

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 16, 1973

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has 20 minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that when we rose for the supper hour adjournment I was alluding to the concerns that have been expressed by some honourable members and I was dealing with some of the contributions of the Honourable Member from Thompson when he alluded to the high incidence of crime in society, and I think I was at the point where I was indicating that there are many opinions by many so-called experts as to the causation of the higher incidence of crime in society. And there are those that say that it's as a result of our greater affluence, supposed affluence, the higher standard of living for many people, the considerations of more material things rather than things of the spirit and of the soul. There are many opinions for every person who holds himself out as an expert. And I for one share the concerns of many who are troubled by the fact that we live in an increasingly more materialistic society where people seem to be more concerned about what they have and what they can get, than what they can give and what they can live for. But there's no easy answer to these problems, Mr. Chairman, and for anyone in this House to suggest that you know, certain people have all the answers and others don't, is really not playing fair with any sense of reason. Surely all of us strive, no matter at what political viewpoint, for a better way of life for our people; we have different philosophies, different approaches. And I sincerely appreciate those who are concerned about standards in our society and notwithstanding his recent rather more vicious attitude towards some members of my party, and certainly in his references in this session to members of this government and his attitude towards this government, I share with the Honourable Member for Thompson concerns about the future of our ever more-increasing concern about material things in society; and it's not a healthy thing. But at the same token for one to suggest that, you know, the steps that we have taken to provide a fairer legal aid system is going to do destruction to social values is unfair and completely improper. To suggest that the establishment of the Human Rights Commission, that naturally is receiving from society concerns about sexual discrimination, and the complaints that have been recorded by the Human Rights Commission, come forward from people, people who are concerned about discriminatory practice in respect to those individual cases that have been referred to the Human Rights Commission.

And surely we can't turn a deaf ear up on the concerns of people in society, and that's what the Human Rights Commission is there for. Now to suggest that we're going to have things on demand that are denigrating to the human being in society is completely unfair; to suggest that we're going to have divorce on demand is completely irrational. No way has the Federal Government sanctioned divorce on demand, even if this government wished to and we do not desire that. There is no way that we would want to have divorce on demand. Now I'd like the Honourable Member for Thompson to contrast what he heard earlier in this Chamber when the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, who's not here now, was expressing, as I understand it, a sincere concern for backlog in the Family Courts, saying that there was too much delay in dealing with causes that came before those courts. A concern that there should be more ready disposition of cases that come before those courts, and that's a complete antithesis of what the Honourable Member for Thompson is talking about. And it's not because the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is concerned to see separation on demand; that's not his attitude I'm sure. But there is a concern that the system should work reasonably well for people and reflect their desires and concerns.

Now if the Honourable Member from Assiniboia were here, and I wish he were here, I would point out to him that the family court is not concerned with just giving separations to people. They're concerned about trying to resolve the problems of marital couples that come before them. They have a family counselling service, and they endeavour to keep the family together where it's wholesome and advisable for that to continue. But not at all costs because the terrors of a matrimonial discord can be even more harmful to infant children than separation where they're going to be living in a much happier and much healthier environment. So it's not all black and white. There are grays, and we have to understand them, and we have to work with this complex human society in which we all live. For the honourable member to say that - as he implies, that we are pro-abortionists. -- (Interjection) -- My goodness, my goodness the honourable member who sits in his chair right now and says, you are, has heard me speak on this subject and for him to suggest that I am pro-abortionist, violates my sense of decency.

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . Because the honourable member sits there and knows that not only I but many members of my caucus -- (Interjection) -- now he says, too. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I won't even rise to his interjections because I want to make it clear that I know that members of my caucus are concerned about the preservation of human life, the dignity of human life, whether it be an infant, whether it be an infant or an adult that somehow has gone wrong in society, even if it be a deformed fetus, even if it be a deformed fetus, and there have been many born in our society. I've heard no member, no member even of this House opt for abortion on demand. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, now. But the honourable member has some kind of a twisted view towards the sanctity of human life. Because he stands for capital punishment. My God is a redeeming God, one who is concerned about the preservation and the sanctity of human life. And you know we're all human, Mr. Chairman, we all err at some time, and I believe in a God that is a redeeming God that believes that there is always hope for people. I don't believe in abortion on demand. I have cited to the honourable member cogent reasons much stronger even than what he has suggested in some of his arguments for proving that there are rights now for unborn children. Rights that have been entrenched in the law, and he has heard me articulate them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to spend over much time dealing with the arguments of the honourable member because he comes with his arguments, I think motivated, in a sincere concern, for what he sees as denigration of morals in society, and I share that concern. But let's not, let's not destroy arguments by indulging in, innuendo, invective, unreasonable language. If we want to assert a cause and have people understand and appreciate it, then we'll use the arguments of reason and rational persuasion. And that is what I choose to do in this House, Mr. Chairman, on these subjects.

Now the Honourable Member from Assiniboia is not here. I wish he were because I'm concerned with some of the things that he said in his remarks. He was concerned about transfers to Juvenile Court and he said, we all know what happens in Adult Court, incarceration. Now that's not always the case. We have numerous instances in Adult Court where we have judges. They may be appointed by another authority, by the Federal Government, but they have compassion as well; they have understanding and they try, and they try sincerely, Mr. Chairman to find answers for the particular circumstances in which a person finds himself before their court. They can't produce miracles but they have human compassion and consideration, and to suggest that a juvenile who's transferred to Adult Court immediately faces the end of the world, or something like that, as the honourable member suggests, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, is false. He's concerned about the number of transfers. Well the Attorney-General's Department has to recognize responsibility and from time to time make application of transfers of juveniles to Adult Court.

He was concerned about drug arrest and the high incidence of drugs in society. And you know, I've heard some people, the old fashioned, maybe the honourable Member for Thompson would appreciate this because I'm a bit old fashioned in some of my terminology, I've heard some of my old fashioned, call them the people who use dope. And you know, I like that; I prefer that to drugs, because in society there are a good many commodities that are called drugs that are helpful that aid mankind. But the kind of drugs that degrade and debilitate and debase man, it's dope. I think that's a better expression for it; maybe it's a bit old fashioned, but I happen to like it. And you know dope is a big business in society. It makes fortunes for some people, and we are certainly concerned about it, and we spend a lot of time and a lot of effort in connection with it. And we will find that there are appropriations in my Estimates covering the cost of police services investigating dope cases. But we deal in a very sophisticated criminal element, international in scope, highly organized, and certainly very able to utilize all of the techniques and apparatus that is available to us, and it's a constant struggle. My understanding is however that generally speaking there has been somewhat of a slackening in respect to soft drugs in our schools, in our society, but the incidence of hard drugs has not abated, if anything it continues to increase because that is where the bigger money is, and that is where organized crime certainly has its greater interest.

Now I want to go on to some of the other matters that the Honourable Member from Assiniboia raised. He was concerned about what he thought might be backlogs in court, and I have the assurance from my staff and from the Administrator of Court Services that there are no extensive backlogs in our courts. Now that's not to say that there are not always delays from

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . time to time. The system is not perfect. What happens from time to time is that the defence counsel in a particular case, for reasons best known to him, is unable to go on. Maybe it's not to his advantage to go on, and maybe the other side in another circumstance is not available to go on, and then that creates a rippling effect in the court dockets, and so on. But short of regimenting the system we have to provide reasonable flexibility, and I don't think from everything I'm advised from my staff, that there is any real backlog problem in our courts.

Now the honourable member was concerned, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia again, was concerned about what the amounts of the grants were from the Federal Government, and if he were here earlier he would have heard me comment about the largesse of the Federal Government and its inadequacy in my opinion.

He was also concerned about crimes compensation and I certainly dealt with that earlier. Also concerned with greater flexibility in respect to Liquor Control Act administration, and so on, and cited a particular problem of some local community, and I want to assure honourable members that in the study that's forthcoming there will be ample opportunity for that sort of consideration. -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member -- I'm sorry if I'm side-tracked I won't complete the review of other speakers, and perhaps I'll be able to deal with your comments in a moment.

