

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 52 students of Grade 8 standing of the Arthur A. Leach School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Doern. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command of the Royal Canadian Legion praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command and Branches of the Canadian Legion of British Empire Service Leagues.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table **The Annual Report of the Department of Co-operative Development** for the year ended March 31, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Tabling of Reports or Ministerial Statements? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have some questions to the Honourable the Attorney-General having to do with fairness and equality in the administration of justice in the Province of Manitoba. Can the Attorney-General now advise the House, firstly, how many persons have been charged as a result of incidents at the Griffin plant since February 28th; secondly, under what sections of the Criminal Code are these charges being laid; thirdly, are all persons removed from the Griffin plant by the police being charged, that is all persons removed since the 28th of February; fourthly, if all persons are not being charged, on what basis are the charges being laid and on whose instructions; fifthly, can the Minister give assurances to the House that all charges laid . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader on a Point of Order.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, would not the honourable member agree that that series of questions would be more applicable either to a written question or to an Order for Return? And if the honourable member is suggesting that it just go on the record of Hansard as if it were a written question then that might be unusual but we could probably accommodate it if we just take it as if it was done in that way. But it seems to me that the proper way would be either for an Order for Return or a written Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader for the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to accommodate you, Sir, and the Honourable the House Leader or the Minister to whom the questions are being directed. I can give them to him one at a time; I can give them to him collectively. He can take notice of them although I don't think he should have to take notice of them, they are current, the information we sought.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the basis that my honourable friend has just spoken then I was perhaps too accommodating. I would suggest that the questions and the nature in which they are put are the proper subject matter for an Order for Return.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be preferable because of the urgency of this matter that the questions appear on the record. My honourable friend can then treat them as a written Question as suggested by the House Leader and give the answer, I would hope, soon. I'll continue with the fifth question.

Can the Minister give assurances to the House and to the people of Manitoba that all charges laid will be proceeded with in the regular manner in the courts and sixthly, if Stays of Proceedings are being contemplated on the charges will the Minister advise the House and the people of Manitoba on what basis and at whose instructions such Stays of Proceedings will be entered.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicate that it would be a disposition to accommodate the

honourable member on this question but I believe we should not be setting a new precedent. I'm suggesting that we carry on as he suggested and that we acquiesce but in the future, in accordance with lengthy meetings of the Rules Committee, that it would not be very difficult for that to have been put on as a written question. However, I am suggesting that we accommodate him but it not be a precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: I am quite willing to accommodate myself to the reasonable suggestion of the House Leader. I think he would agree, however, that there is some urgency to these questions being answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: . . . part of the agreement, I am in accord with my honourable friend but I don't agree with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if he can indicate whether he has replied to the request for support by the Winnipeg School Division for the addition at Carpathia School, the addition that was turned down by the Public School Finance Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear all the question so I will attempt to paraphrase it. I believe it was: Have I replied? The matter, as I recall, is under consideration by the Public Schools Finance Board, I am awaiting their recommendation to me on the review of this project.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether there was any support given or words of support written . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think we are on the Estimates of education, if the member wants to follow it he can follow it during the Minister's Estimates. The Honourable Member for River Heights have another question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources relating to Flyer Industries. He made a statement two weeks ago about Flyer Industries and I wonder whether he can indicate whether the decision of the Board of Directors and the government was made on the verbal communication of the Board to the government or was it made on written communication as suggested by the Provincial Auditor in his report on the year's activities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I deny the assumption in the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I again ask the Minister: Was there written communication from the Board of Directors, backed by statistical data to indicate that a request would be made for continuation of the company at a minimum of 200 buses per year at a proposed loss of \$3 million; was that verbal or written?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the decision of the board and the government, the government's commitment to support a projected loss, was made on good and valid considerations far better than are recommended by the auditor.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister can indicate whether there was any discussion between himself and the members of the Board of Directors to see to it that procedures would be changed for decision-making by the Manitoba Development Corporation so that, in effect, it would follow and conform with the recommendations of the Provincial Auditor that they not be done on verbal communication but rather on written and statistical data.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I deny the allegations of the Provincial Auditor. The Manitoba Development Corporation has always been making its decisions on good and valid information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights, a final supplementary. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Auditor's report was forwarded to the Board of Directors and they have sent their comments to the Provincial Auditor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources. Yesterday, the President of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation indicated that the reason for the reduction from 75 million pounds of fish caught in the province in 1972 to the present 33 million is directly attributable to the reduction of quotas on behalf of the provincial authorities and because of mercury polluted waters. My direct question to the Minister is: Can he substantiate that statement by the President of the corporation? Have the provincial authorities reduced the quotas to that extent and secondly, which specific waters are currently not open for fishing because of mercury pollution in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The last part is Order for Return. The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the exact

