



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 119 - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 28 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 28 July, 1983.

Time — 8:00 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 . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Brandon University - construction

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, the Brandon University Music Building was promised by the NDP during the election of 1981. It was included in the "wish" list released with the Jobs Fund. It was part of a NEED Program announcement made by Mr. Axworthy and the Minister of Labour on July 15th of this year. Can the First Minister advise the House now whether or not approval has been given in order that that project may proceed as planned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated on Monday and Tuesday, this matter is presently being dealt with by the Minister of Education, and there will be an announcement shortly.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister be a little more specific, and advise when a decision is expected?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister advise the House when construction must begin in order that the \$931,000 which the Federal Government has pledged towards the project will not be lost?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are taking that into consideration in respect to the announcement that will be made.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was roughly - this is a further question to the First Minister - there was roughly \$72 million of budgetary authority in the Jobs Fund. Can the First Minister advise the House how much of that 72 million has now been committed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

Wages - construction industry

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister with respect to utilization of the money set aside in the Jobs Fund. I, and I'm sure the members of the heavy-duty construction industry, are still awaiting some word from this government whether or not any decision has been made for some recognition of the problems the heavy construction industry faces. Will the Ministry of Transportation receive some additional dollars, specifically, meeting some of the requests that were made of the government during meetings they had with you, and other members of the Cabinet, a week ago when they were told that some action would be taken?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, yes, there will be an announcement, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Transportation are in the process of completing an announcement that will be made pertaining to same.

Jobs Fund - allocation of funds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister, also, a question on the Jobs Fund, if I can.

I served notice to a staff of the First Minister, I believe, in early July, regarding an application by the Town of Morris for an extension of the Sewer Trunk Project. I was told at that time that the Jobs Fund would consider this request on July 15th. I would ask now of the Minister whether, indeed, that was done?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on or about July 10th or 12th, I indicated that there would be a program that would be revealed which would be an overall provincial program pertaining to municipal and community groups involving some \$7 million in total; the details of that would be announced on or before July the 31st. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, along with the Minister of Transportation, who is partly involved, as well, will be making an announcement within the next several days pertaining to same, along with the details and the guidelines pertaining to same.

MR. C. MANNES: I would then ask the First Minister whether that's a general program or whether, indeed, a certain specific number of applications that have come, you know, to the government covering certain projects would make application for that?

HON. H. PAWLEY: They're pertained to that program, the municipal portion will be a general program that will invite applications from municipalities.

Government polls

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the First Minister. When will he be able to provide to this House the information I requested with respect to details of government polling done at the taxpayers' expense and the cost of those polls?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: There is being circulated a request for information from various departments as to any polling that they have done. When that is obtained then the information will be tabled.

Workers Compensation Board - personnel changes

MR. G. MERCIER: A question to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker. Could he advise approximately how many persons are employed by the Workers Compensation Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I'd have to get specific information for the Member for St. Norbert on that question. I couldn't give him even a rough estimate at this time, but I can find the information out for him.

MR. G. MERCIER: A supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that it is now seven weeks since the Minister undertook to provide to me and the House information with respect to names of persons fired, dismissed without cause, released, and forcefully retired; when will he be supplying that information to the House, and what is the reason for the delay?

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated to the member when he last addressed this question, I will be supplying it to him before the end of this particular Session.

Wages - construction industry

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Does the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, approve or intend to emulate the decision by the Federal Minister of Finance who, as he effectively abolished its own minimum wage requirements for firms tendering on federal construction projects, a move he says designed to keep costs on federal projects in line with the government's 6 and 5 restraint program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe, and I will take the question as notice, that there are any provisions pertaining to wage levels pertaining to government contracts at the provincial level.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister was does he intend to follow the example set by the action of the Federal Government and the Minister of Finance by taking action with respect to minimum wages in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Federal Minister of Finance dealt with changes pertaining to the wage levels in respect to those that contract with the Federal Government because of guidelines apparently established by the Federal Government, pertaining to those doing contractual work with the Federal Government. To my knowledge, and in order to ensure accuracy, I do not believe that there any guidelines in respect to wage levels re contractor companies doing business with the Provincial Government.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister signed an Order-in-Council approving increases in the Greater Winnipeg building construction wage schedule which establishes minimum wage rates. Can he explain why journeymen carpenters received a 24.2 percent wage increase?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Because that was as a result of proceeding through the normal process, the process which I understand involves representation of management and labour. The Minister of Labour is not here. I'll take the question further as one of notice for her but it was the unanimous recommendation on the part of management and labour in respect to the appropriate committee that makes such recommendations.

It is my understanding that government is not interfered respecting the recommendations of that board in the past.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the wage increase for journeymen carpenters was indeed a wage increase that covered a period of two years, because wage negotiations were in effect at the beginning of the period but not concluded. Does the First Minister approve, even over a two-year period, wage increases that amount to 12.2 percent and 12 percent at a time when the Federal Government was imposing 6 and 5 wage restraints?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question as posed seeks an opinion from a Minister. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question so that it seeks information rather than opinion.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister in this way then. Does he see or believe that the wage increase which he and his Cabinet approved - 24.2 percent - even if it does cover a period of two years, is an example for the kind of collective bargaining that should go on in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, the wage levels are set as a result of a board which consists of labour and of business. Since the Minister of Labour is here I'll ask the Minister of Labour to further elaborate in respect to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are several unique feature obviously about the construction industry which it would seem that people do not always take into consideration. Surely the people working in that industry are quite aware of them. One is that people working in the construction industry do not have what other people would call a steady job. Their jobs depend on contracts and these contracts are sometimes available and sometimes not. So their wages do sometimes reflect the fact that they are not working steadily and they're certainly not working through a Manitoba winter, that's often the case. The Construction Wages Act in Manitoba, and it is the last of the provinces to have such an act, the wages are determined by a board that is made up of employers and employees; it is chaired by a neutral person acceptable to both and acceptable to the government. That person, as far as I know, has been chairing that committee for some time.

So construction wages cannot really be compared to the norm. I have never, in my experience, certainly with the labour side of it, heard people working in other industries compare themselves to the construction industry. It would be difficult to draw the kind of conclusion that the member is asking for.

Surface Rights Board

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines. I realize the Honourable Minister has been away for a month on holidays. I would like to ask the Minister what he has done so far with respect to appointment of members to the Surface Rights Board, if there has been any action in that respect.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: A release was issued today indicating that the act will be proclaimed on August 9th, and the board will come into effect. The release also named the members to the board. That release should have been distributed to the member. I would assume that he would get it by tomorrow morning.

Employment Standards Branch - babysitters

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour, could the Minister of Labour indicate whether she will be introducing any amendments to legislation that will clarify the position of babysitters in this province with respect to payment of minimum wages?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: On the Statute Law Amendment bill which I believe has already been circulated - if not, it will be in the next day or so; I thought it had been circulated - there is a provision that deals with the matter.

Wild rice legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I'm sure his office is getting a number of enquiries from those interested in or engaged in the harvest of wild rice. Could the Minister indicate to me at this time what the status of The Wild Rice Act is? It is passed through this Chamber on second reading, and has been held by the Minister at committee stage. My direction question to the Minister is, is it his intention to proceed with the bill during this Session, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite correct in his recall of the facts. The bill is at committee stage. We heard representations on it; some of those representations raised new issues. I have been involved in consultation in respect to the issues raised and, in due course, before the end of this Session, certainly in good time, we'll be bringing a recommendation to the committee. We will then know how we're going to deal with it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I simply remind the Honourable Minister that the season is advancing . . .

HON. S. LYON: Harvest doesn't wait for . . .

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and harvest doesn't wait for this. But, my specific question to the Minister is, there are a number of people engaged in the harvest of wild rice whose applications for permits to harvest wild rice are being held up, and part of the reason is because the legislation's being held up. What is the Minister going to do with those applications that are currently in his office requesting permission to harvest wild rice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, some few days ago we were assured that in the earlier part of this Session that all we had to do was get into Speed-up and certainly we could complete legislation in this House.

I'm under no illusion tonight that I expect we could deal with The Wild Rice Act tonight, so, Mr. Speaker, I do not anticipate any problem in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, Law Amendments Committee had been called, one of the items ordered

for business on Law Amendments Committee was the bill dealing with wild rice. The government cancelled the sitting of that committee.

MR. R. BANMAN: Nothing to do with Speed-up.

HON. S. LYON: Don't lie. You're bad enough without being . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Order Paper, we are into Speed-up now for some days and legislation has not been moving. We've been subjected to filibuster, Mr. Speaker, on the number of issues. For the honourable member to suggest that, you know, we're not moving quickly on legislation is false, Mr. Speaker. There is no problem in respect to allocating rights in respect to wild rice, in the event that the legislation does not pass.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard the Minister state that they had been subject to filibuster. There has been no filibuster in this House and I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker. We've had a series of speakers repeating the same statements on any number of bills in this House and I do not withdraw that remark. It is perfectly accurate.

HON. S. LYON: You can't run things like they do in Moscow now, Al. You might like to, but you're not going to.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think there is a point of order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking, will the Minister bring forward The Wild Rice Act when next Law Amendments sits? He didn't the last time, with or without Speed-up.

A MEMBER: And now they've cancelled the committee.

MR. H. ENNS: So, I'm just asking the question, will the Minister bring forward the bill? I want to pass it. I'll help him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Probably, Mr. Speaker, probably so.

Government polls

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Can he advise who took

the poll with respect to discovering people's views on bilingualism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I believe I've answered that before but in the event that I didn't, I will answer it now. The poll was conducted under the general direction of Wordsnorth Ltd. who actually did the polling itself. I believe there are the specialist outfits that were retained by Wordsnorth to do the actual polling, but the setting up of the poll and the analysis of the poll, which is still being conducted, and I expect to have at the beginning of next week, was done by Wordsnorth.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General indicate how many people were sampled?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, on a random sample basis the sample population was in excess of 600.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney-General table a copy of the question or questions that were asked of the persons sampled?

HON. S. LYON: . . . running about 18 points behind right now.

HON. R. PENNER: As I said when I first answered this question, I will be tabling in the House an analysis of the poll.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Attorney-General include the location where the people lived that were sampled and the full results of same early next week?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to answer the question if I may. I've instructed, or requested that the analysis contained . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . cross tabulations with respect to distribution of the population in terms geographically by age, by any other of the demographics which were, in fact, obtained in the sampling process.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. How many shopping days left till Christmas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, further to the questions asked by the Member for St. Norbert, I have a question to the Attorney-General. On this survey of 600 people in Manitoba, could the Attorney-General confirm that, unlike the survey carried out by the Member for

Elmwood, more than 6 percent of the people polled responded?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, in fact it's my understanding that of the sample population, to get the 606 replies, that there was very close to a 90 percent response.

Enterprise Manitoba Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Economic Development. Yesterday the Minister read a statement in this House dealing with changes of the Federal DREE Program as it applies to the provinces, and the Federal Government policy with regard to the criteria which they will use in distributing monies for DREE. I wonder if she could inform the House whether or not this new change in federal policy will have a bearing on the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Enterprise Manitoba Program is a five-year federal-provincial agreement and it, in fact, expired March 31, 1983. What we're in now is the wind-down period of those programs.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I believe that certain components of the Tourism and Development Agreement were not passed, and are still in place. Does this announcement that she made yesterday affect that particular agreement, the programs such as Destination Manitoba and others?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Destination Manitoba Program does not expire until March 31, 1984, and all funds will have to be committed by that date, but the payout can extend well beyond that period of time.

One of the good aspects of the new program is that tourism projects will be included as eligible tourism and service projects which was not the case in industrial promotion programs in the past.

MR. R. BANMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would she inform the House as to who will now bear the cost for such centres as the Enterprise Manitoba Centres which are located, one in St. Boniface, I believe one in Brandon, and one in Dauphin? Will the province now have to fund the total operation of those particular projects?

HON. M. SMITH: Until next March the funding is shared, but after that their continuation would depend on provincial funding unless we are able to negotiate a successor agreement with the Federal Government to cost share them, however, I would not like to leave the implication that is likely to happen.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and ask him whether he has met, in the past couple of months, with any of the ethnic leaders or groups to discuss the government's policy on bilingualism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I haven't specifically met with any of the leaders of the ethnic community with respect to the government's bilingual program. I have talked to a number of the leaders when we have been meeting on other matters with respect to the position of the government with respect to Section 23 of the Constitution.

Ukrainian Festival

MR. R. DOERN: Will the Honourable Minister be attending the National Ukrainian Festival in Dauphin?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. R. DOERN: Will the Minister be making an announcement in Dauphin concerning any new grants, goodies or buildings for the Ukrainian Festival?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, any announcement that might be made by me at Canada's National Ukrainian Festival would have to wait until that festival does indeed take place.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, is there any truth to the rumour that there is going to be an announcement, either by the Provincial Government and/or the Federal Government concerning a new building with a value of up to \$10 million in Dauphin?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. It is not an appropriate question to seek verification of a rumour in this House. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister whether he and/or a Federal Minister will be announcing the construction of a building that costs millions of dollars, this weekend?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not be making any announcements with respect to any new building in Dauphin this weekend.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A couple of days ago in discussions with the Government House Leader, we had come to an understanding that the House would not sit this weekend, that perhaps a committee would be sitting on Friday afternoon, a committee or committees. Can

the Government House Leader confirm that that understanding is still in place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: There was, Mr. Speaker, no such understanding and for the Opposition House Leader to rise in his place in the position that they're now in, breaking the agreement with respect to Speed-up, shows how defensive they are. Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement that we entered into with some fear and trepidation that Speed-up would be entered into in order to expedite the business of the House. Now for their own as yet unrevealed tactical reasons, they're filibustering on a bill in the sense of grinding the wheels around and around and around and delaying the business of the House so that we must, in order to fulfill the expectations of the public, that the business of the House will be done now that we're in Speed-up in a rational way, he dares to stand up and make that kind of an assertion. He ought to be ashamed of himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I don't believe either member had a point of order.
The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Several days ago, the now House Leader, the Minister of Health, myself and the Member for Turtle Mountain sat down and worked out an agreement with regard to entering into Speed-up. It was indicated at that time and I believe members opposite that were attending at the meeting that this particular resolution would be fought hard by the opposition. It was agreed that that would happen . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a point of order, or is he going to continue . . .

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is, the House Leader has indicated that we gave some kind of indication that this bill would receive swift passage. We did not say that and we are using every means and we indicated we would, and that was aside from the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member does not have a point of order. Order please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

Could the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business, please.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the debate on the motion to refer the proposed amendment to Section 23 to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General and amendment thereto

proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. B. RANSOM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General

HON. R. PENNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, although the Member for Gladstone's name appears on the Order Paper, she did not in fact adjourn the debate. — (Interjection) — Well, she rose, but she did not adjourn the debate. However, Mr. Speaker, we would not want her to lose her opportunity to speak and any other member there can rise and speak to the debate. We would not in any way use the fact that she did not formally adjourn it to have her lose her right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Clerk approach the Chair? Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I demand that the Minister of Energy and Mines withdraw the remark that our member has sneaked out of this House so she didn't have to debate. This government agreed and asked to have a committee sit this evening, and that honourable member happens to be a member of that committee, and for him to stoop to that kind of sleazy comment that she sneaked out of this House to avoid debate - I want an apology from that Minister.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to speak to that point of order. If that person knew that she was going to be at the committee tonight, why did she at 5:30 take the adjournment, Mr. Speaker? Why did she take the adjournment?

A MEMBER: . . . sleaziest person that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: When I'm going to have the Member for Turtle Mountain call me a sleazy person when, Mr. Speaker, this person right over here red-baits, name-calls and tries to act with some decorum when he in fact is following the rotten mannerisms of the Leader of the Opposition, we have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Minister take his seat? Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: And I reject that point of order and those comments by that person.

HON. S. LYON: You better go back to the sewer in Transcona that you crawled out of.

HON. W. PARASIUK: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of order. I've just been told to crawl back in the sewer in Transcona that I came out of.

HON. S. LYON: That's right.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I've heard negative comments and cracks ever since I joined this House about Transcona from that person and I'm not going to tolerate that type of comment about Transcona. I was here once when there was an accident, an explosion and a death in Transcona, I asked a question years back and the Leader of the Conservative Party at that time laughed as he is from his seat and says, "Where's Transcona?" If he thinks we're going to tolerate that type of commentary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister does not have a point of order. Order please.

HON. S. LYON: If you were the Member for Tuxedo, you'd still have to crawl out of a sewer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Leader of the Opposition kindly restrain himself - and other members too?

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, not in the face of that kind of provocation from an honourable member who is acting in a dishonourable way, not for you or anybody else.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I will ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition again.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to draw to the attention of the House on this very question of this requested adjournment of the debate, that I had indicated to the House Leader of the opposition party that it was our concern to get this referral before the public as soon as possible. For that purpose . . .

HON. S. LYON: It is our concern to stop it.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . we would be calling the motion and would not permit an adjournment of the debate. The Honourable House Leader of the Conservative Party said, well, you have to give us notice of that. I said, all right. So I did give notice, and I gave notice yesterday, and here we are.

Now they're asking it to be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. S. LYON: That's your problem. If you don't know how to run the House, that's your problem.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. A resolution has been called, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Since that honourable member began her remarks just slightly before 5:30, she has begun her remarks. If someone

else speaks in the meantime, then the honourable member would be speaking twice if she came back to resume her remarks on it. It is then a matter of leave of the House. Unanimous consent would be required to allow some other member to speak on the motion.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we're quite prepared to grant leave to have someone speak on the motion if the Government House Leader will stick to the agreement which we arrived at two days ago.

HON. S. LYON: If you have any integrity, stick to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is there other member wishing to speak to this matter at this time?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks at this time on this referral motion.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is a motion . . .

A MEMBER: We're not going to be bullied . . .

HON. S. LYON: It's not a question of bullying. It is a question of having you bloody socialists keep your word for a change. That's what it is. It's a question of integrity, and I don't expect you to . . .

A MEMBER: Get lost.

HON. S. LYON: . . . understand integrity. You're too weak to understand anything.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. S. LYON: You haven't got much, and you don't understand it. You're not a person to be believed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to permit the Honourable Minister to complete his remarks.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we have before us, at least initially, is a motion to refer the subject matter of a resolution which stands on the Order Paper before a committee of the House, so that the people of Manitoba will have an opportunity to present their views to a committee of this Legislature, before this Legislature deals with the resolution that stands on the Order Paper that must be passed if we are to complete our understandings with the Federal Government and others that are involved in a question of trying to a common-sense resolution of an issue that is before the Supreme Court. That's the fact, Mr. Speaker. This motion is designed to allow the public

to participate in a decision that is to be made by the legislators in this Chamber.

Now what the honourable members over there are doing in opposing this motion is saying to the people of Manitoba, we will not permit you to come before a committee of this Legislature at this Session while this issue is before the public. It has been brought before the public by members of the opposition, by a member of the New Democratic Party caucus who's in opposition to this matter. It is squarely before the people of Manitoba now. The people of Manitoba should be given the right, which we want to afford them, to come before a committee and make their views known, so that when we vote as legislators on the resolution that's on the Order Paper, we will have their views.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the resolution has been introduced by the Attorney-General, we have already had some views, some highly critical views of this proposed resolution. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we've had some good, constructive, I believe, criticism. I think we could hear more. We can hear more attitudes, feelings, responses and perhaps some more constructive criticism about the proposed resolution. We would benefit by that, Mr. Speaker. We want to hear those views.

There has already, as I have indicated, been some constructive criticism. The First Minister, the Premier, the Attorney-General has said, that criticism has to be considered. There is some merit in some of the criticism that has been presented. The Attorney-General has even been generous enough to indicate that some of the views of the Leader of the Opposition, some, some of his remarks, have some significance, and perhaps have to be considered.

But what are honourable members opposite doing? They are saying, no, no, this matter has to be dealt with on our terms. It has to be adjourned to an intersessional committee when the matter is no longer uppermost in the minds of the people. It is uppermost in the minds of the people now. People do want to make representation. We are advised that there is an extensive number of people who have already signified to the Clerk that they want to appear before a committee of this House, but honourable members over there want to deny the rights of Manitobans to do that. That's what they are doing in this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

I said, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — to the House Leader of the Conservative Party, look, we want to facilitate the will of the people of Manitoba. We want to allow them to come before a committee of this House. You can understand that, Mr. Speaker. They can understand that. Why are they blocking it, Mr. Speaker?

The Honourable Member for Springfield perhaps has the key to this. They've got some troubles, Mr. Speaker. They have got a divided caucus. Within it, they've got some deeper shades of bigotry. Mr. Speaker, they have got a problem with it, because now they have a national leader who . . .

HON. S. LYON: If you'll listen to Springfield, you'll believe anything.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . is looking, Mr. Speaker, to provide their federal party with some basis in Quebec. Mr. Speaker, if this Conservative Party of Manitoba is

shown to be as negative and as hostile to any further consideration of the historic wrong that was done to the French in Manitoba; if that significant fact is laid before the people of Quebec, then Mr. Mulroney has a big problem because the Anglophones in Quebec are going to say to Mr. Mulroney and his Conservative Party, how can we trust you when your party in Manitoba has no trust, no sense of justice. Even the limited extension of rights that was promised there was frustrated and harassed by your party in Manitoba. How is Mr. Mulroney going to deal with the Anglophones in Quebec? Mr. Speaker, I leave it to you to conjecture.

But worse still, Mr. Mulroney, this new Conservative leader, how can he assure the Francophones in Quebec that his party stands for a real consideration of the historic base of Canada, of the two founding nations? How can he look to his Manitoba group of Conservatives and get any support for that proposition? Mr. Speaker, they're in trouble on this issue.

What they are trying to do right now is stall, Mr. Speaker. They're trying to stall. Where do these MPs from Manitoba stand? We haven't heard them saying anything about it. Mr. Speaker, their object is to stall. Stall, why? They are frustrating the will of the people of Manitoba.

Well, they will pay a price for that, Mr. Speaker. If they want to stall, if they want to block, then the people of Manitoba will say, how can it be, an opposition party that harassed and harangued and said, let's get Speed-up. The public knows the Conservative opposition wanted us to go into Speed-up. That's a matter of record now. They will say, Mr. Speaker, how is it that the opposition party, anxious for Speed-up, anxious to get on with the work of the Legislature now is stalling and not permitting the public to come before a committee of the Legislature and make their views known on a matter that they're anxious to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative caucus in Manitoba have some difficulty . . .