He was also concerned with juvenile crime increase and I think I've touched on that.

He alluded to an alleged backlog of cases in the Dauphin area, and I'm not familiar with any report of any backlog. If so, if there is such, it hasn't been brought to my attention; and I think I dealt with his concern about so-called, the faster action in Family Court. That is not a court where you have to -- you should deal with cases like a rubber stamp.

Now the Honourable Member from Morris was concerned about some of the matters, and the Member from Lakeside, and generally speaking concerned about the whole area of cattle rustling, and I think also the Member from Ste. Rose, and perhaps I could deal with all of their concerns with some brief comments.

There's no question, Mr. Chairman, that government considers this question very very seriously. I suffered some embarrassment, I don't mind admitting that the fact that there was light made of my attitude in the House on a previous occasion where I indicated that the first offender should in all cases, no matter what, receive consideration of his circumstances. -- and that's not to say that I believe that first offenders are just to be patted on the head and said, you're a nice fellow, go out and do it again, or have another go. And that's not it at all. The concern of a responsible system of administration of justice has to look at the individual, not only look at the individual who has been offended but also the person who has done the wrong, and carefully consider all of the circumstances. But that's not to say that the Attorney-General's Department considers this question lightly. As a matter of fact the Criminal Code as it is presently drafted makes particular provision, serious provision, for thefts over \$50.00. A person who has been convicted of theft over \$50.00 can go to jail for ten years, ten years.

A MEMBER: Name me one that has . . .

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if these interjections go on I expect that I'll be given leave to go a few minutes to -- (Interjection) -- For example Section 298 of the Code deals with the fraudulent taking of cattle or the defacing of brands, and it contains unusual provisions of reverse onus on the part of the person that is found in possession of cattle under those circumstances, and reverse onuses aren't readily found in the Criminal Code of Canada. So not only has the Federal Parliament but I think every government has considered it a serious offence for someone to take away from another what is the means of their livelihood, the essence of putting food and income into that household. But it's a difficult problem, it's a difficult problem because of the need for, I think, more effective identification systems, and those are costly. I don't know whether there will be ready acceptance for it but that sort of compulsory inspection of brands, and so on, would cost money. Now should that be charged against all citizens or those who ship cattle pay for those costs? It's a good question and I'm certainly concerned that there be more effective inspection systems. But the suggestion you know that the individual cattleman has to take arms to defend his stock I think is offensive to society.

So far as a concern, I hope that sometime before the end of this session I will be able to demonstrate the concern of this government in this area in a tangible way by making some recommendation in respect to some legislative change that may be in the interests of those in

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . society who are so concerned about this problem.

Now, have I got a couple of minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time allotted to the Minister has expired, unless he has leave of the House to continue. (Leave) The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, it has been my concern. I'm not in a position to counsel individual provincial judges as to what their approach should be in respect to a case that is brought before them. However, it is within my jurisdiction to meet from time to time with the Chief Provincial Judge and indicate my concerns to him in respect to sentencing, and I have done that, and I've expressed the concern of members of this House and citizens of Manitoba generally, some of whom have written to me, and particularly some of my colleagues who have spoken to me about this, who are concerned with the problem, and are concerned that a vigorous attitude be expressed by the courts in respect to any offender that comes before court dealing in this area.

Now again, from what I'm given to understand, some of the perpetrators of these times seem to act in a very organized way. They operate large trucks; obviously they're trucks that are prepared for cattle hauling; obviously they must be owned somewhere around in the communities, and I'm hopeful with the kind of vigorous co-operation from citizens that we will be able to get much more information about these operations because, you know, the law is only as good, and the enforcement of the law, as the people want to make it, and I know that people from time to time are reluctant to come forward and inform the police that there is something suspicious going on in respect to the operations by someone of a particular vehicle, or his manner of taking the farm truck out at night, and a big truck is being seen, not cattle hauling that night, but out on the highway. You know, I think we have to have aroused and concerned public prepared to make it their business to enquire about what is going on in the community, and prepared to step forward and co-operate with the police in investigations that are necessary. But it's difficult to apprehend these people. We have very vigorous inspection in respect to wildlife offences, and at the same time the police and the officers have an opportunity to investigate improper taking of animals. And we're very alert to the concerns of honourable members and we're determined that we'll be able to do much more.

The Honourable Member from Lakeside referred about a couple of specific cases, and I certainly am concerned to be able to respond specifically to that particular, the individual case that he alluded to. I wish however the honourable member had brought his concerns to me even more quickly than leaving it until today because there's no reason why any member of this House, any citizen of Manitoba, should not express his concern if there is a problem somewhere in what they consider to be a more prompt response to a matter under criminal investigation. I'm not at all embarrassed if any honourable member is concerned to know what is the present state of a particular action in court. I don't like to talk about those things and use names publicly, but certainly any member of this House has a right to know what is going on in respect to a particular case, particularly if it's in his constituency, and I implore any honourable member who has a concern for any, what he considers to be a delay in respect to a prosecution or any other matter before the courts, to feel free to exercise his right to know the reason, and I am embarrassed by what the honourable member says because I'm not aware of this particular case, and if it has been since September I trust that there is good and sufficient reason, otherwise there's going to be someone with some answers to give me, because I will not accept that our system should be such that there should be any protracted delay in the handling of matters that are referred to them, because I think that sort of thing breeds contempt for the law and the administration of justice, and that is not in the interests of society.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I could probably say a good deal more but I appreciate your indulgence of the House of going for a few minutes beyond the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just a few items that I hope I can present to the Minister that will not be repetitious of those that have been presented by other members on this side up to this point in the debate, and I will be interested of course particularly in those areas and in those topics which have some particular application in the WestMan area.

I think it's rather timely, Mr. Chairman, that the Police Chief in Brandon should have presented his annual report last week to his Board of Commissioners, and there are several

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . items contained in that report that I think are quite interesting to me. I would wonder if they are statistically in keeping with the general trend in the province or we have any special problems developing in our area of the province that might be deducted from the kinds of figures that are contained here. For instance I see that Reported Crimes in 1972 increased approximately 50 percent, and I would ask the Minister whether the provincial average is anywhere in that neighborhood, or whether Brandon as an urban area is developing additional problems in respect to crime as its population increases?

One of the figures, Mr. Chairman, that seems particularly interesting is that the incidence of fraud and forgery as a crime jumped from 49 reported cases in 1971 to 189 in 1972. This seems to me to be a rather amazing increase in a particular kind of criminal activity, that of fraud and forgery; so that's almost a fourfold increase in the number of reported cases of crime in that area.

I note too, Mr. Chairman, and it's been my impression that the Brandon Police Force is one that is very efficiently run and carries out its duties and maintains good public relationships, and takes a very active part in affairs other than merely the enforcement of law and order in the community. And this I think is one of the areas in which the present director has done some useful things in permitting and encouraging his force, and the members of the force, to take part in social activities, to take part in career guidance evenings at schools, and to generally serve in a very useful role in the community not only and aside from their regular duties in the law enforcement field.

One of the statements made by the Chief at the meeting at which this report was made I think is worthy of note. He is commenting on the results of the Toal Commission Inquiry and as members will recall, no doubt, the Toal Commission was established to inquire into alleged charges of racism in the police force and its activities in Brandon. The Police Chief in making his report commented that this department was cleared completely of all charges made against it as a result of the Toal Commission Report being filed. I would like the Minister to comment on that to confirm this result of the Toal Commission Report, because I think it's quite important to the image of the Brandon Police Force and I feel that the force itself is going ahead and is making rapid strides under the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I guess it's about a year ago now that the Manitoba Police Commission was established. I think it's in that neighborhood. I note that in July of last year the Police Commission, the Manitoba Police Commission, held a meeting in Brandon and the Chairman was quoted as saying that one function of the Commission is to make recommendations to the Attorney-General's Department on how police forces might be more effective, and one of their first suggestions may be the formation of a provincial police college. Now that was in July of 1972, and I'd be interested to hear from the Minister whether or not such recommendations had been made by the Manitoba Police Commission, whether he has had a report from them making a recommendation in favor of, or otherwise, the formation of a Manitoba police college. I understand that at the present time the Winnipeg City Police Force conducts its own training, and I presume that the Brandon Police Force is having to do a somewhat similar job in providing training for their own members, particularly those new members that are recruited for the force.

