in the Province of Manitoba was instituted at Gretna. Then there were, of course, the other colleges of a more religious nature, such as the Canadian Bible College on Shaftsbury, but more specifically, we're dealing here in the general educational field, the two facilities, one run by the Canadian Mennonite Brethren Congregation in Elmwood and more latterly the Westgate Collegiate, of which my eldest son was a graduate and many members of my family have been involved in in terms of administration and general support. There is a concern by these people that they should not be weakened in any way in terms of the support, both financial, moral and otherwise that any private institution requires in this day and age.

The Mennonite community is not that large, Mr. Speaker, that this needs to be said. There will be, as the Mover of the bill indicated, every effort made by the proponents of this bill to raise necessary dollars, raise the necessary funds to get the Liberal Arts College that this bill hopes to bring into being, into place. Much of that money, of course, will be coming from the very same sources, the very same people, that are currently supporting the institutions now in place.

I would hope that some assurances will be given at the Committee Stage that the proposed venture into a full-blown Liberal Arts College will not prove in the future detrimental to the schools that are currently in place, relying to a very substantial degree on the support from the greater Mennonite community, as well as I may say from the support that they now receive from the general taxpayer at large.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to at least put into the public record that I find some irony in this situation, that a bill of this nature supportive of the Mennonite community is being introduced in this Chamber by a person, an MLA who has on most occasions indicated his displeasure with respect to supporting private schools, church-orientated schools, religious schools, but that's

a comment that I make not in any way derogatory to my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, but perhaps it brings into question the manner and the approach which the Mennonite community in this instance brought this Bill into this Chamber. It is after all fairly common practice, when a private member's bill of this nature is introduced, that it will often be introduced, yes, by a government member, an Opposition Member would be asked to perhaps second it or at least be made aware of it, but that's all here nor there.

My earlier reservations are really ones that I know are being expressed within the community. There is a concern in the community that the creation of another educational institution not in any way detract from the capability of this same community in supporting the current facilities that are, I'm pleased to say, doing well, but like any other private organization are having to lean fairly heavily for financial support on an annual basis to the community that they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to support the bill and we'll look forward to many further representations made at Committee Stage when it arrives.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood will be closing debate.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to answer a question or two put by the two members of the Conservative Party in speaking to the bill. It's not possible for me to provide any precise funding figures as was requested by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye who wanted to know something about operating costs. I think that's still to be determined. I can only indicate that capital costs and the goal of the committee that's working for the establishment of the bill is \$5 million and they believe, and I think correctly, that it'll take approximately five years to reach that goal. That will be, I suppose, basically private funding, but they may also be eligible for some government support.

I think the concern of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, which was mentioned by his colleague for La Verendrye, is a genuine one; namely, the concern that the community is so large that there are now some educational institutions which provide courses and degrees, and that this may in fact be competitive. I am assured by the people who sponsored the bill that this will complement the other educational facilities in the province because of the fact that the other colleges, two in Winnipeg and one in Steinbach, are primarily oriented towards music and theology and that none of them could be classified as a Liberal Arts College. So the concept is that this is a Liberal Arts College, that there are many Mennonite students who are not attending the other colleges, who are going to the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, and could be drawn to this new Menno Simons College, which will not only offer liberal arts program, but will also focus some of its attention on international development because of the interest of the Mennonite community in doing work in Third World countries and missionary work and so on, including China and other nations of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, both members go out of their way to make a point that I am not the staunchest supporter of

aid to private and parochial schools, but I have to point out that my objection in that particular debate often is not to the establishment of private and parochial schools, but to the complete government funding of such bodies. I am sure the honourable members themselves would be opposed to complete government funding of church sponsored organizations.

I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I was asked by the Mennonite community to pilot the bill and I accepted and I have no problem with that particular action. I might also mention that the bill was first drawn to the attention of the Minister of Finance who has a Mennonite background, and he comes, I think, from Gretna and Altona - he went to school there. It was cleared by my colleague, the Minister of Education, in terms of some of the nuances and so on. I have worked with the Mennonite community before, I worked with them in the establishment of a plaque in this building to commemorate their Hundredth Anniversary in Manitoba. It was an enjoyable experience. I am working with them now and I intend to work with them in the future whenever that opportunity arises.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a representative, perhaps a delegation here at Law Amendments, depending on when that meeting is held, but I am in touch with their lawyer, Robert Friesen, who is checking on the progress of the bill and I believe that he may speak to the bill or other members may speak to the bill or they will at least be there to answer further questions of clarification.

