



FOURTH SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Peter Fox
Speaker



VOL. XXIV No.60A FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1977 10:00 a.m.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thirtieth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Electoral Division	Political Affiliation
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib
BANMAN, Bob	LaVerendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas	Flin Flon	NDP
BILTON, James H.	Swan River	P.C.
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Hon. Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, Hon. J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
BURTNIAK, Hon. Peter	Dauphin	NDP
CHERNIACK, Saul, Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W.	Riel	P.C.
DEREWIANCHUK, Steve	Emerson	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DILLEN, Ken	Thompson	NDP
DOERN, Hon. Russell	Elmwood	NDP
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Hon. Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GOTTFRIED, John C.	Gimli	NDP
GRAHAM, Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Hon. Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Hon. Ben	Burrows	NDP
HENDERSON, George	Pembina	P.C.
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHANNSON, Wally	St. Matthews	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JOHNSTON, Gordon E.	Portage la Prairie	Lib
JORGENSEN, Warner H.	Morris	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Rev. Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Hon. Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MILLER, Hon. Saul A.	Seven-Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
MOUG, Arthur	Charleswood	P.C.
OSLAND, Les	Churchill	NDP
PATRICK, Steve	Assiniboia	Lib
PAULLEY, Hon. Russell	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Hon. Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PETURSSON, Philip M.	Wellington	NDP
SCHREYER, Hon. Edward	Rossmere	NDP
SHAFRANSKY, Harry	Radisson	NDP
SHERMAN, L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
TOUPIN, Hon. René	Springfield	NDP
TURNBULL, Hon. Ian	Osborne	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WATT, J. Douglas	Arthur	P.C.
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Friday, May 13, 1977

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER, Minister of Finance (Seven Oaks) introduced **Bill (No. 48) An Act to amend the Insurance Act.**

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Springfield) on behalf of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs introduced **Bill (No. 53) An Act to amend The Horse Racing Commission Act and Bill (No. 76) An Act to amend The Tourism and Recreation Act.**

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management (Inkster) introduced **Bill (No. 79) An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2).**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker' my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It relates to the announcements that were made of a new prefab housing factory to be located in Gimli. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether support has been completely withdrawn from any involvement with Misawa Homes, and that the government is now directing its attention to this new project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker' there is a liability from Misawa Homes to the Manitoba Development Corporation, but the Manitoba Development Corporation has not been involved as other than a creditor of Misawa Homes for some two years — approximately two years. I would suspect that Misawa Homes is continuing to operate and build homes, and will continue to operate and build homes in the Province of Manitoba. It was never undertaken to them that there would be no other companies in Manitoba doing this type of work.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce is in a position to indicate whether the terms and conditions of the rental arrangements with respect to the Gimli property are equal to, similar to that given to Misawa Homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS, (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be uninformative this morning, but the rental arrangement is an arrangement that that company made with our Department of Public Works, which is the administrating department for the Gimli Industrial Park, so I do not have that information. I would assume that the administrators of the Gimli Industrial Park would be charging a rent that is fair and equitable, but I do not have that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether there is any involvement by way of grants, subsidization or arrangement which would be more advantageous to this particular project than as opposed to that which was given to him as solid that has been provided for by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any Manitoba Development Corporation loan to that firm. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not the case that the government would equate the kind of involvement that it had with Misawa, with that or any other firm. These things are looked at individually when they come up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Just by way of supplementary information, the department did provide market data and technical assistance to that particular company known as VIP Modular Homes but this is a normal type of assistance that we give any company that is interested in locating in the Province of Manitoba. We will continue to provide any technical support assistance as we do with any company, but there are no grants. The big grant that they did receive was one that was announced by the Federal Government in DREE. I believe they received a grant nearly \$100,000 but they were entitled to that by the Federal Government in terms of reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. To the Minister for Public Works. I wonder if he can indicate whether the arrangements for rental space at the Gimli Industrial Park, with respect to VIP Homes, is similar to the

Friday, May 13, 1977

arrangements that were arrived at with Misawa Homes or is there any variation of any significance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Eimwood): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rates are standard in the industrial base.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can confirm or would accept the statement of the President of VIP who stated that their product, dealing with Masawa, is not suitable for Canadian people who want a little prestige in their homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that's not a fair question. He's asking me to give an opinion on an opinion offered by a particular businessman and that is an opinion of a private citizen and that is his opinion. I don't necessarily share that opinion.

MR. GREEN: I'm quite sure that Misawa would say that their product is better than his product, that's not unusual. That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate whether it is the government's position that they are going to be able to recover the money loaned to Misawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that several years ago that Misawa Homes of Japan Ltd. has invested significant moneys in the Province of Manitoba. Alongside of the public of Manitoba there is an industry there. The security force is not solid as indicated but the company is operating and the Japanese have made their investment as a private firm on the basis of investing in the province and the province went along with that investment and equated it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Minister responsible for Communications. Can you tell us whether the closing of the CBC radio station in Churchill, whether he was advised of that closing and whether the Provincial Government is taking any steps to provide alternative telecommunications to that particular port city?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't personally advised more than the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge I gather. I'll investigate and report back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the House Leader. Noting the introduction of four new bills by the government, can he give us any approximation of the number of bills which remain to be introduced during the present session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the last time I was asked this question it was related to bills which I expected there would be significant controversy about. Other than the financial bills, I believe that there are no bills which, in my opinion, would involve significant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask either the House Leader or the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs whether it is his intention to introduce during the course of this session a new bill involving the Credit Union Associations and Societies.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the bill has been introduced for first reading; it is awaiting second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked a question with regard to an investment of \$80,000 to \$100,000 worth of upgrading work that was planned for the Port of Churchill and asked whether I could shed any light on why this was cancelled. There was a statement to the effect that the National Harbors' Board was cancelling this proposed change to the grain handling facility there. The change, in effect, was to convert a grain dumper to handle new hopper cars that someday will come to Churchill. But because the CNR announced that it would not continue at this time with the upgrading program of the so-called conversion or subdivision, that is, between Gillam and Churchill, the National Harbours' Board decided to postpone any upgrading or conversion of this particular piece of equipment. I would like to assure the honourable member, however, that we are rigorously pursuing the matter with the CNR, the matter of upgrading the line between Gillam and Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 16 students of Grade 9 and 10 standing of the Red Lake High School under the direction of Mr. Shorrocks from the area of Red Lake, Ontario. On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer to that question. I would direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce responsible for Transportation and ask him if he has received a copy of the Hall Commission Report on Railway Transportation in Western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the Hall Commission Report, I believe, is in process of being printed. According to the advice from Mr. Justice Hall, it should be available any day now and we expect to receive a copy any day now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupert'sland): Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would table two Annual Reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table **The Annual Reports for the Fiscal Year 1975-76 for Moose Lake Loggers and Channel Area Loggers Limited.**

ORAL QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. It is with respect to a brochure that is being distributed by the PCP Party in this province which claims that personal income tax rates . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. JOHANNSON: Well, okay. I would like to ask the First Minister whether it is true that personal income tax rates are 39 percent higher in Manitoba than they are in Ontario, according to the PCPers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of receiving a copy of that brochure from the honourable gentlemen opposite and I can say that if that brochure is any indication of what my honourable friends in the Conservative Party are up to, then it is a matter of grave disappointment. The fact of the matter is that with respect to income taxation levels, that Val Werier of the Winnipeg Tribune can count and my honourable friends opposite can lie. That's about what it amounts to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPEED-UP RESOLUTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce,

THAT for the remainder of the session, the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., in the evening from 8:00 p.m. and each sitting to be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and the Rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment be suspended, and and the government business take precedence over all other business of the House;

AND THAT for the remainder of the session, the operation of sub rule (3) of Rule 88 of the The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the House be suspended but the report stage of any Bill shall not be taken into consideration prior to twenty-four hours following the presentation of the report of the Standing or Special Committee with respect thereto.

MOTION . presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to extending hours for this year's session, I would indicate to honourable members that the government intends to proceed similarly to the manner in which we proceeded in the last two years. That is, that we would have sittings of the House the mornings and afternoons of Monday through Friday until it was felt necessary to employ Saturday; that we would have sittings of committees on Monday through Friday in the evenings, so that the, sort of, pre-traditional form of extended hours would not be the character of what we would be doing. As a matter of fact, members would find themselves less occupied in the evenings than they generally were because of the fact that not all members sit on committees.

If the motion is approved then it is my intention to have a meeting of the Economic Development Committee on Monday to consider the report of McKenzie Seeds Limited; a meeting of the Economic Development Committee on Tuesday to consider reports of Channel Area Loggers and Moose Lake Loggers; a meeting of the Law Amendments Committee, the first meeting of the Law Amendments Committee on Wednesday night at 8 o'clock to consider bills that have been passed by second

reading; and to schedule additional meetings, likely of Economic Development Committee, since those are the ones that are behind; on Thursday and possibly Friday, although I am not certain.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this will give us a better opportunity to debate bills because the sittings will be separate sittings and if a debate is adjourned in the morning it need not wait until the next day, it could be carried on possibly in the afternoon. So, it would largely expedite the proceedings of the House, I think, to the accommodation of all honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution, I hope that the Minister of Mines and Resources does not arise in exultation, proclaiming that I am now supporting socialist legislation because I would hate to have that interpretation placed on support for this resolution. At the same time, Sir, I don't think that it should be allowed, the impression to be created that, because the Speed-up motion will be applied, that it is going to necessarily speed up the business of the House.