It's been pointed out that there are a number of areas of law enforcement that require more technological skill and knowledge than was heretofore necessary in the operation of various, more sophisticated devices; the kind of traffic control devices that are used now are different from the old methods; and in the enforcement of laws respecting sobriety, the breathalyzer tests, and so forth, have to be conducted by people who are well skilled in this field. So I'm interested in hearing whether or not such recommendations have been received from the Manitoba Police Commission and if so if they have indeed been received, whether any particular areas or locations have been proposed.

It's been suggested also, and this really doesn't fall in the Department of the Attorney-General but more directly in the Department of the Minister of Labour, that there is some reason to believe that in the future there may be a necessity or a need for a training school for fire fighters, and I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether or not there has ever been any consideration given, any discussion between the Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour as to whether or not it would be feasible to combine such a training activity and to include police training and fire fighting training under one type of -- (Interjection) -- Well the question

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(Mr. McGILL cont'd) . . . . specifically was the combination of the two kinds of training in a single facility? That was my question, Mr. Chairman, and I -- (Interjection) -- Right.

Mr. Chairman, in another area I would like to question the Minister in respect to the rates which are now charged for the transfer of title of real property titles under the Lands Titles Department. I understand that in 1970 there was an increase of rates put through by regulation. I think it was in April 1970 under Regulation 59/70 where the rates for the transfer of titles to houses or properties of any kind were increased from, I think probably it was \$5.00 for the first \$1,000 of value to \$7.00 for the first thousand, and from a dollar for each additional thousand or part thereof of value, to \$1.50. Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering what the reason for that increase of rates could have been at the time. Examining the revenues from the Land Titles Department it would appear that the department is a money-making one, that the revenues in 1972 amounted to approximately 1.8 millions and the expenses something like 1.1. Now this is the kind of a tax that falls in my view on somewhat all levels of society without regard for abilities to pay. I'm wondering if the Minister thinks that this is the kind of a tax that fits the current philosophy of the government side, and if in fact there is a surplus of revenue over expenditures in the Lands Title Division, why was it necessary to legislate for an increase of rates. It seems to me that this is the kind of an increase of fees, and so on, that is in the nature of a hidden tax, and on a property for instance worth \$20,000 it would be approximately \$24.00 the fee for transfer of title under the old regulations, and now amounts to in the neighborhood of \$35.00, which is a considerable increase.

Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the areas in which I hope the Minister will be able to comment before his Estimates are dealt with in their entirety.

We're particularly interested again in the activities of the Manitoba Police Commission and in the recommendations they may have made to the Minister during the year in which they have been holding meetings, I think not only in Brandon but in other parts of the province.

The report that has been submitted for the activities of the Brandon Police Force during the past year contains a number of interesting statistics. It does not however have any comment to make on the incidence of crime relating to the non-medical use of drugs. I think the Minister commented just previously in his summation on this item. I would be interested to know in somewhat more specific terms whether there is a decided increase in offences in the drug area and whether this applies throughout the province, or whether it is related specifically to urban areas of the province. Without having any specific references I am led to believe that in some of the larger cities of the United States that they feel that the peak has been passed in respect to this problem of drug addiction. -- (Interjection) -- My colleague says soft drugs. I didn't read it that way; I thought that in general there was some reason to believe that they had turned the corner and that there was some progress being made in the control of this kind of criminal activity.

Mr. Chairman, those are the areas in which I hope that the Minister will have an opportunity to comment. I have nothing further at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had no intention of speaking on this department but I find it hard to sit and listen to some of the comments of some of the members. I have never never given a long long speech, nor do I intend to. It will be a very short speech; I'll make my point clear, and I hope lucid.

First of all I'd like to commend the Attorney-General and like my colleague, my seat-mate who is not here tonight, I'm very proud to associate myself with him.

I'd like to speak of the communication between northern areas and the Attorney-General that was never established before. At any time with any problem, I've had answers within three to four hours, not always affirmative but at least solid, constructive answers. Any appointment made in the north, he has always asked me my opinion of the person who he thought would receive the appointment. Not always has he followed my advice but at least he's had the courtesy to ask me. I'd like to congratulate him on his fairness and his gut feeling for licences in remote areas. And here is area that's really gut. Some of our settlements and reserves have roads that don't actually go anywhere and often some person has a car which they put in motion; they can't afford a licence; they can't afford insurance, and like former governments we overlook this slight discrepancy of the law, and I admire this trait in his character. I admire him for his consideration later on of a dual licence system to protect drivers of taxicabs,

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BARROW cont'd) . . . . trucks and so on who have a human weakness and once in a while they get picked up for something that could cause them to lose their jobs. He has promised to look into it very seriously and later on deal with it.

And now I'd like to take a look at the Member for Thompson, a man's man. And let's take a good look at this man. I'd like to go back to the by-election where he spent 60-some days on the steps in a sleeping bag, in a tent, to become the hero of every man in the north on his resentment to a five percent sales tax. And we looked up to him -- I did too because at that time -- (Interjection) -- Must I put up with these rude interruptions, Mr. Chairman? He became, Mr. Chairman, a champion of the north. Later on he become Minister of Transport, and he said in this House everything pertaining to roads we take it from the south and the north would benefit. And the people in the north loved him for that statement, Mr. Chairman, especially the labour people. At one time his popularity was possibly greater than our Leader. And what happened, what happened, what did happen? I'll tell you what happened to him. He got wrapped up in pornography and, Mr. Chairman, this government doesn't even own a pornograph. Obscene literature, sexy movies, women's lib . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it would not be my intention to disrupt the honourable member's dissertation on any honourable member in the House. I just want to know on what particular department or resolution of the Estimates before us that he is dealing with.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on the Minister's salary.

MR. ENNS: Well then he's speaking about the Minister is he? His Minister. Oh I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Does my honourable friend want to discuss safety in mines?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lake . . .

MR. BARROW: Do you? Women's lib. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, pornography - when I was in Grade 11 pornography was rampant. We had our pornography Tilly and Max, Joe Palooka, nothing was left to the imagination, and that was when I was eleven years old. Obscene literature was the same. Sexy movies, he made them. I saw Joe; I saw him at Curious Yellow, I saw The Stewardesses, which I would never have bothered with only he publicized them. I think he was getting a ripoff from these people. -- (Interjection) -- And he talks about women's lib. Women's lib. Women are different from men. I say, God bless the difference, Mr. Speaker. He says women are weaker than men. My wife could tie her hand behind her back and beat any member of the opposition. -- (Interjection) -- We'll get to the Royal Bank some other time, Mr. Blake. How about the -- here's what happened to the honourable member, it went to his head. Yah. The news media, television, Free Press, 80 percent of his time listening to reports. He forgot who he was representing. He became a peep pimp for the news media. And then he moved from Thompson to La Salle, had a sauna; he got horses; he become a corporation within himself, become very complacent. He become above the working people; he forgot them. He became religious; went to Lourdes in Italy and saw miracles, believes in confession . . .

A MEMBER: Is that bad?

MR. BARROW: That's bad, sure it's bad. Well you can sin all week and go on Sunday and get forgiven, it's bad as far as I'm concerned.