statement made by the official of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, but in reply to the question posed by the honourable member, I am not aware of any areas where the Provincial Government in Manitoba has reduced quotas. Therefore, any reduction in the amount of fish produced in the Province of Manitoba is not attributable to a reduction in quotas by the Provincial Government.

There are many problems associated with the fishing industry in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and they have come up for discussion in this House, one of which is the high cost to the fisherman of producing and transporting his fish to market. We are addressing ourselves to that problem, but the problem the fishermen face is not one which is caused by the Provincial Government quotas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and I accept the Minister's response to that answer, but I would then ask him: Would he seriously take up with the appropriate authorities namely a Mr. Parks of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation when he attributes to this government the effects of mercury pollution and reduced provincial fishing quotas by the provincial authorities accountable for the very substantial reduction of fish caught from 75 million pounds to 33 million pounds. I don't think this government. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . should allow federal authorities to get away with that kind of nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might reply to the question inasmuch as I have had correspondence with the federal authorities with respect to the problems of the Freshwater Inland Fish industry. I would say in reply to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that I would appreciate receiving from him whatever newspaper clipping or other documentation he may have to ascertain whether in fact the distinguished federal official that he refers to, in fact, could have made that statement.

I say that for two reasons: one of them being that in fact the pattern of deterioration in the inland fishery was manifesting itself strongly well before any closing down of Lake Winnipeg during the mercury pollution period, and in fact this deterioration in production was a result of what biologists claim to have been an unsustainable record of production, and in the long run the pattern was already beginning to manifest itself. So if this comment attributed to the federal official is correct, we are faced with the contradiction of opinion or view as between a federal official and professional biologists.

I might say in conclusion that we would want to communicate our views to the Federal Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, that they should advise us whether they believe it is better to mine a lake and to flout practices that have to do with putting it on a sustaining yield basis, or whether it would be better to provide the kind of support that would make it possible for those living in communities in which there is no alternative employment, in which there is fishing opportunity, but because of transportation and location costs require support, whether they wouldn't regard the latter as a more sensible alternative.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question directed to the First Minister and I would ask him to continue his correspondence with the appropriate authorities. My direct question is: having made himself familiar with the comments that I attributed to the President of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, the person in charge of the inland fisheries in this province, whether or not those kind of statements are irresponsible, whether or not it should not be the responsibility of this government and this First Minister's Minister of Renewable Resources concern that this kind of politicking is not in the interests of the fishermen of this province. I know nothing of politicking.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can only say in reply, Sir, that I am not prepared yet to suggest that that statement is irresponsible. I am prepared to say that on surface it seems highly disturbing because it seems to suggest that it is better to mine a lake than it is to provide support for fishing and employment opportunities in other lakes which are not being fished at all because of problems of transportation economics.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if he could assure the House that he has no employees in the Legal Aid Services whose salaries exceed the schedule that is set out by the classification of the Civil Service Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the very reason that the / Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell asked the question of course encourages me to wonder about the reason for the question and I will have to carry out an enquiry as to whether or not there is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General

responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Commission. In view of liquor offences in Manitoba that have increased anywhere from 80 to 300 percent, can the Minister indicate what measure he is taking and will he be bringing any legislation to the House in respect to permits and licensing of socials and banquets?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that that is a matter that we would be better to deal with during the estimate review period. The honourable member has certainly underlined a very critical concern and I think it's best left to the estimate review to further deal with that question.

