

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, July 19' 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report as requested by the Member for Brandon East

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister to whom the Manitoba Hydro reports. Would the Minister look into the question of whether or not Hydro in advising people that they were wishing to purchase their lands, told them that the land would be purchased for three times the amount if they could obtain a zoning application? Mr. Speaker, I ask this question because there was a report to that effect. I consider it astonishing and I would therefore ask the Minister to look into that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Member for Inkster is referring to a newspaper report as of today that refers to that. I would first of all indicate to him that the government will take as notice any question that relates to Hydro and will refer it to them for answer. In that specific case, I would be glad to do so, to refer it to Hydro for their comment. If, as a result of that, the government finds that the position of Hydro is subject to further question, then the government will have a further look at it. But I would be happy to take the member's question as notice, refer it to Hydro and ask them for their comments on that particular question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister. I ask him whether, as a matter of government policy, it wouldn't see to it that a Crown authority which has to be voted Supply by the Legislative Assembly and over which the government has general supervisory control although not day-to-day control over the operations, would not expropriate property so that they would get it at the value as at the date of expropriation rather than suggest that rezoning will increase the value.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, no argument with that question at all, at all. If that turned out to be the case, certainly that would constitute grounds for some very severe investigation if that were the case. On the other hand, if in fact the government came to the conclusion that the purchase of property for right of way, whether it's for Hydro or for purposes for a line right of way or for any other purposes were in question by a Crown corporation, or in some question, what we would be more likely to do is ask a body such as the Land Appraisal Board to evaluate the procedures that were being applied.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, wouldn't the Minister agree that generally with regard to the public taking of property, that it is preferable to expropriate so that value is fixed as at the date of expropriation

rather than to permit negotiations so that value increases during the time of negotiations and in fact a suggestion is made that rezoning will increase the value. My understanding is that if you expropriate, the value is as at the date of the expropriation and does not give the possibility of rezoning to increase the value of property which the Crown is seeking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster is expressing an opinion and indeed is maybe being argumentative. If he wants to raise a question, this is the period for asking questions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I agree and I thought I did except for admonition. I asked the Honourable Minister whether, as a matter of general policy, where land is being taken, that it is preferable to expropriate so that the value is fixed at the date of expropriation rather than permitting the value to increase during negotiations.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I believe the member is probably referring to the report contained in today's newspaper with regard to a particular case and in that case, I think that the reply has been given by the Crown corporation in which case the Crown corporation has replied that the actual amount was being read into it . . . the wording of the letter was being read into it in the interpretation that the member is implying as the basis for his question. If, in fact, the wording of it is such that it would give the indication that land would be re-evaluated at a different level if, in fact, there were a different zoning regulation applied, then I think that the member's question is very valid. But if, on the other hand, the letter was written with the purpose of indicating something otherwise, then I think there is no grounds and I would be most . . . I think it would be very valuable, in fact very important, to establish if that were the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would be in a position to indicate to us, or clarify for us, his present policy with respect to Dutch Elm disease, a question that he took as notice the other day.

A MEMBER: He's going to stamp it out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I had indicated to the House that there had been no change in policy. If the member is indicating that the government had cost-shared with an individual, to my knowledge that has not been the case, but it is possible that a municipality or a town had removed trees on an individual's property which was cost-shared by the town, municipality or the province, if that is what he's indicating, and I have not had any further report from the department on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wishes, I'm prepared to indicate to him, that up until recently there has been no charge for the removal of diseased elm trees from private properties. They fell within the airt of the provincial-municipal agreements. Now last week, two particular people were told that they were to do the r own cleanup job, even though it was an impossible situation for them, given the nuers of trees and the size of the trees, so that in essence, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to check with his department, and if that is incorrect, then certainly his staff should be so advised, so that they can continue the policy that has been ongoing for three or four years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the member yesterday, I believe, that if he knew of any specific cases, that I invited him to tell me about them and he has not done that. Further to that, I have not had a further report from my department on any specific cases, but have requested of them that if there has been to notify me of them, but have not, to this time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give him the specific cases involved, but I would hope that the Minister can say that the program is not being altered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Approximately one month ago, the Minister of Industry and Commerce advised me that the amount of attrition at Electro-Knit Canada would be to the extent of approximately 15 during a six month period. I would ask the Minister if he can confirm that he has information or has received information which would indicate contrary at this time?

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

HON. ROBERT BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, that was the information supplied to me by my staff at that time. If there is any other development, I will be happy to check into it for the Meer for Selkirk, but at present I haven't been informed otherwise.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that we have a nuer of people waiting in Room 254 to proceed with the considerations and the items before Law Amendments Committee, and I would therefore move . . . it is my understanding that the business before the Law Amendments Committee is possibly such that it would not likely be the case where we should call the House back in session, so I would move, seconded by the First Minister, that the House would now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Meer for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister makes the motion, I would like to make a change on Law Amendments. The Honourable Meer for Wellington to be taken off and the Honourable Meer for Lac du Bonnet to be placed on.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I also have two changes on Law Amendments, Mr. Blake (Minnedosa) for Mr. Einarson (Rock Lake), Mr. Domino for Mr. Steen.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Minister of Highways. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I'm sorry, I've been informed of one other change. The Honourable Member for Selkirk to be replaced by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

A MEMBER: You're a winner, Howard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will cast my gaze around the room before I try to make this motion once more, but prior to making that I should indicate that it would be our intention to call Bill No. 5 tomorrow in the ordinary Business of the House. Having made that announcement, then let me move, seconded by the First Minister, that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow and we proceed with the business in the Law Amendments Committee in Room 254.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Minister of Highways, seconded by the Honourable First Minister, that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

I hope that the Committee enjoys the same spirit that has existed here in the last few minutes. The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.