So I commend the bill to all Members of the House and believe that it should receive unanimous support.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point just made by the Member for Elmwood, actually that bill will go to the Committee on Private Bills and I hope to announce in the House tomorrow a meeting of the Committee on Private Bills, as I think we dealt with the last of the private bills. It will likely be on Wednesday and I know that counsel connected with all of the private bills have already been notified and are on call, so that if we can arrange a meeting - it may be just a short meeting - but I hope to set a time for that tomorrow.

With respect to meetings of the House, I've conferred with the Opposition House Leader and indeed he's conferred with me, in the event and likely as it may be that the committees, namely Law Amendments and Municipal Affairs, meeting tonight finish their work, I think that on the safe side out of an abundance of caution, call a Session of the House for tomorrow morning and if the committees have not finished their work and it's necessary to adjourn the House for committees, we would then adjourn the House for committees. Just so that everybody is notified of where we stand in these dying days of this Session and we don't lose time, I'll make that announcement and the House of course will meet tomorrow afternoon and evening.

May I, while I'm on my feet, Sir, announce another committee change, one indeed contradicting one I made earlier today. With respect to Law Amendments,

the Member for Burrows is substituting for the Member for Thompson and with respect to Municipal Affairs, the Member for Thompson substituting for the Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS SUPPLY - MAIN SUPPLY BILL 48 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

MR. CHAIRMAN, J. Storie: Committee will come to order. It will be my suggestion that we proceed with the Main Supply and then Capital and Supplementary Supply in that order. Is there any problem with that?

The Motion before the Committee is that it be resolved that towards making good Certain Sums of Money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1983, a sum of \$2,647,455,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the last time on the 22nd of June when we dealt with Supplementary Supply, the Minister of Finance undertook to provide information to myself on the Supp. Supply voted for Highways and Transportation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that was on behalf of the Minister of Transportation. I do expect that information should be here by the time we are dealing with Supplementary Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee is dealing with Main Supply at this point. If there are there no further comments—pass?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, at what point do you plan to deal with the Detailed Estimates of Revenue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would say that this would be an appropriate time to deal with this revenue.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then we have a number of questions in this area. On the taxation of the Consumer and Corporate Affairs, perhaps the Minister would give us some indication of the amount of money that the projected increase that we're dealing with in this area, why an increase of the size that it is?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, possibly I

could get the member to ask a number of the questions - I'm waiting for my House book, I just have sent out for it. —(Interjection)— I say, I'm waiting for my House book and would like to bank the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I wanted to ask some questions of the Minister of Agriculture dealing specifically with the monies that he was asking for for the beef producers of the province in the support program and it has been very difficult to find out specifically how much money he has flowed to this particular point or if in fact he's finalized his program. He's made an announcement, Mr. Chairman, some time ago to the House that the program would be in place by July and that we could expect the further announcements by that particular time.

I would ask specifically of the Minister of the Finance or the Minister of Agriculture, how much money has flowed to this particular time into the hands of the beef producers? I would hope that there's some indication whether in fact they're going to either make a one-time payment, as was requested by the beef producers, a particular per cow grant as was requested, or if they're not proceeding to do that, they should let the beef industry know, the beef producers know.

How many people have entered into the program that they're proposing and how many numbers of dollars will go to those numbers of people that have entered a program, or if they haven't proceeded to that point, what are their plans, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just to make sure that I have the questions. The member wants to know how much money has flown to producers by this stage, how many people have registered for the program, and how many people are in the process of registering? Are those the three questions? —(Interjection)— I'll take those as notice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have another area of concern and I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture is able to respond to it, because I'm sure that the majority of the members in this House, particularly on our side of the House, are well aware of the difficulties that are being encountered by the small business community and by the farm community in the current economic recession that is taking place not only throughout Manitoba but throughout Canada.