And let's talk about abortion. Let's deal with it. I come from Springhill, Nova Scotia, where abortion was done with a knitting needle or a six-inch spike, and that's what he wants to bring back. Abortion by abortionists who murder and kill. He's never had an abortion or he'd know something about it. What he's doing, Mr. Chairman, he's making a law for the rich and a law for the poor, because if I'm making 60-75 thousand dollars a year I can send my daughter to New York, to Mexico, to India, and have an abortion. They're taking a trip around the world, educations you. But if I'm in the 8,000 dollar bracket I'm at the mercy of these killers. And that's what he's trying to do, put it down on a level, on a scale like that - he's so far out in left field, Mr. Speaker. But the people of the north would agree on one abortion, Mr. Speaker. The people of the north would agree on one abortion and that would be the Member from Thompson's.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think that remark is uncalled for. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. BARROW: I withdraw the remark, Mr. Chairman. I am not in a position to speak the truth.

And then he talked about broken marriages, Mr. Speaker, broken marriages, and what he's saying that once you get married it's a lifetime contract. -- (Interjection) -- No. No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the honourable member direct his remarks to the Chair.

MR. BARROW: Broken marriages, Mr. Chairman - it happens every day. There's no reason, there's no reason in this world why you have to be tied down to one woman or one set of children if the woman and children are unhappy. Why not try again? If at first you don't succeed. -- (Interjection) -- I'll give you two classic examples of people who have come from broken homes, Mr. Chairman. Babe Ruth was brought up in an orphanage, and he was the best ball player that ever lived. Art Linklater -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Art Linklater was a foundling on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. Are we on the Estimates of the Minister of Health or on the Attorney-General's Department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Attorney-General's Department.

A MEMBER: Dealing with human rights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Art Linklater was a foundling and he runs the children's program, one of the best known radio programs there is, and they come from broken homes. So how do you prove your point my honourable friend? And I myself could adopt a child and show the same love as I would my own children, but he couldn't. The Member from Thompson couldn't do that. And let me tell you - let me just mention this fact, and this kind of bothers me, Mr. Chairman. The Member from Rupertsland who left he said, our caucus. This is untrue. The member was thrown out, thrown out of the caucus, and look today, Mr. Chairman, Joe was the main member to having him leave the caucus, and they're sleeping together, sleeping together.

A MEMBER: Arrest them, arrest them.

MR. BARROW: They're both pimping for the media.

And let's take a look at Joe you know, working man, he said he's for working people, the labour movement. What did he say about the Kierans Report? What did he say about it? It's wrong, he said. Obviously he has shares with Inco, or at least some influence when he goes against the Kierans Report.

Alcoholism? Alcoholism and drug addiction. He hates these people, and these people need help which we're trying to give to them. People who are lost, Mr. Chairman, but not to the Member from Thompson. If he said, if he said in all sincerity let's do away with them; let's kill them; let's murder them; let's do something, but he doesn't. He just criticizes them and runs them down. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Thompson has been emasculated. He's lost it. He's no longer a representative of the north and he never says when he speaks that he will run in Thompson or Lynn Lake or Flin Flon.

A MEMBER: You've got it sewed up.

MR. BARROW: Right. That's right. Swan River too.

A MEMBER: That will be the day.

MR. BARROW: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just quote this motto. It comes from my best friends the A.A. people and hopefully it will help this member. It says, "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference." What he lacked was wisdom, Mr. Chairman. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, the three very important men in our society today, there's God, there's Hitler and there's the Member from Thompson, not necessarily in that priority.

A MEMBER: Running third.

MR. BARROW: Peter Warren? And he talks about our youth today, Mr. Chairman, and runs down the hippies. He runs down the drug addiction, the freedom, free love, he runs all that down. He wants to know what happened to the youth today? I'll tell him what happened. In my father's era they had the first great world war, which was a matter of just existing; in my time we had the Second World War and the depression, another form where you just had to exist. But this society of our youth is brought up in an affluent society. They don't particularly like it, our hippies. The work concept has changed. When we used to say an honest day's work



## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BARROW cont'd) . . . . for an honest dollar has gone. When I think of my career where I got 95 cents for one ton of coal 13,000 feet underground -- (Interjection) -- those were the good old days. They sold that same ton of coal for \$22.00 and now I wonder after 56 years what happened to 95 to 22. These kids know now. They're much more intelligent than the Member from Thompson and myself both. Mr. Speaker, I think I've made enough points for today, for tonight. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words for these seven or eight minutes, and I won't be more than a few minutes . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would yield the floor just for a moment. Would the Attorney-General not consider responding to that speech?

MR. McKELLAR: Well the only thing I didn't inform my partner here I have to go to a funeral tomorrow afternoon so I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I think it would be wise that we leave the Attorney-General so he can have a good night's sleep on that speech that was just made by the Member for Flin Flon. I think we should get back to the Attorney-General's Estimates anyway; I think it would be a wise move on the part of all of us here.

One of the problems that has been created - there hasn't been actually created, but it exists in my area, is because of the difference between laws in Manitoba and the laws in North Dakota. I happened to be in North Dakota when they passed the law to reduce the drinking age to 19 and a day after the session ended the Governor vetoed the bill sending it back to 21 years. So what is happening along all the border towns is that we're getting a large influx of 18, 19, 20-year-olds coming in to our towns on Saturday nights and Friday nights to -- this is the tourist industry that the Minister of Tourism -- and it is a large industry because I tell you that the beverage rooms in Boissevain fill up about 8:00 o'clock at night and they're full till they have to go back over the customs before 12:00 o'clock. So this is one of the problems that's been created on our side of the border and some of the hotel managers are saying it's getting worse as the time goes along.

Now another problem - I was just wondering whether, it actually isn't that serious but it's one that was mentioned by the Member for Arthur the other day regarding having to pave the parking lots for Legions. I have two in my area, Killarney and Souris. They've been instructed they have to pave their parking lots and they for the life of me can't see why they should have to do this but the law says they have to, I guess according to instructions that were sent out.

Now one other thing that is bothering them which hasn't been cleared, and I don't know whether you cleared it, Sir, in your opening statement, but it was on the increase on the honorary patrons in the Legions, like Legion clubrooms, it's up from ten percent to thirty percent. Now the instructions that went out to the various Legions mentioned that they could increase them up to thirty percent but there's another factor involved where sons and daughters of all the Legion members are going to be included in that 30 percent, and I wondered if you could inform the members of the House here just how that change in policy will take effect, and I want to relate here on this notice that went out from the Liquor Control Commission and it says, "The number of paternal affiliates shall not exceed at any time 30 percent of the total of ordinary members." Now does that include sons and daughters or is that -- what relationship does that have to honorary members as well as sons and daughters? I think the -- they're just a little up in the air on that particular point, and so if you could clear that up it would be a great help, I think, to most of them.

Now each week we read in the newspapers large numbers of impaired drivers, people who have been suspended, and I was just wondering if you could give us the total number of the impaired drivers, drivers who have been charged for impaired driving in the year 1972 and the year 1971. I think this would be of interest to many of us here on this side of the House because it seems to be an alarming number each week if you read in the newspapers as it's listed. So I don't know whether that comes under your department or under Motor Vehicle Branch. I don't know which it is.

Now one other thing that I would like to bring up before the -- and I read with interest that before Christmas that you were not going to appoint any Q. C. 's and, not being a lawyer,

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . I don't really know what a Q. C. means to the average lawyer, whether that means that that entitlement would make more money for him at the end of the year or at the end of his lifetime, but I noticed with wonderment that you weren't going to appoint any. But the other provinces in Canada did appoint their share of the number of Q. C. 's also the Dominion of Canada. Now what is the policy of your government regarding the appointment of Q. C. 's in the future?

Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for La Verendrye has got about three words he wants to get in before 9:00 o'clock so I'll sit down and let him go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the member that just spoke. I was going to touch on the subject of rustling also, but I think I'll leave that for tonight. It seems that in my area, especially in the deeper part of south-eastern Manitoba, that we have conditions happening that take place even before the hunting season. Animals are being destroyed without a sense of warning or anything of the kind. But, like I said, I can perhaps bring that up with the Minister some time. I have one concern that I would like to bring up tonight and that is a matter of people writing cheques without any fear of being punished or any fear of being even admonished, and I think this has been going on for some time and the Honourable Minister may say that this is part of the federal responsibility, which I agree, but I think our own laws will have to be tightened up in this respect. And I think a lot of these cheques that are being written out by people who are quite irresponsible for doing this, are doing so without, first of all, any respect for the law, but are getting to a point where it doesn't really matter because the fines and the tokens of punishment have been rather weak over the last years in the Province of Manitoba. I'm not going to go into the matter of saying what some of the punishments have been, but I think the Honourable Minister knows that some of the cases that have come up have been very weak indeed and for some reason the law does not seem to have any teeth in this matter.

I could perhaps refer to the strict laws of the people across the border, the United States. You go down there and anybody can travel, and very often in many cases they'll just as well take your personal cheque than any charger cheque or what have you, because the laws indicate plainly that if you do write a cheque of that nature the punishment is much more severe than it is down here, and it seems that our laws for - call them rubber cheques if you like - are not adequate at this time. And I raise this point at this time because I am one of those who firmly believes that more positive action has to be taken, first of all on the provincial scene, and naturally partly on the federal scene. I know that many merchants, farmers and many individuals are pretty well at a loss why so many people are taking advantage of writing worthless cheques and taking advantage of some of the weak laws that seem to exist in the Province of Manitoba. Even when those guilty people that write these kind of cheques finally reach the courts, it seems that countless numbers are taking, continually taking advantage of this type of a situation, and I should perhaps -- it looks like the Chairman would like to see me close and I had really only begun, but I do hope that the Minister can look into this matter because there are many dozens of hours and time spent by people trying to redeem what they have lost because people that are of a low calibre will take advantage of our weak laws presently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Your Committee of Supply begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 16. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, could I have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: It drops to the bottom. Resolution No. 5. The Honourable . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . honourable member I wonder if we could have this matter stand?  
(Agreed)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: No. 7. The Honourable Member for St. Vital has 15 minutes left.

RESOLUTION 7

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Yes, Mr. Speaker. When I spoke on this before, I mentioned at the time that I hadn't intended then to get into the debate but then I noticed something about the resolution that showed maybe a little fuzzy thinking or maybe an attempt to obscure the issue somewhat. And I drew attention at that time, Mr. Speaker, to two of the clauses, where in one of them it mentioned that the ownership of recreation lands in Manitoba should be reserved for ownership by residents of Canada, and where, in another "whereas", it mentioned that farmlands and recreation lands must remain in the ownership of Canadian citizens. And what I was asking the Member for Assiniboia at that time was, does he understand that residents and citizens means the same thing? Is he using those two terms interchangeably or does he see a difference between them? In which case, does he intend that recreation lands should be owned by residents and that the citizenship of those residents should not be a factor in the ownership of them, and by the same token does he consider that the ownership of farmlands should be in the hands of Canadian citizens only, irrespective of their residency.

To take the first one first, as far as the ownership of recreation lands is concerned the Member for Portage la Prairie obviously wants these in the hands of Canadian residents. Now, does it really matter that much if the ownership of a certain section of recreation land in Manitoba is owned by a Manitoban who lives in Manitoba or a Manitoban who lives in Ontario, if there is a difference at all, or from someone who lives in Newfoundland for that matter? What then is his definition of a resident? How would he, for instance, term someone who lives partly for the year in, say, Manitoba and for a good portion of the, say, winter season somewhere far to the south? Would he then be considered a resident of Canada or would he not? Would some minimum time be required, for instance a six-month residency within Canada or a three-month residency or a nine-month residency? That was not made clear either by the Member for Portage or by the Member for Assiniboia.

As far as the citizenship part is concerned, the Member for Portage la Prairie obviously considers that the ownership of farmlands within Manitoba is important from a citizenship point of view, whether or not the citizen owning that particular farmland is resident within Manitoba or Canada or somewhere else. But if he is concerned about the factor of absentee ownership, again does it really matter, or what is the difference between a citizen in Canada resident in Manitoba? Or does it make any difference if he should live in New York or in Nova Scotia?

And again there arises the problem of the ownership of that farmland, or recreation land for that matter, if it should be owned by a company or a corporation. How would the Member for Portage la Prairie be prepared to define Canadian citizenship when it comes to a corporation? Would he require, for instance, that it be a Manitoba registered company or corporation, or one registered elsewhere in Canada; and what about the ownership of the shares of that particular company? Suppose it was, for instance, a wholly-owned subsidiary of an American corporation. Would he consider that as being a Canadian citizen for the purposes of the ownership of land in Manitoba? Would he try to define the issue somehow as ownership of the shares, a certain percent of the ownership of those shares to be vested within Canadian hands, and again, how would he define Canadian hands for those purposes? Or conversely, would he insist that a certain number of directors of that corporation would have to be Canadian citizens, or possibly Canadian residents or both or neither?

It's when we consider factors like this that the whole problem becomes so complex and so difficult to enforce as to become almost impossible to enforce. And I'm sure that the Member of Portage, along with his colleague the Member for Assiniboia, would not wish this Legislature nor any other Legislature in Canada to put legislation on the books which would not be enforceable. So I would suggest to the Member for Portage that perhaps he and his colleagues and his Leader review the resolution that he has brought before us, and see if it says exactly what he wants it to say, and if the meaning is as I read it. Not only that, when he comes to speak in favour of this or some similar resolution, that he would give some thought to its enforcement and the definition of the terms that he uses, and suggest to us some way in which such a law might be enforced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments re this rather

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. McKENZIE-cont'd) . . . interesting and I think very important resolution for debate of the members of the Assembly. I think I would likely support the amendment by the Honourable the Minister much easier than I can support the resolution as presented by the Honourable Member for Portage, because I think basically the resolution itself leaves a lot to be desired in Manitoba today, and the reasons are quite known, Mr. Speaker. I, as a rural Member of the Legislature, suffering from fantastic problems of depopulation, people moving out of the rural areas, and the Premier spoke in my constituency the other night and was the least impressed that it's a problem that even he hasn't got the answers for, and I, in all due respect to the First Minister, on most occasions I hear him, the say I hear him, that he's got the answers for all problems. But this is one that he hasn't got the answer for, and I'm sure there's very few members of the Legislature or anybody in this province who can solve what's happening; that the people are just leaving rural Manitoba and shifting to the urban centres. So basically what the -- in the one part of the resolution here where it says that, where the populations of other jurisdictions are increasing, and possibly it could be possible if some of our American friends in some of those urban centres in the United States, where they're having all kinds of urban problems - that we haven't had in this province yet to date but I'm sure they're going to come - because if this great metropolis of Winnipeg continues to grow at its present growth and all the rural people shift in here, we're going to have urban problems that have never even been spoken about in this Legislature or maybe in this province.

There are some of the metropolitan centres in the United States today that are suffering tremendous problems from too many people confined to one small area which becomes very expensive and very difficult to regulate or legislate to control social and economic problems. And here, if I can envision what the next 20 years of this province is going to be - and I just picked up my local newspaper today, and again I see another 25 sales in my constituency, another 25 people that are selling out and leaving. My gosh, what's going to -- we're going to have all this vast area out in the rural part of Manitoba with nobody living there. Now surely, surely somebody, some government or some of the economists or somebody is going to have to start and seriously study this subject because we just can't let that happen in this vast province. Everybody wants to live in an urban society.