MR. PATRICK: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister given any consideration to increasing the number of inspectors he has now, in force?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there have been increases over the past year. I'm not aware of any intention, at the moment, to further increase the number of inspectors in the employ of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There has been indication that the present Chairman of the Liquor Commission Board will be leaving the post. Will the Minister indicate to the House if there'll be an appointment made during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: Anticipatory. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker I think the question, with all due respect to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, is still very hypothetical and it certainly would be beyond my capacity to properly answer him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Works.

HONORABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to answer a few questions asked yesterday by the Member for Wolseley. They concern the vacancy rate at Aspen Park which is in the Gimli Industrial Park. Since the wind-down of Saunders we have now had a vacancy rate, which was reached in the last few months, of approximately 50 percent, and I think this is evidence of the economic value and impact of Saunders Aircraft in the Gimli area. Secondly ' he wanted to know whether we would be willing to make accommodations that are vacant available to homeless people who have suffered from fires, etcetera, and other dislocations, I assume, in Winnipeg. I'd first of all point out that Gimli is some distance from Winnipeg and may be inconvenient for transporting people there and back. Secondly, it is not our departmental policy to handle this type of welfare, or disaster, or emergency type of operation. That is more the affair of other departments of the province or other levels of government. Our general policy here is to attempt to run the base at a break-even operation or at a profit. But I would also point out that we have had flood victims there in 1974 and 1976 but this was at the request of the Emergency Measures Organization and was funded by them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Labour pertaining to a question I raised last week. I wonder if the Minister would now be able to tell the House what his friend and NDP candidate is receiving to head up this commission called The Industrial Enquiry Commission.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce also in charge of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BANMAN: And I would ask the Minister if he could inform the House whether he or his department has had any correspondence or dialogue with the Federal Government with regards to the setting up of a program to encourage homeowners to upgrade their insulation.

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

HONORABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been in communication with the Federal Minister of Energy, the Honourable Alastair Gillespie, and we expect to be meeting with the Federal Minister along with Provincial Ministers of Energy, in a matter of weeks, and I'm sure this will be one of the items of discussion. But we have submitted that we, in Manitoba, would like to be part of the federal program whereby grants are made available to homeowners for the insulation of their homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if the Federal Government has indicated to Manitoba that we might get the same kind of assistance program such as Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia got.

MR. EVANS: Mr Speaker, this is exactly what we are after. We haven't had any official reply yet but we are intending to pursue it very vigorously. It has been pursued already to some extent at the staff level, and as I indicated, we will be meeting in a matter of weeks with the federal Minister. We would certainly hope that there will be something positive coming out of this but it is a matter for time to tell.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I note that the Honourable the First Minister took as notice a

