

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 20 students Grade 9 standing of the Bruce Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Brian Head. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 38 a Motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I was wondering if the Minister could advise us when we will be seeing the bill, the Amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act, about which he has been speaking to the press without this House being seized of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): I introduced the bill and I anticipated possibly, Mr. Speaker, that I might have some comment from my honourable friend. The bill is so relatively insignificant that just in passing I did make a comment to the press. I'm sure my honourable friend has done likewise in the past but he is wont to criticize me for anything I do.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would take it from the Honourable the Minister's comments then that hereafter when he introduces a bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. LYON: . . . hereafter when he introduces a bill for first reading, will I have the privilege of going to the Legislative Council and seeing that bill before it's presented to the House?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would not deny the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or any other member the privilege that any other member has in this House and I will not make an exception as far as he is concerned.

MR. LYON: Do I understand my honourable friend to have answered the question affirmatively; that we can see legislation before it is received in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It arises from a call from a news service, and another individual in Northern Manitoba, who had a document in their hand that attributed to me from a Cabinet Minister on the other side, the following statement: "The Liberal Party of Manitoba, through Gordon Johnston, their House Leader, may block construction of a proposed road between Moose Lake and The Pas."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you presided in this House at the time that I asked some questions about that road, and I think you would agree with me that nothing that I had said at that time, implied or stated a desire to block a road of people who need that road, and I ask the Minister who made the statement if he will retract, and also retract in the Newsletter where he made the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, if we're required that retractions be made about what members say about what other members are doing and the that their remarks will make on program in the Province of Manitoba industrial activity or commercial enterprises, we would have no time for any other business in the House but retractions.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the statement by the House Leader, I would ask the Minister of Northern Affairs if he would retract that statement because, in my opinion, if it's allowed to stand, it's the old style of white man's politics being played among the Indian people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

HONOURABLE RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the latter part of the member's statement was all about, but the fact is that a requirement of further environmental studies may, in fact, postpone the construction of a road. And that's the fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, my attention is drawn to a statement in the Tribune of last Friday . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PETURSSON: My attention was drawn to a statement in the Tribune of last Friday, which I think should be corrected. It probably isn't of any great concern but the statement mentioned that there is one clergyman in the Legislature . . . —(Interjection)— Ty ne it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PETURSSON: I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I have served in the Unitarian Church beginning in 1929 and that's probably before any of the people in the press gallery were even born or at best they were running around in diapers. I resigned from the church after thirty-five years in it, in 1964, but have on occasion been called upon to perform Ministerial duties on behalf of the church. I thought that if the Tribune has any sort of a research group it wouldn't have been very difficult to find that information and publish it correctly. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation. I ask the Minister if he could endeavour to find out as to whether the Public Insurance Corporation ever refused the owner's of the Town and Country Apartment Lodge at 877 Preston Avenue fire insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that situation and I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways and I wonder . . . Maybe it's not the right Minister but I wonder if the Minister or any member of the government have received any application or accepted any application for approval by the Government of Canada that the Post Office Department can enter the trucking business in this province.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I repeat the question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Repetition is not part of our procedure. The honourable member is aware of that. You may have another question. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I will rephrase the question. Can I ask the government or any Minister of the government, has the Canadian post office system met the regulations and the licence provisions of this province to get into the trucking business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since it was directed to any Minister' I don't know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well then, Mr. Speaker, can the ask the Honourable the House Leader, and it appears the government keeps . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . falling and that is the reason we're going to have a quick election, and the sooner the better because they can't understand what I'm talking about.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Can I ask the Honourable House Leader, Mr. Speaker' will these post office trucks meet the same standard as the local licensed carriers?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the government. I wonder can the House Leader advise if the post office trucks will be charging the same rate as the local carriers.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Ditto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member has had four questions on the same topic. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the statements made by the controller of MLCC that MLCC is a non-secured creditor of Wescana Hotels, can the Minister or would the Attorney-General advise on what grounds MLCC requires the receiver of Wescana Hotels to pay the debts of the former owner before the licence is granted to the receiver and keep some four hundred people employed at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

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

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Can , also, the Attorney-General take the question on what

grounds, on what grounds MLCC requires the receiver to pay the debts because that's the condition, I understand.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also for the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General how many of those that were arrested in the Griffin Steel have been charged in the courts and court cases are proceeding.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is also for the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General how many of those that were arrested in the Griffin Steel have been charged in the courts and court cases are proceeding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, all those that have been charged are presently before the courts and their cases are proceeding in the normal manner. There was an Order for Return, in respect to a number of questions which specific numbers were given, I believe 18. I believe since that date there have been some others but not very many that have been charged.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General intervened on behalf of any of the individuals who have been charged in this?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the government has been requested to participate in a convention, sales meeting or sales trip to three major cities in the United States, at the request of the Convention Centre Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Was the government requested to participate? The answer is yes.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the government accepted the request to participate.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Perhaps I should qualify that answer, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't the government that was requested to participate. It was I, as Minister of the department, who was requested to participate and, with regrets, I declined the invitation.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the request for the Minister to participate was accompanied with the request for funds for the sales mission.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was a request for funds to relieve the financial burden on corporations such as the CPR, Commonwealth Holiday Inns and a few others, and Best Western Hotels, whatever the company is called. Mr. Speaker, I felt that the financial burden borne by many of my constituents is far greater than that borne by the corporations named within the letter of request, and hence I declined to offer any financial assistance to relieve the financial burden off the shoulders of those corporations.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister would indicate the amount of money that was requested of his department.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker' there was no specific amount mentioned within the letter. There was a draft budget submitted of the cost of this junket and I would presume that any amount would have been welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The honourable member has had four questions on the same subject.

MR. AXWORTHY: Further to the questions raised by the Member for Crescentwood to the Minister responsible for MPIC, can the Minister indicate whether the Insurance Corporation has a policy of red-lining in the city, where in certain areas of the city, insurance is not granted for fire protection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I guess the answer would have to be no in that respect.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the Corporation has investigated or examined the potential of undertaking pooling of high-risk areas for insurance purposes so that residents and owners of properties in older areas can get full insurance when they apply for it.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out what the honourable member refers to when he refers to "pooling". Pooling with whom?

MR. AXWORTHY: I'll rephrase the question then, Mr. Speaker. Has the Corporation investigated the possibility of pooling with other licensed insurance brokers and agents in the province to provide for common insurance in those areas where fire insurance is difficult to obtain because of the age of the structures?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the case, but to be certain, I will take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder if the Minister is

in a position to indicate whether his refusal to participate financially in the proposal that was made, was based on the amount of money that was requested or did he refuse without determining what in fact was requested in terms of a dollar cost to the department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, my reluctance to participate in offering financial support to the proposal made to me by the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg was made on the basis that I could see no justification, or no way in which I could justify to my constituents or to anyone in the Province of Manitoba, offering financial support to relieve the financial burden of corporations such as the CPR, the Commonwealth Holiday Inns, Best Western Hotels, Northwest Airlines and other corporations of that kind.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would consider the elimination of his salary as another means of saving money for his constituents.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The elimination of whose salaries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. Does the Minister plan to address and plan to attend the meeting of the Tourist and Convention Association to be held at the Niakwa Motor Hotel April 5th and 6th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that appears in my diary, and I presume the reason why it does not is because of commitments to this House.

MR. WILSON: Could the Minister then tell me who is going to present the Provincial Government Accommodation Awards at this particular tourism meeting, and does the Minister ever attend any tourism meetings?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My department is represented at meetings and conventions involving the tourist industry in the Province of Manitoba. Who it is in particular who will attend at this particular conference that the Honourable Member for Wolseley is referring to, I'm sorry I could not respond to his question at this point in time, but I am quite certain that my department will be represented there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister can advise if his department of the government have done any studies to see if these postal trucks are being subsidized by the taxpayers of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Again, Mr. Speaker, I guess I can answer. I don't know so I'll take it as notice.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if those people who are granted a landed immigrant status, and come to Canada as political refugees, have any special consideration with respect to keeping the peace?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member I think knows full well that landed immigrants, citizens of Canada, are subject to the same laws as anyone else. I don't really know why the honourable member should wish to ask that question with an inference in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. Can the Minister indicate to the House that the Minister or his department are looking into the problem of several school closings in Manitoba, particularly the schools in St. James-Assiniboia, the Birchwood and the St. Charles Elementary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not looking into the closing of schools in various divisions, I do not believe any of the staff of the department are either. These matters of school closings and other matters, I think, within school divisions are the responsibility of the duly elected trustees of the school division.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister again. In view of the previous Minister indicated he would be doing some study in this area on declining enrollment, can the Minister indicate to the House if the department is providing any information into the projected population growth in the St. Charles Elementary School area where this school is concerned?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the department has provided to the administrators of that particular school division information about population projections but I do believe, Sir, that quite the reverse is usually the case, that the department receives information about population projections from the school division.

The Member for Assiniboia mentioned as well, Sir, his question that the previous Minister had undertaken some studies with regard to declining enrollments. That is true. As a result of that study, the Department of Education in the last fiscal year just ended and again for this fiscal year, has

introduced a declining enrollment grant which we discussed during the Estimates. The purpose of that grant, of course, is to keep small schools open. The formula, however, I do not think would be applicable to St. James-Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: My question is: Why doesn't the formula apply to St. James-Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, and may I further ask the Minister in view of the fact that the school is in a growing population area, would the Minister consider meeting with the parents of that school?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Assiniboia and the parents had best make their case to the elected school trustee but, of course, I would be willing to meet about education with any concerned and responsible group that is representative that exists in the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Is the Honourable Minister aware of a situation occurring in Flyer Industries which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Minister is aware this is not a necessary procedure. The honourable member rephrase his question.

MR. ENNS: I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour a direct question: whether or not he is better apprised of the situation than his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and can inform the House of an imminent layoff of personnel at Flyer Industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my honourable friend is aware of the fact that the operation of Flyer Industries, as most of those industries that have an involvement, are under the operation of Boards and they do not have to answer to me.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the Minister of Labour of this Province as to whether or not he is aware of a number of employees working in the Province of Manitoba who are facing the possibility of a layoff? Is he aware of it?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and not only specifically in the industry that the Honourable Member for Lakeside made mention of; it's occurring from time to time. Also, hirings are taking place from time to time.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Was he aware of it yesterday?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are layoffs in many plants throughout this province.

MR. ENNS: I ask the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a final supplementary question: Was he aware of the questions asked by the Member for River Heights yesterday whether or not layoffs at Flyer were imminent?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that I was aware of the question asked by the Member for River Heights as to whether layoffs were imminent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has had four questions on the subject. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Another question to the Minister of Labour. Is he aware of the imminent layoff of some 650 employees at Co-op Farm Implements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my honourable friend that if such a mass layoff is to take place in any industry or any firm in Manitoba, it is the responsibility of that firm to notify me so that the provisions of our legislation dealing with mass layoffs is adhered to, mainly due notice extending over a period which may be 12 weeks.

MR. ENNS: A second supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. I wasn't asking him about the responsibility of the firm . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: . . . I was simply asking the Minister: Is he aware of it? Is he aware of it?

MR. PAULLEY: I do not recall receiving any correspondence accordingly from the Allied Farm industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER PLEASE. Order please. I wonder if the honourable members would conduct themselves like parliamentarians? The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I wonder if he layoff could inform the House if the reported of 150 men at the Manitoba Rolling Mills at Selkirk is a correct statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member is fully aware that that good town of Selkirk is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . is under a great deal of difficulty because of increasing unemployment. I'm rather amazed that the Honourable Member for Lakeside didn't ask about the general situation rather than singling out one particular industry.

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

MR. BLAKE: Thank you' Mr. Speaker. I have another question for the Minister in charge of Tourism and Parks. I wonder if he has had a chance to appraise the damage to the Hecla Island Park by wild animals and if he has had a chance to consider a season to cull the herd there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Personally, no, Mr. Speaker.