My concern is not so much from the Minister of Mines and Resources, as it stems from the statements that have been made by the Premier who has a tendency to slough off some of his responsibilities on others whenever he finds it convenient to do so. He has made statements to the effect that the election cannot be called because of the delay in the processing of the business of the House, and he knows perfectly well that that is not true. There are ample opportunities provided in our rules for the government to move along with the business of the House. And when I am talking about the business of the House, I am suggesting that the only real business of the House is the passing of supply. It is not uncommon for bills to be left on the Order Paper either during an election year or even between election years, important as they may be to some people.

But the calling of an election is one that is a responsibility that is left in the hands of the First Minister and he, and he alone, has that responsibility. I don't want him to attempt to convince anybody, because he is not going to be successful in doing that, that the delay in the calling of an election is because of the opposition dragging their feet in the processing of the business of this House. I think that this session, as the sessions in the last two years, has proceeded expeditiously. I think the work that needed to be done was done and was done without the kind of rancour that was normally associated with the rules that were in existence prior to two years ago.

A MEMBER: Except for question period.

MR. JORGENSEN: But, the passing of this motion, although it will give the opportunity to process the bills a little more expeditiously, it will in no way expedite the passing of the Estimates, which is the important part of the session. It will, in fact, delay to some extent the passing of the Estimates. It's important to have the Estimates passed if the House is to be dissolved for the calling of an election. And I just want to make sure that the Premier is not going to use this device in order to justify the delaying of the election because it will not wash. Anybody who knows how the business of the House operates, knows full well the government do have that opportunity, do have the tools and the weapons whereby they can move along the business of the House and indeed they took advantage of that in 1973 and I recall how the House Leader brought forward as the first item of business every day for a month or more before the election and at that time they knew they were going to call an election. The only order of business was the processing of Estimates until they were completed. They've had that same opportunity here, Sir. So if there is a delay in the calling of an election then the First Minister must accept that responsibility on his own shoulders and not slough it off on the opposition.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the motion that has been presented by the House Leader. First of all, I'd like to go on record that we agree with the necessity for the speed-up motion. We agree that in the past few years it has been used sensibly and we have no quarrel whatsoever with the custom that has been established in the last few years with respect to the use of the speed-up motion.

But I'm rather surprised at the statements just concluded by the Honourable Member for Morris when he suggests that somehow or another members in this House have a duty to only get the Estimates through and leave the legislation because the Conservative Party is in a tearing hurry to have an election. My guess is that they're in such a hurry to have an election because it could be called poor management that they have prepaid a lot of their election advertising and they're stuck with it and if there's no election in June they'll look like fools, they'll look like fools to the people in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'd like to remind my honourable friends on my right that in the first few years that I was in this House, and there are other members who were here then, it was the custom of Mr. Roblin and his friends to call the election when things looked good. And that was usually every two and a half years. It didn't matter what was on the Order Paper. It didn't matter what was supposed to be good for the people or the province, all that mattered was the timing of the election to suit the

Friday, May 13, 1977

Conservative Party. And I compliment this government that they have stayed with their majority and taken four years before they went to the people and we are in the fourth year now. And I think it would be a sign of weakness for this government to bow to the screams and the yells of the Leader of the Conservative Party and call the election to suit him. I believe the election should be called to suit the people. —(Interjection)— The Member for Morris has suggested that it is not important that we proceed with the Farm Lands Protection Act. It is not important. It's more important that we proceed with an election than we proceed with some important legislation. It's not important to the women of the province that we have the laws looked at that changes some of the bad situations that they have been in over the years with respect to the division of property. The Marital Property Act, I guess, is not that important to members of the Conservative Party.

I don't suppose that the Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act is that important either to members of the Conservative Party, and other bills that are on the Order Paper that we feel should be proceeded with and proceeded with in a careful manner. When the business of the House is concluded, then I suggest that if the government feels any time this year that an election should be called, to call it. But for God's sake don't call an election because some cheap politicians want to look after themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines shall be closing debate on the resolution. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure all the honourable members who have spoken that it's the intention of the government to accept all of its responsibilities. That is, its responsibility for its legislative program and its responsibility to face the public of the Province of Manitoba which is something, Mr. Speaker, which we have no hesitation about. Something that is the part of the democratic process with which we fully agree. It is something which is the prerogative of the First Minister; his legislation with regard to the requirement and within that legislation, Mr. Speaker, it's been the prerogative of the First Minister to decide when an election is called.

I can tell my honourable friends that as far as I am concerned I have absolutely no difficulty in feeling that what this government has done will commend itself to the people of the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that we have to leap every time someone drops a hint in order to prove that. We have our responsibilities. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the legislation session can proceed in such a way that the option will be open to hold an election in the spring or in the fall that we will try to maintain freedoms, as we have tried to do, Mr. Speaker, with some of the other legislation which honourable members have been opposed to.

I am not going to try to generate a debate on this issue, Mr. Speaker. I do wish to say that I am glad that the Honourable Member for Morris agrees, and I don't know whether . . . it is not socialist legislation. The Member for Morris and myself happen to agree in many cases on the way House business should be handled. But certainly I agree that the Estimates are something that should come first, but then, Mr. Speaker, from time to time in previous years a criticism of the government that they are not interspersing the activity with the bringing in of bills.

Now we have brought in bills, and we intend to have those bills move along some distance while still spending the bulk of our time on Estimates. We did do that over the last several weeks to the extent that we have been here till 11 o'clock at night, until 10:30 at night, stopping at a convenient time and working on two committees.

I think that the departmental Estimates are very much along the way and will be completed soon. There are bills which will, I suppose, involve some debate. We intend that they be fully considered. We think that they can be. And we think that the options as to all of us putting ourselves to the judgment of the people of the Province of Manitoba will be there, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we will now proceed with bills. No. 5.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, the Honourable Minister for Public Works. The Honourable House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if before we get there, now that the motion is passed, I don't propose that we will sit tomorrow, nor tonight. I propose that we will start on Monday. I have indicated the committees that will be meeting on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. That's Law Amendments on Wednesday, Economic Development on Monday and Tuesday, and that we will be meeting on Monday at 10 o'clock.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING (CONT'D)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works. Bill No. 5.

MR. DOERN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39, the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs.

**BILL (NO. 51) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE
SUPERANNUATION ACT.**

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, you will recognize, Sir, that Bill No. 51 was introduced for second reading a week ago and we are putting our basic remarks with respect to the bill on the record at this point, seven days later, and I just want to make the point, Sir, that the bill is highly technical. I think the Minister recognized that when he introduced it and I find no difficulty in confessing that it has taken me some time to grasp the technicalities of the bill. Perhaps I haven't comprehended all of them fully even yet. I think the Minister would probably concur in that position, because there are some technical aspects to it on which both he and I and, no doubt, others of the House have to turn to the expertise of those in the government in the administration of the province at the Civil Service level, and rely on the judgment of such individuals as those to whom the Minister referred in his remarks, Mr. Stuart Anderson, Mr. Hugh Benham, and others for our understanding of the legislation. But notwithstanding the technicalities of it, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is contemporary legislation, worthwhile legislation and it certainly will receive our support.

The main thrust of the bill is to modernize the kinds of benefits available to members of the Civil Service, employees of Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System to bring their pension status into line with the economic conditions of the times, and with the pension benefits that many others in our society already receive.

The upgrading of the benefits paid, benefits available, is a forward step and one in which we concur. Obviously in order to finance the kinds of increased benefits for which the bill provides, there has to be an increase in the employee contribution as well as the employer contribution.

The Minister has explained the percentage increases in his introductory remarks on the bill. If they are actuarially sound, well then we certainly agree with the steps being taken here, Sir, and we accept the Minister's assurance that the measures are actuarially sound.

The one subject on which I would have some disagreement with the Minister is that having to do with compulsory retirement age, Sir. In his introductory remarks on second reading, the Minister made reference to the fact that because of the unemployment situation in Canada which is probably one that will be with us for some time, because of the difficulty that young people have in obtaining employment at the present time, and because of certain pressures from certain elements of organized labour. In particular he referred to the Canadian Union of Public Employees.

There is a growing pressure to have compulsory retirement age lowered from 65 to 60. The Minister did not say that he necessarily favoured that kind of implementation wholesale, but he did suggest that it is an issue that we are going to have to contend with in the next few years.

I would agree that it is a subject we are going to have to contend with, and at this point I would like to suggest, Sir, that I find it completely manageable and acceptable to move in the direction of making it possible for persons to retire on full pension at age 60. I would not be happy about a move that reduced the compulsory retirement age by that amount at this stage. I think we should do all we can to set up our pension plans and programs in such a way as to acknowledge the service that individuals have given in industry and in business and in service, and make it possible for them to achieve full pension benefits by age 60, if they wish to retire at that time.

But I think we live in a society when too many people are castoffs in their mid-sixties now, where life becomes meaningless for them because of the tendency to put them out to pasture at age 65 when they have many meaningful and contributory years, and constructive years still to give to society. This is a trend that I think is unfortunate and is important for our consideration.