So the resolution and the way it's presented by the Honourable Minister, while it may be in all good faith that Manitoba will not be owned by non-residents of Canada, puts us in a very difficult position if we support the resolution. I like the one by the Honourable the Minister, "that the lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans." I can accept that resolution but I think it's a subject matter that deserves a lot of debate in this House and I'm sure that some of the senior people of government that are looking at this problem and studying it, would certainly be interested in what we, the members of the Legislature, feel on this subject matter, but it's one that deserves considerable debate, but I just can't support the resolution but I certainly can support the amendment as offered by the Honourable Minister and I hope that we can continue the debate and hopefully come up with ways and means not only to, you know, attack the problem of the depopulation of rural Manitoba and come up with some answers as to how to get people to move back out there. It's a pretty darn good quality of life. Us guys that come from the country, we don't look too bad, I hope, to the urban people. I enjoy the country very much and I just can't understand why people don't want to live out there. But nevertheless, in all good faith it's a good resolution and I'm glad the Honourable Member from Portage brought it before the House for debate. I appreciate the amendment by the Minister and I hope that the members will, as many as can, stand up and debate this resolution. But as it stands now, I support the amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to put in a few words on this resolution myself as presented by the Honourable Member from Portage and the amendment thereto by the Minister of Agriculture. There are two problems, as I see it, to the question of recreation lands becoming more scarce and the problems related to same, and one is of course the problem that came up in the last couple of years with the selling of hunting rights - I think that's one of the problems that the Member is talking - the selling of hunting rights by farmers to hunters either from out of the province or within the province and the like, and of course the very great opposition by the Game and Fish Associations to this practice of certain companies or little corporations of groups of people going around from farm to farm

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . . and offering farmers X number of dollars for the privilege of giving access to hunters to trespass on their property and hunt on it.

The other problem, of course, is our summer resort areas, our beach areas, where there begins a small development; shortly thereafter all the prime beach area seems to be picked up very quickly by private people, by cottage owners from urban areas, from all over the place, and then the very good beach areas are then not available to you and I, for instance, who may not own a cottage or may not be able to afford a camping spot, or something like that, along a prime beach area and then accesses is denied to us.

I see the resolving of the first problem of hunting rights. I think that if the hunters and the game associations see this role by private individuals as being very contrary to natural, shall we say, natural justice in the access of hunting rights and hunting accessibility of lands by all individuals in the province and should be left open to the sort of negotiations between the hunter and the farmer rather than having to sell a right. I would say that the hunting associations could quickly deal with this problem by putting out a circular and just going on an all-out campaign to all the people who are hunters. I would say most of the people, individuals in the province who are hunters, belong to one game and fish association or another, and I think they could handle this type of a problem by a quick boycott or just a freeze on these individuals, and I am sure this practice would stop very quickly.

The problem that many hunters face, of course, is that it only takes one bad apple to create a feeling of bad will between the farmer and the hunter in rural areas. You have one fellow go in and either forget to close a gate, the cattle get out, or someone may cut the odd barbed wire fence, and as a result the farmer's back is put against the wall and he says, "No more; all hunters therefore are lousy; they're cutting my fences and they can't go on my land."

But I would say the program that's put on by the Manitoba Game and Fish Association, the operation "Respect" has created a lot of good public relations between the hunter and the farmer, and I know in my area, especially in the Ashern, Fisher Branch, Eriksdale areas, the Dog Lake, Vogar areas, there was a fairly intensive campaign on behalf of the game and fish, on behalf of the hunters, to try and maintain a harmonious relationship between these two groups in society. The farmer in most instances would like to see hunters on his property but he certainly will not stand for any damage or any malicious pranks that may be encountered on his property. I would say that if the hunters got together more often with farmer organizations - and I know there is a course going on now put on by the Department of Mines and Resources in guiding - I think if this course was possibly even undertaken by many of our rural residents, many of our farmers, to possibly bring a better understanding of the areas that can be better hunted, I'm sure that many of our residents of Winnipeg would be able to contact a farmer and take advantage of his expertise and his knowledge of the areas.

The other point that just came to mind was that if in effect the public or the people of Manitoba would like to have and should, I believe, have and give access to each and every citizen of the province to prime recreational lands, I would say that the easiest way, and not try and exclude, as this resolution does, residences and citizenship and the like, the public should in fact, by either through purchasing of prime recreational areas of development of Crown lands such as are being done along Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipeg and even in northern points, these areas be developed, then more of these areas if they could be developed, then the pressure would come off the recreational areas that the public may want.

Now the Member from Roblin dwelt on the point of rural depopulation which has been with us since the late 1930s and 40s where people have continually left the farm, and right now the age of the farmer, if he didn't mention it, but the age of the farmer, the average age of farmers in Manitoba is in the fifties, and he mentioned that there were many sales of farmland coming up in his constituency. I would ask him, what would you do with this property that is up for sale in many areas that farmers are retiring? For one reason or another, not many young people can afford to pick up this property. What would be the logical answer?

You know, if young people cannot come back and afford to start up farming, then I think there has to be an inducement, a policy by government, to make it possible for young people to come back to the farm if they -- you know, I couldn't in '67 when I left the force, I couldn't afford to come back to the farm. You know, I worked on a salary, like I would say most people in the city, and I really couldn't afford to come back to the farm. If it wasn't for a family operation I would not have been able to come back to farming. And I would say that this is the

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. USUSKI cont'd) . . . . case of most young people who would like to come back to the land and who would like to make their living on the farm and who would like to live in a rural atmosphere but they just cannot afford it. There's just no way. Now what do you do in a case like that? Well one thing, of course, that has ever plagued the rural communities, of course, farm income. If there are policies and pressures put on for a national agricultural policy to take into account the disastrous incomes that farmers have encountered for decades, and if the incomes could be strengthened as collective bargainings, the collective bargaining process could do, then this would sort of start the reversal trend.

Now what to do with the elderly farmers that I mentioned before? Well, I would say that in many instances there probably aren't buyers that could purchase this land, and if there are, those farms are probably large enough or of such a magnitude in size that, you know, they don't need to be any larger, that the size of the operation probably in itself would be optimum. The next alternative would be for the Crown or the government agency on behalf of the people to purchase these farms and let the farmers retire in dignity and lease out, lease out on a long term basis to young people so they could come back to the farm.

You know, let's say if I was attempting to come back to the farm now and I couldn't afford the purchase of the farm but I had, say, saved up \$20,000 or \$30,000, I was able to scrimp and save for a long enough period of time, it certainly would not set me up into an operation but I could possibly use that collateral to purchase some equipment or some livestock and start an operation. Now if there was an elderly farmer who wanted to retire and couldn't afford, just couldn't afford to sell out for peanuts because there would be no takers, no one would want to purchase his land, I would say then the logical thing for me to do would be for me to go to the Agricultural Credit Corporation and say, "Look. I want to farm; I can't afford it. I have some dollars saved up that I could put into the operation - oh, 20,000, 30,000 - and then I would say that a life long lease with an option to buy after a certain period of time, if my operation panned out, would be the logical answer to entice and give the opportunity for young people to come back to the farms.

Now the Member for Portage in his resolution mentioned that the farmlands within the province are a vitally important ingredient in Canadian national interests and, like our recreational lands, must remain Canadian-owned. Well, when you get into the question of ownership and residence, and as I mentioned before, you know, the Member for St. Vital pointed it out or pointed the problems of enforcement very vividly. You know, what do you know if I, as an American, or from Saskatchewan, or from Ontario, come into Manitoba and I settle here and I'm a resident here, do you then exclude my purchasing or my being able to purchase any land that may be up for sale? Or let's say I be from Saskatchewan, would we then say, well, the people from Saskatchewan would be excluded of purchasing farmland or recreation land in the Province of Manitoba? I would say this would be a very difficult matter to enforce. You would then probably have to have some sort of an agency and - the member didn't explain it - some sort of a monitoring agency that when every sale or every offer for sale would take place, somebody would have to sit down and say, well, you know, who's selling this land, who's buying this land, and are we going to adjudicate this process or what process would have to be set up? I would say it would be . . .

. . . . continued on next page

## RESOLUTION 7

A MEMBER: Hold public hearings.