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the Honourable Member for Lakeside — Mr. Speaker, the question of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in regard to Co-operative Implements. I've been made aware of the impending temporary layoff of people of Co-operative Implements but the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Lakeside would co-operate with the rest of us? I think I gave him enough opportunity to ask all his questions. He had six — more than any other member. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, I guess, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is willing to pose questions but he's not willing to listen to answers. If you look at any other co-operative implement dealers or manufacturers in the Province of Manitoba, you will find that farmers are not purchasing machinery as they were last year and the problem at Co-operative Implements is not to be singled out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order please. I'm going to ask the Honourable Member for Radisson to kindly contain himself or else stand up when he wants to speak. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the arrests at the Griffin plant, a number of weeks ago a question was asked of the Minister in charge of the Civil Service if he could ascertain how many members of the Civil Service of Manitoba had been arrested at that site. Could he give that information to the House now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Leader would check Hansard, I provided information to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry when he asked that question the second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he can indicate now that his department has responsibility for the overview of employment and unemployment in the province and it's his responsibility to direct the other departments of the danger signals when they arise with respect to the growing unemployment in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: It's rather a peculiar type of question directed to me specifically as Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I do want to inform my honourable friend and all members of the Assembly and the public at large it is a joint responsibility of all members of Cabinet and of the government to make assessments from time to time as to the extent of unemployment and what measures should be taken to overcome that. My colleague 'the Minister of Public Works, did announce a program that was going to be taken in the core area of the city to help alleviate what can be or is a serious problem of unemployment. So while I am answering as the Minister of Labour I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a joint responsibility which we accept as part of our obligation to the ratepayers of Manitoba, the electors, and more particularly to those who are faced with a spectre of unemployment.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether his department has come to any particular conclusion as a result of the drought conditions that appear to be with us, as to what the employment and serious unemployment, at least, will be in the next period of time.

MR. PAULLEY: All I can answer to my honourable friend is yes, that we do from time to time make assessments and direct our programs accordingly.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Labour will acknowledge to the House that we are entering a very serious period of time where unemployment will be high in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are fully aware that we are entering into possibly difficult times and I would want to warn all concerned they would have far more difficult problems to be faced if that outfit was the government of Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker' I wonder if the Minister of Labour could indicate whether he has informed the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry and Commerce that his department . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker' a further question to the Minister in charge of the Civil Service. Could he advise the House of the numbers of civil servants who were arrested on the picket line and the departments from which they came.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member recalls I answered the Member from Fort Garry to the effect that the Civil Service Commission is not the employing authority and does not have the direct records of every department and that each supervisor who is the employing authority is to keep the attendance record of every employee. As far as the individuals that were charged, I was not able to be aware of the names of the individuals until they appeared on the court docket. That type of information was supplied to the House by the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has said that he hasn't answered the question will the Minister find out the names that are on the docket and advise this House the question that he was, asked in the first place. Do your job.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question was argumentative and was out of order. Order please. Order please. Citation 171, if the honourable member will read it he will find out opinions which create argument are not part of a question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: We still expect an answer and we will get one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition can conduct his own if he wishes, on the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: I wonder if the Minister would advise in the course of searching that information if the persons who were arrested have leave from their immediate supervisors to be away from their duty at the time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier I would not have that information because I am not the employing authority, the Minister of Civil Service. And they may have . . .

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could now proceed with the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper following which we will be moving into the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please.

BILL (NO. 4) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LAND ACQUISITION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, some time ago Bill No. 4 was introduced into the Legislature and at that time the Minister of Public Works with this bill indicated that there were no great earth-shattering changes involved in this bill. The Member for Crescentwood looked at the bill and basically what the Minister said was correct.

However, we found that the Liberal Party through its spokesman, the Member for Fort Rouge, who rose in his place and on March 17th he felt that he found a rather strange thing occurring with this bill. And during the whole course of his debate the Member for Fort Rouge referred mainly to the city core and the activities of Manitoba Housing and Renewal in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I find no fault with the Member for Fort Rouge in being concerned about activities that are within his constituency and I think that we have to give him a fair degree of credit for expressing those concerns in this Legislature.

However, I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are problems in the province of Manitoba that do exist beyond the boundaries of his constituency. He may not be aware of them but they do exist in other parts of the province, as well. And while we know that he does look with intense scrutiny at a very small segment of our society, there are the broader aspects that we have to become involved in.

I have to say this, that what the Member for Crescentwood said is basically true. The changes that are involved in this legislation are mainly of a housekeeping nature. They are not earth-shattering in that respect but again, Mr. Speaker, you have to look at legislation in the light of the implementation of legislation and the effect it has within the province.

I have to tell you, Sir, that you can change the Acts, the statutes of the province, particularly where it deals with people, and this Act mainly deals with the actions of government and the interactions with people. You can change those statutes significantly but the application in the field is the only important thing that really counts. We find, Sir, that in the land acquisition in the province of

Manitoba that there have been problems with the actual implementation in the field. Not all those problems, Sir, are the doings of this particular statute. In fact, I would have to say that much of the problem in the land acquisition in the province of Manitoba falls within the category of the Attorney-General and the activities of the Land Titles Office. Now we know that the Land Titles Office has been going through a period of modernization and we expect troubles there. But we also find again, that in itself is not the only problem.

In fact, we have to say that much of the problem in land acquisition in the province of Manitoba deals with the actions of one group of people dealing with another group of people. One group of people is acting on behalf of the Province of Manitoba and the other people are looking after their own interests. We've found that there has been a rapid escalation of the value of land; an escalation which the government may not be willing to accept as being factual. So then when the province, through the Land Acquisition Act, gets involved in the field you find there's differences of opinion, problems do exist. The relative inflexibility that exists in bureaucracy aggravates the problem rather than solving it.

So that you get to the point where according to the figures of The Land Value Appraisal Commission itself, five percent of all properties handled are not settled satisfactorily and have to go the entire process through the courts and through the expropriation procedures, etc.

It is vitally important that in the operations of government dealing with people that the people that are acting on behalf of the province do so in a wise and prudent manner; that those people are above reproach, are, if possible, as far removed from government as is humanly possible. But, Sir, in this province at this particular time I don't think that is entirely the case.

We have found a rather strange thing, Mr. Speaker, that while government is bringing in this bill to hopefully improve matters in this field that at the same time they have also changed half of the members of The Land Value Appraisal Commission, half of the members. The chairman of the Land Value Appraisal Commission has been replaced, the vice-chairman and one other member of the board. Now if you replace 50 percent, then you have a 50 percent chance of improving relations, I would say. Or *vice versa*. The important thing and I think I should probably couch this in my own words, I've heard the statement given to me and we'll use a rather colloquial term, I think, but the "Selkirk mafia" has been destroyed in this particular respect. The Attorney-General seems to have lost control of the Land Value Appraisal Commission. I used that term colloquially for the benefit of the Attorney-General and maybe I should stand up at this time and plead the case for the Attorney-General because it's very difficult for the Attorney-General to enter into debate on a member of his own group. It would be very strange for the Attorney-General to stand up in the House and oppose a bill that is introduced by one of his colleagues. So perhaps I should stand up on behalf of the Attorney-General and ask why the chairman and the vice-chairman of the Land Value Appraisal Commission have been removed from their positions. I think that it is only fair that the Minister, not the Attorney-General, but I think it is only fair that the Minister of Public Works should give us a good and valid answer for making those changes.

A MEMBER: Must be an election coming up.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Public Works does close debate on second reading, I think that it is incumbent on him to give us not only the reasons for the change in the legislation, but his reasons for the change in personnel at the same time.

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

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, this is only the second bill that I have introduced. I don't believe that as a Public Works Minister I have introduced any bills but I recall some time ago introducing a bill to enable lotteries to be held within the province. So that was probably my first foray into legislation. I have followed with considerable interest the debate because we brought in what was, in our opinion, a number of innocuous changes and there has been a long tortuous debate, I think frequently straying considerably from the bill and perhaps, in fact, to some extent being unrelated to it or out of order. But be that as it may, I will attempt to answer some of the questions or comments that were posed by the honourable members and then look forward to the debate in Law Amendments to further refinement.

Now there are two bills that we have put forward and this of course is Bill 4. I would like to again reiterate the amendments that were proposed to the Land Acquisition Act pertain only to the Land Value Appraisal Commission or LVAC and are designed to facilitate the operations of the Commission insofar as the holding of hearings is concerned as well as the ability to review the matter of compensation when it appears that new evidence is available for consideration. Both amendments will enable the Commission to operate more efficiently and will be to the benefit of both landowners and the taxpaying public. Well it seems harmless enough on first outline.

The Member for Crescentwood who led off the debate for the opposition examined these modest amendments and said, "I would agree that these amendments proposed by the Minister are of a

housekeeping nature and that they are to facilitate the Commission." He therefore gave his approval that they go on to committee. Well I guess he and I are sort of men of similar heart, no fooling around, examine the amendments and pass or fail, in this case pass.

The Member for Fort Rouge then followed for the Liberal Party and he spoke against the legislation and said that, for example, he was opposed to new hearings based on new evidence. Mr. Speaker, we just heard from the Member for Birtle-Russell who is concerned with the kind of treatment and the manner in which citizens throughout the province are dealt with by members of the government concerning highways and water control, etc. And it is very common, indeed, or let's say if it isn't that common, it at least happens on occasion that there could be new elements introduced on an expropriation concerning a highway or concerning water control where something happens in the process or shortly thereafter, which in the opinion of both sides merits new consideration and possibly new compensation for those factors that were not in fact foreseen. And this would seem to be a reasonable approach.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge I guess who is out working on his next speech, said that he felt that the LVAC should have its own appraisers. Mr. Speaker, the courts do not have their own appraisers on staff, they make decisions in regard to compensation. They can call other appraisers in on occasion and I would submit that the LVAC which is a quasi-judicial body does not in fact require appraisers on their staff. I also don't think it's very helpful to have an infinite regress where you have a whole series of appraisers commenting on the work of other appraisers. At some point, somebody who is given the responsibility of making a decision has to weigh the evidence, and when two appraisers are in disagreement or there seems to be something questionable about an appraisal, maybe they can call for more evidence. But it would seem to me to be rather unnecessary and expensive to have appraisers on staff of the LVAC when at the same time the government has them in the Land Acquisition Branch. Those appraisals that are brought forward — I only can comment here from conversations I've had, which is pretty rare, with members of the LVAC — but they tell me that those appraisal reports are extremely thorough and would be worth a great deal of money if one went to the private sector and bought them. It sort of reminds me of the comment made after the Second World War about appraisers, your appraisers and our appraisers and these appraisers checking on those appraisers. After the Second World War, some of the more fortunate people among the defeated enemy were the German scientists and the Russians grabbed a bunch and the Americans and the British all grabbed some or attracted some or invited some, and there was a saying after the Second World War as follows, "Our German scientists are better than your German scientists." It seems to me you're into the same kind of debate here: "Our appraisers are better than your appraisers." Presumably if a man is qualified, he is a *bona fide* appraiser and he has studied his subject for so many years and he has credentials, presumably he should have some heed paid to his advice. So you have appraisers in the Land Acquisition Branch who make the reports for the LVAC. On rare occasion you have appraisers called by the courts and frequently there are appraisers and lawyers on the side of the person who is appearing before the LVAC in terms of an expropriation. And if there is general agreement on his case in terms of matters of compensation, then he will also have his legal fees and his appraisal fees covered, which strikes me as a pretty good system. So although the members of the LVAC—I don't think any of them are appraisers by trade—but I think you have on there a number of knowledgeable people, highly knowledgeable about real estate, and you also have some lay people who just simply have good common sense. They hear the evidence in a manner similar to a jury and then they come up with their recommendations.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge said also that he felt that there were excessive prices paid by the public purse. Well, I think first of all, he should be aware of the facts when he makes a statement like that. I don't know how familiar he is with some of the cases that come before the LVAC or whether he is simply reading some of the occasional sensational headlines that appear in the daily press. But these people hear the evidence and the decision is normally made on the basis of comparables. The appraiser goes out and looks at various lands in the area, determines what the market is, determines what current sales are for land of about that value for about that purpose, and that's how you get your price. He says on one hand that we are paying excessive prices. On the other hand, we always hear the other statement that we're not paying enough. I think of one of his good friends in the Liberal Party, Mr. Arenson, who represented some of the people in the core area. He was always saying we're not paying enough. So the Member for Fort Rouge says we are paying too much; the other fellow says we are not paying enough. Well it would seem to me that that probably is about the place to be where you're getting criticism, I suppose, on both sides. It shows perhaps that there are differences of opinion and that you are getting it from both ends. If all you ever heard is "You're paying too much," then perhaps there would be some truth to the criticism. If you're hearing both, then perhaps you are in fact running up the middle and showing some balance. Many times the extreme middle is the position that they occupy. Many times people come before the LVAC in argument, and they end in agreement. That is not all that uncommon.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge, he doesn't trust citizens. Yesterday I guess when he was talking

on his bill, he trusted citizens; he doesn't trust governments. He is very confusing to me. I don't know how to describe his ideas. One time they're one thing, and one time another. Yesterday he said that he didn't trust the experts, he only trusted citizens. Now on this bill, he says exactly the opposite. He says he only trusts the experts and he doesn't trust the citizen members on the board. He only wants to listen to appraisers. Appraisers will determine everything. And which appraisers? Well not the government appraisers, that's for sure. Only the appraisers I suppose of which he approves. So here he seems to prefer the specialist over the generalist or the academic over the citizen.