question of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the amendment to the National Transportation Act, Bill C-33, to the effect whether the government of Manitoba supports a change that is being made where there is a delineation, I believe, of policy matters on the one hand from regulatory matters on the other. I can advise the honourable member that the Government of Manitoba has urged this delineation of policy-making from regulatory-making over the years along with our sister provinces of western Canada. It was a united position, I might add, of all four western provinces. In fact, we took the initiative in this matter. We felt it was not good governmental administration for a regulatory body such as the CTC to also have policy-making powers and that it would be in the best interests of Canadians for the policy-making matters to be clearly delineated in the Ministry of Transport and I understand this is what the intent of this particular amendment to the NTA will bring about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources and I wonder if he could advise the House if the fishermen on Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba have been able to fill their quotas in the last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I believe the fishermen of Lake Winnipegosis have not been able to fill the quota that was established on that lake for many years due to the decline of the fish population in that area. I can't answer for Lake Manitoba. I will take that part of the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. —(Interjection)— Order please. —(Interjection)— Order please.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. In view of the brief prepared by the city which rejects the assertion made by the Minister that city development practices hinders land supply, can the Minister now indicate whether he or officials of MHRC will now be presenting a brief to the Bellan Land Inquiry Commission stating the province's position on this?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, without agreeing with the initial observations made by my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, I can advise the member that it was not our intention to make any formal brief but that members of Manitoba Housing Corporation were prepared to make available any and all information that Prof. Bellan may wish to obtain for the purposes of his enquiry.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Minister indicate or would he be prepared to table in the House an index, a list, of that information or material that is being made available to the Bellan Commission?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't see any difficulty in that. I will look into the matter and just find out precisely what is being asked of us.

MR. AXWORTHY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister is prepared to do that, would he also be prepared then to make any information that is so requested from that index available to members of this House?

MR. EVANS: I don't see why not, Mr. Speaker, unless it happens to bear on some matter that's under current negotiation or unless it happens to bear upon a matter that deals with a private individual, but I don't imagine it would be any difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Housing. In light of the question yesterday by the Leader of the Official Opposition piously stating that Manitobans should own their own homes, is it correct that the Tories started the MHRC in 1967 to build state-owned housing?

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Act was passed, I believe in 1967, by the then-Tory administration.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it correct that that dogmatic Tory government built only 600 units of the National Housing Act-financed housing between 1965 and 1969 while the Government of Ontario built 16,000 —(Interjections)— . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . units so that the taxpayers of Manitoba were subsidizing housing —(Interjections)— . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Let me suggest to those who insist on shouting "Order" that it's totally unnecessary. Unless they wish to conduct the Chair, they should kindly resist from doing that. Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: On that point of order, I am sure you will recognize, Sir, that the question as was being posed by the honourable member is highly irregular and out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I may be inclined to agree or disagree with the honourable member

but one cannot tell what a question is until it has been spoken and therefore if —(Interjections)—
Gentlemen. Gentlemen. Gentlemen. Gentlemen, it's your time, not mine, so if you will resist from
making comments, I will indicate that I'm prepared to conduct this meeting according to
parliamentary procedure but I do need your co-operation. Without it, we can't conduct anything. The
Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I rephrase and ask the question directed to the Minister
responsible for Housing: Is it correct that the people of Manitoba subsidized public housing in the
Province of Ontario at the time when the Government of Manitoba refused to build public housing
even though they established the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the point that is being made is that although the Government of
Manitoba could take advantage of the National Housing Act and build public housing for senior
citizens and those less privileged than others, that they did not do so. I believe this is the observation
and it is true that very little activity took place in the Province of Manitoba while the sister province,
the conservative Province of Ontario, was indeed putting in place millions of dollars of public
housing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: . . . and getting millions of dollars of federal subsidies which Manitoba did not
receive at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you have drawn our attention to the fact time after
time that questions as posed by the Member for Radisson and answers as provided by the Minister of
Industry and Commerce are out of order. And I suggest, Sir, that that rule applies not just to one side
of the House but both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister or the Minister of Finance.

A MEMBER: Laurel and Hardy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Those interjections are bad timing sometimes. The
Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the Provincial Auditor's report and a reference
to the Manitoba Development Corporation, and his statement that he had commented on a situation
indicating a lack of basic financial management system in the administration of public funds. I
wonder if the Minister of Finance or the First Minister can indicate whether any action has been taken
to correct the deficiencies that the Provincial Auditor has indicated in his report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, one first has to assume that one
agrees with that particular statement right out and because of that, I think this should be answered at
the Public Accounts.