HON. S. LYON: You didn't even want the public to come before the committee. We have to put up with fools.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we know they have difficulty with their Leader but, Mr. Speaker, the problem that the Conservative caucus has with their Leader should not be the albatross that will destroy the Conservative Party in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is what's happening. Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition laughs, but the Honourable Member for Fort Garry knows that they have a problem. The Honourable Member for Lakeside knows that they have a problem.

You can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. You can't be saying to the public of Manitoba, look, we wanted them to go into Speed-up so that we could get on with the business of Manitoba. Then when we get into Speed-up, the speak one after another, repetitious speeches, trying to argue for a reason why we don't give the people of Manitoba an opportunity to appear before a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we are not arguing the resolution itself. They are arguing a procedural motion, to allow this matter to go before a committee of the House. Mr.

Speaker, their conduct betrays the confusion that exists within the Conservative caucus. It betrays the kind of dilemma that they have in respect to this issue, in respect to their federal party. Mr. Speaker, the public will understand the government in its desire to get on with having this matter before a committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker, let them balk. Let them continue to filibuster, because that's what they have been doing. They will pay the price for that, Mr. Speaker. We know that we are responding to the needs of the people of Manitoba. We want this matter to go before the committee, and we're prepared to hear them and hear whatever constructive advice they want to give us. They don't want that to happen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. S. LYON: He's at least got some integrity.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I must admit that it is with some sadness and near discouragement that I rise to take part in this debate this evening. I have been in this House long enough to know that heckling is part of the tradition of this House, but I hope that heckling will not be used tonight to prevent me from expressing my deepest and strongest feelings.

HON. S. LYON: Go ahead, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is also a certain tradition that, especially on some occasions, where members of this House, sensing that a member has a particular interest in a subject, will allow him to make his remarks and his speech without interruption. I hope that this will be such an occasion this evening.

Mr. Speaker, until now, I have purposely kept a low profile on this question not because of lack of interest, but rather because it was presented as a legal question, and I felt that the Attorney-General and the Premier were giving it the leadership that it needed. But today, I wish to participate in this debate.

In the past, on occasions such as these, I have always felt that I should deliver at least some of my remarks in French to show that I believe that I have and I possess these rights, to show the interest. It was a symbol also. But this evening, I feel that it is more important to really be heard and be heard today, not wait for a translation. So I will say my few words completely in English, Sir.

Let me assure you that I do not intend to start name-calling or insults at this time. I'm confident that if the members of this House try to listen with a bit of understanding, with an open mind, that they will indeed understand somewhat better and maybe be inclined to change their decision in this or maybe even support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Many statements were made in this House, but the one that I consider to be the most germane to this debate, the one that I consider to be the most impressive and to the point was made by the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association in his letter to the Premier on July 12, 1983, and I would like to quote from that letter, Sir, because we all received a copy.

"The Manitoba Government Employees Association fully supports the reinstatement of the constitutional

language rights that existed in The Manitoba Act of 1870. Had those rights not been abrogated, there would be no need for the potentially divisive debate on this issue today. We further support a limited extension of those rights in the provision of practical bilingual government services."

This is actually, Sir, what it's all about, the reinstatement of constitutional rights that were abrogated in 1870 and 1916. It is reasonable to assume, Sir, that all rights granted to Canadians were increased, were at least improved over a period of 75 years to 90 years. I am sad, and I am saddened by some of the words of our own people who seem to think, well, we had something, make darn sure we don't give them any more than that. That was repeated and that seemed to be the defensive. That's all it said, in 1870, that's all the right you had, and time was supposed to have stood still where everybody else would improve their rights, but time would stand still for a certain group of our population.

You would think that any fair-minded Canadians and Manitobans would want to make amends for the irreparable damage that has been caused to this group of our Canadians and Manitobans, but instead, will say what's the minimum we can get away with? What did we take away 90 years ago? Maybe we should give them that if they beg enough, Mr. Speaker.

In 1916 the Norris Government abolished certain rights in Manitoba. Thousands of Franco-Manitobans had to regress back to zero. This injustice had to be rectified and it was recognized by many great Manitobans, many Manitobans that did an awful lot for this province, and I would like to quote at this time, Sir, from a progressive Manitoba Premier, the Honourable Duff Roblin, who stated on May 4th of 1959, the year that I was first elected to this House, and I quote from Mr. Roblin: "We know that Manitoba is a bilingual province since its creation. We believe that this character must be further developed. My will is that all Manitobans one day will be able to speak English and to speak French."

A MEMBER: Who said that?

A MEMBER: Duff Roblin.

HON. S. LYON: You used to call him a gutless wonder.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I implore this House to let me make my remarks in peace for a little while; it won't last that long. If it doesn't convince the Members of this House, allow me to quote from the Tribune of October 21, 1965, Sir, reporting a speech made by Premier Roblin, the then Premier, in Trois Rivieres, and again I'd like to quote. "Premier Duff Roblin of Manitoba said here Wednesday night that in the long run both French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians face the same fate if they can't get on together - absorption by the United States. Mr. Roblin said Canada must have a new constitution, not just a patch-up, which would recognize not only individual rights but also national rights. By national rights, he explained outside the meeting, he meant French and English language rights, such as bilingualism in government services and use of the mother tongue

official language, English or French, as the principle language of instruction in schools.

"Without French Canada, the Premier said, Canada probably isn't viable because it would then be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a Canadian culture distinct from that of the United States." Even Mr. Crosbie, almost 20 years later, recognized publicly the bilingual character of Canada. Mr. Mulroney, Sir, the present national leader in the Conservative Party — (Interjection) — yes, and a man who could well become the next Prime Minister of Canada, endorses the words of Mr. Roblin spoken nearly 20 years ago, and certainly endorses our action in this resolution.

Certainly it should not be the intention of the Manitoba-wing of this party to be out of step with the Conservative Party and their new leader. The Western Canada Concept movement is gearing to run candidates here in Manitoba. After resisting the Quebec separatists, are we now going to allow the western separatists to take over this province? Surely not. We must unite to resist them and to keep them out of Manitoba and, in order to keep them out, politicians of all colours must provide the proper leadership needed at times such as we are going through now.

Let me now try to make a few points. We are told that it is the Legislature's responsibility to protect the rights of its citizens and not the courts. Do you think for a minute that had these rights not been guaranteed by The BNA Act, Sir, that we would be talking about reinstating them today? Who do you think abolished these rights? It wasn't the courts, it wasn't a dictator. No, it was a duly elected provincial government, a Legislature such as we have now. I don't think, Sir, that they called a referendum to ask the people of Manitoba if they should take any rights away. I don't think that was done; I don't think that they even had a resolution. I think just a government decided, duly elected government decided, to take rights away. Is it any wonder, Sir, that we now are saying we've had enough, we don't want it to go back to zero again, and again, and again?

We want, we insist, we want our rights enshrined in the Constitution. Is it any wonder? Is that being divisive, is that rocking the boat because we want to be protected, rights that we lost, that somebody took away from us? Sir, one of the things that saddened me is the words of the Member for Niakwa, I think it is, the member that spoke this afternoon, because I consider him as very very sincere, very honest, and I know that he thinks he's right on this and this is what hurts. It is the patronizing tone that he gave this afternoon saying, yes, I do agree. I recognize that these people had rights and that those rights were taken away from them. I recognize that, I recognize all these rights, and I want to give them these rights, but gradually. Gradually, bit by bit, it'll come. I know they've waited a hundred years or so, but what's another 50, what's another 100. That, Sir, is patronizing; that, Sir, is wrong.

Then he was saying that because there was a resolution to enshrine them and guarantee them in this Constitution of ours, well then that would be divisive and, if that was done, people would turn against the Franco-Manitobans.

It's just like saying to somebody that has been jailed for 90 years, and then they find out that was unjust, well, take your time. You've waited a hundred years,

wait a little while longer; your time will come. You have your rights but don't rock the boat. Those are not rights, Sir. If those are privileges that were given maybe you can take your time, but when your rights are taken away from you. What happened to our people? What happened to Franco-Manitoban people? Maybe you can point out the small numbers that we have left; maybe you can see people in this House with French names that do not speak French, not because they don't want to, but why did they lose the French? Because of the rules.

It is true that we've had to hide our books when the inspector came; that's absolutely true that we couldn't even teach French as a subject for years and years, Sir. We are saying, but be careful, don't give them any more than they had 90 years ago; make sure you don't because it's the end of Manitoba. You're going to destroy Manitoba, you're going to hurt the people of Manitoba, and this is what we keep hearing, Sir.

Can you fault Franco-Manitobans for then insisting now that rights taken by politicians should be enshrined in the Constitution? We certainly do not want to beg forever. Is that what is wanted by some of the members of this House, that we must beg? You know, sit up and beg, and maybe we'll give you your rights, gradually, in time. That is not good enough, Sir.

We are told then that a referendum should then be held. Can you imagine, Sir, Abraham Lincoln asking for a referendum on slavery? Should we abolish slavery? Do you know how far he'd go? Yes, by then the Doerns of those days would probably have said, well all right, you're going to lose the election, and that is probably true. I have no doubt, Sir, that referendum, the way it is going now, it's so easy to be negative and to divide, so easy.

I have no doubt that many referendums would say, no. Is that what these people across are saying; ask the people, they will decide? We all recognize, every single one of them that have talked on this have recognized, yes, you have rights, and those rights were taken away. That's unfair, but if the people say, no, sorry. Is that what politicians are supposed to do, take a vote on anything?

Could you imagine a referendum on Medicare before we had Medicare? Could you even imagine a referendum on Autopac, Sir? And you can't tell me that those did not have much more of an effect on many more Manitobans than this. They will not know that this exists, those that are criticizing, because nobody is trying to force it in anybody's mouth. Nobody is trying to force it on anybody. These are rights that we wish that we would have.

Was there a referendum, Sir, on the right of women to vote? Would that have passed? Would there be any referendum that passed when the elitists are saying, no, we like things the way they are, don't rock the boat. They would be the majority, the majority of voters.

We heard, take your time, the coloured people, it's coming in the states. Why is it coming? Because a few people probably had to be shot and some people rocked the boat to bring the attention, to go to the conscience of some of the people, some of the Americans, and this is what is happening now.

What is all this thing about having a referendum, going to the public? The people have been talking about that for over a hundred years, Mr. Speaker, what's

another few months going to do? Give more time to try to incite the people that say, resist these people, the French Canadian in Manitoba want to take over; 80,000 of them would take over from a million people. What a ridiculous statement, Sir.

Right now we would take the rights that were taken away from us 90 years ago. If you want us to stand still; if you want us to beg, we'll beg, but give us these rights, those rights that we've earned that are ours. Maybe I'm not a very good Manitoban, but I come from seven and eight generation Canadian, and I also fought in the war and I'm as good a Canadian as anybody in this province, I'll tell you that.

There comes a time, Sir, when a responsible politician must take that responsibility, not count votes. At least the members on this side of this House have talked about reasons, and I believe they're sincere. They might not be right, I might not agree with them. The Member from Hollywood, yes, Hollywood, because he's an actor, the Member for Elmwood, Sir, what did he say? Did he say anything about the rights? He said you're going to lose the next election; everything negative. There's a man who I am not going to comment about him not being on the Cabinet, I always felt that this was a difficult decision to make and a difficult thing to take, and I would find it very difficult, I will not hide that. I certainly will comment on his action now of trying to say this is not something, this is strictly expediency and that's all it is. That, Sir, is a coward's way of doing things and I don't belong in that and I don't want to spend much more time on it.

Now, we're told by this member, well, I believe in those rights. I was in a play "Le Malade Imaginaire." I think if you translate that it was the "imaginary sick." That's what he is, imaginary sick.

It is, Sir, certainly false to claim that because a minority is being granted rights that the majority is automatically going to lose something. What is this great fear? It is rather, Sir, much to the contrary, much like the former Premier Roblin said, and that is why so many of the ethnic groups, the other groups feel, yes, by granting these rights we know that we will have our rights protected, also, and then the majority also know that their rights will be protected. When you haven't got the guts — (Interjection) —

Then, Sir, there was a statement made that the government, in moving this resolution, is going to gain brownie points. Sir, I defy you to find anybody in Manitoba that will say that, other than the Member for St. Boniface, anybody can win points; they're going to lose points. They're going to lose points because it is so easy to be negative, to destruct, to knock down, instead of building. That's a little tougher and it takes a hell of a lot more guts, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Sir, that together we can provide the leadership, the leadership given by Roblin in 1967 when Bill 59 was passed; leadership given by Schreyer and the members of the day in 1970 when Bill 113 was passed. Then too, Sir, we said the same thing. I know, this is one of the main reasons I came in politics, this is one of the main reasons why I changed parties. Yes, I was called an opportunist, and I was, and I will be again if I have an opportunity to serve the people that send me here; to try to get back important rights, I certainly will do it, even if it meant crossing the floor; I don't regret that at all, Sir. I heard the same thing then, you

know, we were fanatics, and it was political suicide. How many times have we heard that, political suicide on the French bills? Remember the days, the first day in 1955 when I brought in a resolution making French a teaching language. I was called every name under the sun. I was a fanatic. In 1965, why did I rock the boat, everybody was satisfied, why did I rock the boat? It was political suicide if anybody gave anything.

Sir, there was a vote on Bill 59, there was a vote on Bill 113; they were both unanimous. I never heard of one person losing his seat because Bill 113 or Bill 59 was passed. Unanimous yes, granted a few ducked the vote which is their right, but those that stood were recognized in this House unanimous and, in those days, it wasn't much more; it was a little better than now, but it wasn't many votes that were unanimous, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the concerns, one of the reasons that there is trouble is that unfortunately new immigrants coming to Canada, and immigrants that later become Canadians, do not understand the true character of our country. This is because no one has taking the trouble to educate them. In 1967 or so there was a resolution on immigrants and I stated, at the time, that the important thing - I think that there was a member, Mr. Lisiman from Brandon at the time was saying well, a ceremony was important and there should be all the pomp and splendor because it was something great to become a Canadian. That's true, Sir, but I added, in those days, that what I thought was greater is the people understanding what a Canadian was.

When they came from Europe or other countries they came to Manitoba here. Nobody told them that there weren't in the United States or the same kind of country, that there wasn't a melting pot here, that they had to their culture, their language and everything just at the border and that there were two official languages, Sir. If that had been said, you would not have people such as my friend from our back seat, going around and telling these people that your rights are being taken away; look what they are doing for a group that a smaller than you.

And, Sir, what are those rights? We're talking about Canada. Somebody - which is his right, again, the Member for Niakwa - said that he was a Manitoban first. I feel that I'm a Canadian first, Sir, and my concern is not just the 80,000 Franco-Manitobans, it is across the country. That is when we'll have a united country, when we will not only just tolerate - you know the way we talk and this paternalism that I hear around this House - that we will be tolerant; we want you to take your place in the sun, be a good boy now, Larry, and we'll let you sit with us. I want to see the day where I will be accepted for being a Canadian such as anybody else not as a favour because I'm Franco-Manitoban, that I should be a second-class citizen and I should be told by one of my best friends, one of the people that really recognize my rights, but be told nevertheless, take your time, gradually, you've waited 100 years, wait again. It'll come if you're patient. In the meantime, we might lose another 40,000 and eventually it won't mean much. I'm not too sure about that. I think that's why we're still alive because we had to fight, Sir, because we had it hard, because we had to hide our books and it became something that was worth something because we had to fight so hard for it.

I think that these immigrants that we're talking about were not well-informed as to the makeup of Canada,

the fabric of Canada and the history of Canada prior to the establishment here. Too often the immigrants to our country feel that they have no other way of perceiving Canada any different, that Canada is part of North America and very similar to the United States, as I stated a little earlier.

Also, I think I covered that one, this is actually the most ridiculous statement that I've heard. The statement that Franco-Manitobans would take over the Province of Manitoba. We're told that we're not too many; why are you raising so much fuss; you're not worth it; you're not up - but then in the same breath we're told we're going to take over Manitoba. These are the things that are said. They'll take your jobs, people like Doern here said that. These are the things that we are given the impression that if you're given your rights, then you'll move in. You'll take all the jobs in Manitoba - wasn't that said? - that's said every day right now. That's said in information that's going out.

Let's stop for a minute and think. What would be so awful for a person who wants to make a career out of being a civil servant - I'm not talking about a secretary or people in some kind of research, I'm talking about a few that are trying to make a career out of serving Manitoba as civil servants - that they should require eventually to know both official languages. What is so bad about that? I want to hasten to say, Sir, that I'm not suggesting that anybody should be . . . I don't believe in that kind of a policy that the Federal Government has that you're talking about people 50-55 and say, you've got six months to learn French. That is utterly ridiculous and that has done us more harm than anything else.

Mind you, my priority is not even in this. The priority, if I have my first choice, I would say that French would be a language that would compulsory in all our schools here in Manitoba. I think that's the way to go. I think if we started like that - it's the same thing that we're talking about prejudice. The Leader of the Opposition in one of his speeches was saying that people hate, and people do that. I hope to have for another occasion that poem that I used in a speech once before and I remember one line so distinctly when we're talking about prejudice, and say if our children have prejudices it's because of us. I think you probably remember the line, "You have to be taught to hate . . ." and it goes on and on. Those are the kinds of things, Sir, that I'm worried about.

I'm sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat today because I wanted to direct my remarks to him through you, Sir, because I've known him for a long time. I don't really know what's the matter with him these days; I don't really know - because he has changed. I remember when he was the echo of the then Premier of Manitoba that he was talking about the rights. I remember right in this House not too long ago when he was opposition and prior to '77 that he made the same statement that he felt that French should be compulsory for everybody. The first time that I suggested that was about 25 years ago or so - and then you'd have what? - that would have been the children 10 years, that would be 35 years of bilingualism, we probably wouldn't be any need to be here at all because it would be second nature; it would be part of education; it would be accepted like in most countries of Europe; it would be another language. It would not

be looked at as something that - even my friend from Niakwa said that he was ridiculed because he took French - it would be something that would be part of the baggage that you bring in life, and part of the things that make you that much better and that make you understand. Because you can talk to people, you can listen to them but you have to look at things through their eyes if you really want to see where they come from.

We heard today where I was talking about paternalism - that phrase, that sentence again that gets me every time it's spoken - "Some of my best friends are French Canadians." I know it was meant in the right way but I never take those sentences the right way - some of my best friends are French Canadians.

I was talking about the Leader of the Opposition and I really refuse to believe that he's anti-French because I've heard him before. I think that he's been getting a bum deal in that but I think that he owes it to the public of Manitoba to say what this is all about and I think that's where we should have the discussion. If he wants to be consistent and if he wants to say, you know it, Larry, I've been against this business of enshrining rights, I was against the Bill of Rights, well, from his attitude the people don't know where he comes from. The people don't know where he comes from and they think that he's against French. If he stood up and said, yes, those rights were taken away, yes, that was unjust, yes, right away. We wouldn't have to go to the public, it would be less misleading. Then he can say, I'm consistent, I'm against it as a question of principle; then we would go back to the argument of a few years ago.

A few years ago, by the way, Sir, I don't remember that there was a referendum. A few years ago, we were told this afternoon, that this is such an important thing, it's going to change Canada forever and a day. We were told then, we were fighting to have a principle enshrined in the Constitution, other provinces were going along. Sometimes I think I have doubts that that is absolutely all gravy or all perfect to have in the Constitution; I've seen things happen.

I'll grant the Leader of the Opposition that he might have a point, certainly that he thinks he has a point. But why do we talk about that and why then are we not strong enough and fair enough and honest enough to say, three or four years ago when we talked about enshrining human rights in the Constitution - I also had a little pamphlet, he would say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I sent that pamphlet before even coming in the House. I didn't discuss it in the House at all; I went to these meetings in Ottawa and I told them where Manitoba stood. Then, when all this was done, I went through the motion of having meetings, having a committee and meeting in Brandon and in Dauphin and in areas like that. What is so different?

Why don't the members there stand up and say, yes, you're right, like one of the members tried this afternoon. Why don't they stand up and say, yes, those rights were there and you should have those rights reinstated exactly like the Government Services people are saying. At no time do I remember that we said we're not going to look at any amendment, I've never said that anytime that people have asked. What we've said, what the Attorney-General said was that we would have discuss with some of these people to see if it

would go along. Now why? Even then it doesn't say that we cannot go ahead and change things even if they don't agree, but we have to talk to them first because there is an agreement that if that is done, they will not proceed with this court case. What's so wrong about that?

The then Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, tried to make a deal with Ottawa in those days - all the provinces - in somebody's kitchen somewhere when they got rid of Levesque. They tried, everybody tried. What was so different then? Was that less important? Wasn't that affecting 80,000 - not 80,000, a lot of them are not going to use this, maybe 20,000 maybe 30,000? We're told today that there's no prejudice; prejudice doesn't exist anymore; that's a thing of the past. How little he understands. The rights are there to build the schools. Go and see, every time the Minister of Education, time and time again, when we were in opposition a few years ago - and now the people are going, okay, forget the school question. The school commission and the Minister should stop these schools. How hard it is not even just for Francophones, but for people that want to learn French in these total immersion schools. Look at how hard it is to build these schools. No, Sir, we'll have prejudice here for a long time as it is all over what we're dealing with human beings. I have prejudices, I'm sure. But what if we try not to act on these prejudices, if we do our best. Then you would have united people. It's not these resolutions that divide the people, it's what's in your heart, Sir. Do you tolerate people? Do you accept them? Do you appreciate them - which is even better and I'd like to be appreciated.

I was talking about teaching French where it would become second nature to all the children here and eventually they would all be bilingual. I think, as I say, if that was done we wouldn't have to fight or to go through what we're going through now. This is a question, I think that it was the former Member for Inkster who made a speech in this House that everybody applauded because he said in those days - my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, and I were on the same platform years ago before he even entered this House, if he remembers, it's probably the first time that I met him face to face in Thunder Bay, it was Fort William in those days, with Rev. Gary Miles, where we spoke to the Christians and Jews. We all agreed in those days and we talked about that and we said exactly that same very thing, give these people their rights and it'll give more rights to this third group that ask where do they belong.