I would simply say this, Mr. Speaker' if I were trying to characterize the LVAC, that it is a practical body with practical people who hear evidence, arrive at conclusions and then determine what represents fair and reasonable compensation. That is their task. The proceedings of the LVAC are informal and I think that the last few chairmen with whom I've been acquainted conduct their hearings in the friendliest of manners and attempt to put any citizen at complete ease so as not to over-impress him with the dignity of the organization.

He also said that given his criticisms of the LVAC that he does by implication suggest or hold out as an alternative, the example of Winnipeg City Council. He says that he approves of the fact that Winnipeg City Council decides on the final values or prices. He thinks that's a good idea. And if we were going to parallel that in this government and in this Chamber, we would then decide — I suppose the Cabinet would decide or the Legislature would decide — what amounts of compensation would be paid for thousands and thousands of transactions concerning the government in terms of drainage, in terms of floodway control, in terms of highways, land acquisition, all these things. Can you imagine us wrestling in this Chamber with the amount of money that should be paid for a particular piece of land in a particular part of the province? This is turning back the clock.

We're all familiar either directly, those who are veterans, or the rest of us by reading about it or hearing about it, of the problems of land acquisition prior to this government's term in office. I think the big problems started in the mid-1960s and it was the Roblin government that established the LVAC over the floodway and other issues. They decided that this was fraught with problems, there was political dynamite here, that the best approach would be to set up either an independent body or semi-independent, quasi-judicial body, to deal with land.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in Alberta about a year or two ago, they had a scandal in regard to the acquisition of land. It was really quite incredible, the fact being that there was some sort of a long story—I only remember the basic outline of the story—where somebody was given a pay-off and he had to meet somebody somewhere in a hotel in Montreal. He was handed a paper bag which was some kind of a pay-off. He opened up the paper bag and I think there was something like \$50,000 in the bag. And he said he didn't even count the money but he said to the fellow who gave him the money, "Is that all there is?" The fellow said, "Why did you say that if you didn't count the money?" He said he thought it would be good business practice to ask for more, automatically try and get a little more. I think we've been fortunate. There have been some fights in this Chamber about land acquisition and amounts of money paid but they have been very few. And in terms of scandals, there have been fewer still. So I think that we are rather fortunate in that regard and I think that the reason is largely, if not entirely, the establishment of this body which I think has successfully operated to date.

So the Member for Fort Rouge, he wants to abolish this particular body or abolish similar bodies like it, but you know I don't hear him saying anything about any federal bodies. I don't hear him calling for the abolition of the Senate. I don't hear him saying that we should abolish the CTC and I don't hear him calling for the CRTC's abolition or any of these thousand-and-one federal agencies and commissions. He only wants to abolish provincial commissions.

Now the Member for Assiniboia spoke following him and he got into an area which I think I will leave for some of my colleagues to answer. He was dealing, I think, beyond this particular bill about condemning proposal calls and so on. And I don't know if my notes are right or not, but he also called for the abolition of the LVAC too, or am I mistaken in that? No, he didn't but he did deal with proposal calls and I will leave my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce to answer that or some of the other Ministers who have handled MHRC to respond to those calls.

The former Minister, now the Minister of Finance, when he replied, he did point out to the Member for Assiniboia that the purchases of MHRC were within CMHC guidelines, that they met the criteria. I am telling you what he said and I am telling you that he is right. When he said that the per-unit price of construction is within CMHC guidelines, he is correct. But you know there is also a problem here between the two seatmates there. The Member for Assiniboia says that we should accept the advice of the Land Acquisition Branch appraisers. That is what he said. His seatmate says we shouldn't accept the advice of the Land Acquisition appraisers. He doesn't believe them; he wants the Land Value Appraisal Commission to have their own appraisers. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I would like to ask the Minister a question. When the land is on the market for a year, exposed to everybody through probably 2,000 salespeople at \$40,000, and then it is picked up

by the MHRC for \$125,000, does he agree with that practice and he says the system is working well? Is that good management of money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal with my bill and my department. I am not going to deal with MHRC. I will ask my honourable friend to convey that to my colleagues. They will deal with that in more detail. But I tell him this, that he says that he believes that we should trust and accept the advice of professional appraisers, and he knows it better than most of us because he's a professional real estate man. He says we should trust and we should rely on the advice of professional appraisers in the Land Acquisition Branch. But his seatmate doesn't say that, his seatmate doesn't trust them. So I wish that he would inform him of what is going on here. —(Interjection)— I am answering the nitpicking in regard to my bill. Now if that's nitpicking, I can't help it.

The Member for Portage la Prairie said this was bad legislation. He says that he doesn't think that it is a good idea for us to hold a new hearing where new evidence is available. Well, the legislation that we are talking about allows for a new hearing and allows for the variance of compensation but it says this, in effect, it says that we "may" hold a new hearing, which means, of course, that we may not. And it says that we may then, on the basis of that hearing, vary the compensation. And of course the other side is that we may not. So all it is doing is giving us the opportunity to hear new evidence and adjust the price if we feel it is warranted. I would also like to point out that the LVAC has the right under the Act to set its own rules of procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Member for Birtle-Russell was going to ask about a specific property but I don't think he got around to it. He was concerned about the . . . property up in St. Lazare —(Interjection)— oh, he'll deal with that under Bill No. 5 so I will wait for that particular comment.

So I would like to, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, sum up the amendments as before us. They are proposed under the Land Acquisition Act to modify some of the operations of the Land Value Appraisal Commission. First of all, under the existing Act it provides that the chairman shall act as the chairman in the absence of the former but there is no provision for the holding of a hearing when neither the chairman vice chairman are present. The Act is to be amended so that when neither the chairman nor the vice chairman are present, the other members of the commission may appoint a *pro tem* chairman and as long as there is a quorum of two members, the business of the commission will proceed in the normal manner.

The second amendment proposed which has to do with the commission is to give statutory approval to a practice of the commission which has been allowed since its inception and which stems from a desire for practicality. The commission has always been prepared to reconsider a case when new evidence was available which would warrant a reexamination of its certificate as to compensation. While the availability of such new evidence is not an ongoing feature of commission hearings, it does happen from time to time and there is certainly nothing to be gained by the commission maintaining an adamant position with respect to a certificate when it is obvious that the factors which were considered at the time of the hearing have been changed.

The purpose of the amendment is to spell out in the Act that the commission has the right to reconsider a case if it is satisfied that there is in fact some new evidence which should be considered and which perhaps might warrant the amendment of a certificate as to compensation. The commission will have the right to decide whether or not alleged new evidence is in fact something which has not been the subject of previous deliberations.

And in conclusion, the object of both of the amendments which affect the LVAC is to give the commission a bit more latitude or flexibility in carrying out its functions, which can only be to the benefit of those property owners whose holdings are the subject of commission concerns. So with that comment, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this legislation to the House.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand.

BILL (NO. 18) — THE RETAIL BUSINESSES HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to add one or two comments on Bill 18, the Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act. I won't be too long. I think most of the points have been covered by my colleagues and by other speakers but I do feel that I should say one or two things on the bill to reflect my feelings and I think those of a great number of my constituents.

In my travels around Manitoba over the past number of years, I have been involved in many communities where closing hours have been debated hot and fiercely, whether it be Friday night shopping, Monday closing, or whatever, and it is something, I think, that is up to the communities themselves to decide as far as their basic shopping hours go and it is something that is very, very difficult for an awful lot of communities to decide. But in all of the areas where there has been

discussion on whether it be Friday closing or Monday closing there was never any problem with Sunday closing. It was a foregone conclusion that Sunday was the day that the stores would close outside of convenience stores of course, and that pertained to my area.

I think if there has to be a day to be closed, I can agree with the Member for Point Douglas that Sunday should be the designated day. It is considered by the majority of people as the day of rest and it doesn't seem to present any problems in being a designated closing day. I don't feel that Saturday in any way should be designated as a closing day any more than it should be Wednesday or Tuesday. I think it is up to the retail people themselves if they want to close on another day of the week other than Sunday, they should be allowed to pick their own day. I realize the problems that were inherent in that closing Act that pertain to many, many communities over the years past. There would be one store closed on a Wednesday and one on a Thursday and it was very difficult for people traveling throughout the rural area doing business to keep all of the dates in mind. They would hit a town that would be locked up on a Wednesday or a Thursday. In my particular area I think the majority of the towns close on a Monday as well as Sunday. That is strictly up to them. They have convenience stores open and of course being in a rural agricultural area, the agricultural people set hours to suit their trade.

But to just add my comments, Mr. Speaker, I do not favour legislating a Saturday closing whether they close on a Sunday or not and that would be one of my strongest objections to the Act. I think many of my colleagues have commented on bringing religion into it and it being a cop-out. I don't think there is any point in me belabouring those arguments any further than to state that my personal view is I feel that the Minister should be firm on designating a closing day as Sunday with the exception of convenience stores of course, but I could not support the legislation to provide for Saturday closing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few points. I rise personally and I believe that many of my constituents are with me in this. I personally support the idea of a quiet, non-commercial weekend and I know that before the session started I myself had at least, I would estimate or guesstimate, a hundred letters from my constituents on the subject and I don't believe I had one that was opposed to closing or a quiet weekend. They all wanted a quiet weekend, they wanted the stores closed. I believe that it is right for people, families, to enjoy a quiet weekend, to enjoy peace and perhaps enjoy a quiet recreation with their families and this is perhaps the purpose of this bill.

I am just wondering if the bill will do that and I know that the Minister has certainly made a good effort, but I think that we have to face the facts, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time there are, I believe, thousands of Manitobans of all faiths that perhaps are required to work in industries in such places as restaurants and hotels, movies, taxi cabs, and police and so on so we already have people working on these days. On the other hand, I think that if we allow to continue what has been continuing, to start the supermarkets to open, we will have the car dealers open and a continuation and the first thing we will have —(Interjection)— That's right, the real estate agents would be, perhaps the brokers, you know, and it would be ideal, and then we will have the large commercials and total industry so there is no end to it. So I think that in general the population and the people in this province and perhaps even in Canada at the present time still would like to have their weekend, or what I may say, a non-commercial weekend, and enjoy their weekend with their families and friends and their children. So I would agree with that.

I think that the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggested that an option should be for the people who have to work on weekends and I certainly agree with that but he also said that the option should be, and I am quoting the Honourable Member, with the employer first. My question is: Is that reasonable? What of the family that both husband and wife are employed and one, say, in a Sunday-closed firm and one on a Saturday? So again it presents a problem if we leave the option strictly to the employer.