So, I would just comment from the point of view of the remarks made by the Minister in this area, that, while agreeing that it is a subject we are going to have to face in this Legislature and, no doubt, other legislative bodies, in the next few years in this country, I would hope that there is a growing awareness on the part of all of us that age 65 is not the end of constructive living, constructive service, it is not the end of a person's ability to contribute. What happens too often is that the person becomes diminished by enforced retirement at 65 and that life does in fact end for those persons in a meaningful way because of the compulsory retirement stricture imposed upon them by society and by our statutes. I would hope that we would move in the other direction and be able to consider elimination of the compulsory retirement age of 65, and be able to make that decision a more flexible one, a more voluntary one, while making it possible for persons who wish to retire at 60 or 62, or 65, to do so with full pension benefits.

This is an area to which the Minister has referred as a forthcoming and impending challenge for all of us and I would agree that it is a challenge for our consideration, Sir, and I would hope that the desirability of many persons to work beyond the age of 65 is taken into consideration and recognized in our laws, rather than constructing our statutes and our system to force them out of work and out to

Friday, May 13, 1977

pasture at a time when many persons do not wish to go and really, in terms of what they have to contribute, should not be made to go.

Sir, the other aspects of the legislation, I think, are highly admirable and commend themselves to the support of the House. At this point, speaking for my own party, we can accept the principle of the bill and move it forward for processing through committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 56) - THE FARM LANDS PROTECTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56. The Honourable Minister for Mines has eleven more minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this bill when it was last before the Assembly and was indicating, in my remarks, that the farmlands policy of the Province of Manitoba was such as to provide the greatest number of options and the greatest number of freedoms; that the farmland policy of the Conservative Party is one which would limit the options available to agricultural producers in the Province of Manitoba and limit the amount of freedom that is available to agricultural producers in the Province of Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the position that is taken on this particular bill, where the Conservative opposition has accused the government of using foreign ownership as a bogey to accomplish a much more sinister scheme in their minds, that is a restriction on non-resident landlordism of farmers in the Province of Manitoba. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the exact reverse is true, that those people of the Conservative side who wish to see larger and larger tracts of land concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, whether they be farmers or not, are seeking to exclude foreign ownership only so that they will not have to compete with other people for these large tracts of land; that there is absolutely no distinction between the two forms of ownership. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that one farmer or that Sid Green — if we want to make it very personal and maybe this will at least scare some of the honourable members opposite — that they say it is okay for me to own 100 sections of land in the Province of Manitoba and lease it out to agricultural producers, but they say it is not okay for a farmer in Noyes, Minnesota, to own a section of land and lease it out to agricultural producers, perhaps his neighbours, in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, what they are really saying is that they do believe in what they advocated in the TED report, that is the reduction of farm holdings from 30,000 to 20,000, or figures which I cannot exactly recall, but, nevertheless, that kind of reduction; to put it into more and more concentrated ownership and let that ownership, Mr. Speaker, be a form of modern feudalism; that it be Winnipeggers or corporations in this province, or in other provinces, owning land on which there will be tenant farmers in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, who is for tenant farm ownership, or the tenant farmer status? The Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker. There is no other explanation for their desperate desire to permit non-resident holders of land, of agricultural land in the Province of Manitoba, to own more than a section of land. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, a square mile of land. So, in order to protect this status — and I am frankly surprised that they are so blatant about it — they, Mr. Speaker, are suggesting that they will vote against that aspect of non-resident land ownership which is foreign, but they will endorse in full, and give their full approval to, non-resident land ownership of whatever quantity to any person who happens to be a Canadian citizen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a difficult position. It is a difficult position to sustain. It is a difficult position to sustain so' rather than move in that direction, they start with a scare, Mr. Speaker. And the scare is that somebody is going to want to set up a farmer, that his son is going to Agricultural College and he is going to want to buy him some land and he won't be able to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely false. First of all, he can buy him a section of land immediately. Secondly, if that son wants to engage in agricultural production, he can buy him 50 sections of land. And the honourable members know that.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding about it, anybody who is engaged in agriculture theoretically, according to this bill, can buy all the land in the Province of Manitoba. And I suppose that that is the ultimate in terms of private ownership insofar as the honourable members are concerned; which shows, Mr. Speaker, that their concept would limit private ownership. Would limit private ownership because the larger the concentrations of land that are held by individual people, the less land is available to a great bulk of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, theoretically, under this bill, the poor fellow that the Leader of the Opposition was referring to, who wanted his son who was in Agricultural College to have some land, if that son is going to be engaged in agriculture, he can buy him all the land in the Province of Manitoba and

exclude my honourable friends, if he can get it. There is absolutely no limit on what a farmer in the Province of Manitoba can buy or a person who wishes to engage in agriculture in the Province of Manitoba can buy. Or, Mr. Speaker, a non-Canadian — and I respect this, my people came here as non-Canadians and most of the parents of people in this House came here as non-Canadians — provided those people want to engage in agriculture, there is no limit on the amount of land that they can buy. So let there be no misunderstanding to the farmers of the this province. There is no limit to what they can buy, Mr. Speaker, and there is no limit to what they can inherit because the bill specifically excludes inheritances and doesn't deal with any landholdings that are in existence now. We are talking about land which will be purchased or acquired from this day forward so it doesn't deal with non-residents at the present time.

So, let's take the three categories, Mr. Speaker. A person engaged in or intending to engage in agriculture, no matter what his nationality, no matter where he lives, there is no limit on the acreage he can buy. For a non-farmer, Mr. Speaker, for a person who is not engaged in agriculture, who merely wishes to hold land — now, how much land does such a person need? I repeat the question.

A MEMBER: What was that story?

MR. GREEN: / Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no difficulty with that proposition because it's human greed, Mr. Speaker, and the desire to have more and more and more which ultimately is the equalizer. And Tolstoi's story is a story which I will have no difficulty telling on any platform with my honourable friend anywhere in the Province of Manitoba and the farmers of this province will appreciate it because they will know that what Tolstoi was saying was correct.

For a non-farmer, Mr. Speaker, if he is a resident Canadian, he can own a square mile of land without ever going near it, without ever using it for agriculture. I happen to think that that's too much but let it not be suggested that it is not enough for a non-resident owner. A Canadian, Mr. Speaker, or an absentee landlord, or a person who doesn't intend to engage in agriculture, is entitled to purchase and acquire 640 acres of land. And for everybody else, Mr. Speaker. That means a person who has no intention of engaging in agriculture, a person who is not a citizen of this country, a person who is purchasing land which he has absolutely no intention of utilizing, he is entitled to purchase 160 acres of land in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that most of the citizens in the Province of Manitoba, Having it understood that farmers have an unlimited right to purchase land, that people intending to engage in farming will have an unlimited right to purchase land in unlimited quantities, that a person who has no intention of using the land will be able to buy a square mile of land, if he is a Canadian, and that a person who is not even in this country will be able to buy 160 acres. My honourable friends say that is restrictive. I pose the question, Mr. Speaker, how much land does a man need, if that is restrictive? In one case, all the land he can get; if he has no intention to use it, a square mile; and if he is not a resident of this country, 160 acres. The person who says, Mr. Speaker, that that is not enough land, is a person who needs only six feet, and that's what Tolstoi's story was saying, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it. If all the land, an unlimited amount of land for a farmer in the Province of Manitoba is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that that person is heading for six feet. If 640 acres, with no intention of ever utilizing it, is not enough, Mr. Speaker, then I say that the only amount of land that will satisfy that person is six feet. Yes.

So, what does this bill come down to and what does the Conservative Opposition come down to? The bill says that we think that agricultural land should be used by farmers. We are going to try to see to it that people who intend merely to lease the land out to tenants will not be able to own more than 640 acres. We are going to limit the amount of non-resident absentee landlordism that can take place with regard to agricultural land. The Members of the Opposition say they will not limit it. So what does it come down to, Mr. Speaker? We are against absentee landlordism and tenant farming in the Province of Manitoba and the people on the other side are for non-resident absentee landlordism in the Province of Manitoba. So, it's the Tories who are for tenant farming and the people on this side, Mr. Speaker, who are against it. Now, Mr. Speaker, they don't like that, but that is the fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would really welcome the Honourable Minister and other members opposite to join me in the refrain with "This land is your land; this land is my land; from Noyes, Minnesota to Sydney, Nova Scotia," because there is no argument about whose land is whose, no matter where it lies.

Mr. Speaker, to comment on Bill 56 at this particular time, I think one has to say that, as has happened so often in the past, the government has used a situation or a concern that has been growing and is there and has been expressed to them by people throughout the Province of Manitoba, and has used that concern to do many more and different things than the original concern expressed.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks made on this bill by my leader, the Member for Souris-Killarney, really needs not a great deal of addition to. My leader correctly identified that concern and correctly indicated to the government the kind of action and the kind of response that the farm community, the

Friday, May 13, 1977

rural community, and I think the broad community of Manitoba, was looking forward to from their government. But it is obvious that the kind of bill that we actually have in front of us and the kind of arguments that are now being presented to us, particularly by the last speaker, that one has to kind of re-identify the original concerns that led to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very plain. I don't consider this a piece of socialist legislation; neither does my leader and he didn't call it that. — (Interjection) — No, he did not call it that; he called it what it led to, an unnecessary amount of social management in the affairs of Manitoba citizens but nobody is calling it a piece of socialist legislation. As the Mines Minister so clearly indicated, any piece of legislation which would allow a citizen to have 50 sections or unlimited land, somebody else one square mile, 640 acres, and somebody else 160 acres, hardly can be called socialist. I think the Minister of Mines would be very much happier with the kind of bill that would, in fact, spell out precisely the kind and the amount of land that he and his government thinks each person needs and requires, namely six feet, and if that was made into law, then he could stand more proudly and hail that as a piece of socialist legislation. But nobody is, neither on that side nor on this side, referring to this particular bill as a piece of socialist legislation.