Sir, I've never, even in those days when it was popular talk about bilingualism and biculturalism, I never believed in biculturalism, it was always multiculturalism and I had no trouble with these groups at all. I was the Minister responsible. Then again, I was told about political suicide when I organized the Manitoba Mosaic because we wanted to show that it was indeed a mosaic, not a melting pot. We don't believe in the melting-pot theory that they have in the United States. I certainly want a Canadian culture and a Canadian culture is this mosaic, this patchwork, this quilt that we see that's made up stronger when we have all these cultures, a little bit of everything, and that together makes the Canadian culture and the Canadian people.

As I said, and I believe it, I think we have reasonable people. At times we go crazy, it's like a zoo. But I've

had no trouble speaking to anybody one-on-one and it's expected we're not going to give anyone around here a free ride; we're going to come hard. I expect that; I do the same thing. But I think, all in all, that we are honest and I think that this is a very important time for our country and for our nation and this is not a mistake or a slip of the tongue. I'm not talking only about the Province of Manitoba or St. Boniface, I'm talking about our country. The Federal Conservative Leader knows it also. It was obvious and that was encouraging, I watched that leadership convention, where they felt that they have to recognize all the people and I was impressed. I think that we would be going backwards, it reminds me in the first days that I was elected in '59, the trouble and the speech and the Leader of the Opposition knows very well - he was there - the difficult time that we had and we saw it through. But now we're going backwards with this. We're going backwards because some people are saying, have a referendum. They're not saying, we want to educate the people; they are saying the people won't want it, give them a chance to organize so they can fight it.

Surely, you must have more confidence in yourself that you don't want that kind of trick to move over on the side. Certainly you must think you've got enough ammunition without resorting to that, without making me a Franco-Manitoban, the fall guy again that you want to go to zero again. I'm not interested in going to zero; it was too hard. This right, we gained it. When I started in this House, French as a subject was taught from Grade 9 only, from Grade 9 as a subject and when they went to Grade 7 - go and talk to the people, political suicide - then it went to Grade 4, and finally they started teaching it in kindergarten, that was fine. But then it was French as a teaching language - that was the very end of it all; you were going to destroy the province. Nobody would do that, political suicide. And Duff brought it in and people stood together shoulder to shoulder; some didn't like it, but it passed and there was no fight.

This is what I see when he talks about leadership. Was it any different then? It only takes one person. That is why I say this is a cowardly way of doing it - one person to wave the flag and say these people are going to destroy your country, your province. There are always some rednecks . . .

Sir, in closing I implore the members of this House — (Interjection) — sit down.

MR. R. DOERN: Sit down yourself. I rise on a matter of privilege. I will not stand here and listen to that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyler: Order please, order please. The Member for Elmwood on a point of privilege.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to express myself or not? I certainly do.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I said he was cowardly and I think it is a cowardly act, Sir. I'll repeat that again and again and again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Sit down, you're out of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, am I recognized? I've been called some names. I want to reply to that. I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood on a point of privilege.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is telling a falsehood. He has stated a falsehood. I have never in my life been against the French people; I have never in my life been opposed to the French language. I am, Mr. Speaker, opposed to the government's policy on bilingualism. — (Interjection) — That is not the same thing. I ask the Minister to withdraw . . . I rise now on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Member for Elmwood please take his seat? Order please, order please.

The Member for Elmwood did not have a point of privilege.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Member for Elmwood please state his point of order precisely.

MR. R. DOERN: The point is that the Minister has made false allegations. He has attempted to smear me in this debate. He has told untruthful things, and I ask him to retract those statements which he cannot in a million years demonstrate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Health to the same point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I stated . . .

A MEMBER: What statement do you claim to be misleading?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Will you shut up a minute? Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I stated strongly that I felt that there was a reason why the stand of the — (Interjection) —

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order cannot be raised on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I stated that I felt, although I did not agree with everything that the Conservative Party stated or said, that I felt that at least they were consistent. I felt that the actions of the Member for Elmwood were cowardly. I don't have to retract that, it is my feeling, if he wants to debate that, if he wants to claim that it isn't, it is certainly his right.

I won't stand up on a point of order. I'm saying that it is cowardly way of doing it and I stand by that, Sir. I think that I have just a minute or so, and I was saying that I would — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood to the same point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member attempted to smear me. He has used the words "bigoted" and "cowardly." I ask him, as an honourable member, to retract those statements. I ask him to retract them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: To the same point of order, referring to Beuchesne in the 5th Edition at Pages 110 and 111. "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions:" - over on Page 111 - "coward." Sir, if there was ever a time when it was parliamentary to use the word "coward," this was it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Minister of Health to the same point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Minister of Health to the same point.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, my point, Sir, is that we have a difference of opinion. I do believe that the action dealing with this thing, the action of the Member for Elmwood of being cowardly, and I say so. — (Interjection) — Eh?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I simply say this. The Minister may have a big gut, but he has no guts on this matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to thank all members for their contributions to this. I would refer, specifically, to Page 111 of Beuchesne where the word "coward" and its derivatives, which I would assume would be included, are ruled to be parliamentary expressions.

The Minister of Health has one minute remaining.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I've signified a while ago that I had a minute or so and, again, it's the same deal that we try to give the leadership on this. Let's fight, if it's a question of principle, that if a party or group or an individual does not believe in enshrining any rights, let's say so, but let's make it clear to the population of Manitoba that we are not fighting - at least these two parties - on the question of re-establishing and giving the rights that were taken away from the Franco-Manitobans.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

A MEMBER: There's no question. It stands in the name of the speaker.

A MEMBER: No, the Speaker ruled that.

A MEMBER: No, the Speaker did not rule that. You'd better get the Speaker back in here, we're going to have another . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I thought the Speaker's Ruling was very clear.

HON. S. LYON: Well, you think wrong most of the time.

HON. R. PENNER: The Speaker said that the Member for Gladstone had begun her speech. The matter hadn't been called again, the Member for Gladstone not being here to complete her speech, then that's it; it cannot be stood. — (Interjection) — No, it cannot be stood. It is clear, that is right. What he said was very clear, namely, that she had begun her speech. He made that as a ruling. That being so, when it's called again it cannot be stood without unanimous consent and there is no unanimous consent.

HON. S. LYON: Well then, you'll get some bells maybe ringing.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Virden to the same point.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, it's surprising how terrible the hearing of the Attorney-General is. The Speaker, in making his ruling, stated that the Member for Gladstone had begun her speech . . .

HON. R. PENNER: That's right.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . and the debate stood in her name unless, by unanimous consent, somebody else wished to speak, but it still stood in her name.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?
The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that the member in whose name this resolution stands is participating in the business of the Legislature in the other committee which has been ordered for business tonight. Because she is participating in that item of business of the House, she is unable to be present to participate in this item, Sir, and it would be entirely inappropriate and out of order for the government to force this resolution through at a time when the member is not here because she is participating in other business of the House.

HON. S. LYON: Totalitarianism, it's called, behind the Iron Curtain.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There seems to be some dispute as to what the Speaker's Ruling was originally. The Speaker will be summoned tonight to repeat his ruling in order that we not have to wait for Hansard to appear tomorrow.

A MEMBER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a dispute as to what the Speaker's Ruling was earlier tonight. The Speaker will be summoned to repeat his ruling so that we don't have to wait for Hansard tomorrow.

MR. B. RANSOM: If you guys think you're going to force this through, you've got another think coming.

HON. S. LYON: You can't break your word and get away with it, not with honest people. Now they're going out to try some other manipulation. You have no morality and your word is no good. Act like an honest man, you get treated like an honest man; act like a liar, you get treated like a liar.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please, order please. I'm informed that the transcript of this evening's Hansard has been requested and is not ready at this moment but is expected to be ready very shortly, within a matter of minutes. If the House is willing to await the arrival of that transcript, it will perhaps satisfy the House; otherwise, I will have to rely on my memory as to what happened at that time.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: May I suggest that we wait for Hansard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: On the question of the adjournment of the committee that I believe you're speaking about, could we be satisfied, Sir, that the government is not merely manipulating an adjournment of the committee and telling the public to go home to suit their own purposes in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not the question that's before the House.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, that sleazy kind of approach may commend itself to the Leader of the Opposition; it doesn't to us.

HON. S. LYON: Then I'll be happy to be assured, Mr. Speaker, that the public will be heard in a normal, civilized way and that these people won't try to manipulate the committee as they try to manipulate everything else in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is not a sitting of the committee that is at stake at this point; it was what the agreement of the House was when the debate on the resolution began in the Chamber.

That being the case, the House will recess for a few minutes until that transcript is available.

**RECESS
SPEAKER'S RULING**

MR. SPEAKER: In regard to the difference of opinion that occurred in the House before our recess, I have now obtained a very rough draft of remarks that were made shortly after 8 o'clock this evening and I would like to restate the ruling that was made at that time and point out some of the remarks that were made to the House.

Just after the motion was called, the Honourable Government House Leader said, "Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, although the Member for Gladstone's name appears on the Order Paper, she did not in fact adjourn the debate — (Interjection) — Well, she rose, but she did not adjourn the debate. However, Mr. Speaker, we would not want her to lose her opportunity to speak, and any other member there can rise and speak in the debate. We would not, in any way, use the fact that she did not formally adjourn it, to have her lose her right to speak."

There followed a matter of points of order there and I then made the following ruling on the matter.

I said, "Order please. A resolution has been called, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Since that honourable member began her remarks just slightly before 5:30, she has begun her remarks. If someone else speaks in the meantime, then the honourable member would be speaking twice if she came back to resume her remarks on it. It is then a matter of leave of the House. Unanimous consent would be required to allow some other member to speak on the motion."

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain said, "Mr. Speaker, we're quite prepared to grant leave to have somebody speak on the motion if the Government House Leader would stick to the agreement which we arrived at two days ago."

It was my clear impression at that time that, since the Government House Leader had given his leave to have the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone and it's clear, from the last statement, that the Honourable Opposition House Leader also gave his consent. It would then seem that leave was in fact granted, as noted earlier in the evening.

Will the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill 3?

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND
READING**

**BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS
OWNERSHIP ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park. The Honourable Member for River Heights has 15 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the Government House Leader had given any indication

that he was not going to allow this matter to stand, therefore, we ask that it to stand.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, we are not granting leave to have it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted to have the matter stand. Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To have the opportunity to speak to Bill 3 is always an opportunity that I would not wish to pass up. I have but a moment to get some notes ready. Mr. Speaker, allow me to begin by saying that it was probably an act of generosity on the part of the Honourable Members of the Opposition in moving the six-month hoist on this particular bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very often that traditional motion or amendment is made to a bill to do two things: (a) to allow a government to find a convenient way - and, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the importance of it - a way to save face, a way to back off from the immediate debate of the situation in the Chamber and in the calmness of the time allotted to him when this House finally prorogues, to reconsider the bill itself, and in a convenient way just to forget about it if it's bad legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the option that this government should seize upon, by virtue of having the opportunity presented to them by the opposition in moving the six-month hoist on Bill 3. Mr. Speaker, I am of course, the first one to acknowledge, admit there's another reason for moving a six-month hoist. If the bill has some merit, but needs some substantial modification; if the bill, during the period that it's been presented publicly to this Chamber and has been debated at some length, and during the course of that debate a number of arguments have arisen that overwhelmingly suggest to the government that the bill is in error, that it is faulty, that it needs major modification, why then, Mr. Speaker, again the government should seize upon the opportunity of a six-month hoist and improve the bill. If they're too proud, Mr. Speaker, to accept the suggested modifications, the suggested changes to that bill, and I'm a human being, I'm a politician, I know that that happens opposite to time to time, it's hard for honourable members opposite to accept good advice from this side of the House.

I can accept that that is a human weakness that perhaps we all share from time to time, but, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely why such time-worn, but well-used traditional measures are introduced from time to time, in this case the six-month hoist. The government can take two avenues; my first advice is drop the bill, forget about the bill. I said in my remarks when I spoke to the bill itself, and I challenged honourable members opposite, I challenged the Minister of Agriculture, who is he getting the mail and the pressure and the advice from to proceed with this bill?

Mr. Speaker, it was an issue in the early '70s, and even into the mid-70s. That was a period of time when there was an issue, and I remind the honourable members opposite that their government acted upon it, to some extent, when they were in office during the

years of '69 to '77. Our government made it a somewhat better bill, a much better bill but, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that the issue, in itself, is not there anymore. One of the fundamental reasons advanced by the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister that's bringing in this bill, for having this bill before us is that it's supposed to keep the price of agricultural land down; it's supposed to keep the price of agricultural land of escalating too fast so that young Manitoba farmers have access to that land. Well, I'm glad to hear that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture now says no, no that's not the case because, of course, that's no longer an issue, Mr. Speaker, agricultural land has dropped in price in the last number of years. — (Interjection) — Yes, it has.

Mr. Speaker, if he would just simply get out in the country, if he were to talk to some of the realtors that deal and sell rural farm land I can tell the Honourable Minister that land that sold for \$600, \$700 an acre five, six years ago is selling for \$400 and \$500 an acre today, so that one major cause for introducing this bill simply doesn't exist anymore. But even more important, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the stats that we use, and which we acknowledged at the time we used them were not necessarily 100 percent accurate, although I have a lot of confidence in the work that a large number of secretary-treasurers working in municipal offices who know their people; who know the land that they are responsible for, for collecting taxes; who know when a tax bill is sent to a numbered company or corporation whether that is, indeed, an offshore corporation, or whether that is somebody living in Winnipeg, or whether that's somebody living in Brandon. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has signally failed to refute the figures that the opposition on its own, with limited resources, with the co-operation of municipal people, brought to bear on the debate on Bill 3. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister has been embarrassed to have to acknowledge that most of the statistical information that he has leaned on in support for the reasons for Bill 3 is hopelessly outdated and superficial at the best. I believe it was a report done by several researchers, professors at the University of Manitoba, back in 1976, and those are the kind of figures, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about in Bill 3 when, in fact, we at least have 1983 figures at our hand that shows municipality by municipality the extent of the problem that we're dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, mind you I always have trouble with this government because I've been in government for awhile and I've been in this Chamber for a little while and, by and large, most of the legislation that governments had to deal with, any government, an NDP Government or a Conservative Government or Liberal Government, but most of the legislation that is brought forward into this Chamber is here because it's perceived, by the Government of the Day, that there's a special need for. It's here because of special pressure put on, lobbying put on by the group that's involved with the legislation. Mr. Speaker, we pass all kinds of amendments to various professional acts, for instance, because if the Law Society comes to us and says to us, we have some amendments to proffer. It's an act that governs our profession, we want to press upon the Government of the Day to make the necessary changes. Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg will come

to this House fairly regularly, just about every Session, and say we need amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act. The councillors, the mayor and those people that are involved in running the City of Winnipeg make that request of whoever is government that day.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing can be said, as I said, for most pieces of legislation. There are exceptions, there are some specific matters that, for instance, a party may have boldly enblazened on its election platform when it goes to the people and it says it will do something. Mr. Speaker, I have always acknowledged in this Chamber that, for instance, the creation of Autopac was one such piece of legislation. It was an election promise, part of the NDP election platform in 1969 when they fought that election and they brought in that kind of legislation. But, in the main, Mr. Speaker, the kind of legislation that we're dealing with day in and day out is a response to what's perceived to be a legitimate request by an interest group. Our job of course is, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that it doesn't just serve that special group, but that it, indeed, also serves the public interest; that we don't bestow upon special minority groups very specific rights, sometimes self-serving rights as they can well be in the case of closed societies. We have to make very sure that it serves the interests of the broader community.

Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to believe that in most cases that's the way legislation comes into this Chamber, up until of course the other night when I had the misfortune of having to listen to a vast majority of cattle producers in this province bring to the attention of this same Minister of Agriculture, and this same government, their opposition to Bill 90.

Mr. Speaker, I am still somewhat baffled, by why a bill like Bill 90 is before us, . . .

HON. S. LYON: Oh, because the reds wanted it.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . because, Mr. Speaker, it has not been requested; it is not serving the interests of the vast majority, 93 percent of the cattle producers in the Province of Manitoba; and it is destroying a worthwhile organization that the cattle producers of Manitoba worked very hard to put together. Mr. Speaker, all it is is a piece of vindictive legislation of the kind that I have seldom seen in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is often accused of being pro-business or anti-labour. I remind the honourable members opposite that as you would expect, after two full terms, eight years of NDP administration, an awful lot of labour legislation was passed during those eight years that we didn't particularly agree with, and we didn't think was particularly conducive to the best of labour and management relationships in this province but, Mr. Speaker, we were never that vindictive as this Minister of Agriculture and this government was. We didn't throw out any of that labour legislation in the four years that we were government, and we aren't that kind of vindictive people.

HON. S. LYON: We're not reds, that's why.

MR. H. ENNS: Besides that we also have a little bit of capacity to count, and why willfully go against

organized labour, even if it's represented by somebody like Dick Martin who professes every opportunity that he has, his opposition to my party, my government when we were in office; but we would not vindictively kick him in the shins or the labour unions by repealing and tearing apart legislation that helped to develop and build the labour organizations in the Province of Manitoba. That's what the Minister of Agriculture is doing on behalf of 3 percent of the cattle producers, 3 percent of the cattle producers who have the right to receive every cent back from that cattle checkoff. All they have to do is send in a letter. Maybe that procedure can be modified somewhat, but there is that option clause for them to get out; but for that reason he is bringing in Bill 90. Mr. Speaker, how is he bringing it in?

I should apologize to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I'm not being totally fair to him because really, in this instance, it was the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Brokenhead, that was doing it. It's not fair really to lay this on the Minister of Agriculture and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Hansard to record and strike the remarks that I made in the last few moments about this Minister of Agriculture - I'll get back to them in a minute on Bill 3. But let there be no mistake about it, and there's no mistake about it in the minds of the cattle producers that sat there on that evening, about who was running the show and who was being vindictive and why. Because they were instrumental in not bowing to the wishes of the then Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Brokenhead, in various nefarious schemes that he tried to foist upon them when he was Minister of Agriculture back in those days of 1973 or 69 to 77.

Well, Mr. Speaker, coming back to Bill 3. Mr. Speaker, I knew that you were concerned that I might not be touching on the subject matter under debate.

My only reason for diverting to Bill 90 was because, normally, I can understand a government responding to a special interest group, in this case we are talking farmers. But, Mr. Speaker, as in Bill 90, this Minister - and now I'm talking to this Minister - he is again wilfully and stubbornly and pigheadedly going against the interests of the very community that he professes to serve. Mr. Speaker, on Bill 90, the Manitoba Farm Bureau was there asking him not to do what he was doing to Bill 90, in fact, a telegram was sent from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, representing agriculture across the country, asking him not to do it, and 93 percent of the cattle producers of Manitoba asked him not to do what he was doing, but he was not listening.

Mr. Speaker, on Bill 3 the Manitoba Farm Bureau, which is the farm organization, representing by far the majority of farm interests in Manitoba, have asked him not to pass Bill 3 in its present form. Those of us in this Chamber who represent, by far, the majority of farmers and farm producers in the Province of Manitoba, are asking him not to proceed with the bill, as it stands.

I simply can't comprehend why this government is determined to proceed under these circumstances. It's like asking the Minister of Education to proceed with a bill that the teachers don't want, that the trustees don't want, and the parents don't want. But I look at the Minister of Education and deep down in my heart I know that she would not proceed with that kind of

a bill. She may have to pick and choose, that's part of the problems and responsibilities of Ministers, sometimes you have to pick and choose when you're going to favour, in her case, the trustee's position or the teacher's position. I would like to think that she should always favour the parents and the children's position, but you sometimes have to make these hard decisions. I'm going to solicit her support because I think maybe she has been rested and she looks revitalized and prepared to play her full role in Cabinet. I simply want her to use her influence and ask the Minister of Agriculture, her colleague, why is it that he's persisting in passing this legislation that the Manitoba Farm Bureau doesn't want, the farmers don't want and, furthermore, will add nothing but further divisiveness within our society which the dear Lord knows is being divided sufficient enough.

It now, all of a sudden, makes it impossible for my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, to operate the farm the way he wants to operate his farm and, Mr. Speaker, that speech coming from the Member for Turtle Mountain has to be recorded, along with many other good speeches that were made from this side of the House, as being perhaps the most rational, logical, explanations of why that particular piece of legislation is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, it's wrong what this piece of legislation does, even in this agriculture field, that we further balkanize Canadians, that we all of a sudden don't acknowledge that people coming from Saskatchewan or from Ontario are Canadians.

On another matter, another issue, perhaps the issue that's before us in this Chamber, we are asked to be very concerned about the whole question of unity in this country, what makes Canada tick; but this same government, this same Minister, is not prepared to, in a fundamental situation like the purchase of land, ownership of property, decide when somebody is a Canadian and when somebody is not a Canadian.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the reason, I fail to see the arguments of the present Minister for this bill. The Minister, and very few spokespersons - I always have trouble with it, spokespersons, spokespeople - very few of them have made any significant contribution to the debate on Bill 3. We've heard from a few of them, but, Mr. Speaker, none that will refute the kind of arguments that were heard from this side of the House; none that will make it logical to interfere in such a Draconian way, in the way that the Ransom farm corporation, for instance, wants to run their farms, that family is by no way unique.

In fact, more and more successful farm operations involve two or three brothers; a father with one or two sons. They are the kind of farm operations that ought to be encouraged in the Province of Manitoba, but aren't by Bill 3.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 3, unlike the constitutional amendment that we are being asked to pass in this House, is of course somewhat different.

HON. S. LYON: Have another strategy meeting, Andy. You're so good at it.

MR. H. ENNS: At least the farm community knows that with a sane and reasonable and common sense

government we can make changes to this legislation in this Chamber, and they will be made within two or three years, unlike the promise that we can make, or we can hold out to the people of Manitoba that that would be possible all that easily - well we know it won't be that possible - on the matter of the constitutional resolutions that we're being asked to pass in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly ask the Minister of Agriculture who, as I told him the other day in the committee, I always have compassion for any Minister of Agriculture in this province, having had the privilege of being one myself. One of the privileges of being a Minister of Agriculture is to be able to walk through the farm community at their different functions, their different fairs, to be able to meet the cattlemen in the back rooms of the exhibition grounds where the cattle are being groomed for their shows, something like that, and to be acknowledged and to be welcome. You know, Mr. Speaker, rural people are very hospitable people. They will welcome, want to welcome, at all times, their Minister of Agriculture, and I have no trouble in calling the present Minister my Minister of Agriculture; and when I walk through the barns with him at the Lunder Fair, or at Stonewall, or Ashern, the Brandon Royal, I'd like to have him welcomed as the Minister of Agriculture, not necessarily acclaimed for his politics, but as Minister of Agriculture I'd like to see him welcomed.