Now I believe that there is concern from almost most people and as I said I at least had, and I am not mistaken, at least a hundred letters before the session started on this issue alone and there was concern for family togetherness, and what I see in the bill that the Minister is trying to make an effort to see. Time will only tell how well the legislation will work. I am not again so sure that we are really attacking the real issue directly because I think that we should be concerned about the employees, that they should have a right of a day off or two days off. I haven't got the formula or the solution but maybe that should be the course of action that we should have taken and perhaps legislate that way.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it perhaps may be very easily that we can concern ourselves that in this province one could be employed by a company to work on either a Saturday or a Sunday except in cases of emergency, that way we may be able to legislate. Then we have the other problem of legislation not applying to small family grocery stores and in most of those places the entrepreneur perhaps works himself and that doesn't affect him. I understand the legislation will not affect the small family grocery stores and I think that is the right course of action.

I am somewhat concerned about recreation purposes where people need perhaps their cars fixed or they need their boats repaired and so on, how will it affect those areas because it would be a great inconvenience in an area where you have a lot of people, say, at campgrounds or lakes enjoying themselves with their family and then not be able to get the services, if it would affect them in any direct way. So that would concern me.

Again before the Minister maybe will have some representation in committee which I hope he will and I think that the Minister will have a lot of representation and maybe any worker or manager would perhaps be allowed to hold a permit either to work on a Saturday or a Sunday. That may be the solution for the whole year.

My concern is for the employees, not the businesses themselves and I think that the concern is that the employee has the right to have his weekend or his couple of days. And that's, I think, what our concern should be, much more than with the employer. We're giving the right to the employer to say you must close one day. And I think that even if he closes one day, it will still affect a lot of employees that may have to work. That's the only concern that I have. Again, I think that the concern of Saturday and Sunday doesn't affect me. I think because of many religious people, different faiths and so on, I think we should deal strictly on what is fair to the employee and they should have a right to have a few days off.

In principle I'm agreeing with the bill. I congratulate the Minister for taking some action in this area, I'm not certain that the action taken will do the job, I hope it does. I think that there is responsibility of parents to their children. They should have a day off on weekends, be it Sunday or Saturday and —(Interjection)— I'm flexible, that's right. So, again I wish to say to the House and to the Minister, I agree with the principle, but maybe we can find even a better formula in Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks I'd like to put on the record regarding this piece of legislation, as one that has been in the retail business for some 30 years and well understands what the Minister is trying to do. And, of course, I understand the NDP, they want to regulate everything. They believe in big government. They believe that they'll control the people. They're going to control the storekeepers. They're going to control everybody, and so do the Liberals. The Liberals believe in the same philosophy; big government, heavy spending government, regulate the people, control them from the time they get up in the morning till they go to bed at night, and that's the system that they believe in.

But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I've seen, in my years in the retail business, where the small — I'm only speaking from the small country merchant — who is regulated today right out of existence by governments at the provincial level and the federal level. And I'll tell you many examples. First of all, country fresh eggs, right off the farm come in and the country merchant can't sell them today. A farmer cannot bring a dozen eggs in to the local merchant and trade for them, because that's been regulated out of existence. —(Interjection)— Well, let's move on into the other fields. A storekeeper today has to meet all these regulations, qualifications, dedications and here he is today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the one that makes me alarmed today is the unemployment figures that were related across this Chamber today. And you think with people being unemployed — you haven't seen that yet in your lifetime, Mr. Speaker, — well I have, I've lived through the dirty thirties and I know that a buck's a buck, and a buck's still a buck today.

But today the government thinks, Mr. Speaker, that they can control the hours of shopping and they want to regulate people more — the Minister of Labour the other day, he tossed it back at me about my concerns about the Minimum Wage Act in those days. I tell you that was a concern and is still a concern today, because those goods and services that will be offered by those little small shop operators, they're closed up. They're not operating after supper today because they can't afford it.

And here now, we're facing unemployment figures across this Chamber today. And I'll tell you, you think we're going to live high on this horse and it's going to stay that way forever. I say it's not. So let's move on.

Let's look at the stay-option plan that this government brought forth. The stay-option, now what was that stay-option plan for? I remember the Member —(Interjection)— Yeh, are you talking stay-option with this kind of legislation? No, you're not. You've twisted your policy all around like you did on land. You see? And that's the problem with the NDP, Mr. Speaker, that's the problem with the NDP. They'll change coats; hh they'll change colours; they'll change principles on any given issue.

I agree that there is a problem today and that labour and management and government should sit down and see if we get ourselves out of this impasse that we're in, which is a very serious time in our country today. I recognize the problems of people that are labour people, but in the main what does it matter? Sunday has always been Sunday. Why, I ask the Minister, can you not legislate this under the Lord's Day Act, either at the provincial level or the federal level. Have you talked to the federal people? Is it not possible? Those are old statutes that have been on the records of this province and

the Government of Canada for years and years. Our country has lived a hundred years, and those statutes have lived over those years, and I still think they are viable today. Because the day that government stands up and tells people, who are paying the shot and providing goods and services, that you can only open now, you can close now. The next legislation, I suppose, we'll have to say, well you can open at 9:30 in the morning and you've got to close at 4:00 because of some other government philosophy.

I don't think it's fair, Mr. Speaker, and there's nobody that goes to church more often than I do. I've been a choir leader, I've taught Sunday School, I believe in the Lord's Day Act and I respect it, but for government to come in and have to legislate people, then there's gotta be something wrong with society. There has got to be a sick society when the Minister of Labour has to come to us with a piece of legislation that said; Sunday is Sunday. My gosh, we've known that for all the years, and so does the Honourable Minister! And that shouldn't be even questioned, nor should the hours of work be questioned, or the fact that we're offering goods and services. Let the people run their own businesses them alone and provide the best service you can for the economy and keep the dollars flowing and we'll all be much happier.

But, I know again the Liberals don't believe in that, they want to regulate them. They want big government. So do the NDP. They want big government, but it does concern me because, Mr. Speaker, I for 30 years tried with our local Chamber of Commerce, with our local municipality, with the retail merchants and others to do exactly what the Minister is trying to do here. It won't work. At least it didn't work for us, it never did because every community is different. I don't see how you can possibly take all the communities of this province and put them in a bill and say, "As of now the Minister of Labour is going to tell them when they can do this, when they can do that, when they can't do this and now he's going to take over." Why don't you leave them alone and let these people regulate themselves? Why can't the municipalities and the cities of this province regulate themselves? But the NDP don't believe in that. They don't want to let the municipalities or the town or the village or — no they want big government to come in — we'll regulate them. So the Liberals believe in the same. We don't believe in that philosophy.

Well, I know, I recognize there is a problem and the Minister has some concerns in the matter, but I think the day that we are going to get ourselves, or government is going to be able to regulate everything — you say you can handle everything — I say, why not let the country merchant go back and sell a dozen eggs that come in from his farmer friend. You can't do that any more. — (Interjection)— Ah, well, he's talking about horse meat and I never had a chance to sell, maybe the store that he bought at had horse meat, I never had horse meat in my store but it is a very clean animal, and if he has any concerns about horse meat — we certainly ate it when the war was on. Maybe he was too young to be in the army. Is there anything wrong? I have a farmer that sells buffalo, he harvests buffaloes. Is there any problem with a farmer coming in — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, that of course again is the problem of these wild-eyed socialists who are not satisfied now. I wonder, are they going to regulate the store that the Minister is talking about — Consumers they're going to open up across the way? I just say, I'm for that store, and I'm for trade and doing business with people, but for government to come in and regulate them I become very very concerned.

So I look forward to seeing this bill come into Committee. I am alarmed about the free enterprise system, about free trade, about the merchants having some judgement of when he can open his store up and when he closes it. I don't think that's any of the government's business. I think that's up to the merchant. If he can't negotiate that with his staff, the people that are working with him, the day that we have to bring government in to regulate our stores, I think our society has moved a step backward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for Rhineland that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried

BILL (NO. 20) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL ALLOWANCES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 20 makes mention of the fact that municipalities will have to limit registering of liens on welfare payments to where payments granted would increase the equity of the property of the recipient. Many municipalities are already limiting liens to this extent and I don't see any particular problem in that respect. I have no objection to the department assuring themselves that the applicant for welfare does not qualify for any other assistance such as old age pensions, unemployment insurance, etc., before granting assistance to the applicant. I do have reservations, however, about the portion of the bill pertaining to summary conviction of applicants, whose applications do have false statements or who fail to inform the director of any changes of income within a period of 30 days. Many of the applicants are people with no previous business experience' who find themselves in a predicament of having to ask for assistance because the head of the household is suddenly no longer able to provide for his or her family. Now many of these

applicants have never filled out a form in their lives and the experience is new and frightening. I hope it would not be the Minister's intention to deal harshly with these people, impose fines upon them when they probably never understood in the first place what was required of them. I am prepared to let this bill go to Committee where we can have further discussion.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 21) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Thank you' Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the amendments in Bill 21 to the Real Property Act regarding the party wall agreements is a step forward in legislation. There have been problems, definitely, between when you have a side-by-side and naturally you have a common wall between the two buildings and the registrar had to be involved with the application as far as the care of that wall was concerned. Now, you run into the situation wheresomebody buys one half of the house and the other half is rented and there still has to be definite agreement and regulations regarding the party wall agreement in the Real Property Act, so there is no question that that particular amendment in the bill is a better situation than we've had and I would say it's very good housekeeping.

But the other area of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that is rather confusing to me and I'm saying that the Attorney General is going to have to give us a real good explanation for the second section where there is a mortgagor encumbrance that it cannot be registered if the principal moneys secured are in any other currency other than Canadian. I don't for the life of me know why a government is really becoming involved in how I'm going to pay off something, or if two people are going to pay off something or there is going to be an agreement between them whether they want to do it in any currency is really their affair. Now I can understand if it's in Canadian dollars or it says in Canadian dollars' so that all of us who read it in this country can understand it, that's fine. But, if it says X number of Canadian dollars and I want to pay that same amount off in yen, or whatever it may be, it's only a bank description or a phone call to the bank to find out how many yen I've got to give him. I really am surprised at the government becoming involved in this type of currency. If you want to pay it off in drachmas or stones, as long as the value is there, that is between the people who are making the agreement, Sir.

There is one other thing that can happen here and that is the mortgage or the encumbrance in Canadian at the present time would be much less than the value of the American dollar at the present time as an example. And you could have an agreement between the two people that the payment would have to be made as to the value of the American dollar but that payment on the separate agreement is not secured because it's not against the property. It can only be secured or the mortgagor encumbrance can only be secured in Canadian dollars, so you're going to run into a very very silly or complicated method of doing things here by having that particular statement in there.

Now as I said the Attorney-General will have to have a good explanation. I hope he has the registrar with him at the time, but it's very very strange to us, as why that legislation is required at all. There are people who publish American price lists in Canada and they put right on the bottom of it, to be paid in American dollars and that is the right of anybody who is doing business with somebody else. The person doing business or loaning the money says, "I want the value of the money in my country." And he has that right. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, if you want to put the Canadian value there that's fine' but certainly it's up to the person making the payment to pay it in any type of currency he likes as long as it adds up to that value. As I say, we will have to have explanation on that particular section of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The other area of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that we'd like to make comment on is: the Registrar-General may designate any member of his staff of the Land Titles Office the authority to approve plans of subdivision. Now the word "any" is a little bit far, Mr. Speaker. I think anybody that has the right to approve subdivisions in the registrar's office should certainly have some experience in subdivision or some knowledge of what is going on and quite frankly, the word "any" says that the person if they were hired yesterday to do the filing in the office could approve a subdivision if the registrar so decides. Now I don't like to tie the hands of the registrar, Mr. Speaker. I think that he would probably use discretion and I am sure he would while he was designating somebody, Sir. But you know, this is legislation we are passing and we should maybe be just a little bit careful of how broad we make it in this particular area. I might say we're not opposed to other people being in the position of approving plans because anything we can do in this department to have things move along faster than they are at the present time, so much the better. But maybe we should take a look at that general clause, the word "any." Other than that, Mr. Speaker, we would say that the bill could go to Committee and as mentioned, we have very definite questions of the Attorney-General on one section.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Tuesday, April 5, 1977

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN : That one will have to stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker' I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable, the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services and the Monourable Member foi St. Vital in the Chair for Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
ESTIMATES — HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital): We have a quorum, gentlemen. The Committee will come to order. I would refer honourable members to Page 37 in their Estimates Books, the Department of Highways. Resolution 71. Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects. The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, if I may just for a minute. There were a couple of questions that we took as notice yesterday and I'm wondering if it would be in order to go back to them now before we proceed with the next resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. BURTONIAK: I believe the Member for Ste. Rose asked the question as to who is responsible for maintenance on the Waterhen-Mallard Road. I think I did state that I thought it was the responsibility of the province and I am advised upon checking that it is a provincial responsibility. It's a main market road.