MR. URUSKI: Well I doubt that was in the member's intent. Now what type of legislation? The member goes on to say that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of introducing legislation to insure that farm and recreation lands located in Manitoba will not be owned by non-residents of Canada but will be preserved for Canadian residents only. Okay. Just on the surface it sounds very good but, you know, as I mentioned before, what type of a screening process, what type of legislation would you have and how would you enforce it? What would you do to the recreational land that is now possibly owned -- there is probably farmland that's owned by people from Saskatchewan and some recreational land in the Whiteshell that is probably owned by residents of Ontario. What do you say to the people of -- (Interjection) -- No? What do you say to the people of Manitoba that own recreational land in towards Kenora?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the member inadvertently made a misstatement if I can correct him. Land in the Whiteshell is leased. It is not owned.

MR. URUSKI: All right, I'm sorry. You may be in the Provincial Park but there are other recreational lands that aren't part of the Whiteshell Provincial Park. No, you're right on that; that wasn't my intent on saying that. But there are other lakes and areas in the south-east or northeastern portion of Manitoba that aren't part of a provincial park system, which could be privately owned and bought. Now what do you do with residents, say, from Ontario that own lots on, say, Burnt Lake or areas like that, or vice versa, where residents from Manitoba may own land there. Do you say, well, retroactive ten years ago no more, or do you say from this day? Do you sort of set a D-Day something like the National Revenue on evaluation day on assets when you file for the new capital gains tax under our revenue system? Or do you say, well, we will forget it but from this day forward things will change? Or would it be better to pressure the government and say, "Look. These areas are prime recreational land. The people of Manitoba would like to go into those areas. Many of the people can't afford to purchase lots and there wouldn't be enough for every one of us." Do you say to the government then, "You set up a provincial park system or a recreational area, and the government on behalf of all the people provide a public access to these areas for every one so that every one will have the same opportunity of utilizing these beaches and areas and the like."

Those are some of the points that have been raised in this resolution that aren't clear and I would think the member probably will clarify them as to their intent. I would agree with the amendment saying that the lands in Manitoba be protected in the most beneficial use by Manitobans. Therefore it is really left to the best discretion of whoever either is in office or the best method and the simplest method to cause the least hardship to people who may own this land and develop policies in such a way that it can benefit Manitobans as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a small contribution to this discussion if I may, and I appreciate the sincerity of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in developing this resolution. The part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that interests me is the Whereas No. 5: "Farmlands within the province are virtually important ingredients in the Canadian national interest and like our recreation lands must remain Canadian-owned."

You know, Mr. Speaker, I've always been an advocate for our young people looking north and moving north. The people of this province now for a generation have spent millions of dollars in opening Northern Manitoba. I refer you, Sir, to Highways No. 10 and 83, and lately No. 6. You know, Sir, there are millions upon millions of acres in Northern Manitoba that's been untouched by man, and making a hazard guess I would suggest, Sir, that there's not many more than 100,000 people north of Neepawa. And when you look at that territory, that part of Manitoba that I briefly described, one wonders why, I often wonder why the people will cluster in southern Manitoba as they did in 1876 when Manitoba opened up. When we think of 500,000 people in this metropolis, it seems such a pity that all these hundreds of square miles, millions of acres of land in Northern Manitoba, have as yet to be put to full use.

I'm one, Mr. Speaker, that would like to reverse the trend. The Honourable Member for St. George made much of the fact that a young man cannot go into farming these days because of the high costs. I agree, but he's thinking big. He's thinking that a man must go in big. I wonder what his forefathers did. How was the Portage Plains opened up? Dauphin

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . area opened up? The Swan River Valley opened up? Mr. Speaker, those people built their homes, they went in there with ox carts and they picked out their land and they developed it and made a success of it. A man, Mr. Speaker, can still make a good living on a quarter section. I know people may make a joke of it, but at the same time the young people today, if they could somehow be educated in some numbers, reasonable numbers it's true, to go back to the land, there's all kind of land in Northern Manitoba or Central Manitoba where they can settle and take the pressure off a metropolis such as this which is growing in leaps and bounds.

My colleague from Roblin spoke of the sales. A few days ago in the budget debate I too spoke of the sales of farms. They're not all large farms, Mr. Speaker, they're small farms on which men have brought up families and had good livings. It seems to me that somehow or other if a system could be developed whereby those small farms could be taken over by younger people that may be inclined to go back to the soil, it would be good for them and it would be good for the Province of Manitoba. It was suggested that in view of the fact that it's so expensive to go into farming today, which primarily I don't agree with, I'm horrified to think that the suggestion was made that the government should possibly buy up this land and that they should put the people onto the land with communal farms, no doubt. This, I hope, will never happen in the Province of Manitoba. And I still insist, I still insist that if some system could be developed whereby the young people could be persuaded to look away from city living and urban dwelling, that much could come of it. I feel that this resolution, innocent as it may seem at this particular time, is going to be placed in the hands of possibly some government to set up land banks that we're seeing across the border and I, Sir, want no part of it, and therefore I can support the amendment of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture but not any further than what he's had to say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank all members who took a part in this debate and there were many constructive suggestions and ideas and proposed policies put forward. But I'm rather mystified by the government's amendment which says, and I quote: "lands of Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans." Now we're talking about two things. Number 1, we're talking about the use of farmland. Number 2, we're talking about the use of recreational land. And perhaps one should deal with one away from the other because there are two separate problems here. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's true, the resolution encompasses the two problems but I think they should be dealt with one at a time. You can't say one thing about recreational land which may not be or may be attributable to a problem concerned with the ownership of farmland. And, Mr. Speaker, if I may talk for a moment about the use of recreational land.

The amendment sounds up not all that bad. It says that lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans. Well, I guess we could say that that's a motherhood resolution, nobody could disagree with that; but what does the government mean by it? If we examine the past use of recreational land in some of the provinces across Canada, it might be helpful. For example, it was only about two years ago in Ontario that a law was passed saying that foreign residents of Canada would no longer be able to buy land for recreational use. They would have to go to a leasing system and even then it was debatable whether or not they could gain control of land. In the Fort Frances area where many people from the United States, especially the Minneapolis area, have for years considered it their right and their privilege to buy land on the lakes in the Fort Frances area. This has now been stopped. Americans cannot buy land any more in Ontario for recreational use.

Now why did this situation come about? Because the local people who for years thought that there was no particular value in this sort of land, it was lakeshore property or wilderness property that had a special appeal to a resident, it was there to be had. Well I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that day is past. That day is past where it's there to be had by anybody who lives in the community. We have the jet aircraft, better road network in North America, so that people think nothing of commuting five hundred miles for a weekend. Nothing at all. It's practically standard practice.

In the city of Calgary there's many people that own land in the Shusqua Valley, Shusqua River area, 340 miles. They drive every weekend, they drive 340 miles to their river front



## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . or lake front property, but the problem is here now; it's not something you can push away and say, well, it's not all that bad. Prince Edward Island -- and I mentioned this when I brought in the original motion -- felt it necessary to pass an act to say that seashore property, some of it must be held for the use of the natives of P.E.I. because the people from Maine and Boston were coming up and buying up this land, and the people who owned the land were of very modest means and they were selling according to the local market, and had the practice gone on it would have meant that a Prince Edward Islander would not have been able to go down to his own seashore. So there is a place for a provincial government to move in this regard.

I might say that Manitoba in the late forties was the first province in North America, or the first jurisdiction in North America to do something about the problem of holding recreational land for the people, and today -- and I'm proud and I'm sure other members of this Legislature are proud to know D. L. Campbell and Mr. Charlie Greenlay. Here were two men who said with foresight, "The recreational lands of Manitoba we should stake some of it out for the good of our citizens," and what do we have today? We have the Duck Mountain Provincial Park, we have the Provincial Park up near Flin Flon, we have the Whiteshell area where there is a control on the land use. There are public beaches, there are trailer camps, there are cottage sites where a person may lease under certain conditions. And really, this is what I'm saying that we should do more of. The amendment to the resolution said that "the lands of Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use of Manitobans." Well, isn't this what Campbell did back in the late forties, the early fifties? Didn't he try to ensure that the people of this province would have their heritage for their children and their grandchildren and forever? So what I'm saying is that if the problem existed at that time, it's far worse now. It's far worse now; that we have to take steps to make sure that all of our people, whether we be Manitobans or Ontarians or from Saskatchewan or B.C., should not have our lands put on the international market where someone one or two or five thousand miles away can buy out from under the people who live here. And really that's what the resolution is all about.