Mr. Speaker, I can't understand the Minister of Agriculture in deliberately pursuing a course of action that makes that difficult. How many cattlemen, that sat through that fiasco the other night, will truly and honestly welcome him on any fairgrounds on any circuit in Manitoba?

HON. S. LYON: They want him in the dunk tank.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the amendment before the House gives this Minister an opportunity to recapture some of that integrity, some of that kind of basic acknowledgement that rural people, farm people, are prepared to give their Minister of Agriculture if he would accept the amendment that we are proposing. It's not necessarily an amendment that calls for a total withdrawal of the bill; it calls for six months to reconsider the bill. It says, and we have said to him very specifically, don't discriminate against the corporations, the family corporations, Manitoba family corporations; don't make somebody living in Arborg a foreigner, or in Stonewall a foreigner. That's what this bill does. If somebody lives in Winnipeg, wants to buy farm land, he is a foreigner, he's treated no differently than somebody living in Pakistan, or living in Iran, or living in Ireland. That is utter nonsense, and if you think that can't be explained, and that story can't be told in rural Manitoba, then keep on asking yourself why you have no rural representatives on that side of the House.

So consider the bill. Mr. Speaker, this is the longest Session in history in Manitoba. The Minister can think of 101 excuses - I'll provide him with a few - for accepting the amendment as we've put it before him. He can say, in view of the long Session we've had, in view of the tremendous things we are doing for Manitoba, we're going to ask them to pay for half our election expenses next year, we're going to do many

other things. I just haven't had time to put my attention to my mind to making this bill the right bill it ought to be, and I'm going to accept the Tory advice. I'm going to take six months and make it into a better bill. They've got so many ads to write; they've got a bit more time to get the names right on some of the ads they sign. There are 101 reasons why this Minister could now say, look I'm just going to need a bit more time, I'm needed. In fact, quite frankly, I suspect if the Minister of Agriculture will right now caucusing with some of those other fellows that are mucking up this House all the time, there may be some common sense prevail in this House.

Get in there with the Member for Inkster, and the Member for Springfield, and the Minister of Natural Resources and get some order into the business of running this House. Mr. Speaker, that's another reason. Mr. Speaker, put your mind to helping your House Leader and your other people to running this House for a little while, and I won't hold it against you if you haven't had the time to look after Bill 3 right now.

A MEMBER: Put Muriel in charge and things will run smoothly.

MR. H. ENNS: You've got 101 reasons, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. Why can't you simply say honestly to yourself and say, yep, I'm going to reconsider Bill 3, I'm going to accept the opportunity, because, Mr. Speaker, that's what it is, it's an opportunity that we are offering the Minister of Agriculture and this government on Bill 3. We keep saying it but it's wrong, we keep saying in the quiet doldrum days of the summer, of course, the quiet doldrum days of summer are fast disappearing. It'll be fall and early winter before we have that time that I'm talking about that this Minister would have time to make Bill 3 into a better bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated to us that he is prepared to consider some amendments. Mr. Speaker, why hasn't he floated out some of these amendments? Goodness knows, there's all kinds of people that haven't used their occasion to speak on Bill 3 on that side. If he doesn't want to appreciate, if he doesn't want to do so himself, then he can certainly call on some of those other agricultural experts like the Member for Gimli, the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs, who is always on top of all these things agriculturally speaking. He could certainly pick up and help the Minister of Agriculture out just for a moment and show us that, in fact, perhaps some of the arguments that have been made on this side of the House have prevailed on members opposite, and that they will be considered for inclusion or improvement in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, honourable members don't always appreciate. We have not opposed the basic principle in the bill; we have never opposed the basic principle of the bill of suggesting, yes, there is some need for some control on the speculative foreign buyer where that could in some way be damaging, hurtful to the cause of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. We have suggested to the ministry different ways that could be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I think, in all seriousness, this Minister ought to consider those suggestions. Mr. Speaker, it's

possible, it is entirely possible, that this bill, the Minister of Agriculture, we could pass Bill 3 unanimously in this House, we would all be supporting that bill. I want to tell the Minister that. The Minister of Agriculture right about now needs a little lift you know. I'm prepared to try to make that possible. Mr. Speaker, why not take advantage of that genuine offer. Why not sit down and negotiate with members of this side of the House some acceptable amendments . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Why not grab your chance at history, Bill.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and then come out of this House with an acceptable bill, a bill that will essentially do the job that we want it to do, but a job that will not divide, will not discriminate, and will not be harmful to the long-term interests of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, you know what worries me is that one gets the impression that either the Minister didn't take time to really consider and listen to some of the speeches that were made on this bill but, more importantly, you know it's kind of incumbent that the Minister, if he hasn't got the time himself, but that he delegates some of his senior staff and say, okay - Mr. Speaker, I'm not naive, I'm not suggesting that the Minister has to agree with everything a member from the opposition says, but some of the speeches that were made were extremely well thought-out researched speeches. I single out two, in particular. I already mentioned the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Member for Morris and others.

Can he stand up in closing debate on this bill and say and suggest that he has had staff look at those speeches, staff refute or accept some of the arguments advanced, some of the positions advanced in those speeches? Can he at least say that he has studied and give us reasonable, rational arguments for rejecting those proposals?

Mr. Speaker, that's part of the business of debating bills. Mr. Speaker, one does sense - I've always been able to sense when I've advanced a position that hasn't been all that strong or that can be attacked and is attacked and attacked effectively, whether one admits it always or not. But one knows when one hears good positions being advanced particularly on a bill that is of technical nature, a bill that talks about how land is to be owned, how land is to be exchanged, how land is going to be made available to the farming community. These are after all not, should not be, issues of great ideological passion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Minister and I make this very sincere offer to him. Out of the divisiveness that we've seen in this House, out of some of the acrimony that we've seen in this House; this Minister could rise above it and come up with a bill that would be supported unanimously in this House. It's still possible, Mr. Speaker, if he would be prepared to take some of the offending passages of that bill and modify them; if he would be prepared to recognize Canadians as being Canadians throughout this country and if he would take to heart some of the very serious recommendations that were made on this side of the House. It's possible, Mr. Speaker, for this Minister to come out of this long Session ahead of the party.

Mr. Speaker, first of all to drop the pretensions, and at least acknowledge some of the politics of it. Mr. Speaker, we have never presented these figures as being gospel. We said they were our best attempt and the best attempt on the part of a lot of volunteer help, a lot of volunteer support; in this case, much of that volunteer support came from municipalities. The Minister has never refuted these figures and the Minister has not come up with better figures. Mr. Speaker, disappointingly enough is that the Minister has never even acknowledged nor thanked the opposition for going to the work, nor thanked the municipalities for supplying this work to the House to the Chamber. He is prepared to work with outdated 1976 figures when we have provided into the debate 1983 figures which shows the problem isn't there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my preference is that he withdraw the bill.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am a man of compassion, great generosity and a great deal of human understanding. I know that a Minister of Agriculture cannot be constantly seen to bend to the will of the opposition or to retreat.

HON. S. LYON: There's going to be a lot of retreat in the next week.

MR. H. ENNS: The Minister of Agriculture has the opportunity of salvaging Bill 3 in a manner that could serve the interests of the farm community. He also has the opportunity of getting acceptance of Bill 3, if he will but listen to some of the sound, rational, logical, non-ideological advice that has been given to him on Bill 3 during the course of debate on this matter.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, accept the six-month hoist. Give him the time to do that thinking.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's always somewhat of a handicap to speak and make comments as eloquently and as well-put-together as the Member for Lakeside, especially at this time of the evening it becomes even more difficult, but, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject matter which is very dear to the hearts of my constituents and I welcome the opportunity to speak to it.

Let me start off by saying that, as enunciated by the Member for Lakeside, I as well as my colleagues, are not opposed to the aspects of the bill which purport to tighten up on the foreign ownership, the foreign speculative ownership of farm land in Manitoba. If someone is living in Switzerland or in Germany or in France and does not intend to move here, does not intend to farm that property himself and become a resident of Manitoba or Canada, I fully believe that there should be restrictions put on those particular

individuals. As part of government that had that philosophy, we strengthened that particular bill and if this particular government feels that there are certain areas which they feel should be again strengthened, fine, so be it, and I will not argue that cause. So let it not be said that the opposition is against this bill because of those changes to the foreign ownership within Manitoba. That is not the case. Our objections deal with the provisions of the bill which will now make it impossible for Manitobans in certain areas such as corporate areas, as well as Canadians to own farm land in Manitoba.

The government has somewhat of a dilemma with regard to this bill, and really it's not the government, it's the Minister of Agriculture, and I, having served on the Treasury for four years, know the dilemma he's got. He introduced this bill last year and then, because of a lot of public outcry, did withdraw it. He withdrew it and I have to give him some credit, Mr. Speaker, he did make some improvements to the bill, and I would suggest to the Minister there would be no shame if he were, once again, to stand up and indicate to the people of Manitoba that, maybe if I take this bill back once more and make some more amendments we can have even a better bill; and I would suggest that if he doesn't do that, if he doesn't take that advice, he's committing somewhat of a political suicide with regard to this particular legislation.

If the opposition wanted to play just strictly crass politics with this, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that we should just let this bill pass, because I can't think of a better issue to go to the electorate with the next time around and say, look at this piece of legislation that was put in place by the New Democrats; look what it's doing to Manitobans; look what it's doing to Canadians, and when we form the government we will repeal this piece of legislation. It is tailor made for a brochure during the election which is sure to grab a significant number of votes away from the New Democrats in the next election.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister that being a member of Her Majesty's Royal Opposition, being a responsible member, I have to say to him that if he were to withdraw some of those offensive sections in the bill which limit the number of people that can own farm land in Manitoba, I think that he would be doing, not only himself a service, but the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain the other day, while speaking on this bill, showed the Minister of Agriculture, in cold, clear logic, what will happen if this bill is passed to his family corporation. The Minister knows very well the problems we are having with definitions in the assessment department today. We are seeing in the assessment department that if over 50 percent of your income comes from off-farm income you then have your residence and your farm buildings assessed. The Minister is now saying in this act if a family farm corporation, if the income of those individuals that run that farm corporation, from the off-farm income, is greater than 50 percent, they are no longer farmers and cannot buy any more farm land. Mr. Speaker, that's a ludicrous position because we have just gone on hearings throughout the province showing what kind of a real problem the municipal assessment determinations, with regard to percentage

of income, has caused throughout the width and breadth of this province.

You have had cases where people who have been in the cattle business, who have lost substantial amounts of money, have started to take a part-time job like driving a school bus, and suddenly have found that their off-farm income is more than from their cattle, and here they're working to try and pay off their debts by working off the farm, and suddenly, to add insult to injury, what happens is the tax assessor comes along, he asks for the income tax return, bang, suddenly he gets his farm houses and farm buildings assessed and he's in a worse position. He couldn't make it before and now we're going to take even more money from him, and these are some of the inequities in the assessment field that this Minister now wants to transfer into this particular bill.

I say to him, I really don't think that anybody in his department, nor he or any members of the caucus, have really sat down and thought this thing out. If this bill passes in its present form a farm corporation of two, three brothers and a father, who experience some financial trouble, face two droughts in one year or lose their crops for some reason, who are then forced to find employment off the farm to subsidize their farming operations for a year or two, will find that, under the act, they can't even acquire any more land.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture really believes that the farming community out there wants this type of legislation, then I say to him he knows not of what the rural people and the farming population is made of, because they don't want it. Representing a rural constituency with a lot of mixed farming, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had one person say this is a good bill. I have had many calls about asking whether it's really true that they will be limiting the amount of land that a Canadian or a Manitoban can own. That is of concern to my people and, as pointed out by the Member for Lakeside, one of the things that I just don't understand about this piece of legislation is the Minister of Agriculture should be really representing the true concerns of the farmers; and does anybody think for one minute that the members on this side of the House would get up and commit hari-kari by speaking on a bill and opposing it, if all their people were for it? I mean, what does he really think is going on?

We represent some of the major farming areas of this province, as a matter of fact, most of them.

HON. S. LYON: He's satisfying the reds.

MR. R. BANMAN: I want to say to the Minister that it is time, with regard to this bill - I know he has been put in the spot of withdrawing it once and it's very hard, he's trying now to save face - I think it's time he swallowed a little bit of his own personal pride in this matter and then go ahead and do what is right for the people and the farmers of Manitoba; and the right thing, Mr. Speaker, is to either withdraw the bill, hold it over six months, put in the proper amendments and then bring it back into the Legislature next Session. As I mentioned before, he withdrew it last time, he did make some good amendments but, if he maybe takes it one step further, withdraws it, makes the amendments, brings it back next time, who know, he might have a

perfect bill and we can all support it and we won't have this type of debate going on.

I want to say to the members opposite, and I want to reiterate a few of the things which I've been saying in the past. The thing that really bothers me on this bill is the total lack of any facts or cold, hard figures that the Minister has not produced. In other words, he really has no statistical basis on which to justify this bill. I mentioned several months ago, when speaking on the original bill, that I had talked to the municipal people in my area and, in particular, the secretary-treasurers, and one of the municipalities that really pointed out the thing that I'm going to once again reiterate, that the government didn't have any statistical information and really is doing this on a knee-jerk basis, is the RM of Ste. Anne.

Let me just spend a little bit of time with regard to that particular municipality. The Minister, in a letter to the Leader of the Opposition back in November of '82, said that the percent of farm land owned by absentee landlords was 22 percent. Now, last time when I spoke, I indicated that the foreign ownership of that municipality was only .2 percent, and that the Canadian ownership - in other words people living outside of Manitoba - was 2.1 percent for a total of 2.3 percent of the total municipality was what the Minister indicated was an absentee landlord. He said it was 22 percent. He was only like about 100 percent out, that's all, Mr. Speaker.

The question that was asked of me at that time by the Member for Springfield, he says, well, what's your definition of farm land, and how did the municipal secretary know what was happening. In conversation with the secretary, he indicated to me that the municipality consists of about five townships, some 115,200 acres, and that the information which was provided on this particular documentation that he forwarded was based on the 1983 assessment roles. He used the definition of farm land and interpreted it as the municipal assessment branch would, and therefore used the Code 4 definition of farm lands for the purpose of the information.

To determine whether the people were foreigners, they used the addresses, because it's impossible to determine whether the numbered companies are owned by foreigners or not. The amount of land owned by the companies that were not familiar with them is very minimal, because we all know that the majority of secretary-treasurers that have served some 20-25 years on these municipal councils are very very knowledgeable about the properties and their ridings and could tell you - all you have to do is give them a legal description and they can tell you almost off the top of their heads who lives there and who owns the property.

Mr. Speaker, the individual also told me that some lands were owned by an American who lives in Winnipeg, and therefore they put that particular resident in the non-farming category. The total farm lands in the municipalities under the Code 4 municipal assessment figures, total farm land in that municipality is 85,018.42 acres. This farm land is broken down as follows: non-resident foreigners own 157.26 acres of farm land, or .2 percent of all land in the municipalities. In the letter the Minister of Agriculture sent out to my leader, he says 22 percent were absentee owners, and we're talking about .2 percent. Non-Manitoba resident

Canadians own 1,784 acres of farm land, or 2.1 percent of the farm lands in the municipality.

Mr. Speaker, in the RM of Ste. Anne, which the Minister said was owned 22 percent by absentee landlords, the actual figures according to the 1983 assessment roles is 2.3. Out of that, Mr. Speaker, only .2, not even 1 percent of the farm land in the municipality, one-fifth of 1 percent of the land in the RM of Ste. Anne, the farm land, is owned by non-resident foreigners. Here he gives us a document saying that percent of land owned by absentee landlords which indicates that they're foreigners, 22 percent.

Mr. Speaker, he has gone ahead and brought in a bill under the pretext of information that is totally inaccurate, and is not factual. I suggest to the Minister that before he proceeded with a bill like this, he should have asked his departmental staff to get the facts. My goodness, he's got people on staff there making \$30,000 - 40,000 a year, making more than any other members of the Legislature here, and surely to goodness, they can dig this type of information up for the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I could deal with the RM of La Broquerie which has another history with regard to foreign ownership and reiterate the figures in the RM of La Broquerie. His figures are also totally wrong there. So, I say to the Minister that, first of all, he started off with regard to this bill with totally inaccurate facts, and how then can he proceed with this particular bill?

I have to say to the Minister that in light of the facts which I have just brought forward, I cannot think of any other reason for this bill, and for the Minister's unwillingness to deal with certain amendments. I believe that the bill has to be a deliberate attempt to try and restrict the private ownership of farm land in this province. Why else would he bring in a bill of this type, why else would he?

The poll which I conducted in my riding asking my people to indicate whether or not foreigners should own land, whether Canadians should be able to own land in Manitoba and whether Manitobans should be able to own land, Mr. Speaker, a very good sampling of it indicated that well over 98 percent believe that foreigners, in other words, people living offshore if you want to call it that, should not own farm land in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly the reverse when it came to Manitobans being able to own farm land in Manitoba, or believing that Canadians should be able to own land in Manitoba. My constituents, and the Minister of Agriculture should take this to heart, my constituents in a rural constituency say that Canadians and Manitobans should be able to own farm land in Manitoba. I wish he would really sit down and talk to some of the farmers with regard to this bill because that is the real feeling out there.

The other day we had - I guess if you're in opposition you look for everything that could possibly dissuade a government from making a bad error and trying to make good legislation and I thought it was kind of interesting the other day when a press release came onto my desk - a group that hasn't been, I think, very responsive to much of the legislation that I've been involved with from time to time because they're fairly critical and they're not known particularly as our allies, I don't think, but in this particular instance they are. I think the Attorney-General has seen fit to give them

a little bit of money, I think something like \$25,000 to keep them going, but the Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties is now taking issue with the Minister on this particular bill. Well, now he's got it coming, not only don't the farmers want it, not only do the people in the villages and the towns in rural Manitoba not want this piece of legislation, now we've got the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties saying, hey, we think that this could possibly contravene the Charter of Rights, conflict of mobility rights section.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting now, all of a sudden, we have a group who is concerned about this bill also. Here, Mr. Speaker, you have an indication of the type of opposition, not only from the farm community, but also from other segments of society which are funded by members opposite or by the people of Manitoba who are now also expressing the type of opposition to this bill which many people are concerned about. One really has to wonder what the priorities of this particular Minister of Agriculture are. Is it really that he wants to get into confrontation situations with the farm community? Is that really the role of the Minister of Agriculture in this province? It was always my belief that the Minister of Agriculture in any government was there to express and bring forward the concerns of the farmers in this province, and he should have the interests of the farmers at heart. Mr. Speaker, it is so important to have a strong Minister of Agriculture because we have now already found out, and especially in that group across the way. They are basically urban based right now. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield doesn't agree, over 20 members of their group come from urban areas. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield says, non-Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I don't consider the Member for Thompson an expert on agriculture; I don't consider the Member for Flin Flon an expert on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that this province needs a strong Minister of Agriculture because the balance of power is shifting to the urban areas, and if we do not have a Minister of Agriculture, in whatever government there is, who is strong, who stands up for the rights and for the interests of the farming population in this province, the farmers are in trouble. What we are seeing here is a Minister who is not talking to the farm population with regard to this matter, and with regard to a number of other issues that are before him. He is not putting the farm issue before the members of his caucus; he is not representing the true feelings of the farming population in Manitoba, and this bill is a classic example of what I have just said, because the majority of farmers, by far the largest majority of farmers in this province, do not want this bill, do not need this bill.

The Member for Lakeside indicated that farm prices were dropping. If my memory serves me right, when the Minister of Agriculture was talking and introducing this bill he says one of the prime reasons we're introducing this bill is that land prices have been escalating and this is going to bring them down. Well, let me tell him that farm prices are dropping everywhere, land prices in my particular constituency, very close to the Member for Springfield's area, close to the landmark area, land prices that were up three years ago at \$850 - \$900 an acre are now at \$600 - \$625.00. I just saw a parcel sold the other day the farmer

indicated that he could have had \$850 an acre two years ago and he now sold it for \$625.00.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't because of this bill, it was because there have been problems in the farming community, the high interest rates have affected the farmers, the cost of productions have escalated to the point that with the low returns they are receiving it just is practically impossible to pay the kinds of prices that were being paid two, three years ago and people just aren't doing it.

So I say to the Minister his stats are wrong, this bill is not based on statistical information. Mr. Speaker, this is not a bill demanded by the farm population; it is, as a matter of fact, opposed by the farm population. This is a bill that is opposed, not only by farm population, but by the majority of residents in Manitoba who do not want the right taken away from them that they cannot aspire to some day owning some farm land. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not, in its present form, acceptable to the opposition because it is not acceptable to the people, and that's what it's all about, that's why we're here. I say to the Minister my remarks today are based two-fold; No. 1, to represent my constituents and their wishes here; and No. 2, to represent what I believe, personally, is the wrong-headed approach that this Minister is taking with regard to this bill.

It is not a good bill; it needs some amendments; I implore the Minister to bring in those amendments; tighten up the areas where you think there are some loopholes dealing with foreign ownership; but do take this bill, have a good look at it and allow the Manitobans to own farm land in Manitoba. If they want to set up a corporation, if they want to arrange their family business in such a way that the accountant says it's better because of tax structures, because of problems that they might have for estate planning and things like that, if it means that is what they should be doing, fine.

But I want to say to the Minister that I will support him. If he brings in these amendments, which reduce or do away with these offensive sections of the bill, I will have no hesitation in supporting him in this bill, and I might even have a few good words to say about it. But the way it sits right now, nobody wants this bill, and I think that it should go back and be redrafted.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I believe the hour is about 12 o'clock and I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make an issue of this, but from the point of view of the precedent of the House I believe that it is the case that a person who had just spoken ought not to be the person to adjourn debate. If somebody over there wants to adjourn, let somebody else move the adjournment. — (Interjection) — No, or adjourn the House.