The Minister of Agriculture has indicated during the committee meetings that there had been some 102 people have qualified for interest-rate relief; but I again go back, Mr. Chairman. The regulations or the parameters which the Minister of Agriculture has placed on that program are literally, to the majority of particularly those people in agriculture production, of very little use; that some of the numbers that are starting to come from the accountants and from the different businesses in the agricultural community are pointing out that it's those individuals, who are grossing \$70,000 and more, that are having extremely tough times in being able to meet financial commitments to the banking or lending institutes.

I would hope that in light of some of the tough times that are throughout the province - and I'll let one of my

colleagues if they want to ask particularly on small business - the program that has been introduced, the Interest Rate Relief Program is not, and I reemphasize that, is not helping the people who are in the most need of support at this particular time.

I would ask the Minister of Finance or Agriculture to give us an update specifically on how much money has flowed to help the small business community, the farm community, and give us numbers of dollars and number of people who have qualified?

The third question, is the government preparing to reevaluate their programs, make an assessment of them, and make changes so that there's an availability of some form of support to those people who are grossing more than \$70,000?

I think, Mr. Chairman, that as we enter into the harvest period for this coming year - and I think the Ministers are well aware of the fact that a lot of people have had spring payments they've had to make; they've financed their inputs for their crops - normally comes the fall period, at harvest time they would either pay off some of those debts or in fact have long-term commitment payments that they'd have to make and I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, what the government has done to reassess their programs or to realign them with the difficulties that are being faced in the Province of Manitoba? I would hope the Minister of Finance could give us some kind of a response.

There's been another area of concern, Mr. Chairman, and maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs could respond to this. In the media today we have seen or heard from the Union of Municipalities where the tax arrears or the people who have not been able to pay their land taxes have increased substantially this particular year, they are not able to make those payments, and I think again that is an indicator of the tough situation that's in the province and the shortage of cash flow that's available to make those land payments. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this again is taken into account when the government is looking at the kinds of programs that they've introduced for the province.

I think, just in an overall concluding remark, Mr. Chairman - and I hope that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture can get those answers - I can't emphasize enough the seriousness of the economic situation that the people in rural and small towns in Manitoba are facing; it is not to be underestimated. I would hope in all sincerity that the government, if they're sincere in trying to help the people who are under extreme financial stress, that they would be prepared to make those kinds of changes that would assist those people who need the assistance and not through some regulatory or some form of a small hangup that they would not be able to act.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the government in looking at the monies that are being made available through the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, that they have a tool in the Credit Corporation to make it more available to and expand on the programs. We introduced the Debt Consolidation Program something like a year-and-a-half ago. A whole injection of capital that they've made available through MACC for these programs, I fully support, and I would hope that they would keep pretty much in tune with the people that are in need; but particularly on the Interest Rate Relief

Program, to restrict it to those people who are grossing \$70,000 and more, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the government they are not helping those who are in the greatest of need and again, without the farm community I think you can look for every small business in rural Manitoba to suffer the additional hardships of high interest rates and a shortfall in sales which, of course, generates the income.

So those are some questions I would hope that I can get answers for before we pass this bill, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the honourable member could just summarize the questions. There was quite a long string of them and I will undertake to get the updated information.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to do with the Beef Program, I think the Minister of Finance has those; it's the number of people that have been helped. How much cash has flowed to the beef industry? Have they plans to give them a one-time payment of, I think, it was \$45 a head that the beef industry had requested on a one-shot payment and then work on a longer term stabilization program, because as I understand it the funds are available and have been voted?

To do with the Interest Rate Relief Program, Mr. Chairman, it was the numbers of people who had received support, interest rate relief, in the farm community. Are they giving consideration or will they give consideration to making some regulatory changes or changes in the parameter so that those grossing over \$70,000 can receive some form of support?