What it is, is again adding a great deal of management into the everyday lives of people in the Province of Manitoba. That really is a diversion from the original purpose of the bill, the original request for some kind of action to be taken by the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have possibly as much, indeed, in most instances, more experience with this particular problem. The RM of St. Francois Xavier is in my constituency wholly, as well as the RMs of Woodlands and Portage la Prairie which have had a fair amount of this kind of land buying activity taking place as supported by the Minister's own figures and some of the studies that he has taken on this matter. And when I move around my constituency and I ask my farmers about what to do about this particular problem — yes, there certainly is a concern about the extent to which land is being bought up by what we refer to as foreign buyers.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, when you examine the problem with them a little bit further most of them tend to come down on the question that they're concerned about the unfairness in the competition for that land as it affects their sons or neighbours, or native Manitobans, from purchasing or offering to buy that same kind of land.

Mr. Speaker, there is a concern about the fairness in a competitive way, the availability of money, the costs of money. Rumours float around as to whether or not foreigners have access to money at considerable less interest rates than we have, than our Manitoba boys and Manitoba farmers have. Whether they are substantiated or not, there are rumours floating around that the West German Government, for instance, is actually subsidizing interest rates for would-be purchasers of land in Canada. There is talk of money being available for as little as three percent. We know that Americans have access to capital funding in the area of six and seven percent whereas our young farmers, bidding on that same quarter or half section of land, have to deal in Canadian interest terms and Canadian costs of money.

I find very often that the original complainant, the farmer, or the neighbour, or the rural person in my constituency that complains to me and indeed, pressures me to do something about controlling the amount of foreign interest in our prime agricultural land, that when you take the time to talk to him, it is often this aspect of the problem that concerns him most; the fact that he is led to believe that there is a certain unfairness in the availability of money to the foreign buyer as compared to the Manitoban buyer.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the impression that I got from sitting on the same committee that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources sat on, the Land Hearing Committee, and the Minister of Agriculture. . . . And I agree I didn't sit on that committee as long as other members, I just joined that committee in the last year of the two years that it was sitting. But one heard much the same kind of complaint emanating from farmers there as when they compared the activities of the Crown agency, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation's activities in buying land. The complaint often was raised that their tax money, public money, was being used in competition with people that were bidding on the same land.

Now, I know that fell on deaf ears with honourable members opposite but it was essentially the same argument that is being made very often to me when reference is being made to the easier availability at lesser cost, that it is essentially creating unfair competitive advantage to those persons of native extraction here in the province that are bidding for the same parcel of land against foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that in the course that the bill has taken to date, in the Minister of Agriculture's introduction and the comments just concluded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that that principal concern is being evaded and I suggest to you it's being evaded purposely. There is an opportunity here to use that concern to bring about, even in a slow way, certain fundamental changes in terms of how property rights have been regarded historically in this province over the past 107 years. And that surely is recognized in the bill and is recognized by

honourable members opposite.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the bill, when it's called and referred to as The Farm Lands Protection Act, you know, there is a misnomer to it. I mean "farm lands protection" augers up in my mind a concern about the use of prime agricultural land, whether or not it should be preserved for the production of food. There is nothing in this bill that suggests that. Indeed, the former speaker just finished saying that one buyer can buy all the prime One person can buy all the available prime agricultural land in this province and then sit on it. You know if that theoretical concept could be pursued, it's hardly the kind of thing that augers up in my mind The Farm Lands Protection Act. I mean you think about particularly those areas in our country such as in Southern Ontario where there has been extreme industrial commercial pressure and other developmental pressure on prime farmland and the concern is indeed for the very literal protection of prime agricultural farmland for the sake of food production. Nothing in this bill talks about the protection of prime agricultural farmland for that purpose. I'm not taking that hypothetical position the Minister of Mines takes but simply agreeing with him that if most people, say in Winnipeg, exercised their option under this bill and bought the allowable limits and built their suburbia homes out in them, which in fact is precisely the case that has happened in B.C. under a similar bill, which has driven the price of farmland up to astronomical heights and has probably put into limbo more prime agricultural farmland than any other piece of legislation in that province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is drawing to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture that, to some extent, it is a misnomer to call this bill under the title that it is called, "Farm Lands Protection Act". I think that you could have called it "A Limitations of Who Can Own Farm Land". It protects against potential speculative buyers of farmlands but the title in itself is, from my agricultural point of view, somewhat misleading because it doesn't really suggest to me in any way that, whether it's the foreigner or the resident who purchases this farmland, there are no more constraints put on him other than are now there in such things as planning or rural planning acts that are contained in other pieces of legislation that designate or prioritize the importance of agriculture and food protection on the very land that we're talking about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but devote a little bit of time and attention to my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Firstly, again he has the capacity of intellectualizing an argument which sounds pretty convincing in this House. I welcome him to make that same argument on the platform in rural Manitoba and I will tell you exactly what will happen. I'll bring, for his benefit, a group of my farmers and rural people into the Woodlands hall in the community of Woodlands and they will listen to him and they will nod their heads with him in agreement and they will, as they are sitting there, believe every word that he is saying. Then they will go back to their farms and they will scratch their heads and they will say, "It can't be. It can't be. I mean that's not the way the real life is out here. That's not what farming is all about. That's not why I buy more land or I buy a larger tractor." He buys it, Sir, to continue in that evolving process of creating, that we have in this North American farm economy, some of the finest agriculture industry that we have possibly in this world. Well we will likely have that opportunity, and I will in no way back down from the invitation that I'm making now to the Honourable Minister, to come and debate the question with me in

Because, Mr. Speaker, what is being missed on — no, the honourable members opposite aren't missing it at all — they are merely taking astute advantage of the situation. The historical fact is that 91 percent of the farmland is now in the hands of what we both agree to be the most desirable situation — owner occupied, farmer resident persons.

There is not a case that calls for this kind of massive interference in personal property rights to the citizens of Manitoba. And if the Honourable Minister wants to walk on public platforms with me and say, there once was a particular right that I had as a Canadian citizen, and now you can't have it anymore, and he looks upon that as a great advance in proposing, you know, in moving forward this proposal to the people of Manitoba, then I invite him into doing that.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I haven't touched on the particular flaw in the Minister's argument, and that of course is the notable exemption from the bill. I honestly believe that he believes this — and that's why I can't even get too annoyed or too mad with him — he honestly believes that it is not possible for me to make an arrangement with the Honourable Member for Gladstone, in terms of renting land from him. I may be disabled for some reason or other, I may have broken a leg chasing somebody, and I decide that the Member from Gladstone, because he's my neighbor, has been my neighbor for many years, has the kind of equipment, that I can make a perfectly satisfactory private rental agreement with him. No, he doesn't believe that, his statement was: why not better a tenant unto himself *vis-a-vis* the public ownership. That's fine, and theoretically, that sounds very good. Of course in that sense, there is no such thing as tenant farming, for instance, in Eastern European countries. They're owners, they're all owners, every Russian, every Ukrainian person, someone like that runs their own farm. That's fine.

But this is where the argument, that I would like of course to advance with my honourable friend in the hall at the community of Woodlands, and where we will begin to sort out the wheat from the chaff.

The difference is, and this is in the bill, that the major land baron or land buyer, namely the government itself, exclusively and specifically exempted from the bill. And that is not good enough.

They also have incorporated into the bill, the necessary clauses that will dry up the very necessary private capital that is required. So that the only alternative over a prolonged period of time, is for the farmer to avail himself of government agencies, in the first instance for loan money, and if the government agency is then set up in such a fashion as in fact it now is, that it doesn't loan long term money for the buying of farmland except, that is, in election years, as we've done in this year. The then option is that the government agency buys the farmland, and so you have the *troika* contained in this bill, that (a) begins to interfere with the Manitoba citizens owned land and secondly interferes with the private capital to sustain, and private capital has always been very important in agriculture. But how on earth does any mortgager lend me money, when you've taken by virtue of this bill, when you've changed the ground rules. I mean you will lend me a thousand dollars if I'm prepared to give you whatever collateral, and you evaluate it, and you say, yes, if you default you have your collateral. But what you're doing is now, you're taking that collateral away, or appreciably altering it, by telling the person that you can only have it for two years, and he has to divest himself of that in two years, whether the market is good or bad, whether there is no market, whatever the economic situations are. What it means is that the private sector will, in the first instance, drive up interest rates horrendously on agricultural land, and in the final analysis will not be interested, will find other places where these kind of conditions are not placed on their borrowings of money.