HON. S. LYON: When you've been here a bit longer and you've stopped listening to the passing wind, you'll find out what the rules are.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have the precedence of at least 1974 and '73 which allow members to both speak in debate and to move adjournment of the House.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is that the House do now adjourn.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you would please explain to the House the situation. This is a new sitting of the House.

MR. B. RANSOM: No.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm raising that as a point of order. You may rule against me, Mr. Speaker. The sittings of the House, as called for in the rules, call for a sitting of the House that begins Friday at 10 o'clock in the morning. It is now Friday, slightly past 10 o'clock in the morning, this is a new sitting of the House.

It is my distinct recollection on precedent that has been made by the Speaker in Ottawa, which I expect ought to be persuasive in this House, is that when a matter of the adjournment of a previous sitting has been allowed to stand that it dies automatically with the coming into being of a new Session of the House. This is not a Session by leave, this is a Session by the Rules of the House. It seems to me that when we go into a new sitting of the House, which this clearly is, and you put a question of adjournment which should have died with the dying of the previous Session - because there cannot be two Sessions which take place simultaneously - if you were to make that ruling, Sir, then indeed we are going to have this House held up to the mercy of anyone who wants to take advantage of a procedural wrinkle and hold the House to ransom and hold the business of the House to ransom.

That ruling would be very very serious indeed, and it seems to me, Sir, that would be a great error if you were to follow a new precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: To the same point of order, Sir, following on the logic of the Attorney-General, I would point out that the rules also call for adjournment of the House at 5:30, but if there is a motion on the floor and a vote being taken at the time, the House does not automatically adjourn at 5:30. The House does not then adjourn until that motion is dealt with, whether that is a substantive motion or whether it is a motion to adjourn, Sir.

I therefore suggest that you are correct in calling for the vote to end the previous sitting that will then allow us to proceed with a new sitting of the Legislature in

order that the government can reorder the business and call the referral item, for instance, which they would probably wish to call again this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: The Opposition House Leader fails to make, in my view, the distinction which must be made, and that is a distinction between a procedural motion and a substantive motion. — (Interjection) — I believe that to be the case, and I believe that to be the thrust of what you are now ruling, but perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will withhold further comment until I have the benefit of the ruling that you are in effect making. You are making a ruling by implication. I think it would be helpful if that ruling were spelled out because, as I have understood it, when you come to the end of the previous Session and there is nothing but a motion to adjourn, then it's impossible, it seems to me, logically, that that motion to adjourn a Session which is no longer in existence can be put to a new Session of the House. How can that be?

MR. B. RANSOM: A further point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, I note, Sir, that the Orders of the Day which are before us are for yesterday, for Thursday, 8:00 p.m. No Orders of the Day have been distributed for Friday morning, July 29th, Sir. We clearly are still in the sitting of 8:00 p.m., Thursday, July 28th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: Surely, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be suggested seriously that the tail wags the dog, that by the happenstance of some official not having put before us an Order Paper, the fact that the Order Paper isn't here then dictates that we do not have a Session of the House when the rules call for a Session of the House. I would again benefit from your ruling or explanation as to why it is that we do not have an Order Paper in front of us to begin this Session which is called for in the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an Order Paper dated Friday, 29th of July. It's true it was not on my desk here in the House; it was distributed in the caucus room, but it has certainly been printed and is available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health to the same point.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, as far as I am personally concerned, I was part of a group that tried to arrive at an agreement to expedite the affairs of the House. Now, I can't comment

on the battle or the misunderstanding, whatever you call it, that happened yesterday; I wasn't privy to that. But my understanding was very clear that we and, in fact, the members of the opposition were suggesting that we should go and make sure that we had the Speed-up Motion. The Speed-up Motion has to have some flexibility and it is to be able to sit longer, to sit on Saturdays and so on.

Now, if we have a situation that at any time the minority decides that they're going to adjourn the House and then they let the bell ring, which in effect is adjourning the House, there is no way that we're going to conduct any business. I want to say that what was said yesterday, and that's true that at the time the members of the opposition said Bill 3 and this bill and so on, we're going to do everything we can to take our time because we feel you should have that between Sessions. We recognize that, but that is certainly their prerogative.

But here, the only way we can combat that is by saying you're not going to adjourn it any more or by closure, and that should be respected also. Then it's a question of you wait people out, make sure that they're speaker until it comes to a vote. If not, all hell will break loose again; there won't be any co-operation at all. I would suggest that we try to co-operate. We've had enough name-calling for a while now, I think, and that we co-operate now.

As far as this agenda, if we're going to co-operate, it's very easy to say, with leave, we suggest that we take Thursday's agenda; I don't think anything was passed, and we go from there.

A MEMBER: We've got Friday's here already.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, if we have Friday's, then there's no problem. It was just that currently it wasn't distributed in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert to the same point.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments to try to assist you. The Speed-up Motion passed on Monday of this week, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the House have leave to sit from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., and in the evening from 8:00 p.m. It goes on to say, "and the rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment to be suspended." Mr. Speaker, it is therefore within the prerogative of the government to call sittings at those particular times; but the Session called at 8:00 p.m. in the evening does not end until it is adjourned. That Session, Mr. Speaker, from last night could continue on and on for days until it is brought to an end by a motion of adjournment, and it's completely within the prerogative of the government. Therefore, according to the Speed-up Motion, it is necessary that a vote be called on the question of adjourning the Session which began last evening at 8:00 p.m.

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

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, the way I understand it, there should be a distinction between a procedural

motion to adjourn the House sitting itself and if there is an adjournment on a specific topic of debate. If the adjournment takes place on a substantive motion and the Session has not yet ended and the bell rings, the bell can ring forever. But if the bell-ringing is on a procedural motion, such as a motion to adjourn the Session, certainly the validity of that delay can last no longer than the end of the Session. The end of the Session is certainly at the point in time immediately before the new Session begins; so that the Session last night ends immediately before the new Session this morning begins. A spring cannot rise higher than its source - it follows that no subsidiary motion in a particular Session can last longer than the Session itself. Therefore, that motion to adjourn last night has validity only - the ringing of the bell has validity only up to the very point in time when that Session ends. That Session ends when, according to the resolution on Speed-up, we have three separate Sessions. The one that we have now is an entirely new Session which begins exactly at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, surely the Member for Fort Garry is not serious. Theoretically, if he was right, we would have a situation that in effect that . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . the Member for Fort Garry has not been allowed . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sorry, sorry, the Member for St. Norbert. Theoretically, you would have a situation that the opposition, the minority in this House could recess the Session. They could have a motion; it would go on forever and let it ring for three months. You would have a Session if the government wanted to call an election, they can adjourn the meeting, ring the bell for a year, or something. You know, this doesn't make any sense at all and you know it. There's not going to be any co-operation with those kind of things.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: The argument being put forward by the Minister of Health doesn't deal with what the rule is. The argument put forward by the Minister of Health deals with whether or not he thinks that would be a good rule. The fact is, Sir, that what the Minister of Health points out about the possibility of the opposition being able to tie up the business of the House, Sir, the opposition is able to tie up the business of the House if they wish, at any time. What this House depends upon is the co-operation between both sides of House to order the business and, . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . Sir, therefore the proper procedure is to deal with this issue, to adjourn yesterday's sitting, to proceed with the business of the House. We will grant the government leave, if they wish,

to have the committee sit this afternoon, which the public has been advised is sitting but the House has not yet ordered, and therefore the committee cannot authorize its own sitting, Mr. Speaker, but in order to facilitate that, it's quite possible that we can grant leave for that. If the government is simply prepared to see the House adjourn today at 12:30 p.m. and the committee sit this afternoon, we'll all go home for the weekend, then come back and proceed with the business of the House on Tuesday.

A MEMBER: Good idea!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, behind the veil of sweet reasonableness lies a procedural problem of general application, which I think must be resolved and I think it is a fundamental importance to the operation of this House. Logically, a motion to adjourn a Session cannot have any force or effect when that Session is at an end. You cannot have two Sessions running at the same time. By the rules of the House, there is a Session ordered for 10 o'clock this morning. At 10 o'clock this morning, regardless of that kind of a procedural motion for adjournment, there was a new Session. There is nothing left to adjourn.

I'm calling upon you, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on the precedent that was set in similar circumstances, it appears to me, by the Speaker of the Federal House. It became necessary for her to set that precedent after a great deal of research, because the Federal Tories, from whom they appear to be learning some bad lessons but none of the good ones, were using procedural gimmicks to tie up the business of the nation. They wanted to tie up the business of the province by procedural gimmicks. That must be put an end to or this House will be in turmoil from now till heaven knows when.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think what this demonstrates is that unless there is a minimum of co-operation and common sense applied, the House cannot function. If the government is determined to drive through its bilingual proposals, it's going to be a long, hot and bloody struggle.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry to the same point.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I wonder if the member for Elmwood could explain his reference to a "bloody struggle." What has he in mind?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're on a procedural motion and not a debating matter.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader began his remarks by stating that he was looking

beyond the veil of sweet reasonableness, and I want to say that I'd like to begin mine by stating that we should look beyond the veil of sweet comparison, which is what the Government House Leader has attempted to do. He's attempted to equate the situation here with the situation that existed some months ago in the Federal House.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague and Deputy House Leader pointed out, the Government House Leader has hoisted on his own rhetorical petard as a result of his own statement when he moved the Speed-up Motion on Monday, the 25th of July. At that time, he clearly stipulated, as that motion must stipulate, Sir, and I quote from Page 4501 of Hansard: "... the rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment to be suspended." That's a direct quotation from the Speed-up Motion moved by the Government House Leader himself.

Now when he attempts to equate the situation here with the situation in Ottawa, he overlooks the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal House was not in Speed-up, or in the equivalent of our Speed-up procedures and Speed-up situation, when the episodes to which he refers occurred. They were still operating under the prevailing conventional rules of the House of Commons. We are not operating under the regular conventional rules of the Legislature of Manitoba. We are operating, Sir, under the provisions of the Speed-up Motion, which are clearly stipulated and clearly articulated by the Government House Leader himself as being rules which are suspended with respect to the 10:00 p.m. adjournment.

As my House Leader has said, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to get on with the business of the House and the business of the province in two minutes, if the government is prepared to face reality and face reason on this point and refrain from being so stubborn on a procedural matter on which they are clearly in the wrong. All we have to do is adjourn yesterday's sitting, have the new Order Paper distributed, and move in to the new day's sitting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This will be my final comment. I think you should be making a ruling. The effect of what is being said is that by the unilateral action of one side of the House, a whole Session can be wiped out because, by that reasoning, the bells would ring until 12:30 p.m. and the morning Session, as called for in the Order Paper, would be wiped out by the unilateral action of one side of the House. That is the implication of what is being suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell to the same point.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I can support your problem in this matter. It was a motion put last night by a certain member, seconded by another member, that this House adjourn. That motion still hasn't been dealt with by this House. How it's going to be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, or not, I don't see how that motion

can be set aside. I think that the Speaker possibly may have to make a ruling or we just deal on the motion, but I don't see how possibly this House can just waive that motion and say it doesn't mean anything. The motion is still on the record and it's got to be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows to the same point.

MR. C. SANTOS: To the same point, Mr. Speaker. There are only two possible ways in which a Session can end. By a time fixed for its ending, a specific time, or a motion to adjourn. According to the Speed-up Motion, we have three Sessions. One begins at 10:00 a.m. and ends at 12:30 p.m.; the second one is from 2:00 p.m. and it ends at 5:30 p.m.; the third one begins at 8:00 p.m. and it doesn't say any specific point in time in ending. But, by implication, it must end one minute before or at the very moment in time when the next Session the following day begins at 10:00 a.m. So that if we want to adjourn that Session earlier than the 10th hour of the following day, it has to be through a motion to adjourn. But the motion to adjourn is good only as long as there is a Session to adjourn. This Session terminates when time runs out at 10:00 a.m. the following day, so there is no more validity to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo to the same point.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that point the Member for Burrows has made our argument for us. He said that the only way in which the House can be adjourned is either by a time fixed for that adjournment or by a motion for adjournment and that is precisely the point. Because of the Speed-up Motion, we waive the 10 o'clock adjournment. It says: "... and the rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment to be suspended," and that's as simple as that. So therefore it must be on a motion for adjournment, that's what we have before us, and when we vote on it the matter will be settled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: One further point, Mr. Speaker, which may be of assistance to you, because it reflects the practice and tradition of the House, is that when the vote was called on the motion to adjourn last night the mace remained on the table and you technically, Sir, were in the Chair until called back to the House this morning. The mace remains on the table, Sir, and the only way that the new sitting of the House can commence is that the old one has to end. The mace and the Speaker will leave the Chamber at the time that the new sitting begins, Sir; the Speaker and the mace return to the Chamber with prayers, and we begin the Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance to the same point.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The rules clearly called for a sitting last evening at 8 o'clock.

Let us assume that we had been sitting here all night debating up until 10 o'clock this morning as we could have if nobody would have made a motion to adjourn, surely at 10 o'clock this morning, Mr. Speaker, you would have been required under the rules of this House to call the 10 o'clock Session because of the rules of this House called for a Session at 10 o'clock on Friday morning. That is the Session we are here for. It is after 10 o'clock and I believe it is as simple as that. It does not require an adjournment motion once we get to 10 o'clock on Friday morning when our rules call for a sitting. I think we should get on with the sitting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, let us appeal to reason and logic again. Let me give an illustration: The rules said the Sessions will be a triple kind of a Session. The last one began last night at 8:00, and naturally it will have to end if we have to have a Session at 10:00 this morning. If a man is dying and he is to die at 10:00 a.m. and you want to extend his life, he must have a life yet to extend, but if he has already died and it has expired, what life do you have to extend? This Session can be adjourned if there is still a Session. The Session is ended at 10:00 a.m. this morning, so what will you adjourn? There is nothing else to adjourn because the motion to adjourn dies with the Session when the Session ends.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a motion to adjourn is not debatable and we've been debating for the last 35 minutes.

A MEMBER: You started it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It doesn't matter, you said that I shouldn't dislike the rule, that we've been against the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

I thank all of those members who have spoken to this point, pointing out, in particular, that something similar has happened in Ottawa, and we do have the precedent there to look back on. We have made a study of that and the best advice we can get from Ottawa this morning is from the table there - who are able to advise us that it has occurred in the past in Ottawa that one Session has overlapped another one. In fact, there has been an occasion where two days have been called just the first day because there is that overlap there.

We remind honourable members that our rule book is specific in that it requires the House to sit at certain times and to adjourn at certain times. That is clear. However, about a week ago the House passed a motion to suspend the rules. If members will read that motion, it says that the House have leave to sit in the forenoon. It doesn't say that it will sit at 10 o'clock, it says it may have leave to and members may recall that there have been other times when the House has leave to sit under

the Speed-up Motion that it has in fact not sat and it has taken its time in some committee.

It would therefore seem to me that since the mace is on the table and has been on the table since 8 o'clock last night that the Session we are in is last night's session. When the mace is removed on adjournment, it will then be brought in for the 10 o'clock Session this morning immediately following. The question then is . . .

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Just on a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking only for a clarification of your ruling. Are you saying that once the Speed-up Motion was passed, which having been passed, the House gave itself leave to sit at these times, that on each occasion the House is called it has to do so by leave, by whose leave? Or is it simply by the Government House Leader standing in his place and announcing a Session of the House and that Session of the House is automatically ordered because the House by a previous motion has given leave? I would appreciate it if you could explain that because if the House can only sit, for example, by leave of the whole House, by unanimous consent, by leave of the opposition, then I think we ought to know that so we know where we are for the balance of this Session.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is not going to debate the ruling once given.

MR. B. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker. I was going to offer some comment that might have been useful relative to the question raised by the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me see if I can clarify the matter for the Honourable Government House Leader. I read from the Speed-Up Motion that the House has given itself leave. It is not a matter of leave of all of the members individually or one side or the other. But unless the House has put in a mandatory retirement time for the evening - it says it's suspended but it does not put a limit on it.

There is not a fixed hour any more for adjournment time until the next one appearing on the Speed-Up Motion which is 12:30 p.m. That would be a time when certainly the motion of the previous Session does become redundant, a nullity, I believe is the proper term.

That being the case the question before the House is that the House do now adjourn.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Downey, Driedger, Filmon, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Kovnats, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

NAYS

Messrs. Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Ms. Dolin, Messrs. Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Ms.

Hemphill, Messrs. Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 14; Nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3 and the amendment proposed thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

Are you ready for the question? Those in favour of the amendment?

Is the honourable member wishing to speak?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, by all means, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, as has been often said in the House, I didn't intend to speak on this matter right now but circumstances have caused me to undertake debate on Bill No. 3. Mr. Speaker, members on the government side of the bench may, from time to time, wonder why the opposition undertakes to put six-month hoists on bills and why they proceed to use the rules of the House in certain ways.

Members of the opposition, like members of the government, must face the electorate at a time prescribed by the government. When they go to the electorate, they must say to them, we are worthy of your support and we are worthy of forming the next government of the Province of Manitoba. When members of the opposition see that the government is making legislation that is not in concurrence and agreement with the majority of Manitobans, it is their right and it is indeed their duty to make that message eminently clear to the government in the hopes that the government will not bring in legislation which is damaging to the social fabric of the citizens we are elected here to represent.

That, Sir, is why we have chosen on Bill No. 3, to put a six-month hoist on that bill, to give the government an opportunity to go back to the drawing boards and to better draft legislation in the ownership of farm land so that the citizenry of Manitoba will be comfortable with that legislation and in agreement with it.

Similarly the rules of the House are there, that if the government wishes to proceed with an amendment to The Manitoba Act, the Constitution of the province, which is not in agreement with the citizenry of Manitoba and if the opposition believes that the citizenry of Manitoba are not in favour of that amendment, they can use this House and the rules that have been granted to it through the years and the history of its existence to stop passage of that amendment to the Manitoba Constitution. They do so, Mr. Speaker, members of the

opposition do so at their own peril because if they are wrong, next election the people of Manitoba will tell them they were wrong and they will go to defeat. Likewise, the government can so do that.

We believe on several issues in this House, in this Session that the government is wrong. We believe they are wrong on Bill No. 3. We believe they are wrong in the process by which they are attempting to amend the Constitution of Manitoba to make this province officially bilingual. We are simply using the tools at the disposition of any opposition to assure that the government cannot make bad legislation for the people of Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

Now, the Member for Radisson says the government has the ability to make the rules. What the Member for Radisson fails to recognize is that what he suggests, if it were true and carried out to the ultimate then we would have a totalitarian system in Manitoba, that the government, if they so desire because they have the majority could pass a bill in this House using their majority to eliminate each and every election from the Province of Manitoba and retain their office of government forever. That is what he is saying is the ultimate power of a government. — (Interjection) —

Well, he says I'm wrong. I am absolutely correct. They could come in, the government could come in with a bill tomorrow and say that they are the government of this province forever, and they have the majority, Mr. Speaker, to do that. We in the opposition they are saying could do nothing about it.

Well, what we are demonstrating last night and again this morning is that the rules are set up to avoid just exactly that happening; that a government cannot make such changes to this Chamber to the laws of this province that are totally objectionable to the people of Manitoba; that the opposition must and has to be equipped with tools to stop a government with ambitions and desires that are not in the best interest of the Province of Manitoba. We are showing you that as we were shown in our term of government by some of the members that are presently in this government when they were opposition.

They used the Rules of the House to stop a number of pieces of legislation that we proposed that they said were wrong, were bad, were not good for Manitobans. They used the rules and the techniques that are at their disposal, as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to thwart those majors and they were successful.

The Member for Transcona knows that because he was part of an effort to get us to withdraw, I believe it was an energy bill, tabled by the Minister of Energy and Mines. I think he'll recall that. They found that bill objectionable . . .

HON. W. PARASIUK: We debated it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And they debated it . . .

HON. W. PARASIUK: We debated it; we didn't run away.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And what we did - Now the Member for Transcona says, "We didn't run away."

HON. W. PARASIUK: You're running away. You ran away last night.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What the Minister is saying is we ran away last night. What I am telling him is that when we found out that the opposition was not willing to pass that bill through debate, we withdrew it because we recognized that the opposition could tie up the House and thwart us from carrying on our duties as the government of the Province of Manitoba because the opposition believed our legislation was bad.

They did that when they were in opposition; they said it was proper then. Now, when the shoe is on the other foot and they are bringing in bad legislation for the people of Manitoba and they will not withdraw it, they will not refer the bilingual amendment to an intersessional committee, they say, no, the opposition can no longer do that, even though they did it when we were government. That measure happened when they were in opposition because there was co-operation between both sides of the House. We recognized as government that the opposition could thwart the efforts of us as government and we co-operated with them, we withdrew the bill and we modified other bills to accommodate them.

But now what do we see with this government? They've got a bunch of young radicals in the backbench that won't allow their Government House Leader to make deals and stick by them. They say we are going to control this House and we are not going to allow the opposition to stop onerous pieces of legislation and matters of terribly important decisions to the people of Manitoba. We are not going to allow the opposition to stop them; we're going to ram it through. There's no negotiation with the opposition. The opposition is nothing in our eyes; we're going to beat them at every opportunity. There is no co-operation in this House. There are no meaningful discussions and agreements between our sides of the House, because it is broken down because of a gang of young radicals in the backbench that believe they can railroad this House.

Well, the Member for Transcona must surely recognize that cannot happen. He also must surely recognize when we attempted to do it as government, we were forced to back down, and it isn't easy to back down when you're government. I know it because I was part of a government that had to do it on a couple of measures.

Don't give me the phony argument that we won't debate any issue. We'll debate any issue you want to put before this House, but the government has the obligation from time to time, Mr. Speaker, to recognize when they're wrong, to recognize when what they're doing is not in the best interests of the Manitoba people, the voters that elected them. We are pointing that out to them and they will not take our advice. Well, does that mean we sit idly by and let a government pass measures that are permanently damaging to the social fabric of Manitoba? I say no, Mr. Speaker. That is not what we were elected to do in this House. We were elected as government and as opposition to pass laws in the best interest of the people of Manitoba. That is our oath of office. That is the oath of office we take when we become elected MLAs. That is what we say each and every start-up of each and every Session of this House when we pray for the passage of laws which are to the benefit of Manitobans.

What the government wants to do now is say, no, that isn't what we're here to do. We are here only to pass the kind of legislative measures that the

government wants regardless of what the future implications are to the people of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is anarchy; that is totalitarianism; that is not parliamentary democracy.