Last week I had a letter from the Portage la Prairie Game and Fish Association, where they were raising the problem of a foreign owner who overstepped his rights as a land owner and was now, or is now, flooding by pumps, flooding the land which is the road allowances next to his property to keep Canadians out. Well, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not here tonight but I drew to his attention this problem and he said, "Well, we'll certainly look into that." But what I'm saying is we can't look into these problems on an ad hoc or a piecemeal basis; we have to have a policy, and that's what I'm saying. There has to be a policy to handle the problem and if we allow time to pass and we use piecemeal efforts to deal with the situation, really we're not doing a service to our citizens.

There has been a suggestion made that this sort of a law is restrictive. Certainly it's restrictive. We have a precedence right now where the national government had passed a law four or five years ago with respect to foreign ownership of our news media -- television stations and newspapers -- and at the time that this law was brought in, there was a great deal of criticism by the opposition of the day and by the people who owned television stations and owned newspapers, but I see nothing wrong with a Canadian government saying, "Look. This is our business." Our country is our business. We do not wish foreign ownership of our news media. We wish the opinions that are formulated, the editorial policies that are made in the news media of Canada should be representative of Canadian interests, and I see nothing wrong with that. And that measure passed through parliament; I can't remember if all parties supported it, but it was passed.

Mexico, Mr. Speaker, has passed laws with respect to foreign ownership of land, and I say good for them. They, like Canada, were living next to a giant in numbers and in natural wealth -- I'm speaking of the U.S. now -- so that to keep the country of Mexico for their people, their leaders felt that they had to pass this sort of a measure. And I think Canada is in the same position today. With jet travel it's nothing for tourists to travel 10,000 miles for a month's holiday. We only have to look at the results in Hawaii, which is now an American state, and there are no controls on land ownership there and what has happened in Hawaii? The natives have been pushed back from the beaches; they've been pushed back from the recreational land, and who has it? The hotels, the condominiums, the apartments, the plantations. Who has them? The Japanese, the Americans, some Canadians and the Hawaiians

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . are living in poverty in their own country. -- (Interjection) -- Well the Member for St. Vital says, Hawaiian-Americans. If he is saying, well that's their problem - all I'm doing is pointing out is what happened to the people of the Hawaiian Islands. They have American citizenship but they no longer own their own islands, and I defy the Member for St. Vital to tell me that they do. They no longer own their own island where they were born and brought up. The ownership lies elsewhere. The Hawaiian Islands are for the wealthy people, and the people who thought that that was their birthright are pushed to the background.

So this is what the resolution is all about and I'm anticipating no doubt by some years but the problem is already here. The problem is already here.

The members on the opposite party -- and now we'll talk for a moment about farmland. One of their -- one of the New Democratic governments, the B.C. one, has looked at the problem of farmland use but they have looked at it in a very narrow context. They have looked at it in the context of the green belts around the cities, and there's nothing wrong with that. They're saying that there's only so much farmland in British Columbia, the people who come on the cities should have, should have some natural right to know that when they go out of the cities that there is a place to go. And I see nothing wrong with that. But they still haven't attacked the problem, Mr. Speaker, of the foreign ownership of farmland. A few years ago in Saskatchewan the problem existed. Why? Because American farmers had some dollars to invest because of the particular economic situation there, they were better off than the Canadian farmers, probably through government subsidy, but anyways the American farmer had a better economic situation than the Canadian farmer did, and it wasn't too many years ago, and I'm sure the Member for Arthur who lives near Saskatchewan will know and could tell us about the serious and alarming amount of Saskatchewan farmland that was falling into American ownership. Why? Because of the dollar value in the different countries. What would sell and be a good price for \$100.00 an acre in Canada, an Iowan farmer or an Ohioan farmer or a South Dakotan farmer, would think nothing of paying three or four hundred dollars an acre, because that's what he was used to. So a large amount of our farmland fell into American hands. We, here, today, in 1973, see the glimmerings of the problem. Our grandfathers or our fathers it wasn't noticeable. It wasn't noticeable. The odd person would come and buy here and be an absentee owner and nobody thought anything of it. But now I think the time has come for provinces to act on this problem, to say, look let us form long-range policies. Let us say to ourselves that our children, our grandchildren, are coming after us and we should not in the short term for the sake of some votes, or for the sake of not rocking the boat that we should do nothing and leave it as it is. And that's the purpose of my resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to speak but I had already spoken on the resolution. But the Honourable Member from Portage leaves me no choice. He of course in my judgment has just effectively indicated why the resolution was redundant in the first instance and why, you know, and for a change I find myself having to support the honourable members opposite and the government. The resolution as amended by the Honourable the Minister of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . Agriculture I believe it is, simply states that the government agrees to continue the kind of stewardship and concern for the use of lands in Manitoba to the benefit of Manitobans. Well, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that any government, any responsible government would do that. The Honourable Member for Portage has indicated to us that when the administration of this government lay in the hands of a Liberal regime under Messrs. Campbell and others, that that was precisely what they did when they set aside such lands as the Whiteshell or the Duck Mountain, or other areas, for future use by, as then, unborn Manitobans. And that's of course true and we are making full and adequate use of those wise decisions made at that time. But, Mr. Speaker, it didn't stop then. The next progressive government that took over the reins proved even more progressive in this respect and established one park, and one area after another, Birds Hill, Spruce Woods, etc., among many other areas, smaller areas. I can indicate -- I know the Honourable Member for Arthur recalled to me a situation which developed in his area where some 17 sections of valuable wildlife or recreational lands were being -- it was proposed that they should fall into foreign

## RESOLUTION 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . hands, American hands, and the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Buck Witney, the Honourable Buck Witney, decided that that was an excellent time, that was an excellent time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . to purchase, to purchase this very same land so that it would indeed be put to the best use, the best benefit for Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, this government, pursuing on the wise path, the wise course that I, as the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, presented for them have bought and have taken back into the public domain Hecla Island for that same purpose, and I would assume that they will develop that for the use of future Manitobans and expand on the potential of the recreation and wildlife areas as that particular piece of Manitoba property presents itself.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that one assumes that the governments of the day will take this kind of an attitude. I think what has been demonstrated just in this resolution is that this is precisely the kind of attitude that governments of all political persuasions have indeed taken when it comes to this kind of concern for recreational lands, for farmlands, etc., etc., being used to the benefit of most Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it doubly sure that the government after all has at all times the power to do with the lands in Manitoba as it chooses to do. This government is choosing now to flood some several hundreds of thousands of acres of land of Manitoba's soil at South Indian Lake, and there may be some debate about it, but they can do it. When I was on the other side I wanted to flood a few extra hundred thousand acres of land, and I could have done it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: And I could have done it, Mr. Speaker, but I chose, I chose, Mr. Speaker, on that vital important issue to take it to the people of Manitoba, to that higher court, and let them have a say in the matter unlike this government. They are just proceeding ahead in the determined bulldog approach of ruthlessly stamping over the wills and desires and the rights of people. But, Mr. Speaker, the point being as far as this resolution is concerned, as far as this resolution is concerned all it does demonstrate is that whether the land is required for a highway, whether the land is required for a drainage ditch, whether the land is required for a park or recreation, whether it is required for whatever purposes, any future government in this province decides it should be used for, there is absolutely nothing preventing and nothing stopping a government, this government, from doing that. And, Mr. Speaker, as long as that is the case then I suggest that we should learn from this bitter experience of our friends in British Columbia where the socialists there in their enthusiasm decided to tackle this resolution or this similar kind of resolution with gusto, where the other socialist friends in Saskatchewan tried it but had to pull in their horns in a hurry, this government or this particular group of socialists -- maybe it's because they've been around a little longer -- they have seen the wisdom . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . and have amended . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)