MR. SPIVAK: Another question: Has any action been taken as a result of the report of the
Provincial Auditor with respect to the financial management of the Manitoba Development
Corporation?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the comments of the Provincial Auditor are made available to the
various agencies and departments involved, they have responded to the Provincial Auditor.

MR. SPIVAK: Let me understand this correctly. Is the Minister of Finance indicating that they have
responded satisfactorily to the Provincial Auditor or . . .

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question of satisfaction is something entirely subjective. It
may or may not be satisfactory to the Member for River Heights, for example, what answer was
received. All I am indicating is that in fact a reply was received or responded to in every instance.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can indicate to the House whether he is aware of
any one action that's been taken by the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation
consistent with the recommendations of the Provincial Auditor.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, again I have to repeat, this can be discussed at the Public Accounts,
the question can then be posed. If the suggestion is that somehow funds were improperly handled or
something illegal took place, I suggest that the member is not correct and I wouldn't want that kind of
thought to be carried forward.

MR. SPIVAK: On a matter of privilege, there was never any suggestion of anything illegal. The
reference was, in fact, a direct quotation of the words of the Provincial Auditor which dealt with a lack
of basic financial management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It will be noted from the Provincial Auditor's report
that he has not suggested that one cent was improperly advanced by the Manitoba Development
Corporation. He doesn't show an instance of one penny having been improperly advanced.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the question was asked, the quotation was direct

from the Provincial Auditor, the interpretations by both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources are their own. The issue is a lack of basic financial management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can he indicate whether he has been in contact or has received any information from the Federal Minister concerning the saccharin damage that was announced yesterday in the House and whether he has any responsibilities for enforcement here in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I have received no information other than that carried through the media and I am quite concerned because finally I had found a way of reducing my weight and now I am quite concerned.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. When the Minister finds an answer to his problem, will he let the rest of the House know?

MR. DESJARDINS: Watch me, look at me.

MR. AXWORTHY: A final question. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether his department has finally granted the support for the Osborne Crisis House for women?

MR. DESJARDINS: This is something that we could certainly deal with during my Estimates. The deficit has been taken care of and there was a suggestion made to the City of Winnipeg that was approved in principle and the last that I heard, this was being carried through. I don't know if they actually received cheques or any money at this time; I will enquire and let my honourable friend know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Minnedosa requested information as to aircraft leases for fire fighting. I am now able to confirm that we have in fact provided new leases for the heavy water bombers for the coming fire season.

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I get accused of many things improperly, but I would like to refer your attention at this time, Mr. Speaker, to the Hansard of Wednesday, March 9th, Page 517, where you called upon the Attorney-General; and it is noted on Page 518 that the Honourable Russell Paulley of Transcona stated, "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have consent to file two more reports?" You asked if it was agreeable, it was agreeable and then it goes on to state, using my name, in the Tabling of Reports: "Mr. Paulley: One is a Report under The Controverted Elections Act from the Court of Queen's Bench, the second is the Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Annual Report for the year 1976." As I say, I am unjustly accused of many things, Mr. Speaker, but I would like the correction so that the proper Pawley gets credit for tabling these reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for the mention.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, with leave, I would like to make a change on Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: The First Minister will replace the Minister of Northern Affairs. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday we had a motion on the floor which we did not get to complete, therefore the Honourable House Leader on the question.

MR. GREEN: First you proceed with the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: First, very well.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

ORDER NO. 30:

MR. L.R.(Bud)SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

1. The monthly rent paid by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission for the premises it has occupied at 1310 Pembina Highway during each year for the years 1969 through 1976.

2. The annual sales revenues achieved by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission

at its premises at 1310 Pembina Highway for each year 1969 through 1976, inclusive.

3. The monthly rent being paid for the premises at 1310 Pembina Highway for 1977.

4. The projected sales revenues of the 1310 Pembina Highway store for 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on the motion.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we will be prepared to answer the questions posed in the Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Order for Return is therefore accepted, so ordered.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

ORDER NO. 31:

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information based on the Principal's September Statistical Report survey and for each fiscal year since inception of the Department of Education's Bureau de l'Education Française:

1. What is the formula used for determining the amount of grants receivable by the Province from the Federal Government for assistance in French (or Français) education programs.