The Member for Gladstone-Neepawa asked a question in regard to maintenance costs by districts, I believe. I have that information here. As the members know, we have 12 districts in the Province of Manitoba and the expenditures in each district: District No. 1 for general was \$991,600 and there were \$572,000 for special items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, when we have the breakdown of the area, could we have the area specified as we do it? Like Area No. 1 compromises what?

MR. BURTONIAK: District No. 1 is Selkirk. District No. 2 is Steinbach area — \$1,221,600 for general and for special items \$192,000.00.

District No. 3, which is in the Carman area — general expenditures there were \$1,486,200 and for special items \$456,000.00.

District No. 4 which is Boissevain — in general \$900,900 and special items \$341,000.00.

District No. 5 which is Brandon — for general purposes \$1,090,500 and special projects \$300,000.00.

District No. 6 is Portage la Prairie — general expenditures \$1,367,200 and for special items \$183,500.00.

District No. 7 is Minnedosa — for general items \$1,215,300; specials \$245,000.00.

District No. 8 which is the Dauphin district — \$1,277,600 in general and \$175,000 for special items.

In District No. 9 which is the Swan River district — in general \$707,600 in general; \$34,000 in special items.

In District No. 10 which is The Pas — general \$1,133,000; special \$162,000.00.

District No. 11 which is the Arborg district — \$1,142,400 general and \$385,000 special items.

The last district No. 12 which is the Winnipeg district — \$607,500 for general purposes and \$320,700 for special items.

There was one from the Member for Portage la Prairie. His query was in regard to funds, if there were any funds available for transit studies. I did indicate to the honourable member last night that there were funds available through the Department of Urban Affairs. I wasn't exactly sure as to what the formula was but I have that now. Urban Affairs, of course, advised the Council of Portage la Prairie that they would be eligible for transit assistance as previously stated. They then enquired whether assistance would be available to carry out a transit study. Council was advised that the province would pay 75 percent of the cost of such a study. The cost of the study was estimated at \$4,000.00. To date the council has not decided to proceed.

I think that was all the questions that were asked. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, there was one other one I believe that the Honourable Member for Roblin was enquiring about, the \$12,966,000 in 15(4)(d) — \$9,666,000 was for machine rentals, mostly our maintenance, and some to other departments and agencies and and — I'm sorry, \$9,566,000 — did I say \$9,666,000? It's supposed to be \$9,566,000.00. Yes, for rentals, and \$3,330,000 for warehouse storage charged to construction and maintenance projects.

I think that those are the questions that were posed last night that we took as notice.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, in the matter of Selkirk, Selkirk was the first one — what was the breakdown?

MR. BURTONIAK: The first one, Mr. Chairman, is \$991,600.00 — that's for general purposes, and \$572,000 special items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, thank you for acknowledging me. I am going to be somewhat parochial as far as I am concerned and that's the way it's got to be. Insofar as the highway

from No. 10 into Pelican Rapids — and the Minister knows exactly what I'm going to say and I'm not going to kick old straw around, but I think it's a public disgrace that something isn't done for these people on a highway such as they have to travel. This particular item suggests that it is the responsibility under this item to provide safe roads. If you can tell me that that 20 miles with 200 curves is a safe road, well, you've got another think coming. There's been deaths on that road and there's some 500 people in there. I know it's an agreement between Ottawa and the province and the province have done their share over the years but I go onto it every winter and those people are not sure that their road is even going to be ploughed out. It's also a service road for Hydro — hydro follows that road. For years I have brought it before the Minister and his predecessors for something to be done about it. I suggested years ago if they only took one or two or three of those curves out every year, which probably is an expensive proposition at this late date, they'd have some sensible type of a road. Children are being brought over that road to school and, Mr. Minister, one of these days we're going to be confronted with a fatality that's going to be terrible and something must be done about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with our Rule 19(2) I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour to return to the Chair at 8 p.m.

ESTIMATES — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I direct the honourable members to Page 14 of their Estimates Book. Resolution 32(b)(1)—Research Planning—Salaries \$56,400.00. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks with respect to some of the statements that the Minister made yesterday and he is aware that this will come about at this time but the matter will probably be further discussed under his Estimates under Rent Stabilization. But because the statements were made yesterday in relation to certain items, I would like to draw his attention and the members' attention to the regulations in the Manitoba Gazette, Regulations 101-76 dealing with the Rent Stabilization Act and particularly Section 20, which would indicate, Mr. Chairman, under Section (k) of Section 20, that interest costs and service charges are not allowed as a cost pass-through under the Rent Stabilization Act. I would also, Mr. Chairman, indicate that the Ombudsman in his report on page 25 dealing with dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Rent Stabilization Board and on Page 26 and 27 deals with a case in which he cites the regulations and indicates that this is, in fact, the law and therefore he can't go beyond that. It may very well be that the practice, Mr. Chairman, in some cases of the Rent Stabilization Board has been to allow the interest charge and the changes related to interest charge as a cost pass through, but I do not believe that that is the law today. If this is what the Minister considers to be the law or the members of the department consider to be the law, then the law has to be changed.

I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, to clarify this, the very important point being that for many people who had arranged their financing some five years ago and who have the standard clauses that every five years the interest rate is to be adjusted to be able to conform with the prevailing interest rates at the time, the increased cost to them is in fact an expense that they must pay and certainly one of the factors to be considered as part of their expenses in the determination of what they are entitled to be able to pass through as a cost to them to which the tenants of their residential premises would be required to pay. I wonder if the Minister at this point will clarify this so that at least on the record this statement would be known and would be clear and the public would understand the position. If the regulations are to be withdrawn, if the Act is to be changed, if the policy of the government is not as promulgated, then I think this House and the people of Manitoba should know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to possibly say a few words in regard to the discussion that took place last evening, but I don't believe that I'd like to go into any more details pertaining to the Leader of the Opposition's points on the educational kits. I'm willing to make available to the Leader of the Opposition the detailed information sheet pertaining to the process that we've taken in regard to the creation of same and that can be put on the record later if need be.

In regard to the Rent Stabilization Act and Regulations, especially as it pertains to increased costs in interest costs by landlords for re-financing of the same amount, not exceeding the amount that was previously mortgaged, at a higher cost of interest, I'm informed by the rent stabilization officers that this is now being allowed to be passed through. Landlords have been informed of this. I agree with the honourable member that the regulation as it stands leaves something to be desired in regard to that position. My understanding equally based on legal opinion is that the Act itself does not have to be amended. Regulations would have to be amended. I indicated to the House some time ago that that is being considered, not only in that regard but in other regards pertaining to what I consider to be inequities pertaining to cost pass through and that happens to be one of them. So, my understanding equally is that the amendment to the regulations would have to be retroactive in that case.

There was a question by the Member for Fort Rouge, I believe, pertaining to housing starts in the Province of Manitoba. That in 1976 year-end figures as produced by Statistics Canada, housing stocks and completion, single detached houses in Winnipeg — 2,927; for the province — 4,726. Apartment dwellings units — 2,374 in Winnipeg; all of Manitoba — 2,934. Duplex dwelling units — 558 in Winnipeg; 574 in all of Manitoba. Row housing dwelling units — 859 in Winnipeg; all of the province — 1,105 for a total of 6,718 in Winnipeg, 9,339 in the province. These include public and private sector activity in 1976.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Mr. Chairman, equally talked about the Competition Act revision. The Department of Planning and Research has done some work on this, but this is definitely a federal responsibility but we have attempted to be of some assistance to them in supplying them with required data.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: To close up my comments under the Research and Planning Section, I didn't join the chorus of people boxing the Minister's ears last night pertaining to the cost of food and housing because I felt it was a federal responsibility. But upon checking with the Federal Consumers

Department over on Main street, I find that the Member for Fort Rouge and his party have frozen the budgets of the federal department here locally and I think what we should do is be demanding that the Minister opposite approach the Federal Government to give Manitoba consumers proper protection. And if it is their responsibility, I don't see why the Minister should have to have an expansionary budget in this area to pick up this federal responsibility. I think that the general thought on the street is that the consumer is not being protected in the rise in these particular two very important areas and I would ask the Minister's department to give extra emphasis to demanding the Federal Government to pull up their socks and get on with the job of protecting the Manitoba consumer in areas of which they are supposed to be protecting us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 32(b)(1)—Salaries. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of other items that I'd like to raise with the Minister before we leave this particular area. One has to do with the marketing of gas and oil in the City of Winnipeg. Again I think there are two particular items that deserve examination, either because they are confusing the consumers or that in fact, there is something in which the consumer is not being fairly dealt with. One has to do with the issue of what appears to be a range of disparity between gas prices charged in different parts and sectors of the city. One can, just doing a rough survey of my own, take the same service station company with the same kind of products and go into north end, south end, west end, and find in some cases a discrepancy of three or four cents per gallon of gas. There may be a logical reason. I daresay I find it hard to find out why there should be two-cents difference by crossing over a bridge or going from one thoroughfare to another. But it seems to me that the whole pricing system for retail gasoline at the pump is something that does deserves some examination.

I realize that there is a variety in the way some operators have retail or budget type outlets. But even the same company offering the same kind of franchises, self-serve and so on, finds that on Stafford Avenue it may be 83.5 and you go five blocks over and it's 82.5 and you go across the river and it's 86. I don't know if they're charging according to who they think can bear the market or — (Interjection) — Maybe that's it. Maybe they adopt the whole idea of progressive taxation in the gas business depending on the size of the lots on the streets.

But there certainly is a very visible and apparent series of discrepancies in gasoline pricing and marketing in the city. And again, it is certainly a confusing issue and I think that something the Consumer Bureau here should be looking at, if it isn't already doing so. I would hope that they would be looking at it because it needs to be done.

Now in combination with that there perhaps is a more serious issue that has been drawn to my attention; that is, as the retailing and marketing of gasoline products has increasingly gone towards the self-service type operation, the availability of maintenance for automobiles is being severely cut back. And as the number of cars increase, the number of retail units that actually have mechanics on staff or have the opportunity to do maintenance, just to do the normal kind of check-your-oil, check-your-windshield, batteries kind of thing which the normal motorist, I suppose, could do himself but finds oftentimes inconvenient to do because of the nature of the self-serve operation, that talking to several service station operators who, by the way, feel themselves almost forced out of the business, that that whole question of maintenance is one that could become a more serious problem in the city, and have a repercussion I guess going all the way back to the general cost of running automobiles. We all know that in this time of conservation consciousness, that we should be concerned about the mileage that one gets of gasoline and that is connected with the maintenance of a car and certainly connected to the ability to gain repairs. And as the market or the availability of sources of repair and maintenance decrease because of the increase in self-serve areas, then obviously the price of repairs will go up.

Mr. Chairman, it's an issue that both the question of marketing and retailing of the actual product itself and also the change in the form of delivery of that to a self-serve is one that has happened really with a great deal of rapidity in the last year or two. Again I am wondering if the department has decided that this should be an area of investigation and has been looking at this whole problem of the distribution and retail marketing system of gasoline products and maintenance services in the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Wolseley that the cost of living index review that was sought of us last evening, being a federal responsibility, it's hard I guess in a sense to probe the Federal Government and get them to increase their budget or reduce their budget and transfer funds to us for us to do it. But I happen to believe that it is their responsibility and whatever they must do in regard to collating information from different provinces in Canada, that they should do so. I don't believe that we should attempt to duplicate that responsibility here. We're pleased to try and supply the information desired by them, to have a more complete and useful review of this survey and have a more half decent result of the review. So, yes, by all means when we do get a chance to talk to the Federal Government, we'll try to see that they do pick up their responsibility and they do the same for us in regard to our own provincial responsibilities.