To do with small business, Mr. Chairman, the Minister probably could get the same kind of answers for us in that regard and maybe one of my colleagues has a more specific question in that regard, but I would like it for the agricultural community in a specific way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I have a question to the Minister of Finance. Could the Minister indicate how much revenue he's anticipating from the sale of agricultural Crown lands that have been sold and will be sold?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, I'll add that to my bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some questions under the finance areas, specifically, the Canada-Manitoba Income Tax Collection Agreement. I'd like to know as to when the numbers provided, they are both under Subsection 1 and 2, Corporation Income Tax and Individual Income Tax, when in fact they were presented to the Manitoba Government and when they were prepared? —(Interjection)— I'd like to know the two figures as presented under the Finance section listed (a) Canada-Manitoba Income Tax Collection Agreement:

the \$145 million listed under Corporation Income Tax Revenue coming to this province; and the \$582 million under Individual Income Tax. When were those numbers received by our Provincial Finance people and, more importantly, when were they prepared by the Ottawa Finance people?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, I'll add that to the bank as well.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, my difficulty in waiting too long for the answer to that question of course is how reliable are they are this time? Of course, we're all aware that we've had now three successive quarters of negative productive growth in this country, and prospects for showing any type of a positive economic growth for any quarter through 1982 appear to be fast fleeing, at least, by the latest reports.

Of course, we're also aware of the high unemployment rate and we have to know that many businesses that have not gone bankrupt to this date, in fact, are going to be experiencing low profitability levels. My question again and my main concern, I'm sure which is shared by the Minister is, how reliable are these figures at this particular time? Because, although I'm lead to believe they're always developed in a very conservative fashion, I would have to think that in today's terms that one can't monitor these particular figures closely enough and that in every sense they have to be reviewed in an almost twice-monthly manner. Again, my question is, when is the last time they have been reviewed? Are they in fact estimates from some six months previous? Are they figures, again, that we're prepared to live with until others replace them? I think his department, no doubt, has given some judgment recently and I'm wondering if he can share them with us - that judgment of it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The first question asked was exactly when those Estimates were prepared. I don't have an exact date, it was about six months ago in fact, and when the member says there should be some concern with respect to the accuracy of those figures today, he's very right. There's no doubt that we're most anxious to see exactly what those figures will show the next time the national accounts are estimated again. As I understand it though, when they do come, they will be based on an across Canada averaging and they will be going back to the last year for which we have final figures which would be the 1980-81 as opposed to 1981-82 year for Manitoba. When you recognize that was not a good year for Manitoba, there may be some adjustments later on for us to be involved with, but we do expect some more numbers, some more up-to-date numbers, from the Federal Government within the next month or so.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering then, is there a specific time that the Federal Government does report normally as to updating and the confidence they can display themselves in these figures. If so, when the Minister says a month or two, is there an actual specific reporting date that

again he is aware of and that he can make us aware of also?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there is not a specific day on which they come out, but traditionally they come out somewhere in February or early March and again during the summertime, July or August, and that's when we're expecting them again this year.

MR. C. MANNES: Has the Minister's department at all attempted to reflect on these numbers at all or do they just sit waiting for the Federal Finance Department's Estimates or have they themselves spent some time in attempting to prewarn themselves in attempting to decipher whether in fact they can expect significant change, and does the Minister have some knowledge of that at this particular time?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman, we don't have the capability at this time of making those kinds of calculations, but the department is of course looking at things and looking at things in the same way that the member would. There is a belief in the department that the statistics will show that there will be a decrease in Corporate Income Taxation Revenue for the year. That's what we would expect to see when we get the next set of figures.

MR. C. MANNES: I'd like to move on to (d) the Levy for Health and Education. It's estimated in the Estimates of Revenue at a figure of \$70 million. I'm wondering what impact all the closures of businesses and again the same general downturn in business throughout the Province of Manitoba and of course across Canada will have on the impact of this figure. Obviously, this is a number that has to be developed within our own province, within the capabilities of our own Department of Finance and I would feel, no doubt, there would be some estimate that the Minister would have at his disposal that he could share with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the member raises a valid point that when you have fewer employees you're not going to be collecting the same amount on this tax - and I'm talking without the numbers before me - but I believe we're in the range of employment in the vicinity of 460,000 Manitobans and we're within about 2,000 or 3,000 of where we were say a year ago. We're below the employment that there was a year ago by approximately that amount. I believe in February and March we were a few thousand ahead, we're down now and it's going back and forth. Certainly too much back, not enough forth, but there's no doubt that would have an impact but it wouldn't have a huge impact unless there's a significantly greater number of business failures over the months ahead.