2. What is the total number of "full-time equivalents" for Manitoba.

3. What is the total amount of money receivable by the Province under the arrangement?

4. How much money will go to each school division under the plan along with the number of full-time equivalents that justify or explain the amount due to each division.

5. How much money is apportioned to the administration of BEF as a result of the application of the formula.

6. Apart from formula considerations for what amount do the administrators of BEF determine the destination of the money available from federal grants.

7. How much money went to all the divisions in total for:

(a) Français

(b) French as a second language.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the order acceptable?

MR. SCHREYER: Agreed as written, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: As written, very well, so ordered.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

ORDER NO. 32:

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. The amount of granular fertilizer, in tons, exported from Manitoba to the U.S.A. in each of the following years — 1974, 1975, 1976.

2. The amount of granular fertilizer, in tons, imported from the U.S.A. into Manitoba in each of the following years — 1974, 1975, 1976.

3. The price, per ton, of the fertilizer exported to the U.S.A. during each of the following years — 1974, 1975, 1976.

4. The price, per ton, of the fertilizer imported into Manitoba from the U.S.A. in each of the following years — 1974, 1975, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, my colleague here, a former Statistics Canada official, might be able to explain that we will attempt to provide this information to the extent it is available to us. Much of it involves Customs Canada but we will endeavour to get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? So ordered.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Stand for both No. 4 and No. 5, they are both in his name.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: We are now into Supply, the question is open. The Honourable Minister of Mines has 25 minutes of his time left.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday a grievance was made in connection with the motion to go into Supply relating to an industrial dispute that has now received prominence in the City of

Winnipeg, and when debate was closed yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we were talking about certain matters with relation to that dispute.

Now let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there are two things in issue. One is, how an industrial dispute is dealt with in the Province of Manitoba — and I have not heard anything from any member of the opposition including the Member for Fort Garry — which would indicate that he isn't entirely in accord with everything that the government has done. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there were a problem with what we are doing that would make me very suspicious because it's not often that we can be entirely in agreement with the Member for Fort Garry as to what we should be doing; and perhaps that's as good a reason for examining our policy as anything. But in any event, there is nothing about the way in which that industrial dispute was being handled which my honourable friend found fault with in the least; because what is happening *vis-a-vis* that industrial dispute, Mr. Speaker?

We have, in complete concurrence with what has always been the position of the employee movement in this province, said that we will give them full opportunity to withdraw their services in support of a position and in support of trying to improve their terms and conditions of employment; that we will not interfere with that right to withdraw and that furthermore we will not interfere with their right to carry on in every way possible persuasive methods to get support for their position either from persons in the vicinity of the operation or persons without the vicinity of the operation; and let it be clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, those freedoms did not exist for the labour movement in this province until this government came into power. They were not the law of the Province of Manitoba prior to this government coming into power.

We also indicated, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the features of free collective bargaining — and everything that is worthwhile has got its responsibilities as well as its benefits — that as far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned — and this is not a new position, this is the position that was endorsed by the employee groups in this province before we came into power — that they would have to accept the test of strength provided both sides were being handled equally in accordance with the law, and that an employer would not be prohibited from seeking to obtain other employees if his own employees went on strike against him.

Now that's not the end of the situation, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't terminate the employee rights. The employees have a right to persuade those people not to enter the plant, not to work for terms and conditions of employment which were unsatisfactory to them and, Mr. Speaker, they can go further. They can go to any supplier, they can go to any purchaser, they can go to people facilitating the plant, and they can urge them to support their position in this combat with their employer. And let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that was not the law before this government came into power. That is an extension of the law that has been made available to employee groups within this province.