Parliamentary democracy requires the co-operation of government and opposition. When that co-operation fails, when there is no ability to get agreement, we have the kind of circumstance that we see in this Session. I am not going to say that the government is 100 percent at fault. They're only 99 percent at fault. The government has the obligation to make agreements with the opposition on the order of business on which motions can be debated and how they shall be debated, and they have to recognize that the rules are structured to protect the minority in this House. This New Democratic Party constantly tells the people of Manitoba that we are a government which will represent minority opinion and minority rights; but yet when it comes to this Chamber, they want to thwart the minority rights of the opposition because they have the absolute majority to defeat us on any measure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, generations of parliamentarians over the history of the British parliamentary system have recognized that can not lead to the survival of democracy in the parliamentary system. They have structured the rules of the operation of this House in such a way that a government cannot ram through measures which are totally unacceptable to the people. The rules are structured to allow the opposition to thwart, to stop, to stymie a government passing bad legislation.

Members over here who are veterans of this House who have been in opposition know that to be fact. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that we have MLAs like the MLA for Inkster - I'll by-pass the next one - the MLA for Radisson, the MLA for Springfield - and there is the most shocking member of the whole works of that group. He was a former Deputy Clerk of this House and saw how oppositions, if they weren't being co-operated with on matters such as the passage of Bill 3, that the opposition could stop the process of this House until an agreement was reached in accommodation with the wishes and desires of the opposition. Governments don't always win in this Chamber. I found that out much to my derision when I was part of a government and part of a Treasury Bench.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it's necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to rise on a point of order. I think that there's an obligation, Mr. Speaker, on you to direct to the member that we are debating Bill No. 3 and a proposed motion and arguments that might be advanced as to why that bill should not be read at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly pleased that you, Sir, have a greater understanding of a six-month hoist than obviously the Acting Government House Leader has, who I might say

is one of the major problems of this House as is just demonstrated now.

I am explaining to him the purpose of a six-month hoist which can delay debate, which can — (Interjection) — Well, my honourable friends over there say I never mentioned it once. I mentioned the whole process by which we are delaying the passage of Bill 3 because we believe that we have the majority of the people on our side in rural Manitoba, and I am explaining to him the rule of the six-month hoist, the process of the Rules of the House by which legislators in opposition can use those rules, such as the six-month hoist, and he gets up and says I'm not addressing the issue. I am addressing absolutely the issue of the six-month hoist on Bill 3, and why we are doing it and what the rules allow us to do. I am debating it exactly, Mr. Speaker.

So I'm sorry that the Minister of Natural Resources, as Acting Government House Leader, doesn't understand the process of opposition and, Mr. Speaker, that is understandable because he has only been in government - he was elected in 1969, part of a government, defeated in 1973, didn't run for election until this last time and once again became part of government. He has never been here for a term in opposition. He has no knowledge of what the abilities of the rules are, such as the six-month hoist on Bill No. 3, what those rules are and what their abilities are in terms of allowing the opposition to stop a government from passing bad legislation.

I'm sorry that the Minister of Natural Resources doesn't have that basic understanding of this House, this Parliament, and the rules of it. It's sad, Mr. Speaker, that he is still Acting Government House Leader. If they passed that job onto one of the veterans in the front bench, who understand the rules and who understand the essential need of co-operation between the opposition and the government, then this House indeed would be moving much much smoother. We would not be debating a Session now that has gone from 8:00 p.m. last night to 11:00 a.m. today. We wouldn't be doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker. I raise a point of order with you that the rules of this House and that the members, when they're involved in debate, have to keep their remarks relevant to the matter that's under discussion. The Member for Pembina has been involved 15 or 20 minutes in a protracted lecture on the role of the opposition, the responsibility of the opposition, only after I rose on a point of order to draw to your attention, Sir, that arguments must be addressed as to why the bill should not be read a second time and passed, the objections to reading to the passage of that bill at this time.

The honourable member has done everything but relate arguments to that, and surely if the rules are to have any meaning, the rules of relevance in debate, you should draw to the attention of the honourable member that he should address his arguments as to why that specific bill, for reasons associated with that bill, should not be proceeded and passed for second reading - not to lecture us all morning on what he

considers to be the role of the opposition, the role of the government on a wide-ranging harangue about miscellaneous grievances that he has.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources for bringing that so clearly to the attention of the House and to the honourable member. I hope the honourable member will be aware that a provision in Beauschene says that our remarks should be directed to the matter before the House, that he will direct his remarks as much to that particular motion as any other member has done.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the motion which I am debating to the Acting Government House Leader, the Minister of Natural Resources and the MLA for St. James, if he doesn't decide to leave before I can get it to him.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Uruski, No. 3, The Farm Land Ownership Act, and the proposed motion of Mrs. Hammond in amendment thereto as follows: That Bill No. 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, Loi sur la propriété agricole, be not now read a second time but be read this day six months hence. The six-month hoist motion is what I am addressing my remarks to.

In the context that a six-month hoist is but one of the tools that are given in the rules of this Chamber, which have been developed over decades, indeed, centuries, to allow the opposition tools by which they can represent their people in this House and the people of Manitoba in this House and protect those voters and those citizens of Manitoba from a government that is incompetent, out of touch with the people on the issues, from passing legislation which would be detrimental to the people of Manitoba.

The six-month hoist is exactly that. It is a procedural technique which we are willing to use, which we are using. It is one of many techniques that are there, available in the rules, to allow members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to draw and focus public opinion on the wrong and incompetent actions of an incompetent government. That, Sir, simply is what we are doing on this six-month hoist. That is something, God forbid, that will never be removed from the rules of this House, because it provides the check and the balance to the power of a majority in government from ruling roughshod over the people that they are elected to represent.

If those techniques were ever removed from the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, we have totalitarian government. We have government that listens to no one but themselves; we have a government which will dictate policy to the people of Manitoba. In Manitoba, the voters, the citizens, the people of Manitoba, did not elect a dictatorial government. They did not elect a totalitarian government and they expect this government to be responsive to their desires, their wills and their wishes. They expect this government to do their best job possible in carrying out their mandate. The people of Manitoba know now that this government is incapable of doing that, we know that. But the people of Manitoba don't want this government to pass laws which will permanently alienate people in this province,

tear the social fabric of this province, bring in legislation that is wrong, counter-productive and damaging to a sector of the economy. That, Sir, is why we have moved a six-month hoist on Bill No. 3, because Bill No. 3 was never promised by this government on an election campaign; Bill No. 3 is not in the best interest of one segment of this economy, namely, the farm economy, the most important single sector we have. This bill will tear the social fabric of this country, because this Bill No. 3 makes second-class citizens out of Canadians who are not residents of Manitoba.

Can you, Sir, think of three better reasons why we, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, should not be opposing this bill with every tool at our disposal in the rules of this House? I say, Sir, that you would certainly agree that we should oppose it, not promise to the people of Manitoba, not in the best interests of the farm community, and a bill that destroys the unity of Canada by making other Canadians aliens and foreign to the Province of Manitoba. Do we want to honestly pass that kind of legislation in Manitoba to make Manitoba a little island unto itself within the 10 provinces of Canada, to put up a Berlin wall on the west side of Manitoba and on the east side of Manitoba? Is that what this government and this Attorney-General want us to do? When do they start ordering the bricks and the mortar for the Berlin Wall on the Saskatchewan border, and the Berlin Wall on the Ontario border? Because this Bill No. 3 gives us that. Canadians are second-class citizens; they are aliens; they are foreign to Manitoba under Bill No. 3.

Here we have this government saying to the people of Manitoba, and attempt to say to the people of Canada, "We're promoting our bilingual amendment for the unity of Canada." While they say that and attempt to mislead the people of Manitoba and Canada from that standpoint on the bilingual issue, they are passing Bill No. 3, Mr. Speaker, which makes Canadians not living in Manitoba aliens, foreigners and second-class citizens. What kind of a government do we have? What kind of a purpose do we have in a government that speaks from both sides of their mouth with "forked tongue?"

MR. H. ENNS: And Elijah knows what you mean when you say that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And if these people who are temporarily in government do not recognize that the people of Manitoba know you speak with "forked tongue," know that you have no principle in the legislation you are bringing forward - especially as exemplified by Bill No. 3 - then we are simply telling you that Manitobans don't trust you. Because when we put the six-month hoist on this bill, when we use the rules of the House to stop the passage of bad legislation, including the constitutional amendment on language rights, we are putting our political careers on the line. We would not do that without public opinion on our side. We are here to pass laws for the betterment of the Province of Manitoba. I remind each and every member over there, we pray to that effect each morning, each afternoon and each evening when we start a Session. We are led in that prayer by the Speaker of this House to pass legislation for the betterment of this province.

We would break our oath to the Lord God if we allowed you to pass bad legislation. We know that you have no such concern on the government side of the House in breaking your oath to the Lord, but we happen to believe in the prayer that we make. We happen to believe in the oath of office that we took. That is why the six-month hoist is one of the tools we are using to stop you gang of incompetents from passing bad legislation in this Province of Manitoba that will inflict badly on the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are! Here we are at 11:09 in the morning - Oh, Good Heavens!

A MEMBER: Oh, Al, sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you heard the words of the honourable member or not, but he accused honourable members on this side of the House of breaking our oath with the Lord, in not respecting the concerns of the Lord in respect to legislation. — (Interjection) — Now, that's what the honourable member said, Mr. Speaker. Did you not hear that? And if you didn't hear it, I tell you, that's what he said. I ask you that he reflects on the integrity of members opposite, and I ask you to call upon him to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I did hear the Honourable Member for Pembina use words the same as, or very similar to those complained of by the Honourable Minister for Natural Resources. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Pembina will explain his intent, or perhaps he would clarify his remarks on that matter.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be pleased to do that. It seems as if the Minister of Natural Resources didn't have a very good evening last night, and he is trying to force debate in this House and stall progress in this House by his constant interruptions.

Mr. Speaker, what I indicated is that when we come in here in the morning and we say prayers, we pray to the Lord that we will pass legislation for the betterment of Manitoba. I did say, Mr. Speaker, that members in the government are breaking their promise to the Lord, and I will withdraw that for the betterment of progress in this House and the decorum of this House.

I will simply say, Mr. Speaker, that to any objective outsider, it must appear that members of the government are breaking their prayer to the Lord, when they say each morning that we are going to pass laws to the betterment of the citizens of Manitoba, when they are trying to ram down the throats of Manitobans - without consultation, without request, without public support - Bill No. 3, the constitutional amendment on bilingual services, and other onerous mazes that they have brought before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I find the situation that we have gotten to in this House to be a most distressing one. We, indeed, appear to be truly at an impasse. The government is saying to us: There shall be no more compromises. The government is saying to us: We

shall pass each and every measure that we have brought forth this Session; we shall not listen to the people of Manitoba. The government is saying that the opposition does not reflect the views of Manitobans on any subject. They are saying that they have all of the answers.

Bill No. 3 is the one we're talking about now. There are eight other pieces of legislation that are similar. They were neither promised as an election promise; they are neither desirable for Manitobans and Canadians. They are not desired by the majority of Manitobans and the government is saying to us over the past several months, we do not care what the members of the opposition say about these matters, we believe we are absolutely right, we, the government, we, the New Democrats are absolutely right. We are never wrong, we shall proceed full speed ahead, we shall not listen to the opposition, we shall not listen to the people of Manitoba, we shall pass everything that we brought into this House.

So in effect, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying to members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we will not allow you to represent the people of Manitoba in the methods that are provided to you by the rules of this House. That is what they are saying because in this House as I have pointed out already this morning, if a measure is totally unacceptable to the opposition, they believe and they know that it is totally objectionable to the majority of Manitobans. They are saying, members of the government, and it's particularly some of the new and inexperienced and radical members in the backbench, are saying that we are not going to allow the members of the opposition to use the rules such as the six-month hoist on Bill No. 3. We are not going to allow the members of the opposition to use those rules that have been in existence since the advent of British Parliament and we are going to force them and the people of Manitoba to accept what we believe is right.

Rules don't count; traditions don't count; consultation doesn't count and agreements and words given by members of the government to our House Leader don't matter because when we make an agreement and if our radicals in the backbench say, no agreement; your people who have negotiated that agreement come back and say, the deal's off. Well, the rules were there, Mr. Speaker, to allow the opposition as in the six-month hoist on Bill No. 3 to deliberately, conscientiously, with full knowledge, stall the government. What is the purpose of that, Mr. Speaker? Is the purpose of that not to deal with any other business in the House? No. The purpose of that rule is to bring cooler heads to the negotiating table so that the government and the opposition can sit down, settle their differences, make an agreement and come in here and get on with the business of the Province of Manitoba.

As long as we have a government that refuses to accept any semblance of co-operation from the opposition, that wants to break their agreements with the opposition, then we will have these kinds of circumstances. Mr. Speaker, that is not wrong. That is perfectly right and in order because that is what the rules were designed to do. The rules were designed to prevent the tyranny of the majority in the House.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this government, I'm amazed at them. They say we want to protect the minorities in the Province of Manitoba. They have no concern of

the minority on this side of the House. They speak with forked tongue on their care for minority interests. In this House, they say the minority does not count, we will ram any legislation we wish through this House.

Well, wiser heads in the history of the British Parliamentary democracy have said that such is not the case. Cooler heads, more intelligent minds, than are presently here in the presence of the Minister of Natural Resources have drawn up rules to prevent governments with members like the Minister of Natural Resources from inflicting tyranny on the Legislature, on the Parliament and on the people of Manitoba.

I thank the Lord that cooler heads have developed these rules to prevent the kind of tyranny, the kind of totalitarian action that the Member for St. James, the Minister of Natural Resources is willing to inflict on the people of Manitoba in this House. That's what the rules are for. We learned that as I have said when we were government, and we had to eat a little crow which is a popular buzz word nowadays among the New Democrats.

It isn't pleasant when you are government having to concede that you have legislation that cannot be sold to the people of Manitoba. It doesn't make you feel good to have to back down on a measure, but let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba by and large are well served by a government who is forced to back down on issues, proposals and legislation that they are trying to ram through that are not in the best interests of the people.

Oppositions don't deliberately thwart the business of the House if they don't have public opinion in their favour. Governments should recognize that. Governments do recognize that when they have some semblance of sanity in their ranks. Unfortunately this government has not that semblance of sanity in their ranks. They have a group of radicals, the new left in their backbenches and some of them in their Cabinet benches that don't care about the traditions of this House, that don't care about public opinion on issues such as Bill No. 3. They believe that they are right, that they are never wrong and they are willing to ram things through this House to the detriment of the people of Manitoba and ultimately to their political detriment because they're going to have to go to the people of Manitoba, the next election and explain why they rammed through a bilingual amendment, why they rammed through Bill No. 3 if they insist on doing it.

As I said before, we should not do anything to stop you people from ramming those kinds of measures through because they are bad. We would be best served in the opposition from a purely political standpoint to let you ram them through, let the people of Manitoba suffer the consequences and we would be handily re-elected next time. But unfortunately, there is some social conscience on our side of the House where we do not believe that the people of Manitoba, for purely political games of the Progressive Conservative Party, which not all Manitobans agree with and vote for should have had legislation inflicted on them because it's to the Conservative Party's political advantage.

It would be, no question, to our best interest to let you put these crazy pieces of legislation through. Let the people suffer the consequences for three full years until you call the election and say, we told them it wouldn't work, we should be government, we can

represent you better than the New Democrats have. But we are not here solely to protect the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba. We are here to protect the public interest of Manitoba. That is why we are stopping these kinds of bills. We are thwarting them, we are stalling them and we are doing it for the interests of the people of Manitoba. Any government that does not recognize that does not recognize it at their own peril, at their own electoral grief next election, and much to the benefit of the opposition and the Progressive Conservative Party.

So, Mr. Speaker, if they do not wish to take the advice that is given to them freely by members of the opposition, which is allowed the members of the opposition to do by the rules that are struck in this House by cooler heads and saner minds over the decades and centuries that the British Parliamentary system have been in place, that is their peril. We will let themselves destruct as a party and as a government, but we will not allow them to inflict undue harm and injury on the citizens of Manitoba. It's our job to protect the innocent people of Manitoba from a totalitarian group over here that wants to ram through bad legislation, and we will do it. We will do it with every rule available to our disposal.

Mr. Speaker, we will do it and thereby defeat this gang of incompetents and be better government for the people of Manitoba after that ignominious defeat that they will surely suffer at the hands of voters, because they will not listen to the people of Manitoba. If you think that we are going to stop our objection to your bad legislation, you are wrong. We will continue with every tool at our disposal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I was not standing in my place today in support of this six-month hoist by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, I would be doing the most terrible disservice to the people in my constituency and the most terrible disservice to the people of this province that any member could do.

This NDP hate-farmer legislation - such as the other incident we saw the other night with the cattle producers who they hate - they hate the cattle producers; they hate any farmer in this province who wants to try to make a living. So, Mr. Speaker, any time any government or any Minister puts legislation on the table of this House and comes out and attacks the people that I represent, such as this Bill 3 does, anybody that doesn't oppose it would be a fool. That's what I'm charging the members opposite as being. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, why the NDP, the so-called do-gooders of this society, have such a hate against the farmers in the farm community in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we saw the other night in the cattle producers' legislation where all the cattle producers wanted was the right to assess a dollar a head so they could advertise the beef industry and promote beef in this province. What does this gang of so-called do-gooders opposite who call themselves a government do? They put the boots to the cattle producers. I never

saw a group of farm producers in this province ever get the ill treatment and literally get kicked in the fanny by any government like this government did.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I know, as the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park said in her six-month hoist, why they hate the farmers. I know why the Honourable Minister of Highways sat in his seat and saw that the cattle producers gave them their licks for what they did in those days when he was Minister. I know this is the same bill we've got here by this Minister who had to withdraw this legislation last year because it was shoddy legislation, because it doesn't agree with the wishes of the people in this province. It certainly doesn't agree with the farm people, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, why am I standing in my place here? I will likely stand here till Christmas to fight this legislation if I have to because, as I said earlier in my remarks, I'd be doing an insult to the people I represent.

Mr. Speaker, I have the editorial column of the Winnipeg Free Press, attacking this Minister and this bunch that call themselves a government for their position on this Bill 3. I have the editorial page out of the Brandon Sun attacking this bunch across the way and telling them: Bill 3 goes too far - if the government held committee hearings across the province, it would soon find this out.

Mr. Speaker, I'm standing in my place today in support of the position of the Manitoba Farm Bureau, who will stand up and tell you what to do with this legislation. I'm standing here supporting the position of Manitoba Pool Elevators, who told this Minister and this socialist horde across the way what they should do with this kind of legislation. Mr. Speaker, I'm standing here and supporting the position of the United Grain Growers, one of the greatest grain companies in our province, who had told this government what they should do with this form of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, how far do we in the opposition have to go to finally get this bullheaded bunch of people across the way to listen to what the farmers in this province are saying? I don't know what we have to do. We debated the bill in the House. The Minister says he's not going to make any changes whatsoever - none whatsoever - Mr. Speaker. That concerned me, first of all, because agriculture is our No. 1 industry in this province, and to see this Minister and this horde across the way tear the guts out of that industry by a bill such as Bill 3, Mr. Speaker, I will stand here as long as I can breathe and oppose that type of legislation; absolutely oppose it, and I would be naive if I didn't oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, why are the socialists out to get the farmers in this province? What's behind it all? I read in a column that John Plozman, the Minister of Government Services, wrote in the Roblin Review. He writes there now pretty regularly, even though it's not his own constituency, but he does compete with me and I don't mind that at all. He says there are a great many problems confronting Manitoba farmers today, and threatening the demise of the family farm as we know it. That is the NDP, the biggest threat to the farming industry that we have in this province today, even worse than inflation, even worse than the interest rate the farmers are facing in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder why I'm rising in my place in support of the amendment, the six-month hoist that

was presented by my desk mate behind me here, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park? I say not, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I should likely talk here for a week on this subject matter if I could try and convince the government opposite to change their ways, to go out and listen, to go out and talk to the farmers. I know they don't have any farmers over there in their backbench; that is their first problem. There are no farmers over there who understand the farm problems of this province. Not a one; not even the Minister, no. He's a turkey farmer; he doesn't care about owning any more than 10 acres of land; that's all he needs to farm turkeys. He's not worrying about the young people in this province today, Mr. Speaker, who need to expand themselves and move on.

Mr. Speaker, what did my honourable colleague, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, say in her six-month hoist motion? She said that she had a brother and his family who are now living in British Columbia and would be prevented from buying more than 10 acres of farm land in their native province, Manitoba, if we pass this legislation.

MR. H. ENNS: Shame, shame! They're still Canadians, Billie.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Right.

MR. H. ENNS: Just because they live in British Columbia.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Is there any member across the way that's prepared to stand up and oppose that? Is there anybody over there at all that believes that her brother shouldn't have the right to come back to this province and hold more than 10 acres of land?

MR. H. ENNS: Well, they're aliens; they're aliens.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Well, there are a whole bunch of them over there that believe that, Mr. Speaker. What about if her brother was a storekeeper and wanted to come back and buy 10 acres of land or 12 acres of land to go in business, are you going to tax him too by this kind of restrictive legislation? They haven't brought it in yet but maybe they will next year, because, Mr. Speaker, we know deep down what they believe. They want the state to own all the land. A socialist doesn't believe that you and I should have the right to property - never did. Socialists never did and never will believe in that and I'm sure they renewed their faith in the Regina Manifesto in that dogma that they've been dragging around behind them for the last 50 years in this province.

Mr. Speaker, they're a strange bunch. They are a strange bunch. They also got us hung up on this bilingualism thing. Again the vast majority of the people in this province don't like it and don't want it, so we're going to be fighting that one here, likely, till Christmas. And why can't they understand? Why can't the Honourable Member for St. Johns, who is standing right close in front of me here now, why can't he stand up in his place some day and tell his good friends in Poland that he believes that a citizen in this province,

if he wants to come in, should have the right to more than 10 acres of land? But he wouldn't do it, he wouldn't do it.

A MEMBER: He's muzzled.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: He's muzzled. I guess he's muzzled. Mr. Speaker, what were the other remarks that the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park said when she rose in her place and gave this legislation the six-month hoist? She said, Mr. Speaker, that this may violate the property and other rights guaranteed under the Canadian Charter of Rights. Mr. Speaker, I have talked to quite a number of legal authorities on that subject matter and I dare say if the Government of the NDP proceeds with this legislation they will end up in the courts on this very subject matter under the Charter of Rights.