MR. C. MANNES: Obviously, the Minister is including in the \$70 million the portion that would be payable by the Federal Government. Has anything transpired since this issue was dealt with at length last week as far as the Federal Government paying their

portion of this tax?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman, other than that maybe between last week and now I know I did receive official word from the Federal Government that they are not prepared to collect the tax for us. As you will recall, I had asked the Federal Minister to do the collection, which would have saved us a considerable amount of money and the necessity of hiring employees, etc. We got the answer back; the answer was no. Other than that, I don't recall anything of significance occurring in the last week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of corporation income tax, there's an estimate this year of 145,273,000. The actual revenue for 1981-82 was only 114 million, which was 17 million below the estimate for '81-82. How accurate does the Minister think that projection will be under today's circumstances?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I'd indicated earlier, there's an expectation on the part of the department that there will be something of a decrease in the amount that had originally been estimated. The estimate was based on the federal estimate that we had at the time the documents were prepared.

While I'm up - I see the Minister of Transportation here and the Member for Pembina is here as well - possibly I could get him to answer the question of the Member for Pembina.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm afraid the Minister of Transportation can't help me, it has to be the Minister of Finance in this case, I believe.

Well, the question I posed, I received an answer on how many SMYs are involved in the additional salaries request and a breakdown of the other expenditures that are being asked under Supplementary Supply, but there still remains the problem of determining whether the recoverable of \$800,000, which in effect reduces the total Supplementary Supply Estimates by \$800,000, has been duly budgeted for by the user departments; namely Natural Resources and I would assume the Attorney-General's Department is a major user of Government Services aircraft, because the \$800,000 recovery stems from two recoveries; namely, additional revenue from the third water bomber, I assume used by the Department of Natural Resources to fight fires; and secondly, from the implementation after preparation of the '82-83 Estimates of a new aircraft utilization schedule, so that user departments - Natural Resources, Attorney-General - would all share part of the additional \$600,000 recovery.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: Have those user departments already budgeted the \$800,000 before the Minister of Highways and Transportation knew that it had to be budgeted?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I thought the member was asking the Minister of

Transportation a question and I was busy with other things. Could you please repeat that? Could the member then please repeat the question in order that I can answer it?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the \$800,000 that is recoverable from other appropriations in the Supp. Supply Estimates of the Highways and Transportations reduces the total request for Supplementary Supply by \$800,000 to \$46,042,700.00.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: has the user departments from which the \$800,000 recoverable from the utilization of a third water bomber and new user rates applied after the Estimates were drafted, does the \$800,000 already appear in the line-by-line estimates of the various user departments as appeared in the Main Estimates, or should that \$800,000 have been shown in the Supp. Supply requests of the various user departments?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the funds shown will have to be taken from funds budgeted within the departmental existing budgets.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then the Minister is telling me that the user departments of government aircraft, primarily the Department of Natural Resources, had the wisdom or else the flexibility in their budgeting process to absorb another \$800,000 of costs that they cushioned their estimates with during the regular Estimate process and that in fact they already had built in almost a million dollars of anticipated fees that not even the Minister in tabling his Estimates back in January or February had knowledge of being part of his departmental expenditures?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the short answer to that is that the departments are going to have to prioritize as the member knows. There is not an unlimited amount of money available and they will be required to reprioritize in order that they can meet these requests.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So in other words if the department is faced with various departments, user departments of Government Air Service are faced with No. 1, the necessity of utilizing the additional aircraft, hence being charged the \$800,000 as shown, recoverable under the Supp. Supply, that they are going to have to cut \$800,000 worth of other programs within their existing Budget as appeared in the Main Estimates and recoup the additional monies owing to Government Air Services in that manner and that in reality we will not have an additional \$800,000 added to the deficit?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the member that in the Financial Report for the year ending March 31st, there was a lapsing of, I believe, \$67 million. That's one factor to keep in mind.

The second factor to keep in mind is that departments are required to prioritize. In this particular instance, one would hope that they will be able to find funds that they might otherwise have spent on other programming. It may be that if we have a bad year in terms of forest fires that we will be required to seek a

Special Warrant, because it may be that it will be impossible to do what has to be done within the department with the amount of money that is available, including this \$800,000.00.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, to go back to the corporate income tax, in '80-81 the government received \$111 million and in '81-82, it was only \$114 million, a very small increase of '81-82 over '80-81.