Now certain employees, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it is either a small group or a group which is asking for something which it knows no government can offer, suggest that they also want the right and the privilege of blocking the highways, preventing other people from working and preventing an employer from trying to carry on business without those who have gone on strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what I think is the validity of doing that type of thing or not — and that is the latter part of my phrase, and that is an employer deciding that he will carry on business despite the fact that his employees have gone on strike — regardless of whether I think that is a wise thing to do or not, regardless of whether I think that that is a prudent thing to do, regardless of whether or not I think that the employer who does that is asking for trouble and may, in fact, destroy his own position, I say, Mr. Speaker, that he has the right to do that. And there is no place that I know of in North America, there is no place where the labour movement has reached its most sophisticated element such as in Great Britain, that the government has passed a law saying that an employer can't try to obtain employees if his existing employees won't work.

What is the logic behind such a law, Mr. Speaker? Those who pursue it say, "Well, if the employees are on strike and are suffering the employer should suffer as well, and that there should be equal suffering until the dispute is settled." But, Mr. Speaker, what would be the logic of such a law, and I urge this on the labour movement. The logic of such a law is to say that the employer can't try to operate if a group of his employees go on strike and none of the employees can seek other employment while they are on strike, they have to be on strike waiting until the employer opens his doors to them and to them alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize the desperation of the situation. I sympathize with the people who are involved in the situation; but I suggest to you that the passing of such a law as is now suggested by certain groups in the height of a desperate situation, would be to the utter detriment of the employees of this province or any other jurisdiction where such a law is passed.

Those people who talk about slavery — which is a hard term — I suggest that that type of law is the path to slavery; and this government as well as every other government in Canada has not passed such a law; and I am confident, Mr. Speaker, will not pass such a law.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry raised a point which he suggests he has proof of and which I am satisfied beyond any shadow of a doubt whatsoever, there can be no proof of. He suggests that this government had promised legislation with regard to this question and that the legislation and the specific of this legislation were offered as some type of a deal to the company. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not deny that legislation is being considered and that legislation has been discussed with various people; but I know because it is not in his power to do so, and the Minister of Labour knows well what he is able to do and what he is not able to do, that he made no promise that legislation would be passed; he made no promise that he would pursue legislation. He discussed various means of dealing with this question with various people which is exactly what the Member for Fort Garry says that he should be doing. And the honourable member cannot, Mr. Speaker — because it doesn't exist — substantiate with any evidence whatsoever that the government made an undertaking that certain legislation would be passed with regard to the question of overtime employment.

That brings us to the issue, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were talking about politics and why you do certain things politically and why you do not do them; and I said that certain things you do not do. But, Mr. Speaker, when I said that I didn't say that you are taking a higher position than the seeking of votes, I said that you do not do certain things because it won't get you votes, it'll lose you votes. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it'll lose those people votes who think that they are making a political issue out of, let us say, Manitoba's position in the State of North Dakota, that those people who want to make a political position as to how their government is behaving in that circumstance, those who do it will lose votes and the reason that I wouldn't do it is that I don't want to lose votes, and those who want to do it I welcome it, Mr. Speaker. They have not got any votes from it at all and I suggest to you that they are losing votes.