So, in essence, under Section 5, clause 5, sections 1 and 2, you are insuring that henceforth, the agricultural community will have to rely more and more on the public sector for its capital inputs. But that is a desirable goal on your part, and I understand that. Secondly' you have also indicated, and we have had the experience, that the public lending sector is no longer really all that interested in lending money to the farmer to buy that land; they will buy the land and lease it back to us. And so in a very, well not so subtle, in a very straightforward manner, you have built into this bill, the kind of far-reaching goals and ambitions you as a government, and as individual Ministers, have from time to time expressed. And so for the Honourable Minister of Mines to suggest that this bill doesn't read, "tenant farmers" and that it has been the Tory position that supports tenant farmers, well I welcome that argument to take place anywhere in rural Manitoba. And we will do that, the sooner the better, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the argument that the First Minister, and the government wants to make anytime, that suggests that if the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation owned all the farmland in the Province of Manitoba, and all the farmers had to lease, and had to rent their land from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, that you can convince the majority of Manitobans that not one of them is a tenant. That's what you're telling me. You're telling me, it's not possible to be a tenant when the state owns it, that's what you're telling me. That of course, Mr. Speaker, is patent nonsense.

No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the scare, and of course there are unfortunate other regrettable oversights that honourable members bring into debate, when they perhaps understandably, from lack of agricultural experience debate this kind of bill. One does have the fleeting moments, if one closes one's eyes, that you're listening to an agriculture economy and community being described, that could more aptly be situated in some east European country' where perhaps four acre or five acre plots constitute a good farm, other than the communal farms. For the Honourable Minister to suggest that large tracts of land here, are solely, and wholly attributable to human greed, I suppose that there's an element of truth to it. The fact of the matter is, you know farmers drive four-wheeled tractors, and pull, as you are pulling right now, tandem 30 - 35 foot diskers because they have to be able to produce.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I never said that large tracts of land in Manitoba are attributable to human greed. I said that a man who never intends to use land, never intends to farm it, who says that he needs more than 640 acres, that that is human greed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we'll check the Hansard for it tomorrow but I believe the Minister is incorrect in this particular instance and his memory is faulty.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, in conclusion, to use the Minister's own favorite approach to a particular argument and not describe anything as being attached to a particular ideology or something like that but to suggest simply what makes good and common sense. If the argument is correct, if it produces a desirable result, then let the people make their choice and put their descriptions or their label on it.

But the fact of the matter is that is the kind of agriculture that we have developed in this country that has probably provided for us the cheapest food source that any peoples on this planet earth enjoy. In fact it's a constant thorn in the sides of Ministers of Agriculture. We refer to it as the national key food policy, we fight it in protection of our more parochial constituents if we're talking as Ministers of Agriculture. But, you know, we really want to do that quietly and not let the consumers get to hear about that too often because the fact of the matter is if you were to look at the purpose of

agriculture, namely the production of food, and the abundant supply that food to the citizens of any particular land or indeed the continent or the world, then why are we getting ourselves hung up about the size of farms. Certainly the question of putting bread, meat, eggs, potatoes is the important question And certainly the question cannot be denied that, for instance, just across the line from us in United States most of those products are available for 25 or 30 percent less than they are here. —(Interjection)— No, no, the whole question is a concern that honourable members opposite have. It's a limitation of size because it concerns you about size. It is a limitation of people who can farm because you would like to limit that and the Honourable Minister avoided the word the other day but he came very close to it. That old hoary word that the Farmer's Union like to bring up every once in a while "licensing all farmers." You spoke about franchising farmers when you answered to the question from the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, when he made some references to fishermen he said, "Well, we license fishermen, they can fish. That's a little different resource we're licensing it because it is a particular resource that is for conservation reasons that we describe what we can harvest and what we can't harvest."

Mr. Speaker, the basic essence, the concern that Manitoba Farmers have asked, was to control, rightly or wrongly, the foreign buyers in the foreign involvement in the buying of land. And I suggest to the Honourable Minister that there is a reason for this difference. His argument that he so repeatedly made at Committee, or here in the House again, that there is no difference between Noyes, Minnesota or Glace Bay, Nova Scotia he misses a very essential point. There is a very great difference and the difference happens to be about 6 percent interest that the Noyes, Minnesota buyer can buy a farm or the Canadian can buy a farm. Six percent on \$200,000 is a lot. Or 3 percent that a West German buyer can buy a farm as compared to a Manitoban buyer. The Minister wasn't in his seat when I made those initial remarks on this bill that in my constituency where I have had perhaps more activity of foreign buyers than at least many other members have had, that comes back to me as one of the most central complaints, the central arguments. Very few, I've run into very few farmers that in the final analysis are opposed to the prohibition of selling of land. What they ask for is that Manitoba farmers be competitive, be competitive, and quite frankly if actions were taken and if through transfer of taxation policies on transfer of lands were adopted that, in most instances, would cover the thing. That in most instances would cover the thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear while I have an opportunity on this particular bill that the policies of the Progressive Conservative Party would be such to encourage in any way possible the greatest number of private owners, farm owners, and we intend to enlarge on that in any considerable fashion, certainly now that we have far more information about some of our lands, some of our Crown held agricultural lands. Certainly many of the ranchers that are living in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will have an opportunity of buying the Crown land under the new administration. All in pursuit of the purpose diametrically opposed to what the Honourable Minister of Mines just suggested that we want to create tenant farmers and that you are in support of private ownership.

Mr. Speaker, that's not going to wash, certainly not going to wash whenever the election is called. We support, and we see not enough in this legislation, the concept that some control of foreign ownership of land should be begun in this province. There should be some monitoring of the situation. It could conceivably be, Mr. Speaker, that under different economic circumstances, either here or in other countries, that in five years or four years or ten years this kind of bill, particularly with the attitude that the Minister brings into it, that there is no desire to control, you know, the Canadians or the Manitobans, that this bill could be withdrawn if the interest by foreigners in our farmland decreases notably.

The historic fact doesn't justify, doesn't justify the kind of sledge-hammer approach this bill takes. The foreign interest in our land justifies that some action be taken and that's what the farmers and that's what rural Manitoba have asked this government to do. They have not asked you in a basic way to interfere in the way that the agriculture industry is funded. They have not asked you to basically interfere or to make it much more difficult when a citizen contravenes a law, when he's within the law, didn't really ask you to make much more work for accountants and lawyers. He didn't really ask you to make it much more difficult to gain *entrée* to farming by people who have had no farm background and despite what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said. I say that certainly as this bill is written right now, it's left entirely in the hands of his colleague, the Minister that would decide whether or not your son will ever be able to farm. —(Interjection)— Certainly it does. Under the definition the Minister decides who farms and who doesn't farm. And when a farmer is designated as a farmer and it's the Minister who decides whether or not that decision will stand. No appeal mechanisms in the Act.

Mr. Speaker, that wasn't what the people, and particularly the farmers of Manitoba, were asking this government to do. They were asking this government to recognize that there was an undue amount, an accelerating amount of interest in our prime farmland by foreigners and like — (Interjection)— Yes, it was. And like other jurisdictions of different political persuasions, Alberta,

P.E.I., and for different reasons, in the east more so for the protection of prime leisure lands or recreational lands.

This government, Mr. Speaker, chose not to address itself to this specific problem and concerns that rural Manitobans had in this area. They chose, instead, to bring in with it a host of other problems that fit — and I have to say it — the ideological approach that they wish to take towards the citizens of Manitoba and I even say towards the citizens of Manitoba more so than towards the land because, you know, as it affects the land it's fraught with inconsistencies. You know, there is no farm protection element built into the Act as such in terms of land use, there is no equity built into the Act as has been pointed out. I can own every acre of farmland in this province, so there's no social concept built into this Act. All that is really built into the Act is a little bit more control, a little bit more control. It doesn't even fit the "2 ½ times 1" concept because, you know, I can control, I can buy, I can own 5,000 acres, the Minister can own 640 acres a square mile and a foreigner, a West German can own 160 acres. There's no relation to that either. That's because, gentlemen, the honourable members opposite really don't have any real feelings or beliefs or support for this bill. Their concept of how that big and major resource that we have, namely land, should be used and should be divided is entirely different than contained in this bill.

Nobody opposite really believes in this bill at all other than a measure that it does the one thing that has been asked for. There is the element of controlling foreign buyers. But their concept of how the land resource should be utilized and how it should be apportioned among the citizens of Manitoba is entirely different and seeds of that are also contained in this bill. When they are prepared to aid, to fundamentally tamper with how the agricultural community has been funded to date and have demonstrated their willingness to expend large amounts of capital money, tax money, public money to pursue the policies that I have already spoken on.

They are quite prepared, despite this rather heavy urban orientated government and caucus, they are quite prepared to give their Minister of Agriculture the kind of moneys that perhaps, no other Minister of Agriculture in this province ever put his hands on. I must concede that. They are prepared to give this Minister of Agriculture 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200 million dollars in the next budget to buy farmland. Unlimited money to buy farmland and have done that, and have done that. I would ask the Minister, you know, how many offers for sale to the MATC, I say offers, has he refused? Obviously some, obviously some.

But Mr. Speaker, we know, we know how this government and how members opposite regard, you know, what in their judgment the proper management of the land resource base should be and, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba know that too. And that is not a big lie, that is simply believing what you re-affirmed at your last convention and it stately firmly, it was repeated, and is repeated whenever you gather in conventions, that you do believe in your own constitution, you do believe in the Regina Manifesto. You re-affirm them when you get together every once in a while as you did last January and that certainly when you regard, you know, such things as automobile insurance as being something so important, so high on your priorities that that can't be left to the private sector, that it has to be pulled into the public purpose, then surely you cannot convince anybody in this province that you would let something so much more important like land to be left in the private sector for all too long. I would tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, there is not one of them opposite that can honestly accuse me or anybody else on this spokesman from speaking this way and be accused of spreading any portion of the big lie — any portion of the big lie — because, Mr. Speaker, there is simply not a credible position for honourable members opposite to take that would make it otherwise.