The marketing of gas and oil and related services to the consumer is certainly not a responsibility of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. And the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge knows that. There is no way that we can control the price of gasoline and oil and related expenses. We have no legislative powers to do that. The only thing that we could do is to try and collate information pertaining to what is being charged by the retailers. But we can't control prices. The only way that we could actually play a meaningful role is to ask AIB to take up their responsibility and that is not being done. But obviously we can't do that. It has never been assumed by the previous Minister who got in with Ontario to freeze the price of gas although that was being done, that it was giving us a responsibility of setting prices of gasoline. He don't have that responsibility. I can't assume to have it. I can read the two-three page summary of what's being done on the provincial basis in regards to helping the federal authorities do a better job, but it's not our responsibility. I can't gear up my department to have that done.

Now if that gives the honourable member headlines in the papers because he is talking about federal jurisdiction, you know, I can't deal with that. But all I can say that price-fixing, or the regulation of prices and profits is not a provincial responsibility. AIB has it. If there is a differential or an increase that is beyond the provisions of AIB then they should deal with it. I don't think you can just pass that on automatically and assume that I, as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, should deal with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member on a point of order.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's really a point of interference for the Minister that before he gets carried away that was not the issue that I was raising at all. He simply misunderstood totally what I was saying, or wasn't listening, or either one. What I was saying is that there is a price variance in different areas and parts of the City of Winnipeg, for the same product, and that we want to know, or I would like to know and many other people would like to know, whether that particular problem which is certainly within the provincial jurisdiction to examine and determine whether in fact those variances are there, and why they may be there, and then bring it to the attention, is within his jurisdiction. And that is the issue that I am raising with him, not the question of fixing the price of gasoline.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I don't see that as being a proper intervention of a member when he is speaking but obviously you haven't ruled so I can't assume that the honourable member did not have a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. That was not a point of order and we don't have points of intervention. So the honourable Minister can carry on.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, in regards to prices that are being charged in different parts of the city, whether it be on gasoline, oil, related services to the consumer pertaining to services of automobiles or vehicles generally, we don't have that jurisdiction. To indicate to a given area in the City of Winnipeg you're charging 89 cents a gallon and you should be charging 79. That I assume as being the marketplace, really. What does the honourable member feel that we should do with the department to try and curtail that? That's something that exists in chain stores, and something that you see in gasoline stations whether they be self-serve or you know we can indicate what's happening but we can't regulate. We don't have the power to regulate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. According to the Rule 19(2) Private Members' Hour having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Private Members' Hour. The first item is Private Bills. Bill No. 37. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 24. The Honourable Member for Radisson. Shall we give him a minute? It's an introduction. Possibly we could proceed to Bill 31 in the meantime.

BILL (NO. 31) - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT RESPECTING THE HOLDING OF REAL PROPERTY IN MANITOBA BY THE MANITOBA AND NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO COMMAND AND BRANCHES OF THE CANADIAN LEGION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE

MR. HENDERSON presented Bill (No. 31) - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command and Branches of The Canadian Legion of The British Empire Service League, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, many of the local Legions have got very few members now, and

some of them are closing up. In some cases they have assets and they are wondering how to dispose of them. In some cases the assets have been sold and the money has been spent by a few remaining members of the Legion. The Command feel that this is not right and that nothing should be sold before it has been approved by the General Command. This resolution was passed at their meeting and it means that no property now can be sold, if this Act goes through' without it being referred to the General Command and being passed by two-thirds of a majority vote at their meeting.

It also involves a change of name from The Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League to the name Royal Canadian Legion. This has been discussed at their annual meeting and was passed by them.

I have notes here that have been prepared for me that I can pass out to anybody on the other side that may want them. Thank you.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The honourable member wish to proceed or not?

MR. AXWORTHY: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 8. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, when we were speaking on this the other day I got up and I spoke for a while. Since that time I have looked over the remarks that have been said by the Member from Inkster, and the Member from Lakeside, and the Member from St. Matthews, and others members before that, and it's like threshing old straw. I remember when we went around and held these hearings about land ownership and we found at that time that the people did not want the government to be buying up the land, they wanted to be in private ownerships. I am sure there is no doubt everybody will remember that that is what the members on this side of the House said, that the people should be given the option to buy it right from the very beginning.

Well now the government's position has changed because it is an election year, and that's the very thing that they're advocating now. In other words, they've made a turn of 180 degrees. They're right back to what we were advocating. It's what we were advocating, and they can say that they believed in this all the time but we know they didn't because we held the hearings and they had the recommendations and they didn't do it. The reason that they're doing it now is because that this should be election year and that they're thinking that they had better change their position or else they won't have any support at all in the rural areas.

If they believed in private ownership as much as they say, they would have had this from the beginning and they wouldn't also have brought in their Mineral Acreage Tax Act. Because here if a person moves off the land and still owns it, they're charging him ten cents an acre. So by doing this they're hoping that the farmers won't pay their ten cents an acre and move into the local town. They're hoping that they'll quit so they can get the mineral rights. Before they were trying to get the land and the mineral rights.

I'd like to say, and I hope it gets out to many rural people, on the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, that if I was one of those farmers that was getting forced to pay the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, I wouldn't pay it at this time because they haven't started to proceed to take it away from the people and until they have taken it away still yours so why sign it over to the government now and loose it. So you may as well hold it, at any rate' until such times as the government is forcing you to give up your mineral acreage rights. So I just hope that the rural people will not write letters to the government telling them to go ahead and transfer them in the name of the government because you can be sure that if they do the government will see that that's one of the things they get. That's probably one of the things they'll do the fastest. Because this is what they're wanting.

I haven't anything else further to say. I feel it's very definite that the government didn't want this but they had to make this turn-around because it was an election year. This is what we've advocated so it's pretty hard to be against it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to my feet primarily at the urging of my colleagues who feel that, if nothing else, this particular resolution and its amendment deserve a certain clarification. I know that the truth is not something that is in great supply nor in great demand oftentimes in these debates, but certainly I think that the comments in the past on this particular resolution deserve a clear definition on the public record so that when either the voters of the province or future historians come to assess exactly whose position was right on this, then I think that we should be very clear as to

whose was right. I think we don't have to go that far back in history, Mr. Speaker, then to only one year ago, when a resolution of almost identical wording as those brought forward by my colleague from Portage la Prairie was introduced in the House, and at that time, of course, the spokesman from the government, the Minister of Agriculture, I believe the Member from Ste. Rose, himself, if I'm not mistaken, suggested that any move in this thing would be a great transgression what was at that time a perfectly pristine policy that was serving the best interests of Manitoba. And any suggestion that it should be reverted back to a one-year option for purchase, as suggested by my colleague, was treated with great scorn and derision by members of the government saying that that would certainly break the whole principle.

Now, we find that not only has the government reversed itself' but that the Member from Ste. Rose is now taking credit for the foresight and insight to bring that particular reversal about. Well of course, Mr. Speaker, that's hogwash and he knows it, and they know it, and Hansard is full evidence of it.

What is even slightly more curious, Mr. Speaker, is why the Conservatives also now feel compelled to begin acquiring credit for having pushed and plodded in this direction. Mr. Speaker, I also went back and read the debates on this very same resolution that was produced last year, and what was the position taken by the spokesman for the Conservative Party? Well they were even more wryly abusive in their opposition to such a move than was the government itself because the position taken by the Conservatives is that they would get rid of the lease programs, totally and completely and they would have nothing to do with them. That was their position. No equivocation, no ambiguity, the Member from Lakeside said with all the force and vehemence that only he can bring to debates in this House that to pull this resolution was only paying further due to the devil, or words to that like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get the last speaker from the Tory Party and successive speakers, the Leader of the Opposition, saying, "Look, it's our program after all". Mr. Speaker, I suppose if it wasn't a serious business it would be amusing how Tory programs immediately become those that they have borrowed quickly from somebody else.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else this particular debate on this resolution shows how many people are susceptible to death-bed confession and how quickly an idealist where this group has had to fight and propose and suggest resolutions, time and time after again, rejected by other groups in this House because they were considered to be idealistic, or visionary, or Utopian, or full of dreams, how one year later they all of a sudden become practical programs which are now totally stolen or carried away, and adopted as their own.

Mr. Speaker, the only problem is that usually when they take those ideas they usually butcher them up in the implementation and application of them. That they usually take a good idea and they turn it into a bad bill as we've seen in many other cases.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important in this particular debate, history does have a certain relevance, certainly to learn from it. And if there's any lesson to be learned from this particular policy issue about what to do with the land lease program, it was that the Member from Portage, beginning in 1974, when he first introduced the resolution was on the right track. And now that we have the New Democrats and the Tories accepting that' I think it is clear to say that we can underline the fact at this time in point, who was right. I think that's all we have to establish here. I think that the statement and position taken by the government in reversing itself is obviously the proper and correct one and it certainly gives us great pleasure that the Tories, themselves, find it now in their wisdom to support that position.

I would only suggest' Mr. Speaker, that if the lesson is to be drawn further that many other resolutions that have been presented by this group, in this House, will probably carry the same kind of relevance, and many have of course in the past, and many that are now on the Order Paper have yet been dispensed with, with a scolding derision. We watched the Minister for Public Works sort of convolute himself in a mass of contradiction and paranoia yesterday. I think that we will probably have full occasion to be satisfied and say I told you so, in a very future date, because I believe that the ideas presented, of course, had nothing to do with his representation.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, the only unfortunate part about this resolution is that there was a second part to it, introduced by my colleague in his original resolution' concerning the impact upon municipal taxes. I think that it would have been better rather than playing the time-honoured game of simply amending it out of existence and going through an exercise in self-congratulations if the Member from Ste. Rose had looked at it. I think he brought forward some useful points in his debate concerning some changes that should have been made in the resolution, if he had stuck to that. If he had changed some of the wording and added some things to it and maybe tried to improve upon it rather than simply exercising it, it really does become a little bit of a useful exercise by displaying even more platitudes for the government than he normally does.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the resolution, as amended, is really an improper amendment because it doesn't really properly describe what has happened. I think that the

point of the resolution brought in by my colleague was to both set the record straight, but also to provide some improvements on the announcement made by the Minister of Agriculture, and that is what we had hoped would happen to this particular resolution. That rather than becoming an opportunity for other groups in this House to all of a sudden congratulate themselves for things they never did, that they would have used the opportunity to try to improve upon the land lease program and bring it into a better form than it was, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we would certainly not have to agree with the amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BANMAN: I'd like to put several things on the record so the historians, when they're searching the records, will have a proper perspective of what's going on here as far as the Conservative Party is concerned, with regard to the Land Lease Program. .

Number one, we were absolutely opposed 100 percent against the Land Lease Program and that is the speech that the Member for Lakeside made during the debate on the resolutions last year. That's why we voted against that program. And I suggest to the member who just spoke that it's probably the opposition and the strong opposition from the Tory Party against the total program that we've seen any changes at all in this particular legislation. The Member from Fort Rouge doesn't have to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BANMAN: . . . get up and tell the members of this particular caucus where we stand with regard to this particular resolution. We are not in favour of seeing Manitoba farmers become tenants of the Crown. We're not in favour of that policy, and we've said so in the House many times. The Liberal *troika* over there doesn't have to get up and paint us into that kind of a corner. As a matter of fact, we want to go one step further, we want to see that certain Crown lands which can be used for agricultural purposes will be put back into the hands of the farmers, sold to the farmers so that the farmers in Eastern Manitoba and in the Interlake area have their own land, can farm on their own land and use that land. So for the record, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very brief, I don't like to be painted into that kind of a corner. It's a total misrepresentation of the facts and I think that the historians and the people of Manitoba and especially the rural people who have opposed this policy along with this particular party will make the decision at the time when it comes to vote in the next election and I think they'll send a message pretty clearly back to this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I'd like to add a few comments to this debate also, Mr. Speaker. And it seems to me that the Liberals, every time they stand up, have only one thing in mind and that seems to be a "me too-ism." If something seems to be working, why then they want to jump on the bandwagon. I think that there's no doubt in anyone's mind as to what the Conservative stand has been. We have advocated all the way through that the land should be turned over to the young farmers and this idea of the one-year deal, I think that we've all brought up many many times, that in the event that a person happened to win the sweepstake or fell into a windfall, that they'd have the opportunity of buying the land immediately.