And, of course, we have on our Order Paper, the proposal for people who to own property in this province which was submitted by my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, months ago. Of course, we sat here and waited and waited and waited for the government to finally bring their position in and, Mr. Speaker, it's a joke. Their position on the right to own property in this province is as long as my arm and longer. They drag all these red herrings into these other things what you have to do to own property in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I tell the honourable members opposite today, that amendment, or their proposed position on property rights, would never pass one province in this country. They would laugh at it; they would scoff at it. Put the resolution, as you have it on our Order Paper before the Premiers across this great country of ours, Mr. Speaker, you would be sneered at, you would be laughed out of the conference room, because it doesn't make sense. Mr. Speaker, they are going to do it through the back door.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could apologize, first of all, to the member that's speaking and ask the member and the members of the House if I can have leave of the House to make an urgent statement. (Agreed) Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, information received today from the Cadham Provincial Laboratory has identified the virus of Western Equine Encephalitis in *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes collected within the Winnipeg area on July 13th.

This is the first time the virus has been identified in the disease-carrying mosquitoes this year.

I would emphasize that there have been no laboratory confirmed human or horse cases identified in the province at this time.

I would also add that, based on the information received from the Manitoba Arbovirus Surveillance

Committee regarding mosquito levels and infected chicken flocks, I have designated Brandon, Virden, Dauphin and Swan River as areas to be included in the Aerial Spraying Program.

Considering the fact that this is a health emergency and that Swan River, Virden and Dauphin are hosting major annual social events this weekend, which will involve thousands of people being outside in the evening hours, I am announcing that every effort possible be made to conduct aerial spraying over these three centres during the morning hours, commencing at approximately 5:30 a.m.

Weather permitting, aerial spraying will be conducted over Brandon this evening beginning at 8:00 p.m. If this is not possible, Brandon will be rescheduled as an alternate spraying time during the weekend.

The community of Dauphin, weather permitting, will be sprayed Saturday morning commencing at approximately 5:30 a.m., however, the communities of Swan River and Virden will be considered as alternate sites.

Should weather conditions remain ideal, aerial spraying will be conducted over the community of Swan River Sunday morning and over the community of Virden Monday morning.

Because the Aerial Spraying Program schedule is subject to change due to weather conditions, I would urge the public with concerns or questions to contact the Emergency Information Centre, toll-free at 1-800-362-3305.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House thank the Minister for the announcement which he has made. I must say that I don't follow the logic of the identification of the Western Equine Encephalitis in *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes collected in the Winnipeg area resulting in a decision to spray western Manitoba, but perhaps that's something that'll be further explained later.

I emphasize to the Minister, as I did to the Minister of Government Services, that with all of the thousands of Manitobans and visitors who are going to be in that area for the various affairs and exhibitions and celebrations in Swan River, particularly, in Dauphin and Virden this weekend that I would hope that he can keep to the schedule of morning sprayings because at a time when most of the people are not outside it would seem to me that that's the only logical way to go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill 3, the Member for Roblin-Russell has 32 minutes remaining.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an interesting thing about this legislation and the same applies to our amendment on the bilingualism issue, very few people opposite have got the guts to stand up and defend themselves. That's strange, that's strange. On this farm bill, and of course the first problem they have over on Bill 3, The Farm Land Ownership Act, as I said earlier in my comments, they don't have

any farmers over there that know what's it's all about. They don't have anybody that can speak on the subject matter, and yet they're prepared to put the boots to the farmers by Bill 3, to kick them around and tell them, look, we're boss - like they did the cattle producers and said either you tow the line and do what you're told or you're going to get it. This is their tactics of how they're going to get it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was in support of the motion by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park giving some of the reasons or reason why she rose in her place on that day and proposed this six-month hoist. I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the first one, of course, was because of the fact that she had a brother and his family in British Columbia who would be prevented from moving back to their home province and purchasing more than 10 acres of farm land.

She also raised some concerns about the Canadian Charter and I mentioned the NDP's position on the right to own property which, of course, is part and parcel of this resolution. She also said that she was concerned that the majority of the farmers across this province are equally concerned about, and opposed to the proposed legislation.

I think beside the reasons that I'm going to put in the record, in my ongoing remarks, I think those three comments, that the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park put into the record, are sufficient for any member of this House to stand up and oppose this ridiculous ill-founded, ill-conceived piece of legislation which hopes to restrict the rights of the people in this province, Bill 3. Certainly her amendment was extremely timely. Mr. Speaker, one only has to start looking around this province and reading some of the comments into the record that has been said by some very learned people.

Let's read what the editorial page of the Brandon Sun said, one of the great farm papers that we have in this province, Mr. Speaker, who are right in the heart of the No. 1 industry of this province - agriculture. Right in the heart of the wheat. It's the editorial of June 1st, or May 31st, I wasn't sure. It'd be the weekend paper of that anyway. It says here, Mr. Speaker - the impact of the Farm Lands Bill. The Brandon Sun on that particular day said, the Manitoba farm community sits and waits on the outcome of a bill that has tremendous - read the word tremendous - potential impact on the province's primary industry - agriculture. Tremendous potential impact on our No. 1 industry. The editor goes on, Mr. Speaker, and he says Bill 3, The Manitoba Farm Land Ownership Act has been making its way slowly through the legislative process. Right on that one. It sure has been slow because they, for some reason, haven't been calling it very often. They possibly are getting the message.

MR. H. ENNS: They start calling it at midnight though.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Oh yes, they like to call it at midnight. Mr. Speaker, the editor says - the government has not pushed passage of the bill and every few days an opposition member will rise to make a speech against some of the aspects of its most controversial aspects. Now comes the hooker. The NDP government may eventually invoke closure, or withdraw the bill, or introduce it in a different form.

Now that makes at least the Brandon Sun - the Minister should read that - he offers the Minister two alternatives. He said - he could withdraw the bill, or he could introduce it in a different form. That would be acceptable to the Brandon Sun, the heart of the wheat industry in our province, the Brandon Sun. Mr. Speaker, he says - the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the Manitoba Pool, and the United Grain Growers have already expressed their concerns to the most draconian aspects of the legislation. The biggest objection to the bill would single out other Canadians and prevent them from owning farm land in Manitoba. The Tories as well, the Brandon editor says - as the major farm groups feel that it is one thing to block foreign ownership of Manitoba farm land but it's quite another thing to block Canadian ownership of farm land in this province, Canadian ownership. — (Interjection) — I know, the Honourable Member for St. Johns wouldn't support that. He couldn't support that as a member of the cloth. No, he couldn't. The heritage that he brings to this great country, how could he, Mr. Speaker?

The biggest objection, Mr. Speaker, it says - the Tories as well as the major farm groups feel it is one thing to block it, but it's another thing to block Canadians, and that editor has got our position dead on.

That editor knows what we're talking about. That editor knows why this Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park rose in her place and gave this bill the six month hoist, Mr. Speaker. That editor knows. He knows what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this learned editor of the Brandon Sun went on and said - that the other main objection to Bill 3 involves the definitions imposed by the government on what type of business structure can own Manitoba farm land. The Brandon Sun understands our position 100 percent because I am concerned about that aspect.

My colleague back here, who raised the six month hoist motion, she is concerned and raised that very subject matter. I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. Johns is concerned about that aspect of it.

The bill goes on to say - restricts non-farming corporations and we've had debate in the House on that. The bill restricts non-farming corporations.

Now why would the Minister of Agriculture, if he had any love for the farm industry at all, if he had any love for agriculture in this province, why would he bring in that kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that restricts non-farming corporations? — (Interjection) — I wonder, if a Manitoba resident chooses to farm in a corporation structure but still works off a farm and receives the greater part of his income this way, he will not qualify under this legislation as a family farm corporation. Now that has got to be a sick society if we're going to pass that kind of legislation. That's got to be a sick Minister. It's got to be a sick government, Mr. Speaker, that would bring in that kind of restrictions on our No. 1 industry in this province, agriculture.

MR. H. ENNS: If not sick, then harsh and cruel.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, I've already said, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, they've already put the boots to the beef producers in this province, kicked them all over in the committee the other night. Of

course, we know the reasons, we know the old grudge, we know the old hate that the NDP have against the farm community in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on. The editor of the Brandon Sun goes on and he says - if a person who owns farm land in Manitoba, but doesn't farm, decides to retire outside the province, he must divest himself of this farm land within three years.

Now isn't that an insult to a man or a woman or any family that's lived in this province for decades, and for whatever reason they've worked, and slaved all their lives in this province; they've propped up the No. 1 industry in this province; they've paid their taxes in this province; they've lived by the laws of the land of this province, Mr. Speaker; they've done everything to be great Canadians and great Manitobans, and this hoard of gangsters across the way comes on this late day and says - look you can't do it. If you leave this province we're going to take it away from you. We're going to take it away. The state is going to take it away.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a hoard of gansters are these people opposite? Who, Mr. Speaker, would even think of doing such a dastardly thing to any man, woman or child in this province, for whatever reason, saw fit to move out of the jurisdiction for a while and then return? But they can't do it, Mr. Speaker. The Minister says and the NDP says, no, he must divest himself or she must divest herself of this farm land within three years.

A MEMBER: Or else.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: How could the Honourable Member for The Pas support that kind of legislation? He has a fair knowledge of farming; he has a good understanding of a farm community

MR. H. ENNS: And he's a pretty decent guy.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: And he's not a bad guy, a pretty decent guy, but I suspect, Mr. Speaker, they put the whips on the poor guy. They put the whips on him. They put the boots to him like they did it to the cattle producers and said either line up or you're out.

Well, we can offer some hope to the Honourable Member for The Pas because we see the Honourable Member for Elmwood knows how to get out of that caucus. He, a gentleman and understands the problems of this province, he knows how to do it; and I'm sure there'll be others over there that will find the easy way to get away from that pack, to get away from that horde that calls themselves a government, that said they were going to do all these things for the people, Mr. Speaker. They are not doing them at all.

You're tearing the heart out of this province; you're tearing the heart out of agriculture in this province. You're an insult to society, Mr. Speaker. They are an insult to agriculture; they are an insult to any farm woman in this province. They are an insult to any farmer in this province who has given up his life to pay his taxes, pay his bills and be an honourable citizen. You're telling him if he moves outside of this province, Mr. Speaker, he must divest himself of his farm land within three years. What kind of legislation is that that you have brought into this province? Mr. Speaker, it's

unbelievable that these kind of people even have the audacity to come and sit in this House and bring that kind of garbage before this committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Brandon Sun also goes on and says - he said, "Such . . . — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Brandon Sun has a very learned editor. He said, "Such legislation as this may indeed work against the interests of beginning farmers who rent much of their land often from people who may wish to leave the province." There's another reason why my colleague, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park rose in her place . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've sat and I've allowed the member a lot of latitude, and I still intend to do so; but, Sir, when he makes statements that are completely inaccurate with respect to the provisions of the bill, I would ask, Sir, that you draw him to order, or else ask him to read the bill in terms of the farmers who have to divest and the citizens of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Oh, he's quoting the Brandon Sun now, okay.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is clearly a difference - order please. Order please.

There is clearly a difference of opinion between the two individuals as to what the content of the bill is. The Minister of Agriculture does not have a point of order.

The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling because I am talking about the editor of the Brandon Sun, and if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and members opposite disagree with the Brandon Sun, go talk to the Brandon Sun, don't talk to me.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order. The Member for Burrows on a point of order.

MR. C. SANTOS: There is a rule in Beauséjour, Section 332, Page 117, which says, "The rule is quite clear that the quoting of a newspaper . . . directly or indirectly is entirely out of order" if the member is quoting opinions and not facts. "(Members) may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any discussion in the House, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, to the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the rules and the practice of our House, of course, take precedence over Beauséjour. It's only when our rules or the practices of this House do not deal with an issue, that it's necessary to refer to

Beauchesne. The practice in this House, Sir, has clearly been over the years that editorials in newspapers have been referred to on many many occasions, and I'm sure, Sir, they will continue to be referred to on many occasions, as they should be.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Housing to the same point.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell is citing an editorial opinion and making comments on it, and suggests that the members on this side, if we have any disagreement with his comments, should disagree with the writer of that particular editorial in the Brandon Sun. Mr. Speaker, I would assume that it is a job of legislators who have read the legislation and speak on the legislation, having some knowledge of it. Clearly, that isn't the case and hasn't been the case on this bill and a number of other bills, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Member for Burrows has raised a point of order regarding the admissibility of opinions which reflect on debate in this House when expressed in the press. The point of order is well taken. However, I would prefer to allow the previous practices to continue. I would hope, though, that the Member for Roblin-Russell would confine his comments on this bill to his own opinions rather than those of the Brandon Sun.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, are you making a ruling that it is no longer appropriate for members of this Legislature to refer to editorial comment in the newspapers?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps I should clarify that. The ruling does not say that it is not proper to refer to newspapers or editorial opinions. However, in the debate, it would be best if the member referred to his own opinions.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it's a question of rules. Is it proper or not? It's not a question of judgment, with all due respect, Sir, as to whether it's appropriate for a member to refer to his own opinions or to someone else's. Editorial comment reflects informed thought and opinion on most occasions, Sir, and it's been the practice of the House to refer to it for decades. I should hope that you're not making a ruling at this point that that is no longer appropriate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to refer again to Section 332 of Beauchesne, which says specifically, "The rule is quite clear that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book . . ." - and this is the operative section which reflects upon the debate in the House, and that is the section which concerns me the most, its editorial opinions which reflect upon the debate before the House. This is a guideline; it is not a rule. It has not been ruled out of order in the past; however, it is a guideline which would be proper to follow.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I must ask for further clarification. Are you making a ruling? Because if this is a ruling, that editorial opinion cannot be referred to, then that is, as a ruling, inconsistent with the practices of this House in the past. If that is the ruling, Sir, then of course we would find it necessary to challenge that ruling, but I don't wish to do that until I have a clear understanding of what your ruling is.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. It is editorials which reflect upon a debate in the House, not upon the subject matter of the debate. It is not the editorial itself which would be ruled out of order. Beauchesne provides guidelines for the use of editorials in debate and these guidelines are much the same as the guidelines which will be provided for questions in question period. Perhaps they observe more in the breach than in the observance.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming then that you are not making a ruling - period.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it very difficult to avoid the editorial page of the Brandon Sun on this issue, which I dare say is the second most important issue that we have before us in this Legislature. And it's right in the heart of the wheat country of this province, right in the heart of our No. 1 industry in this province. The members opposite, of course, I understand their problem, they don't like what they're hearing.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: They don't like what they're hearing. I can understand why they're rising in their place. I suggest to the Honourable Member for Burrows, I'll give him this editorial page when I'm finished with it and he can jump in his car on Monday or Tuesday and drive out to Brandon and have a talk to the editor about it; so can the Honourable Minister of Housing. Maybe they could ride together in the same car, go out to Brandon and talk to the editor about this bill and maybe, just maybe, Mr. Speaker, they'll change their mind on this dastardly legislation that we got before us.

They might just change their mind if they talk to the Brandon editor because he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "Bill 3 goes too far." Bill 3 goes too far, that's what he said. "If the government held committee hearings across this province, it would soon find this out," that's what the editor said. We live right in the heart of the wheat country in this province and these people, Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture and this government, this so-called government, are going to proceed with this kind of legislation, which the Brandon people, the Brandon Sun don't want; and I don't want; the farm community doesn't want; the Farm Bureau doesn't want; the Pools don't want it; the grain growers don't want it; the Winnipeg Free Press doesn't, who does want it?

A MEMBER: Who wants it? Me.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yes, this little cell over here of left-winger socialists, who think that they are going to take over this province and take over the farm land and enshrine it all in the state. It'll never happen as long as I'm a member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I've been here a long time. If it does, it'll be over my dead body, over my dead body, that you bunch of socialists over there are going to take the land away from the people of this province. Never, Mr. Speaker, never.

Mr. Speaker, what does the Winnipeg Free Press say about this piece of legislation, about this motion that was raised by my colleague, the Member for Kirkfield Park, giving this bill the six-month hoist, Bill 3? They praise the honourable member for doing what she did and you know, Mr. Speaker, I think it's one of the greatest things that happened to this piece of legislation, that this six-month hoist was given by one of the fairer sex, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, who happens to be an urban member and has a keen interest in agriculture in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press, which is read by I dare say half the people in this province, here's what they said about Bill 3. "Stalling the Land Bill" is the heading. It says, Mr. Speaker, the hoist motion by the Conservative Gerrie Hammond, the last member of the official opposition to speak before the Legislature, was to vote on The Farm Lands Ownership Bill is a legitimate opposition tactic. So they support us in doing what we're doing right here this very moment, opposing this bill and using this tactic to oppose it. Even though the members opposite don't want it, we're prepared to stay here on a long weekend, on a holiday weekend, and fight for agriculture and fight for the farmers and fight for the farm wives of this province to try and save their farms. We're prepared to stay here till Christmas, if necessary, or longer to save the farm land for the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press went on and said, Premier Howard Pawley and Minister of Agriculture Bill Uruski have availed to them a tactic to overcome this problem. The government can, as the Premier has hinted, that it might introduce closure on the debate. But they don't have the guts to bring closure in on this one. They don't have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to come and put closure on the farm community of this province and this kind of legislation. Because if they do, I dare say you would never see another NDP member elected in rural Manitoba ever, if they put closure on this bill and restrict the use of farm land and the ownership of farm land in this province by closure. Could anybody in his wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, envisage that? That's what they do in the Balkan countries. That's what Hitler did. That's what Hitler did by closure; he took over everything in the country. These people over here would even hint, Mr. Speaker, that they would invoke closure, I dare them to invoke closure on this legislation. Because there's nothing I would like better to take back to my people on the election campaign and see closure by the socialists on a bill such as this.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press fully agrees with me on that because he said, "However,

they would be well-advised," this is when he's talking about the government, "to think carefully before using this device to ram through this piece of legislation." I agree with the Winnipeg Free Press and that's why I'm standing in my place today supporting the six-month hoist that was put on this piece of legislation by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

So I agree with the Winnipeg Free Press, they wouldn't dare bring closure in on this motion. No way. They are scared and I'd like them to just try it on for size and see what happens. I'm sure the former Minister of Agriculture would like to see them bring closure in on this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, because he says, "Whatever support the present administration has in rural areas could disappear if closure is invoked." No truer words were ever spoken. I agree with the Winnipeg Free Press. I agree whole-heartedly with what they're telling us to do and what they're telling the official opposition and the people of this province; that they wouldn't dare bring closure in on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, this worthy comment by the Winnipeg Free Press in the editorial page says, "The opposition to the bill is built on two solid . . ." - hear this again - they're not listening, of course - ". . . is built on two solid foundations," and that's what my colleague said when she rose in her place that day and said that I'm going to hoist this bill. She said her position was not only on two solid foundations; it was on three. There's two at least that the Winnipeg Free Press agrees; my colleague and I agree that there are more. There are three or more reasons why we should be standing here today and fighting this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition, it says, it would deny Canadians, this bill if passed in its present form - and the Minister of Agriculture has told us over and over again he's not going to change it - this bill, the Winnipeg Free Press says, "if passed, will deny Canadians living outside of Manitoba the right to own more than a token amount of farm land."

Now, Hitler almost got to that stage.

A MEMBER: Who?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Hitler. He took it all. They're leaving 10 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what they read in their back rooms of their caucus, but I found it extremely interesting on seat belts, as an example - they have special papers that they feed amongst themselves on these matters - we found out in the seat belt committee meetings last night that they passed papers of statistics back and forth on seat belts and helmets. And this one honourable gentleman, Professor Levine, he tore those figures all to shreds. This is what they do. They meet in their little cell in the caucus room and they share this little wisdom that they have on farm matters and then enshrine it in legislation without thinking of the consequences. That's what you've done here. That's what the Winnipeg Free Press says; that's what the Brandon Sun says; that's what I am saying; that's what my colleague over here said when she gave it the six-month hoist, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Free Press said on this matter, "Provinces do have the power to limit ownership

of farm land, and other provinces have used it with varying degrees of restrictiveness; but," - he said - "before Manitoba embarks on a course set out by Mr. Pawley and Mr. Uruski in this farm ownership bill, there needs to be a careful examination of the need for such legislation." That's what the Winnipeg Free Press said, "the need for such legislation."

And here the Minister of Agriculture says he's not going to change this bill, no way, shape or form, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister says, I may put closure on. I defy him to bring in the closure of motion on this bill. You'll be the laughing stock of Canada, you'll be the laughing stock of this province, and you'll sure be the laughing stock of the farm community in this province if they dare bring in that closure motion on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to say here, "While this year's bill has eliminated some of the objections from the one he brought in last year," and I don't know why the Minister likes to take all this punishment in continually bringing in this stupid legislation. He pulled the one last year, but here's what the Winnipeg Free Press says. He pulled the bill last year, but he said this bill here that we have before us today, Bill 3, has retained, however, the objectionable restrictions that apply to Canadian citizens, and it proposes to place limits that are far too narrow on the composition of acceptable family farm corporations. It doesn't merit the imposition of closure.

Hear that, Mr. Speaker. This bill doesn't even merit the imposition of closure by members opposite. Now, that's pretty hard-hitting lines for one of the leading newspapers in this province who circulates to half the people. Half the people in this province, I dare say, gets the Winnipeg Free Press. They said to this government, to this horde of socialists that are looking over there across their benches at us this afternoon, or this morning, Mr. Speaker, they said Bill No. 3, the Farm Land Ownership Bill does not merit the imposition of closure. — (Interjection) —

They'd better be sick, because before we get finished with them on this and that bilingual accord they're going to be really sick. They're going to be really sick, and I strongly recommend them to take a good long weekend, this one that's coming up, because you're not going to get much rest after you get back, because you have laid some extremely difficult issues before us. One, Mr. Speaker, is this Bill No. 3.

I don't know what reason; I don't know where they got their support for this legislation; I don't know where it came from.