The words that honourable members opposite so often use is that we can tolerate the private sector. The Minister of Mines uses that when he talks about the mining companies. "I tolerate the private sector. But if they don't want to co-operate, they don't want to get in on the action, then we will do it; the public will do it. We tolerate the private sector."

Mr. Speaker, we believe, and the farmers of Manitoba believe, that this government and this Minister of Agriculture tolerates the present situation. In fact, we'll emunerate it from time to time as is done so with respect to the MAC's activities in land-leasing and land purchasing, particularly when it is politically expeditious to do so. But the people of Manitoba and particularly, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba, are not going to be fooled.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into this debate because I feel that there is a discussion about policy and principle which does not normally take place in this House. I have some ideas which I would like to contribute.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for having raised the level of his contribution in this House from the nadir that existed up to the time he spoke on this debate to the intellectual level of a frog. —(Interjection)— Well, I was really thinking of the physical level as well.

In other words, it did go up, Mr. Speaker. At least for once he was not spreading distortions of fact in order to accomplish his objective. He was talking about philosophy; he was attempting to attribute

philosophical approaches to our party, and that I think is valid, I think that one should discuss philosophy. He was violently aggressive on his attack and his description of what he called socialism. I'm afraid he showed that he knew very little about socialism except it was something that he was taught to use as a frightener to those people whom he addressed, as the bogeyman. The one thing I regretted was that he could not refer to anybody on this side of the House without a phrase of an insult at the same time. But that's his style and I trust I can leave it to him and not follow his example. But, at least he did discuss it on the basis of philosophy and, to that extent, I did want to congratulate him.

I believe that the Member for Lakeside has taken a higher level approach to this and has been discussing philosophy and policy to a greater extent. I want to deal with some of the issues raised.

The analogy he gave to the Auto Insurance, I think was not valid. I think the Auto Insurance is a different kind of a difference that we had and it related to the inability of the insurance industry to provide a very necessary service to the people of Manitoba to the extent where the governments preceding ours found it advisable and necessary to bring in compulsory forms of insurance coverage for the protection, not of the owner of the vehicles, but of those who suffered damage from it. Since they made it compulsory that there should be insurance coverage, it became an inefficient method of handling insurance that was left to the private industry and they made a mess of it and they have done that in other provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the honourable member, I apologize. I overlooked introducing a group of students from Teulon Collegiate, 57 in number, Grade 11 standing, under the direction of Mr. Al Riensch. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. We welcome them.

I thank the Honourable Member for St. Johns. The Honourable Member.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's quite all right. The fact is that the need for the Auto Insurance that we brought in is evidenced by the acceptance of the program by the Conservative Party. Their acceptance is a recognition. I don't think that we can welcome them into the group of political thought that is ours, but the fact that they finally saw that what we established was necessary advisable and works.

I have been having a different kind of a problem in trying to understand the approach of the Conservative Party on this bill as evidenced by what was said by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lakeside. The Leader of the Opposition used this debate to have a general attack on the New Democratic Party. He has been fighting this election for quite awhile and he started quite awhile ago. He's still doing it and every opportunity he gets to attack, he takes advantage of it which is, of course, his rights and his opportunity. What I regret, as I've said before, is that there is the use of the big lie which the Member for Lakeside rejects. But there is no doubt that in the technique and the style of the Leader of the Opposition and, I guess, the people who write for him and the people who are following his lead, is to make use of distortions and to appeal to emotions.

The distortions of fact are something that we have to try to deal with. In this case, there was not distortion of fact but distortion of attitude. So, trying to understand him was difficult. Trying to understand the Member for Lakeside who had a more intellectual approach to this and I think today a more honest approach — you'll have to pardon me for having used the word today, it sort of slipped out — is that I wanted really to understand what is it that the Conservative Party wants in this bill because they are going to support it? They are going to support the measure which the Leader of the Opposition called socialist and which he later said, "in part, socialist in part," and I think what he means is that he can see something there that is not socialist that he can support and that is the attack on the foreigners. That is what I heard the Member for Lakeside say today. It's the foreigners which he wants to legislate against. When I hear that kind of phrase, it concerns me because my parents were foreigners; the Member for Lakeside's parents — I think he was a foreigner but I know his parents were foreigners in that they were born in and lived in a country other than Canada — and most of us who are here, all of us who are here are descendant, to some extent to some degree in our past, from foreigners. I said to some degree.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Member for Lakeside talk about the history and apparently, to him, the history is that today, now is the time when one deals with the threat of foreigners coming to buy up our farmland. That's apparently what the Conservative Party is concerned about. The threat of foreigners coming to Canada to buy our land. I understand the need for their concern about land. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I was distracted for a moment.

We are speaking about the history of Canada and the present threat which concerns the Conservatives of foreigners coming in to buy land. I think back to those foreigners that I know who are Canadian citizens and who became parents of Canadian-born citizens, and I reflect as to why they are in this country. The vast majority of them are people who came not to, but from, not to

Friday, May 13, 1977

Canada but to avoid something that they rejected in their past. Be they the tenant farmers of Scotland or be they the tenant farmers of Ireland or be they the tenant farmers of Eastern Europe, they came because they wanted to see that they should have an opportunity which was promised them in Canada to develop themselves in those areas which attracted them.

I am sure the Member for Lakeside knows and I suspect many others know, that Jews in Russia were not allowed to own land or to farm land. Jews were denied various opportunities to develop themselves, and in relation to the agricultural scene, the reason one does not associate the Jewish people with being farmers, is that for many generations in Europe they were denied the right to occupy the farms. And they came here to Canada because there was a freedom here to develop themselves and those people who came here — and I speak now more about the tenant farmers, I forget the term, those from England — who were never given the opportunity to own land, who worked on land that was owned by the barons and the lords and the large landholders . . .

A MEMBER: They were serfs.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . and they were serfs. I guess I've rejected that term intellectually so much that it couldn't come to me when I wanted to use it. Yes. They were serfs who worked the land; they were people who came to Canada in order to be able to develop themselves in their field and in their field, it was agriculture they were interested in. So they came here for that reason; they came from foreign countries and they were foreigners. They came here to develop their opportunities which were given to them. And, Mr. Speaker, now we are told we are afraid that foreigners are coming for other reasons. What is our concern? Not that the foreigners will come here in order to farm land but that the foreigners will come here to invest in land, to control land, to hold land.

I have a problem because I'm not sure that I can understand why that foreigner that the Conservatives fear is different than the corporate entity in Canada which wishes to control just like the foreigner might, or the individual in Canada who hasn't the slightest desire to work the land but wishes to have that kind of power which may be that person's antecedents in England, or in Scotland, or in Eastern Europe was able to control and have the serfs work the land for him. So that the Member for Lakeside is now apparently disassociating himself from the bill by saying, "It's your bill." I'm trying to point out to him, Mr. Speaker, that I am having a difficulty accepting his desire to keep out foreign ownership with his acceptance of the thought of Canadian ownership being all right and unrelated to the way the land is used. And that, to me, creates a problem because I am trying to understand him. Because I believe that what he talked about what we have been talking about is the use of the land. And to me use of the land is to take advantage of the life on the land and I'm told that there is a great attraction to living on the land, that the rural scene is very attractive and I often wonder why members opposite leave their farms to come here and live in the city and work in this Chamber. But still, that's the sacrifice they make for doing what they think is right for their constituents and I share that desire with them. But the rural life is attractive to them and people want to live there and people want to be able to work the land to get the product of the land in order to satisfy their own needs in order to work on the land.

So it's not the ownership of the land that I consider is a reason they want to work on the land, it's the freedom to use the land. Therefore I've never felt that it's too necessary to worry about who actually owned the title to the land providing that person had security of tenure and providing that person was undisturbed in being able to develop the land, to use the land, and providing that person was not used, that is not exploited, whose labour was not being used for the benefit of others. And that may be a slight problem we have in approach as between Conservatives and people on our side, and maybe I should say and me rather than attribute my thoughts to others on this side.

The land, it has been said, it's not original with me but it's something that we have to recognize, that land is the only material thing that cannot multiply, that cannot be developed to any large extent. There is a limitation on land. It is true that with technology we've learned to make better and more extensive use of land but there is a finite end to it that we cannot build more land or hope that more will become available to us than now exists. And therefore it is essential that the people who benefit from the use of the land are the people who work the land. To me that's essential. I don't believe that farmers should be subject, as they have been in the past, to having to pay very high interest rates in order to be able to acquire land.

It has always been easy in my experience as a lawyer to borrow money within the city in order to build an apartment block, or a warehouse, or a home. But I've always known it was very difficult to get a mortgage on farmland without paying exorbitant interest rates and that means that somebody has been exploiting that need for borrowing and that's why I always felt that governments have been justified in making it possible for people to be able to acquire land, to be able to work land without being exploited. And that is why the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in its day had procedures whereby they were lending money at reasonable rates of interest to people who were interested in developing their farms.

It developed a little further, and this already started to put some doubt in my mind, when governments brought in plans to subsidize the opportunities to acquire land. And I didn't quite

understand why a mechanic who wanted to open a garage had to pay commercial rates of interest to finance his opening of the garage whereas a young farmer was subsidized by all the people of Canada in order to be able to pay lesser interest than it cost the people of Canada to provide the money. But that was a program and it had to do with the recognition of the need to maintain farms and it's not a program which I quarrelled with although I didn't quite understand it.