Something else that hasn't been brought up is another thing that the Conservative Party has suggested and that is the fact that capital gains are not going to be included. I know there was a little bit of dissension in our own caucus about this but capital gains are not being included or added to the sales of the land that was bought in 1972-73 and now is coming up for resale to the individual. I don't think I made that quite clear but in any event, it is that capital gains are not being added to land purchased in 1972-73 and it can be bought now and there is, of course, a penalty clause there that if you buy today and sell tomorrow, that you'll be subject to 90 percent capital gains phased out over a twenty-year deal. And the government made much to-do of the stay option and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that under the conditions prior to the death-bed repentance of the Minister of Agriculture, there certainly would have been the stay option because there would have been no opportunity to buy or get out, you'd either have the option of staying there or else you would just have to pack up and leave and that would have been all there would have been to it.

I don't really think that there's a great deal more I would like to add to this except that, as I said before, this is a Conservative . . . the whole set up on the amendments to the lease were things that had been suggested by the Conservative Party. I think we're well within the rights of claiming the benefits for the farmers that should accrue from the amendments that were given by the Minister. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few things and perhaps the Member for Gladstone — I don't know if he touched on it or not — but a 20 percent capital gain over a period of twenty years, it may seem pretty fair to some farmers but I would be concerned with the five percent capital gain for

one year because some land that some farmers purchased, they may have to spend something like \$5,000 or \$10,000 to bring it up into good production and if they would for some unforeseen reason, because of a disaster in the family or sickness, they would have to sell this farm, they would not only not be able to recover their expenses that they spent to bring up the land into good productive process but the five percent may not be sufficient. I would hope that in Law Amendments, in Committee, that perhaps some consideration should be given because there's much land in the province that perhaps is not in good producing or not in good shape. Somebody that purchases the land has to spend considerable amount of money to bring it up in good production and it may be a considerable amount of money so then if he sells it within the first year, all he is allowed is five percent capital gains which is not sufficient to recover his total amount. So I think that's one area that perhaps we could look at in Committee.

I do wish to make one point and one point clear because I feel that the Member for La Verendrye is much less than honest in this House and furthermore, the Leader of the Official Opposition speaking to some 800 people at a nomination convention, he says, "You know, the government accepted our policy. Just exactly what we wanted." What was their policy? And the Member for La Verendrye in his paper — (Interjection) — Well, you're totally against any lease program of any kind, that was the philosophy, that was the policy and — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Morris still is and I congratulate him because he makes a point and he's specific. He says, "We still are." But the other members are saying, "Well, the government accepted exactly what we wanted." And what did the government do? They accepted that within a year that you can buy the land and also 20 percent capital gain within a twenty-year, your total capital gain which, again I say, it may not be sufficient because in the first year the farmer may spend much more than what is allowable, so I think that we have to look.

But for the Member for Pembina to get up and say that, you know, the government exactly accepted our program — that's completely wrong, it's completely wrong. At least, the Member for La Verendrye can be much factual than he has, to say, you know, this is the program, the government accepted what the Conservatives did. Well, why not be specific and say: Look, we're against the program completely — which you were. But to go on the hustings and say the government accepted our policy, that you were responsible for the government going to allow the land to be sold within a year, I think it's false.

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

MR. TOUPIN: I spoke on the resolution but I would like to say a few words on the amendment. You know, I don't think we can be as gullible as some members of the House would like us to be in regard to the position taken — the positions, I should say, of the Conservative Party. — (Interjection) — That's the positions. I do say positions because if we go back to prior to the coming of this administration in power — and the Conservative Party know this — that they brought in the Act making land lease allowable and how much did they use it? Well, I guess not much because the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and Fort Rouge is right that at the last session — or was it two sessions ago when the Member for Portage la Prairie brought a resolution — they talked against the total program. Now that's at least two positions that had been put forward by the Conservative Party. Now the third is that I can see them endorsing the resolution before us in regard to an amendment that was brought forward by this government and that's the reason why we amended the resolution. It's not only for the reason that we wanted to glorify or to pat the Minister of Agriculture on the back; we don't have to do that. But I mean even before that was decided in regard to the amendment of the resolution, it was decided that we would amend the regulations allowing for a change in the mode of operation of the Land Lease Program, which I happen to agree with and I've said this on the main motion before us, that we should have the option. It's a question of giving additional options to the farmers and mainly younger farmers that are wanting to go back on the farm.

Under the previous style of operations under the Land Lease Program, I indicated that quite a few of my constituents, especially young farmers, had availed themselves of this option. Instead of going to a credit union, going to a bank, going to the Farm Credit Corporation and borrowing and purchasing the land, they decided to lease and were hoping to exercise the option to purchase after five years. But the portion that they couldn't really endorse and they came and told me, was that the amount that they had to pay after five years in most cases, because of the price of farmland going up, it would have been very difficult for them to exercise that option, so now this is being modified. This is being modified now so hopefully anytime after the lease agreement is signed, they can exercise the option to purchase at the set price at the initial signing of the agreement. I feel that's right and that the spreading of benefits should be spread over a period of twenty years. So for the reasons announced, I don't think that the Conservatives should try to take credit either way. I don't believe that the Liberals should try to take the credit either because, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were in power 22 years before the Conservatives and what did they do?

A MEMBER: There was no money.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, that's a good excuse but it's not good enough. You know, even if the budget of the government of that time was much lower than it was in 1969, you could have still made available through banks, through credit unions, that possibility, that option for farmers, especially that the Liberal Party over 22 years exercised the stay option — it really was a stay in many parts of the province, it stayed the same for 22 years. But at least if that option would have been made available to the farmers, I don't believe that we'd have seen that big reduction from 39,000 farmers to getting close now to 20,000 which I abhor. I'd like to see the farms go back, not necessarily to 40,000 or 45,000 farmers, but I'd like to see the option really exercised here, whether it be directly by means of the Land Lease Program but that we do get younger farmers back on the farm. And I think by specialization in certain crops, in certain mixed farming if need be, that success can be had on smaller farms. It's been proven in my own constituency and I think it's possible to increase the number of farmers in this province which I would personally like to see. I think the type of policies that are implemented by the Provincial and Federal Governments have an implication pertaining to either the reduction or the increase of numbers of farmers in this province like in any other provinces in Canada. I think that this is an option that should have been available in the past to farmers, hopefully that with the modifications that we've allowed, that we've modified now, it will be a true option that will be considered by many younger people wanting to get back to the farm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to get up and speak on this but I've had to sit and listen to some of the members opposite deliver to this House such a bunch of garbage that really it just can't be let go by.

In the reply to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson got up and praised this government for having the best roads in his constituency that could possibly be there and yet he gets up in Highways the other night and said he's got the worst roads in the country. So this is the kind of speeches we're getting from the other side and we really just can't put too much credit in what they say over there. I'm even starting to doubt some of the speeches that come off from the left side over on his particular side of the House, Mr. Speaker, because I was on the land hearings and it was pretty obvious after the first some 55 briefs that we had, I think 52 of them indicated pretty well to the Committee — although the Minister of Mines probably won't accept this — that people really weren't that concerned about ownership, it was just that they didn't want the government owning the farmland and that was loud and clear, even though the Minister will probably say we're a little biased in our reading of those briefs — it came out pretty clear. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House in the Conservative Party, have always supported the ownership of the farmland by young farmers and we would certainly encourage young farmers onto the land as much as the members opposite or as much as any government would. I think it's important . . .

A MEMBER: How?

MR. BLAKE: There's a method of long-range mortgaging that can be brought in just as simply as not because the members opposite know very very well that under their program that they brought in, there was no way that that young farmer was ever going to own that farm and it's pretty obvious by the flack that they were getting, by the speeches that were made by members of this side, that they had to amend that policy especially in an election year because they've talked to the young men that are leasing those farms and they have found out there was no possible way they were going to own that land regardless of what they might say and how they might want to throw the window dressing on it and cover it up to say it was a good program. It was a misdirected program and it wasn't to the advantage of the young farmer. He could have been on that land, he could have had ownership right from Day One without having to go on bended knee to this government in order to get onto the farm. I think that message has been brought to the Minister of Agriculture loud and clear.

It is nice to hear the Member for Ste. Rose get up with the grand amendment that he brought in and this government has finally had a change of heart; they're going to have the young men flocking back to the farm; we're going to have a farmer on every quarter section according to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. But, if we get that type of farming back in Manitoba, we're going to have so many specialized crops that we're going to need another 16 marketing boards to handle them.

But the members opposite snickered when I mentioned long-term financing and there has to be long-term financing whether it's a government program or whether it's a program sponsored by the financial institutions. The very simple method brought in at the conclusion of the Second World War to help veterans relocate on their farms. They brought in a long-range financing program to enable farmers to get onto the farms; they tied their payments to production — if they had a good crop, they made a fairly substantial payment; if they had a poor crop, they made a small payment. That way, he wasn't faced with a large mortgage payment. The Member for Portage says, "That was a good Liberal program." To give credit where credit is due, they tied into that program the Farm Improvement Loans Act, I think one of the finest pieces of legislation that farmers have enjoyed in this country ever and it's unfortunate that the existing government's economic and fiscal policies over the last ten

years have turned the country into such a schmozzle that it's no longer possible for a farmer to get a Farm Improvement loan anymore because the interest rates have gone sky-high and I don't know who's going to take credit for that program. I suppose the Liberals should take credit for that one also. I don't mind giving them credit where credit is due but I also want them to share the blame for the mess the country's in right now.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the member is anxious to have this voted on and get us to support his amendment but I just didn't want it to go by without stating the feelings of those of us who have lived in the rural areas and have got a feeling for some of the young men that have rented this land and if the members opposite are trying to convince themselves that this program was bought holus-bolus by all of the young farmers that rented that land, it is a lot of nonsense. They were on the that land because it was a means, maybe, to get there and they were hoping that they would find a way out, probably this coming election when they knew damn well that we were going to scrap that program and allow them to buy that farmland. The Minister of Agriculture has just upstaged us by bringing in the exact program that many of us had made in speeches throughout the country on the Land Committee hearings. I agree with the Member for Assiniboia, he says they are running scared. There is no question about it. It was an election gimmick and he is going to need lots more of them in the country. I think he will need a lot more of them in the city, too.

But, Mr. Speaker, those are the feelings of the members on this side of the House. There is no question in our minds that young men should be allowed to buy those farms. I just hope that the Minister is going to bring his department back into play again with mortgage financing because if he is going to hold them up and say, "Well, you haven't got the cash to buy out this contract, you are just going to have to stay there and rent for ever and ever or until you can come up with \$100,000," he is going to have to have the financing package available to give them the option to obtain ownership of that land. That is the only way he is going to have productive young farmers on there and there is no question in my mind that the man that is renting is not going to husband the land and use that farm the way he is going to treat it if he owns the farm.