A MEMBER: Jackie Skelton.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Jackie Skelton, well, maybe. I don't know. I've talked to all kinds of NDP supporters in my constituency and asked them: Did you tell those guys to bring in that bill? They said, no way, McKenzie; we would never restrict the use of farm land in this province. Well, where did they get it from? There had to be somebody else than Jackie Skelton and the Minister. Who else?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every member over there will stand in his place and put in the record what you think about this kind of legislation which both of our leading newspapers in this province, the Brandon Sun

and the Winnipeg Free Press, says it's dastardly legislation. It doesn't even deserve closure. I defy the members opposite to bring closure in on this one, and we will sure take it to the people in a hurry.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for The Pas says we'll now hear from the rural part of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I may not be qualified to speak on this bill as a result of not living in rural Manitoba, but I am indeed qualified, more so than the Member for The Pas, because I understand the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with attempting to debate and discuss this bill and the motion that is before us, that the bill not be reported for a date six months from now, is that in speaking to members opposite, they do not understand what the ramifications and the future consequences to Manitobans will be of this sort of legislation. They are off on an ideological cloud that prevents them from seeing the truth; that prevents them from seeing through the real consequences of all these words that have been put together, presumably, in idealistic terms to satisfy the kinds of feelings that they have about how the world ought to be reshaped in some form, in some image that they have for themselves, for Manitoba. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that image, that reshaped view of Manitoba is not shared by the majority of Manitobans. It's not only not shared by Manitobans who live on the farms today, but it's not shared by Manitobans who live in urban environments, who share the concerns for freedom, the opportunity to own one's own land; the opportunity to order one's affairs within the bounds of the laws and the morale standards that we set for ourselves in this country, but these people opposite, Mr. Speaker, cannot see that. They have no view of that. They have a very narrow, restricted concept that is ideologically hidebound as to how Manitoba should be in the future.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to destroy all of the things that we stand for today, all of the things that our parents worked for, worked hard in order to establish, in order to try and achieve just some socialist ideology that will satisfy some of the fringe groups who supported them and put them into office in 1981. It's a tragedy, Mr. Speaker.

So in talking about why this bill ought not to be referred at this point in time to committee for further consideration, ought not to be reported back at this Session, but rather ought to be delayed, Mr. Speaker, I hope to give a little more information, a little more of my views as to why there's a need for a little further thought about this bill and a little further consideration that will enable, perhaps, the government to put it in better form, in better shape to achieve its purpose which I believe they have stated as prevention and elimination . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . that will achieve their purpose as they have stated it which is to eliminate foreign land speculation in Manitoba farming. I say, Mr. Speaker,

that of course as we all know and understand from having reviewed this bill, it goes far beyond that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would dramatically alter the rights and privileges of Manitobans and Canadians to own farm land here in Manitoba. It's an unjustified intrusion into that right and privilege and relationship that has always existed here in Manitoba and in Canada. It's an unwarranted restriction of our freedoms to own property, whether that property be our homes in Winnipeg, or in Brandon in urban environments, or whether that property be farm land which we are seeking to use for the production of agricultural commodities for the good of all Canadians and indeed on a worldwide basis.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as I've said before strikes at the very heart of our traditional sense of freedom in Manitoba and Canada. We have a history of this area of the country being settled by immigrants, immigrants who came from other countries because they could not have those freedoms in those other countries. They fled oppressive regimes that would not allow them to own their own farm land. They did not come here because there were signs up that said, farm land for rent in Manitoba. They came here because they knew they could own their farm land and therefore have the opportunity to pass on a real legacy to their future generations in their family to own farm land, to own land of all sorts in Manitoba.

Now we're saying in a variety of different measures in this bill, that those freedoms are going to be restricted; that that dream, that ideal can no longer be passed on to future generations, or indeed to others who want to come to this country from other countries. Now we have a rich country. We have a good deal of resources and certainly the agricultural resources of this province are amongst the most attractive still to offer to others to come into our country.

But rather than simply restrict themselves to the issue of preventing foreign land speculation which I think could be accomplished without the draconian measures contained in this bill, this bill goes much further.

1. It prevents Canadian ownership by other than Manitobans. We'll talk a little bit about that as we discuss what the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties says about that in their brief to the government.

2. Another major restriction that it provides, Mr. Speaker, is that it prevents through a variety of mechanisms the expansion or extension of corporate ownerships, whether they be family farm corporations which is very very common. Many speakers on this side have indicated that they themselves are involved in that type of arrangement to own farm land in Manitoba. That's not unusual. That's something that is contemplated by federal legislation, that's contemplated by provincial legislation. There is a purpose to having the vehicle there for corporate ownership of farm land in Manitoba and that purpose is for tax planning purposes, for legitimate means of being able to order your affairs so that you only pay those taxes to the government which it is entitled to and for estate planning purposes so that you can indeed use the best means possible to pass along the ownership of your farm land to future generations within your families.

Indeed, as I say the corporate vehicle is in many many cases the best vehicle to allow this family

relationship to continue, the family ownership of the farm land to continue from one generation to another. The transference from generation to generation can certainly be enhanced through the corporate vehicle in estate planning and tax planning or to allow brothers of the next generation, brothers and sisters together, to own that farm land on an equitable means and it's up to them to decide how the asset is shared and indeed, how the returns from the use of that asset, that is the farm production, are shared amongst the next generation, some of whom may live on the farm and may participate directly in that farm operation, others of whom may not but still have a legitimate entitlement to it by virtue of the having it left to them in a will or a bequest by their parents.

That should not be a concern of the state. That should not be a concern of this Provincial Government or any Provincial Government or indeed any government in Canada. To interfere with that — (Interjection) — sorry, in response to the Attorney-General, the Minister of Housing looks very intent. Now he may be blank, indeed in what's behind, but he did look intently towards me as I was speaking.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government should ask as a prerequisite to coming forth with this legislation, is the farm land that they are attempting to prevent from being owned by other than those who are listed as able to own farm land in this bill? Is the farm land that is, for instance, being held in family farm corporations or is being held by other than Manitobans, being taken out of production, out of agricultural production, so that it is no longer indeed a resource for the use of all Manitobans and Canadians worldwide in the production of agricultural commodities? I suggest that the answer is that it is being used for the production of agricultural commodities. It is not being taken out of production by virtue of its form of ownership in most cases, in I would say 99 percent of the cases, but it may be 100 percent of the cases. People are not just holding on to that land on a speculative basis without allowing Manitobans to farm it and to produce agricultural commodities on it.

So it is in my view, in any case, contributing to the betterment of Manitoba's economy, Canada's economy, and our status in the world as a whole. So why must it be done this way? It's contributing, as I say, to the betterment of our economy and our country. It is producing agriculturally as it should, and yet there's something in the minds of members opposite that says, but the form of ownership is not good for Manitoba. That corporate family farming form of ownership has some harmful effect. Canadians outside of Manitoba owning that farm all of a sudden create a harmful effect on the rest of Manitobans. That's obviously behind their thinking, otherwise, they wouldn't bring these restrictions into the bill, and I say not so, not so.

So, Mr. Speaker, why must it be done in such a draconian measure that wipes out so many legitimate opportunities for the furtherance and the continuance of good farming operations in this province? I say that there's no justification, and that's aside from the fact that in recent times we've seen dramatic dropping in the price of farm land in Manitoba despite the fact that there is so-called speculation right in this province, dramatic dropping in the prices of farm land all over the place. So we see how the economy adjusts to

situations that arise and they are not harmful. Indeed, if that weren't the case, then Manitobans who want to buy farm land wouldn't benefit from that price reduction.

We wouldn't see what is happening today, that some of the people who were caught in speculative situations are giving up their land that they bought at one price, they're giving it up at a lesser price. They're taking a loss on it; even it's being sold for tax sale purposes because they made a wrong move in getting into it on a speculative basis. So the market has a way of penalizing them; the market has a way of punishing them and driving them out if they were in it just for speculation. If ultimately they weren't in it for the production of agricultural commodities for a return on their investment that is legitimate and that carries on the way it should, then they get caught and then other Manitobans who want to buy that land are now doing it on a more beneficial basis. So they're paying the penalty if they were in it on a speculative basis over the last decade I would say, Mr. Speaker, but that's aside from the principles that I'm speaking to.

Mr. Speaker, we said earlier, the Leader of the Opposition gave the facts and figures as we could gather them, and in fact we gathered them in a good deal more detail than did the Minister of Agriculture in preparing this legislation. He had an old study, he had one that was done on just sort of a random sampling that was not — (Interjection) — Yes, a master thesis random sampling that was really not very representative. When we demonstrated to him through the figures compiled and presented in this House by the Leader of the Opposition that at best, at very best, we are talking about 5 percent of the farm land in this province that may be non-Manitoba owned and farmed. Well, he just has no response for that. It matters not to him because in fact he's on an ideological tangent that blinds him from the truth, that blinds him from the reality of what he's entering into, Mr. Speaker.

So I suggest that this warrants further study, that this warrants further work on an intersessional basis. The Minister has already brought some fairly major changes in this legislation as compared to the bill that he brought forth in the last Session. I say that the changes improve the bill substantially, as has been said previously by many speakers on this side, but it's still a bad piece of legislation. Because, as I have indicated, the two major areas of restriction, the two major areas of discrimination that it contains, that ought still to be looked at further and ought still to be amended.

Intersessionally is the best way because we're terribly overburdened right at this point in time. We know what we're going through, the agony that members on both sides of the House have endured this week and are continuing to endure today of trying to find some rational way of gathering together and deciding how to proceed with the business of the House in a legitimate form that accomplishes the purposes of the government, that doesn't trample on the rights and freedoms of individual Manitobans, that allows for legislation to be carried through in a proper form.

We're carrying it on now, as I say, in an agonizing manner because we just have too many things that are crucial, major in their import to the future of Manitobans, and that have not been well thought-out, that have not been well conceived and drafted, and that have so many harmful potential effects for us in future; that

let's go easy, let's have a cooling-off period. This bill is one that cries out for that kind of treatment. The six-month hoist is absolutely essential and absolutely necessary, so that they can look at those two major areas that I have demonstrated to them when I said earlier are unwarranted intrusions and restrictions on farm land ownership in Manitoba. We want to help the government to arrive at better legislation; that's our job in opposition as an opposition. We want to help them, and we cannot help them if they insist on forcing it through, pushing it through over the objections of virtually every farm group in Manitoba.

Okay, we know that the Farmers Union, who are as ideologically hidebound just as they are that come on the same cloudy plane, are the ones who are pushing for this, but surely there is virtually no other farm group in Manitoba pushing for this. Indeed, all of them have told the government don't go ahead, please don't go ahead. We are taking the same tack as we speak with them on it; use the opportunity of the six-month hoist to take one more look at this bill.

They say the Minister brought in major changes between the bill that was brought forward last Session and the one now, but it still isn't good enough. Now, if you will only take the opportunity to look at two more areas that I believe ought to be changed, and I'm speaking, as I say, as a Manitoban who does not own farm land but who believes in principle that you ought not to totally restrict the opportunity for certain classes of people in Manitoba and Canada to be involved in farming.

That is No. 1, look at removing the prohibition on Canadian ownership. I don't believe that virtually any farm group other than the Farmers Union have agreed with that prohibition, that Canadians outside of Manitoba should not be able to own farm land is wrong, wrong!

No. 2, look at the possibility of removing the restriction on corporate ownership in the context of family farm corporations and other legitimate Manitoba corporations to own land in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is the second major change that I suggest ought to be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The time being 12:30, when this motion is next before the House, the honourable member will have 22 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that we are still in the sitting, in Thursday's sitting, and that debate will continue under Thursday's sitting until a motion for adjournment is moved and that there is no more justification for adjourning the House at 12:30 than there was for starting the new sitting at 10 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: It's perhaps an all too rare occasion where I find myself saying that the logic of the Opposition House Leader is impeccable. I understand that the motion to adjourn the previous Session was

put to a vote and defeated so we are still in that previous Session. I do not see how it can come to an end automatically at 12:30 any more than it could have at 10. The case was put to you that it would end at 10 and I put that case strenuously at the time. You have found that that is not so. It seems to me that the logic of that position is that it doesn't end now until there is some agreement and we adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: If that is agreed, then the Honourable Member for Tuxedo has 22 minutes remaining.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I speak on this motion, the motion to give a six-month delay to the second reading of The Farmlands Ownership Act, Mr. Speaker, I call to bear with my argument some information that has been provided to the government by the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties. The Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties is an organization I think, close to the hearts of several on the government side, I know particularly the Attorney-General heeds their advice and welcomes their views on all legislation that is brought forward. I know that the government funds the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties. It did in our time, it continues to in large measure in the time of this government. They are - I think it might be said in many ways, the conscience of civil liberties in this province. They attempt as much as possible to present that viewpoint as they analyze all pieces of legislation that are brought forward to this House for debate.

They have presented the government with some major, major suggestions and criticisms in a brief that they brought forward about 10 days ago. They take a perspective as I say, that is not only based on the principles contained in the bill and I think that members on our side have shown how the principles contained within the bill are sadly lacking and are wrong and will be harmful to Manitobans in future. They take the perspective in a pure sense, of the civil liberties that are at stake should a bill such as this be passed in this Legislature.

I would like to quote from the brief that they have presented to this government because I believe that it's good information, it's sound reasoning and it's sound criticism of this bill that is before us, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things that MARL has said to the government is that some clauses of The Farmlands Ownership Act may be in conflict with the mobility rights, Section 6 of the Charter of Rights. Here we're speaking of the rights of Canadians to own farm land in Manitoba and a principal point that we have said over and over again, is not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, The Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties goes further. They say that under this act, people who own and till land may be subject to greater infringements of privacy and breeches of confidentiality than non-farm people. I'll go into much detail as to how they demonstrate that to happen as a result of the provisions contained within this bill.

Mr. Speaker, a further thing that MARL brings forward is that this bill in some of its provisions places the onus of proof of innocence on the person accused of contravening the act, totally reverse to what we accept in Canadian law, and that is that a person is innocent

until proven guilty, but in fact under the provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the individual is judged to be guilty unless he can prove his innocence before the board - unless he can prove his innocence before the board.

Mr. Speaker, further the MARL brief states that the onus of proof should be as in other cases of law on the board charged with the responsibility for the enforcement of this proposed act. There is no question that that principle ought to be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, the brief that they bring forward also criticizes the procedure on the issuance of search warrants and urges that an affidavit in support of a search warrant request should spell out the reasonable grounds in detail with enough back-up materials to support the alleged grounds, not move in a heavy-handed manner with the jack boots and say, here we are, we believe that you have contravened the act and we're going to just move in and take over in whatever manner we can to prove to our satisfaction that you have. They're just unwarranted powers and MARL criticizes them in great detail and I believe very rightfully so, Mr. Speaker.

MARL as well expresses opposition to the principle of regulatory boards determining what is or is not in the public interest. That determination, that is a determination of what is in the public interest, should always rest with this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker. That is the sole grounds and the sole place in which that determination should rest.

Mr. Speaker, as they go into detail on some of these sections, the people from MARL have laid out their case I think very thoroughly for the Minister of Agriculture and members opposite, that this legislation brings into play the classic conflict between rights of individuals and what is deemed to be in the best interests of society as a whole.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have demonstrated that when we're talking about the interests of society as a whole, what these people are attempting to legislate, appears to be in less than 5 percent of the instances of farm lands ownership in Manitoba. That is less than 5 percent of the farm land is currently in a situation that is not owned and farmed by Manitobans. That is the area that they have brought in this draconian legislation to protect the rights of society as a whole while trampling on individual rights. That's in essence the conflict that MARL sees in this legislation and they are going to have imposed upon the farm community, limitations to deal with their property by virtue of the very nature of that property, that is the fact that it's farm land takes it out of the normal rights and responsibilities of ownership that everyone else has in society and says farm land is special. It is in a class by itself and the people who own that farm land shall have their rights diminished in the interests of society.

We, on this side, Mr. Speaker, do not believe that, and obviously the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties do not effect that. Because that diminution of rights, Mr. Speaker, would not affect just individuals, but a whole category of individuals who are special by virtue of the fact that they farm in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, MARL goes further on to say that the property rights of a class of persons, residents in a province, are affected by the legislation to the extent that such a class of persons, that is the farmers, suffer

an adverse effect as compared to every other person or class of persons resident in Manitoba. Not a good principle upon which to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, they say further, a point that I made in speaking about the opportunities that Manitobans legitimately ought to have to own their farm property in a corporate status, that a number of the sections of this act adversely affect the farm businessman owning real property as compared to a non-farm businessman owning real property. And the right to challenge the efficacy on a particular transaction is left entirely to the discretion of the board that is proposed to be set up under this legislation - very very major power to leave in the hands of non-elected people who have no responsibility to the public, who are not answerable to the public in any way; a very very major area of concern that MARL has brought forward that we believe is legitimate and ought to be considered by members opposite before they proceed with such heavy-handed legislation for Manitoba.

Further, MARL has stated, for example, that some of the terms of the act would subject people who own and till land to all sorts of infringements of privacy, breaches of confidentiality that do not apply anywhere else in this province to other people.

I spoke earlier of the reverse onus provision that they have suggested, it needs further consideration. Mr. Speaker, they go through it chapter and verse. We look at the sections that deal with definitions and they have said that it's very unworkable as the definitions are contained within the act. Many of them lack clarity, many of them have too much specificity and many of them are too general. So, in all respects, they are unclear. That is something I believe that requires major reconsideration by the government, such major reconsideration that it can't be done in the normal atmosphere of the committee structure that we would refer this to in this Session of the Legislature as we attempt to bring the business of the House to a close.

What would happen would be that because such major changes are being asked for, because such major redrafting is being required, it couldn't possibly be done under the pressure that we currently find ourselves under to try and bring all this major legislation to a head and pass it through this second reading stage and then the committee stage and then the third reading stage and so on. Very, very strong argument in support of our motion to set this aside for six months that the bill not be read until six months hence. — (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General said he didn't get the little aside that we were discussing on this side as I prepared to go on in discussion of the bill.

Another major area of concern of MARL and one that I believe ought to be of concern to members opposite, although they showed no concern for it last year when they brought in The Rent Regulation Review Act and that is that they're bringing in legislation which has a retroactive effect. In general, I believe that all of us ought to oppose the retroactivity provision of any legislation because people make their plans, they set forth all of their arrangements, that is a family farm corporation, that is split up with ownership amongst say a father and three children or three brothers and sisters or cousins or uncles or whatever, and they set up the family farm corporation ownership on the basis

of certain information that exists today. That is, this is what the tax laws of Manitoba and Canada say, this is what the estate laws of Manitoba and Canada say, therefore, we are setting up our corporations and our ownership provisions based on that given set of information.

Then you pull the rug out from under them retroactively and you say that we as a government have wiped out all that planning that you've done, have wiped out all that legitimate honest endeavour that you put forward to set up your affairs in a reasonable manner. We have said that retroactively you are not going to be able to farm and own your farm land in the manner which you expected to as a citizen of this province. It's absolutely shocking that the retroactivity provision of this legislation could wipe out that kind of planning for people and put them in a disadvantageous situation, Mr. Speaker, and I don't understand why any government would do it.

We argued against it and, in fact, we were sensitive to it. There were times when we were wanting to bring forward retroactive legislation when we were in government and members opposite when they were in opposition hammered away with great vigor and said, never, never, should you bring in retroactive legislation, and we listened to them, Mr. Speaker.

I can only think of one case in which we felt that there was justification because we had gone on record stating that it was our intention as soon as the House opened to bring forth this legislation and therefore we felt that we had publicly informed anyone who might be affected that this legislation would, indeed, be passed at the next Session.

Even then, the members opposite said that isn't good enough, and here, they are bringing forth legislation that has the potential for retroactivity back to 1977 in some of its provisions and yet they're saying that's okay. Wipe out all of the prior planning, wipe out all of the legitimate arrangements that people have made in good faith under the laws of this land and this province and say, retroactively we're going to put you in a disadvantageous position because we think it's in the public interest.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it has not been demonstrated to be in the public interest and I say that with all the conviction that I can bring to bear on this argument.

A further area of concern that MARL legitimately expresses to the government and that ought to convince the government not to proceed at this time with the legislation is that throughout the act there are provisions which appear to be gross breaches of confidentiality and invasions of privacy.

Now, of course, we have seen that the government is not all that concerned about invasion of privacy in a variety of acts that they're bringing forth. The two conflict-of-interest bills in this Session, that is, Bill 18, which is The Legislative Assembly Conflict of Interest Act, and Bill 47, which is The Municipal Government Conflict of Interest Act, both have invasions of privacy where people are required to list, not only their own assets but assets of their spouses and their dependent children merely because they seek elective office in this province.

So, therefore, they must open up all the information to do with their disclosure of all of their assets and interests, and invade their privacy because they seek

elective office, not only for the individual but for his or her spouse and their children who are dependent upon them.

Now this, as MARL points out, includes a provision that subjects the farmer businessman to enormous exposure by being required to provide private and confidential information regarding their businesses. Changes, no matter how infinitesimal, would have to be reported to the board; that appointed board and body that has jurisdiction over farm lands ownership in Manitoba as proposed by this bill.

"In a world of constant change," as MARL says, "the farmer might well have to spend as much time reporting to government as they would carrying out their normal business affairs as farmers." Because of the wide-ranging and all-inclusive nature of some of the subsections that are in this bill, Mr. Speaker, every item of a farmer's undertaking would require reporting because of the wording, "other interests of a proprietary nature."

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has so many loopholes, so many weaknesses, so many areas of critical concern to groups throughout our province - groups that the government I think respects in many cases. They may not respect the views of the opposition, but surely they respect the views of all of the farm organizations, of MARL, of the Farm Bureau, of so many other people who have a legitimate interest and a good deal of information on this matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say if they believe that what they are going to do is in the best interest of all Manitobans, then listen to these groups. Take the time, give it the extra six months and don't give it second reading at this Session, as we suggested. Mr. Speaker, I say to

them today as I said to them yesterday on the resolution that's before us: Listen to the people. Listen to the people, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the House be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to House business, there is a committee set for 2 o'clock. At least, I should put it that it was announced to the public that the committee would be meeting. It is ordinarily the case that if there is a sitting of the House, then the committee should meet by leave. There is no sitting of the House called for 2 o'clock, and there will be a meeting of the House at 8 o'clock this evening. Committee meeting this afternoon; the House at 8:00 tonight.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a change of committee, could you please substitute on the Committee for Statutory Regulations and Orders, the Member for Burrows for the Member for Concordia?

MR. SPEAKER: The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.