We then, this government, recognizing that this wasn't enough, that in spite of that there were people who were leaving the farms, developed a concept of saying, "Well, if you don't have a buyer who can afford to buy then we, the government, will purchase from a willing seller at a fair price" — in order to enable somebody who couldn't afford to buy that land to work the land and work it for the benefit of himself and not for the benefit of an outside owner whose purpose in owning the land was to get a profit out of it. And that was the difference. Because really today, this very day, anyone has the right to go to any farmer and buy land and then rent it, or sell it, to a young farmer. The only problem is that that young new farmer is unable to find the purchase price nor is he able to put down an equity down payment, nor is he able to undertake to pay the interest rates or rents which a profit-oriented owner will require. And that's why, we have found, that there was no substantial movement in the direction of private acquisition of land and then resale to the new potential farmer.

Apparently what we are finding and which the members of the Conservative Party don't like, it seems to me, is that foreigners are coming in for purposes altogether different from that of developing the productivity of the farm, are coming in and starting to buy, and they are now getting onto an emotional band-wagon that is taking place across the country. And they're saying, oh well, we can always attack the foreigner, so that's okay. We worry about the foreigner. The fact is that I still don't accept the fact that if they are Germans, or Italians, or Frenchmen, as referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, that they make that much difference in the use of the land.

The Member for Lakeside doesn't like the title "Farmlands Protection Act." I invite him to suggest a change and if he wants to say "The Farmlands Use or Protection of Use Act", that's fine, or "Protection Against Exploitation by Others", that's fine. If he wants to say "The Opportunity for People Who Want to Farm the Land to Acquire the Land", that's fine. But really what he is saying is that this government wants to acquire the land and this is not only wrong, it is not proven. The government has not nationalized land. The government has not expropriated farmland for farm purposes. The government has made moneys available to enable people to make full use of the land without having to pay exorbitant prices in purchasing nor exorbitant interest or profits to the owner. And to that extent —(Interjection)— Pardon? That is the intent.

Now, the farmer has now been given the right to make the purchase as soon as the lease comes in, or just about then, which I'm not sure is quite the way one decides whether a person is truly a farmer who knows how to operate because I know that I could never get onto a farm and immediately start making it productive. I would have to learn the business and it has become more and more of a specialized business. —(Interjection)—

Well you see, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside, who is always ready to twist a little bit is now talking about licensing. I'm not aware that there has been any proposal that farmers be licensed or that they have to pass examinations. Mind you, we make a real estate broker pass exams. There are all kinds of licensing that have been devised in order to try to protect the people who have to deal with professionals, deal with agents, so as to protect them. But I'm not sure that there is any purpose or desire to do the licensing that the Member for Lakeside wishes to bring about. But that's a red-herring that he is prepared to debate in, is it Woodlands or wherever, but which I really don't think that he is going to make that invitation. I don't think he is going to make it stick because I believe that the Conservatives, in fighting this election, are much happier to print documents that are distributed, to make speeches where they cannot be answered, to spread the distortions which they have been doing in this last period of months will be their technique. I don't think they will be looking for debate of the old style. I don't think they will. And if the Member for Lakeside has committed himself to doing that then I hope it is well publicized and given enough time so we can all go and participate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: So, Mr. Speaker, my problem is making the distinction which this bill itself does. The Member for Lakeside said, "Well, it's your bill." And it's true. We here make a distinction between a resident Canadian and a foreigner. There I have a little bit of difficulty reconciling that in my mind, especially to the extent that the land that a resident Canadian can purchase being up to a section of land, is much too much for any gentleman farmer to need. Frankly, I don't see the need for such a large volume of land that can be owned by any person, or should be owned by any person, who is not farming the land himself. There is the problem I have.

The Conservative problem is one that I really can't comprehend at all except that I think that they are reluctantly supporting a bill — and I shouldn't say reluctantly, are gladly supporting the opportunity to deny foreigners the right to buy land — but that is something that they have not rationalized as far as I've been able to gather from the speeches made by either the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Lakeside. I'm sure there will be other debates and maybe they will

justify for me, as an outsider looking in, and I say that in the sense that I know very little about agricultural land or the use or abuse of it. I would like to hear from them why it is that they rise to support the sanctions imposed on a foreigner from buying land.

The Member for Lakeside said, "Maybe five, six years from now it won't be necessary at all." I want to know why is it necessary now? What is the fear that they have of foreigners owning land?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I noted that the Honourable Member for St. Johns was in his seat most of the period of my address. Would he not agree that the sanction that I was seeking was essentially one of economics in terms of creating a more favourable and more fairly competitive situation. I addressed myself principally to the availability of money and at interest rates, not so much against the exclusion of foreigners.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate that interruption because now I understand that what the member wants to do is to cut down on the demand for land. And he says that if he cuts down the demand then the price will remain at a decent level. Well, the price includes the interest rates. The price includes the availability of capital and apparently what the honourable member says is that by confining the right to purchase land to a smaller group of people then the price won't go up or the rates won't go up, and therefore that economically is better for the potential purchaser to own it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any potential person owning any of the land that is gradually becoming owned more and more by non-occupants and non-users of the land. It is self-defeating to say that the foreigners are the ones that are raising the prices or the costs unless one recognizes that the people who should be investing in land are the people that are going to have a direct relationship with the land, are going to work the land, are going to develop the land, and that is really the way in which one keeps the price down.

If you say, I can only sell my land to that person who will come in and take it over and work it, then of course the market drops. With the market dropping, he will not have the competition that apparently the Member for Lakeside fears comes from foreign countries. He will not have it even with Canadians who can, again, raise the land.

Well, obviously the Member for Lakeside does not agree with my interpretation or my conclusion and I'm sure that there will be opportunities for other members on that side to explain better what their attitude is. But it's one that I'm looking forward to hearing because I cannot take credit for this bill. I did participate in listening and voicing some thoughts about the purpose of it but not being able to take credit gives me the opportunity to say I want to hear what members opposite have to say, not in their violent manner of attacking the philosophy of this government which I don't think this bill reflects, but rather what is their purpose in supporting it.

I'm beginning to understand their objections and that is they want themselves to see that anybody should have the right to own farmland, for whatever purpose, which must mean — when I say anybody, I mean anybody in Canada — and that must mean vertical integration must be acceptable to them, I don't know. The Member for Lakeside nods his head, but I don't want to assume that he's agreeing that vertical integration is acceptable to them, I hope to hear about it. I want to know whether the trend that developed over a period of time, of a food processor owning the land, owning the product of the land, owning the processing of it, the manufacturing, the canning, owning the distribution at the wholesale level and at the retail level, is acceptable to them, because if it is let's find out. And that of course means not only tenant farmers, tenant producers, tenant operators, tenant salespeople, tenant clerks, all the way down the line, and that is really what the foreigners that came to these countries and became Canadians, tried to avoid. And that is what I would think and hope that this bill will attempt to avoid, and that is a replaying of the history of the last century as it occurred in Europe, and as it may well happen in Canada if there are not attempts made to prevent that.

So I come back to my attitude to this bill, is to see to it that those who work the land, control the land. That's all really I want to see. If I could be assured that a group of ten farmers could form a corporation to own land, and use that land for their benefit, that's fine with me, and if that happens to be called a co-operative, that's a term for it, or if that happens to be called a community, that's acceptable to me. And if the community of Woodlands wants to own land, and see to it that the people who vote in that community should own the land, that's fine with me. If you take it into the analogy of the province representing the people of Manitoba, making it possible that that land should be worked by people, who developed their full life on the land, and are not being exploited, then that is okay with me too.

So let me make it clear. I see a distinction between a non-profit operation owning the land, and somebody working it, as long as their interests are the same, as long as their objectives are the same. And whatever government in this province would hold title to land, as it does now for recreational purposes and other purposes as long as it's not being used to exploit the people around it, then they

are trustees in effect, for those who are working it. So I don't expect to be embarrassed in any way by the suggestion that the government is the same as a foreign owner, or a Canadian non-resident owner. That is such apparent nonsense. **or do I accept the fact, that farmers fear what the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation has been doing up to now. The only fear that which they are led to believe by the Conservative Party, is what could be a threat to them. But anybody who knows the way the Agricultural Corporation has been prepared to buy land at a fair price, and looking and finding people who are prepared to work the land, that should frighten no one except those who want to use it for political purposes, to distort the objectives, or to distort the method.**

I have not heard from the other side, a valid intelligent description of the dangers that have been proven, as a result of this government's policy on the Land Lease Program, and on the opportunity given to young people to stay on the land, rather than leave it. I have heard all sorts of threats made to others of what might happen, or what is the purpose, and none of it have I heard as being validly a description of what is happening that is dangerous. And that I expect, we will be hearing. As I said, I think we'll all have to go to Woodlands, so that we all make sure that the truth be pictured in a balanced way, in an objective way. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm afraid the Convention Centre will not be the place for the farmers to hear it, and it's when you get out to the farmer constituencies of the members for the Conservative Party, where you hear these distortions and these frightening stories that are told about what may happen, not what has happened, what may happen. Therefore, I do not accept that farmers being told what has happened, and being told what the program of this government is, would fear it one bit, because as has been said many times, not one farmer has been forced to sell, not one farmer has been forced to buy, not one person has received more than what is considered to be a fair return, not one person has been denied the right to buy at other than what is considered a fair price.