In view of that fact and the fact that the economy is in quite difficult circumstances today, does the Minister believe that he is actually going to get more revenue in '82-83 than was received in '81-82?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. I missed the first part of that question. Which component was the member talking about?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if I might refer the Minister to the Preliminary Financial Report of the year ended March 31, 1982, there is a line in that Report in Schedule 2 which shows the corporation income tax and on the left hand side it shows that in 1980-81 the province received \$111,739,000; in 1981-82 they received \$114,887,000, only \$3,148,000 more in '81-82 than they received in '80-81.

My question is —(Interjection)— the Member for Inkster says these are thousands, Mr. Chairman. I think you'll acknowledge that when the figures are given in thousands they mean, when read out, it's 111 million, not 111 thousand and any financial analyst worth his salt should be aware of that. These are only \$3,148,000 more in '81-82.

Does the Minister believe that in view of the financial circumstances in the province and the country today that he actually will receive more money in '82-83 than was received in '81-82?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, I had indicated previously that the numbers we used were the numbers provided to us by the Federal Government, as I believe the numbers used in predictions in the previous year by the previous government were numbers provided by the Federal Government. We've gone to the identical source. I don't profess to have a crystal ball. It may well be that the amount of revenue shown as being predicted by the Federal Government for this coming year may be somewhat high. If so, then we will know about that by the end of summer.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is simply going to wait until he gets a further figure from the Federal Government, but I would have to think, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of the past record, that we might well be lucky to receive even as much in '82-83 as we received in '81-82, rather than being able to look forward to receiving \$145 million.

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister please give me an indication of how the metallic minerals tax is handled now in the Estimates of Revenue? I have some difficulty in making that out as compared to the financial statement for last year.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll just get that information for the member. While we're getting that I can answer a previous question of his with respect to the revenue

increase, taxation increase in Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The reason for the significant increase from \$10 million to \$13.4 million . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: If you could try and gain the attention of the Committee, in order that we might be able to hear the Minister's answers and I think that maybe he's having trouble hearing what the questions are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Member for Turtle Mountain has raised a good point. I would ask members to limit their private conversations, and if they continue to be necessary, to continue them out in the hall.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, that is appreciated, Mr. Chairman.

The reason for the increase from \$10 million to \$13.4 million is the increase by one percentage point of the tax on certain insurance policies.

MR. B. RANSOM: While the Minister is seeking out his answer on metallic minerals then, Mr. Chairman, there was another one having to do with the corporation capital tax. The actual figure in 1981-82 being 17,858,000 and the estimate before us is for 19,700,000, could the Minister explain how it would be that we would have that type of increased estimate?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I remind the member that includes the increase to the banks, which I believe raises something better than \$2 million, \$2.6 million, in that area. There is an increase from .8 percent to 2 percent on the corporate capital tax of the bank.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the Minister of Finance advised the House during question period that he had a legal opinion regarding the constitutionality of the Health and Education levy payroll tax. Could the Minister advise from whom he received that legal opinion?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: From the Attorney-General.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have that legal opinion from the Attorney-General in writing?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we've gone through this in question period a few times. There was an opinion by the Attorney-General that there is a presumption in favour of the legality of the provincial statute; that happened to be a verbal opinion which he passed on to me. So I had indicated to the Leader of the Opposition —(Interjection)— well, the Member for Tuxedo is making a point which may or may not be valid. The fact of the matter is that the legality of the tax was an item that was briefly under consideration when the tax itself was considered. We looked at the fact that another province, Quebec, is successfully levying that tax, has done so since I believe the late 1960s, and so we see no real concern. Later on, we got in fact two written opinions. I recall just a few days ago we were in the House and the Attorney-General was wondering —(Interjec-