The Member for Ste. Rose is mumbling away from his seat there. There is lots of leased land up in his area. There is some land that is not suitable to produce enough to make a sufficient and an acceptable living for farmers. That land certainly can be leased in conjunction with some land that he owns in order to provide him with a good, viable operation and a good living and I think the member is very well aware of that but we are certainly not going to ask someone to buy farmland that he can't use productively and make his unit more viable than it maybe is with whatever land he might have down in the south.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the ownership of farmland, farmer-owner operated farm is the most successful farm, the most successful operation that we can get into. I urge the Minister that if he hasn't considered it, and he very very seldom goes into programs like this with prior consultation with financial institutions and those engaged in credit granting and in the mortgage field. He has probably done the same thing again, he is going to pile into this program without finding out who is prepared to grant mortgage funds to these young men to buy the farms if he is not prepared to reactivate the credit corporation to provide the mortgage money necessary. And as I say, there are certainly examples available to him from the previous federal programs that have worked extremely well. Now all he has to do is find out what criteria they took to bring their program in and he can bring in the same program that will establish these young men on the farm in a sound, farmer-owned operation, which is what I know the Minister agrees with — I shouldn't say "the Minister," some members on that side agree with it — I don't think the Minister does agree with the family-owned farm but I know the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does and I think that is the most successful and most viable unit that you can get going in the type of economy we have in the type of agricultural communities that we have in Manitoba today.

I urge the Minister to make sure that he has those programs in place, that he ends up with happy farmers that are now leasing his land rather than having them disgruntled and it will take us a year or two to quiet them down after we formed the government after the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose have a question.

MR. A. R. (PETE) ADAM: Would you answer a question, Sir? The member suggested we should set up a lending agency to buy land. Would you agree that your party, when they were in power, did away with that very institution that you are now advocating?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I don't know just what the member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. I suppose he is referring to the fact . . . are you insinuating that we scrapped the MACC? That is a lot of damn nonsense and you know it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, we are caught in a very difficult position with this amendment of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose because those of us who were in Brandon the other night at the

dinner that was tendered by the Minister of Agriculture heard the Minister of Industry and Commerce — and you heard it too, Mr. Speaker — loud and clear say that it is most unfortunate that agriculture is still the number one industry in Manitoba. Now that was the comment of the Minister of Industry and Commerce in Brandon at the dinner. I think there were some sixteen of our caucus that were there and I think that the Honourable Speaker was there. Now we have the great Member for Ste. Rose asking us to commend the Minister of Agriculture when one of the Cabinet, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, says on the other hand it is most unfortunate that agriculture is still the number one industry in Manitoba. I wish the Member for Ste. Rose, who drafted this amendment, would either communicate with the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Ministry and give us some direction on this resolution because it is his amendment and what a difficult position we are in to try and vote, Mr. Speaker, because we don't know whether to believe the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

I would suspect —(Interjections)— Or the Member for Ste. Rose. We have three honourable gentlemen who are members of the New Democratic Party and two maybe have some agricultural experience; I don't know about the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I don't think I've ever heard such an arrogant, ill-timed, uncalled for statement in all my life, as that Minister made in Brandon that night at the Royal Winter Fair to the dinner crowd and said, "It is most unfortunate that agriculture is still the number one industry in Manitoba." Now I wish the great Member for Ste. Rose had been there at that great fair, to see those great cattle and see those great farmers of that western region of Manitoba and they came from his own constituency. Unfortunately he was at the drawing board drafting his campaign . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . would permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member consider it a great misfortune to the Province of Manitoba if oil in the quantities that are in Alberta were discovered in Manitoba; that the farming population did not decline at all, but oil passed wheat in total revenue to the Province of Manitoba?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when this great exploration force that the Mines Minister has got going around this province. We're waiting for that announcement to get some of the taxes off our — and I know when that announcement does come and he says that I now have made those explorations and this province is going to move, that oil is going to flow freely all across the province, then I'll be more than pleased to admit that agriculture is number two.

MR. GREEN: My question to the honourable member is, considering the fact that the agricultural produce remained the same or increased, would the honourable member consider it a misfortune for Manitoba if a natural resource product such as oil or nickel or uranium found not by, let us say, our exploration company but to make it even more pleasant for you, found by a private concern, surpassed agriculture in total product produced in the Province of Manitoba? Would you consider it unfortunate?

MR. McKENZIE: I don't see how we can relate that to this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I await your ruling that if that is part of the resolution, I'd be prepared to deal with it.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it again shows you have ill-timed, ill-planned, ill-conceived, ill-researched resolutions that we get from a falling government, a government that's tumbling on its head, can no longer keep itself in place, nor do they understand what the beat of the people is, nor do they understand the thrust of the province, nor in fact what Manitoba ever was. Because if the Minister of Industry and Commerce doesn't understand that Manitoba has had a great agricultural background and it is a very important industry in this province, why could the Member for Ste. Rose, in his wildest imagination, in the drawing room in the caucus there with some of his buddies — and maybe the clergyman on his left was the one that got to him and got him to commend the Minister of Agriculture — because the Minister of Agriculture is not that popular in the province at this particular moment and you only have to drive through some of the areas or find out why he wasn't at Brandon Fair with us the other day and listen to what the farmers were talking about. What does he say? The achievements under the Minister of Agriculture — because they're not very happy with some of his achievements: And a lot of farmers wonder why the Minister of Agriculture wouldn't go with the caucus from the legislature to the Brandon Fair or why would the backbench over here not join us that day to go out to the Brandon Fair and talk to the people. —(Interjection)— Unfortunately they weren't there. The only two that came was the Honourable Speaker and this great Minister of Industry and Commerce. The rest of them all stayed here at their drawing boards shooting out their election material, and they know they're going to lose, they know they're going to lose. As somebody said today, it's like —what kind of animal was it? . . . to a sinking ship. —(Interjection)— . . . not worried about Rossmere, I'm just worried about this province. And finally, the people have got the message because when you see the day the Member for Ste. Rose has to come in here at a late hour and stand up and ask us to commend the Minister of Agriculture when, in another room in a different part of the province, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is saying, "Agriculture, most unfortunate, most

unfortunate, is still the number one industry in Manitoba."

So, Mr. Speaker, don't you think it's time we go to the people. Don't you think it's time that we get rid of this government? Two ministers, one Industry and Commerce, one Agriculture, and the Member for Ste. Rose don't agree. They don't talk together; they don't speak; they don't know what actually is going on in Agriculture.

So I say, I don't see how we in Opposition are going to possibly vote on this tremendous amendment that the Member for Ste. Rose brought in which is a sort of an earth-shattering decision we're going to have to make — either support him or the Minister of Industry and Commerce who said, "Agriculture, unfortunately is still the number one industry." Now do we believe the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, or do we believe the Minister of Agriculture or do we believe the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose?

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave the resolution in your good hands and maybe we'll have to recess for a couple of minutes to go back into caucus and see if we can make a decision on this earthshattering amendment.

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

MR. JONANSSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have exhausted my right to speak, but I do want to raise a point of order. The resolution that has been distributed with the proposed amendment is incorrect. If members will refer to Votes and Proceedings No. 23, Monday, 21st of March, the beginning of the resolution of the amendment should read: "That Resolution No. 8 be amended by deleting everything following the fourth line and that the following be inserted" and the following is listed in the resolution but that has to be corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct and that has been inserted in my copy and in the Clerk's copy and it will be corrected in Hansard.

MR. JOHANSSON: I gather that the Honourable Member for Roblin now knows that he has to caucus this particular amendment with his group?

QUESTION put on the amendment and carried.

QUESTION put on the Resolution as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: There is only ten minutes left. I might as well use up the time. I'm rising only to reply to some of the comments that were made by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation who made some rather — (Interjection) — or the Minister of whatever it is he is now, the Member for Springfield, put some rather amazing statements on the record.

We're supposed to be the Conservatives and we're the ones that are supposed to cling to the past but I've never seen a person that clings to the past as much as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. He made the suggestion that when the Liberal Party was in power there was no stay option policy, and there was no policy that enabled young people to buy farms. What he forgets is that that process was going on, there was no difficulty in those days for farmers to purchase farms because that was prior to the advent of socialists in their various forms, whether they were in the Conservative, the Liberal or the NDP party. They never had an opportunity to screw up the country the way that it is being screwed up right now, and we did not have the rate of inflation that exists in the country today.

There was fairly stable government, and I tell you there's a lot of people that look back on the Campbell years, and some may criticize Mr. Campbell for being a little bit slow in building roads and doing a number of things, but one has got to admit that there was a very slow rate of inflation in those years, and it enabled people to do some planning, and it was not necessary to bring in one government program after another in order just to keep up with inflation. The member should not forget that when he talks about the lack of programs that existed in those years, they were not necessary. They were not necessary because farmers were able to buy land, they were able to farm their farms and they were able to make a living without any assistance from governments. And that's the difference between then and today, and the Minister should not forget that.

This is not the first time that the Minister has stood up in this Chamber and started talking about the past and how we did not have programs that we have today. I tell the Minister again, you didn't need them in those days, you didn't need them at all. And for him continuously to stand up in the Chamber and talk about how great and how wonderful the programs that they have in this country today, in order to what? In order to compensate, and to sort of make up for the mistakes that they have made in administration, in order to enable people to survive in the mess that they've made in government, the debts that they have created, the inflation that they have created, and all the other problems that they have created for society. And it is because of those difficulties that now they make heroes of themselves to bring in programs that are intended to solve the problems that they created themselves. To me that is not a step forward, that is not progress, that is a road to destruction, and we are heading on that road. And how much longer our economy can stand the kind of mismanagement and the kind of nonsense that has been perpetrated on this country by socialists of various forms, only remains to be seen.

The British, and we are not very many years behind them, have discovered it. Now, when you have the former Prime Minister of Great Britain saying that they've got to have . . . he compares the difficulties that they have in Great Britain with the worst years of the war and suggests that the crisis is even greater than they faced in 1940. And what is necessary is to have a coalition of political parties in Great Britain to solve the problem that he considers greater than the problem that existed in 1940. That's the problems created by socialism and that's the problem that has been created in this country and if there is an inability on the part of young farmers to buy land on their own, it's been caused by inflation created by free-spenders, mindless dedication to a philosophy that will not and cannot work without destroying the people that it's intended to serve.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Cultural Affairs, should look back over some of the things that have happened to this country creating the problems that currently exist and he will find that the answer lies in the removal of the socialists from this province as well and everything that's identified with socialism because only and only when that happens in this country are we going to get back to a sound economy that will enable people, that will enable people to find themselves in this province and to take care of themselves. Well, my honourable friend says, "Get back to the days of R.B. Bennett." How far back do my honourable friends want to go? You know, they continue to talk about those years, suggesting that it was R.B. Bennett and that's one of the amusing things that we hear all the time as if R.B. Bennett created the depression in those years. It was a world . . . you know, they like to think in isolation with tunnel-vision. —(Interjection)— Well, the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . world wide depression that took place in those years, yes. — (Interjection)— No, it was not; that's where my honourable friend is wrong, they continue to suggest that it was free enterprise that created that problem. If my honourable friend will look over the history, he will find that it was interference by governments in free enterprise even in those days. — (Interjection)— Well, you know, you can call them what you like, you can call them what you like, whether they're in the Liberal Party, the Democratic Party, the Republican Party or whatever you want to call them, it was interference in the free enterprise system, it was interference in the free markets by those governments in those days that created the problem and you can call them by whatever name you want to call them and I've identified them as socialists whether they be in the Liberal Party, whether they be in the Conservative Party, the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or whatever party.

It's the suggestion by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that we should not provide some opportunities for people to take care of themselves, that the government should take care of everybody, is the one that I reject. —(Interjection)— Well, that's really the effect of your suggestion — that's really the effect of your suggestion. It's that sort of thing that's creating the inflation.

MR. TOUPIN: On a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Oh yes, of course. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't need the Member for Morris to try and put words in my mouth. I did not say that.

MR. JORGENSEN: I just wonder what the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is accusing me of accusing him of. Perhaps if he will identify that, then perhaps we could . . . Well, identify what I said that you're objecting to. Identify it so that I can deal with it. What did you not say? What did the Minister not say that he now rises in such great indignation about? What did I say? The Minister stands up and objects on a point of order to something I said but yet he refuses to identify what I did say and I'd like to know what he did say. —(Interjection)— Well, now he says, "Read the record." Well, my honourable friend, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs better get back to his Girl Scouts, he perhaps knows more about that than he knows about agriculture.

QUESTION put on the Motion as amended.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANSSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, in that case I'll call it 5:30. The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.