On that basis, it being completely voluntary, it actually answers in every sense, the distorted attacks made by Conservatives on the Land Program of this government. But that is not what is pictured in this bill. What is pictured in this bill, is an attempt to see to it that land which is the one resource which is not developing and which is finite, is available to those who are prepared to work it, not those who are prepared to use those who will be working the land, and doing it for the advantage and benefit of the owner, rather than that of the worker. That is why I want to hear, and I'm looking forward to debate, on why it is that foreigners are such frightening people, whereas other people who do have no intention of working the land, are acceptable as long as they live in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members where we have some guests from Thompson, North Dakota; 27 seniors under the direction of Miss Bahneman. We welcome them. The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No 59. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No 61. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No 62. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. (Stand).

Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Roblin. (Stand).

Bill No. 68. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand). The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and that 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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES — ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I would refer honourable members to Page 11 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 23, Land Titles Offices (a) Salary \$1'819,500.00. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the operation of the Land Titles Office and the salaries of the employees therein, I have a copy of an Order-in-Council, I believe it was the 4th of May of this year, dealing with a position where there was no competition held whatsoever and that was for the position of an Examiner of Surveys. Perhaps the Attorney-General can tell us why the position was not bulletined and why there was no competition for that position.

Friday, May 13, 1977

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, the reason was that the Chief Surveyor, Mr. Donkersloot, resigned and it was his deputy surveyor who had served in that capacity for ten years that was appointed to assume the responsibilities that Mr. Donkersloot had performed, so it was in-house; it was the deputy after ten years of service in that position.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that if the deputy who had ten years in that position had applied for the job, after all the requirements of the Civil Service Act had been met, I feel sure that he would have got the job anyway. I just want to know why the regular requirements that are spelled out in the Civil Service Act were dispensed with in this particular case. I think that the law is spelled out very clearly and government should live by the spirit of the law and the Civil Service Act and follow the steps that are laid down there. I haven't got the slightest doubt in my mind but what the deputy, who had served for ten years, would not be a qualified person to be appointed to the job after having met the requirements of the Civil Service Act and properly bulletining the job and holding a competition.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the sentiment expressed by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I think there is very little disagreement except I must say this, that in a situation where the position is highly professional, extremely technical, an individual has performed competently in a deputy position for ten years and no reason not to appoint him in the position just above in the event of the retirement of his head, then I think by posting and by bulletining, that sometime we can create a lot of expectation all over, from many many people, in a situation that really there would be very very little reasonable basis to give that position to somebody else. Here is a man ten years, highly technical, highly professional, it would have been extremely unfair to have awarded it to somebody off the street. But then I say to the Honourable Member for Russell, if we had bulletined under those circumstances, I think we could generate hope and expectation from a dozen, two dozen people, throughout the province when there would be very little chance of their success, only for them later to have their hopes smashed unnecessarily. I don't want to appear to be suggesting that there isn't importance in Civil Service bulletining because that is certainly the normal process but there is discretion allowed and surely, on this type of position, under these circumstances, the discretion is one that is reasonable.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that the position is such that the government shouldn't have that discretion but, if that is the case, then I suggest that the Civil Service Act be amended to allow discretion when it comes to that position. However, we have not done that. The Civil Service Act still states that that position is one that should be bulletined and a competition held. Here we see a clear violation of the Civil Service Act by the government and if the government wants to have the right to hold that without a competition, then I suggest they change the Civil Service Act.

All I'm asking is that the government abide by the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Act which they do in normal cases but in this particular case they chose to ignore it. I think that there is an expectation on the part of the people of Manitoba to have the government live up to the rules that are laid down and are put forward. It certainly causes me some concern and I am sure it must cause some civil service people some concern to see that the procedure that is followed by government shows no consistency. In some cases, a job is bulletined; in some it is not. And that, I think, is more damaging, far more damaging than having the regular procedure followed in which case I am sure the man with ten years experience as the deputy would almost automatically get the job.

There is no danger whatsoever in following the procedure that is laid down by the Civil Service Act and this is the point that I am trying to make to the Attorney-General. He can argue all he wants about whether it would place any doubts in the mind of one individual. I think it is far more important to the other 10,000 or 12,000 civil servants to know that the government is following the guidelines that are set down. I am sure that it is far more important that the 10,000 are assured that the government is following the proper procedures.

I don't know the gentleman that got the job at all, but I am sure, being a good civil servant, I think that he would want to follow the regular procedures that are laid down. If he is a well-qualified man, and I am sure he is, he would have no qualms at all about having a competition and meeting the necessary requirements. So I find it somewhat strange that the government would not follow the rules that they themselves are bound to live up to, and in this particular case — and I must say that it is not the only case, there are some other cases that I have heard something about — where they do not follow the regular procedure, and I think that it is imperative that our Civil Service in this province have the confidence and the assurance that normal job procedures are followed and competitions are held where the Civil Service Act spells it out that they be held.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I say to the honourable member, there was no illegal action on the part of the department insofar as this appointment. If the honourable member would, since he does have the Order-in-Council in front of him, if he would refer to the preamble of the Order-in-Council he will read that there is legal authority for exactly what was done here.

There is legal authority to deviate from the posting under certain circumstances and that is

exactly what happened here. There is legal authority. The legal authority is outlined in the preamble and the honourable member could read the preamble to the House, which clearly establishes the legal authority for what has been done in this case. I am advised that, in fact, there was nobody else within the government service that had this individual's particular skills and talents, profession, and we also are of the view that, from what we know, there is nobody in the entire province that has these particular skills. He served there for ten years. There is provision in the Civil Service Act to allow us to do exactly what we have done. My department advises me that we have received no complaints from the Manitoba Government Employees Association or from any party on this particular appointment.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, just to keep the records straight, the Attorney-General implied that I said it was done illegally. I had never said that. I said that I think it is imperative for the confidence of the Civil Service, that you follow a standard set procedure. And while you may very well have the authority to do it this other way, to retain the maximum confidence that it is possible to retain, I think it is implied or it is implicit that government follow a standard set procedure so that all civil servants know that when a job does come up that it will be bulletined and the competition will be held in the manner prescribed by the Civil Service Act.

Again, I say that if that is done in some cases and is not done in some cases, if the position of the head of that department is one that should not be bulletined, then let's take that requirement out of the Civil Service Act. If the heads of departments are positions that should not be bulletined, then let's say so in the Civil Service Act and spell it out specifically. All I'm referring to are the 10,000 civil servants who see variations occurring and they just begin to wonder, well, if I want to apply for a job, am I going to have the opportunity through the normal prescribed regulations set down by the Civil Service Act or is the position that I would like to apply for just going to be filled without a competition being held?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 23(a). The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I believe under this item I can ask the Minister about the Land Titles and the office and the operation. I know last year we had some debate on this and there has been concern among some of the lawyers in the city that there has been quite a bit of delay in the way of the Land Titles Office operation and the transfers of titles. Has there been any streamlining and can the Minister give us some indication that there has been some streamlining and up-dating of the procedures as far as the transfer of deeds in the Land Titles Office or has there been any action taken in respect to speeding up the procedures of transfers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General

MR. PAWLEY: Well, yes, there certainly has been. I think when there was a great deal of difficulty with delays was back in the summer and fall of 1973, I think there were delays then of four weeks. I am advised that the delays now are not extending beyond approximately 10 days, down to ten days.

There may be instances that the honourable member will have of delays longer than that but those delays are for legal or technical reasons and, of course, requirements have to be met insofar as the preparation of documents submitted to the Land Titles Office for registration. It can be that those legal or technical requirements are not met and sometimes, I must be so bold as to say, Mr. Chairman, sometimes and sometimes too often, lawyers will blame the Land Titles Office for sometimes their own deficiencies in the preparation of documents. The document is rejected; they have to reregister it and three or four weeks go by and the Land Titles Office receives the blame for it. But my information is that if the document is properly prepared, meets the legal and technical requirements, that 10 days should be the maximum time period now.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I know we had some discussion on this last year and even not too long ago this year. I have had discussion with several lawyers and the Minister may be correct, or the Attorney-General may be correct, maybe it's because of an isolated case but this concern has been expressed to me and the Minister himself has indicated that, a few years back, the normal was four weeks and to me it was indicated it was more like six weeks those times. What has happened since? Can the Minister indicate, has there been more staff hired or have we gone into a different type of equipment that has improved the procedures? There is still concern because it is a concern to a lot of people if they can't get their documents, they are waiting on a transfer and I am sure the Minister is aware that there must be . . . I don't know how many transactions go through the Land Titles Office each month, I am sure it is in the thousands. You know, I wouldn't venture to say how many thousands but I am sure it is between four and five thousand, I am sure.

So, if there have been some improvements made and there are still delays, cannot those improvements be again up-dated and what has happened that we have improved the system say from five weeks to ten days? What has taken place? Has there been any equipment or automation or what has happened? Or strictly staff?

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, also dealing with the operation of the Land Titles Office, there are quite a few other questions that have to be asked but I notice that it is about 12:30 and probably when we reconvene at 2:30 those problems can properly be brought forward to the attention of the

Friday, May 13, 1977

Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder, should I answer the honourable member now? Do we have time or should we leave it until after?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30, noon hour break, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.