tion)— I thought maybe my answer was getting too long.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister contemplate any change in legislation as a consequence of the legal opinions which the government has received?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there may be some minor changes as a result of the opinion which we've received.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister over the past weeks, since this tax was announced and the Budget, has on several occasions made reference to the premium systems that are in place in Ontario, for example, and continues to equate this tax, which the government is levying on all employers including the Federal Government, with the system of premiums which is in place in Ontario. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if he would acknowledge that in fact the two systems are not the same and that the Federal Government where they pay the levy in Ontario, it is done as a consequence of something agreed to between the Federal Government as an employer and their employees and that premium is not in fact levied on them directly by the Provincial Government?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, several points. The Government of Ontario views, certainly, the tax as one that in general falls on the employer; that is, they argue that they raise the tax. About 80 percent of an increase is paid by the employer and 20 percent by the employee, regardless of what happens to each individual employer. They say that with the existing plans more than 70 percent of the dollars are now in fact being paid by the employer. So it would seem to me on that basis that statistically there is nothing wrong with the statement that more than 70 percent of the \$648 that is charged to an individual for Medicare premiums comes from the employee and 70 percent of that amount is over \$400 on the average for that type of an employee.

That, in fact, is happening with respect to the average employer in the Province of Ontario. Now, there may be some employers, 20 percent maybe, not 30 percent, but somewhere between 20 and 30 percent who don't pay or they don't pay the full amount, or the employee pays 30 percent on the average and the employers pay 70 percent. That is a fact; but the other fact is that there is so much on average coming from employers in the Province of Ontario in the form of this particular tax. I'm sure the members are aware that with the latest Budget presented in Ontario, there was a discussion paper which went with it, entitled "Ontario's Tax Structure Options for Change."

The Minister of Finance here referred to the payroll tax base for the tax and there's some interesting quotations. He does say, "Administrative complexity is clearly lowest for employer paid taxes without floors or ceilings." That's fairly significant in terms of this tax. We can talk about the fairness of that. I certainly think that is more fair than a tax such as the Medicare premium, which just is a flat rate for anybody regardless of what income they're earning. This one has the attraction of charging less to those employers who

have employees earning less - one would presume less skilled employees, etc. - and paying more where there's more pay and probably more utilization of certainly the education system, etc. It's more fair, it's not just one dollar amount regardless of the income being generated. So I would say that, in fact, Ontario is just strongly looking at this system.

They are also saying, and I quote again from page 11 of that report - "Were the employer to be required to withhold any portion of the tax from the employee, a complex individual reporting system would have to be created. The administrative load would be far less significant for some 280,000 employers and 200,000 self-employed persons than if tax were collected from over four million employees." Now leaving that business of the self-employed individuals aside, because our tax doesn't apply to them, I think that the position put forward there is a very logical one.

They also say on page 22 - "The timing for implementation of a payroll tax depends on the nature of the administrative machinery and the structure of the tax itself. In rough terms, a two-year phase in period would likely be necessary, thus the earliest possible implementation date would be 1985." So they're certainly looking at it; they don't have the confidence that they could do it all in one year, but their province is larger and there may be more problems there than there are here. Certainly, I agree that it's not an identical tax to Ontario's tax. It is similar in terms of - in fact, per employee, employers in Ontario are paying more than they will be paying under this particular tax, on the average. Now for some employees they would pay less, because if you have an employee earning \$60,000 a year in Manitoba, there will be 1.5 percent of that full amount paid. Whereas in Ontario, you just pay up to the \$648 a year and that's it, you don't pay any more, so they do have that ceiling. I suppose you could say they have a floor in that an employer who has absolutely no concern for the welfare of his employee may get away without paying anything. I don't know whether that's possible or not, or whether the Ontario law requires them to pay half of the Medicare premium. It seems to me that there is some minimal provision, but I'm not sure of that.

Certainly the bulk of employers in that province do recognize their responsibility and do pay some of it. I again remind members that we're dealing with an instance where we lost \$719 million in federal revenue. It was for health and post-secondary education, and equalization. So when we looked at something to get back some money for ourselves this was an area, it's not a pleasant area, I don't think that any tax increase would be a pleasant one, but this was the best we could come up with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister wandered so far on that answer, I think I've forgotten what the question was that I asked him, but I know it wasn't basically what he answered.

I wasn't debating the merits of the tax, Mr. Chairman, I'm simply trying to determine where the Minister saw the similarity between his payroll tax, which is imposed upon all employers including the Federal

Government, to the situation in Ontario where the premium is applied against the individuals and employers, including the Federal Government, pay it on a voluntary basis.

What I see here, Mr. Chairman, is that the similarity is that indeed this government has ended up levying what is in effect going to be a health care premium. It is eventually going to come out of the remuneration of the employee. It is eventually going to work its way into the benefit package that the employee receives through reduction in wages. Even though in Ontario, the Minister I believe says 80 percent of the employers pick up the health care premiums, there's no question in my mind that there have been adjustments then in the general compensation package to make up for that. Even though the employer submits the remuneration, in the long run the employee is also going to pay it.

So to that extent there is a similarity but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the difference here is that in Manitoba the Federal Government is imposing the tax on the employer, whereas in Ontario it's paid on a voluntary basis. It could be made similar if the Minister was able to get from the Federal Government a commitment which I believe would be consistent with the opinion given by Legislative Counsel, and that would be that the Federal Government agreed to pay the tax, as they are paying some other taxes that the provincial governments have imposed. I think the Minister would be wise to approach the Federal Government on that basis and seek their agreement to pay this tax.

Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have the answers with respect to my question concerning the metallic minerals tax?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will give it a whirl. If you look to the Preliminary Financial Report, page 5, Schedule 2, for '80-81 there was \$23,000,053; '81-82 it went down to \$8,769,000 - although it was estimated for \$23,500,000 and then the actual came in there; and we are estimating \$10 million for '82-83; and of course that decrease is related to actual profits being less than anticipated due to reduced demand for base metals. We expect that the depressed market will continue during the year.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I take it then that what is listed in the Financial Report as the metallic minerals tax is then shown in this year's Estimates of Revenue as the which - the mining royalty tax or the mining tax?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The name of the Act was changed in January of 1981. It used to be The Metallic Minerals Tax. It is now The Mining Tax Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: The mining royalty tax then, Mr. Chairman, what does that equate to in the financial report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, a number of questions were raised by the Member for Arthur concerning the Interest Rate Relief Program as to the numbers who have received money on the Farm Program and parameter of changes.

Mr. Chairman, I'll give the honourable member a breakdown of the three programs and what monies they represent. This is as of up to June 18th, so I can give him the report up to June 18th. 167 applications have been approved up to that point for farmers under the Farm Program, representing a financial commitment of \$2 million, provided the clients stay on the program for the full 24-month period.

Under the Small Business Program, 59 applications have been approved and they represent assistance commitments of \$708,000 if the clients stay on the program for the full 24-month period. Under the Housing Program, 182 homeowners have been approved for assistance. Of the 182 approvals, the financial assistance commitments are \$612,000.00. The total projected commitment for the full two-year period is \$3.3 million if the clients stay for the two-year program.

The farm and business assistance is 50 percent interest free repayable and 50 percent grant and the Homeowner Program is 100 percent grant. The assistance breaks down to 1.354 million capital and \$1.96 million in current against the approval of 9 million capital and 23 million current originally approved for the allocation of the . . .

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the overall take-up program, the take-up is less than originally anticipated with the farm component being closest to initial estimates. I'd like to point out as well that the committee will be meeting and are meeting again, that due to fiscal constraints, the initial program guidelines that were approved were within fairly tight parameters. Promotional efforts were pursued geared to a low profile and in light of the present low take-up levels, the committee will be providing appropriate recommendations concerning changes over the next number of weeks and months. If the numbers are starting to drop off in terms of applications, we will be reviewing the program parameters. As well, should we change, those people who have applied under the program will have an opportunity to be called and be contacted as well should the guidelines change, so those applications that are on file will be reviewed again if the program parameters change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The mining tax is the successor to the metallic minerals tax. The mining royalty tax was in existence previously and the reason for the \$4 million increase in mining royalty taxation for the coming year is that there is going to be some tax assessment for prior years which will be completed. In the Revenue Estimates No. (h) and (i), (h) is mining royalty tax which goes from 6 million to 10 million and (i) the estimate goes from 23.5 down to 10, but as I indicated previously, it actually was down at 8-something in actuality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's

deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Bill No. 63, An Act to Amend The Credit Unions and Caisse Populaires Act be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and transferred to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, by leave.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd like to move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the House be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning (Tuesday).