The Member for Fort Garry says that the reason that he is not doing certain things about this dispute is that he is higher than politics, and although he could bring this government down in a day if he did these things he will refrain from doing them because he is above politics, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the Member for Fort Garry that the reason that he does not do those things — and he knows the reason that he doesn't do those things — is that he will lose votes, not that he will gain votes if he does those things. Because if he could do it, Mr. Speaker, the notion that he is permitting this government to exist one day longer than it would exist if he had the power to stop it is ridiculous to every member on that side of the House. It's just not possible and he's right, it will lose him votes to try to make an issue out of it in a way which would suggest that this government, Mr. Speaker — and the interesting thing is — has handled it in every way with respect to the collective bargaining area, that he can't find any fault with it; and that really he is trying to embarrass us not in the eyes of the general public but in the eyes of some whom he thinks could cause perhaps dissension in here, not with regard to the populace of the province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it would take me 40 minutes if I wanted to make a speech about dissension in the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba. I appreciate that my honourable friend would like me to get on that issue but I will not accommodate him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will merely indicate to the honourable member — he says don't go into history but he goes and I'm willing to go, he says that in 1969 people took a position *vis-a-vis* the Churchill River Diversion in order to make political mileage of it and they appeared at hearings, and they made a lot of noise. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should remember that I didn't appear at those hearings until the Member for Lakeside said: "It doesn't matter what happens at those hearings, I'm going to decide in any event to proceed with the Churchill River Diversion."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when I appeared at those hearings I appeared on one issue only, on what a hearing meant. I said, "If you are to have hearings they have to be hearings where what takes place at the hearings can affect the decision." If you are going to fraudulently tell people that you are holding hearings and that the hearings are merely a *facade* and a smokescreen and window-dressing, then you are going to create the worst feelings amongst those people who you have defrauded and you are going to cause a great deal of trouble in the Province of Manitoba.

The hearings are on the record. What is there is written down. I suggest to you that that's why I appeared at those hearings and, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I wouldn't appear on the issue of the diversion itself — and then Mr. Borowski appeared, by the way he was not an MLA, he was running for election in Thompson and he didn't win the election because he spoke on those hearings — and the honourable member knows it — he won because the Member for Thompson, a member of the Conservative administration had resigned his seat — the Member for Churchill — in protest of just what the government was doing in the north. That's why we won the election, not because Joe Borowski appeared at those hearings; because the real opportunist says, "They always were."

Who were at those hearings were those people over there. You will remember the Leader of the

Liberal Party being at those hearings every day shouting from the floor, hollering about what witnesses were saying, and did he make political capital out of that? Mr. Speaker, within 35 days of those hearings there were four elections in the Province of Manitoba and to get to the proof of what I am saying about how you lose votes — not gain votes — the Liberal Party lost in every by-election that was held including one which was their own seat, including two which they should have had a pretty good chance in, and the fourth in northern Manitoba — Mr. Speaker, I can't say they lost that one. Do you know what happened in that one? The candidate was so sure that he was going to lose that he didn't file his nomination papers on time' and he wasn't in the race. That's what happened. And the Leader of the Liberal Party who decided that that was the way to make political mileage resigned immediately after those by-elections were held because he had realized that what he had done did not commend itself to the people of Manitoba.

So don't say, Mr. Speaker, we did not on the Churchill River diversion, the member knows full well that we never took a position that that diversion should not be proceeded with; we never took a position as did the Liberal Party without having read one report, even a one-week report, that D. L. Campbell now criticizes Cass-Beggs — that Bobby Bend without any kind of evidence, without looking at any material, decided without having the hydro experts available, that he was going to proceed with what? A low diversion of the Churchill River and Lake Winnipeg Regulation, without any evidence whatsoever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we said is that: We do not have the answers from this government. We know that they said that they're going to have a hearing to determine what to do. We know that in the middle of the hearing they decided that they would not pay any attention to what it said, and we know that when we got into the House they asked us to act as the administration of this province in approving a bill on which they would give us no information. Now, Mr. Speaker, that we will take political advantage of, as well we should. Any opposition that did not under those circumstances challenge what the government was doing would not be an opposition that was serving the people of the Province of Manitoba. But those who think — and there are those in this House who have proceeded in this way — that the obtaining of a particular vituperative headline at a particular time when feelings are high and appealing to sort of a mob position that there is political mileage in that kind of operation should learn the lesson of history, Mr. Speaker.

In 1970 the Liberal government enacted The War Measures Act by regulation and then took it to the House. At the time that they did it, Mr. Speaker, they claimed that there was total support across this country and that they had universal approval for what they were doing in the Province of Quebec and in the rest of the provinces in Canada, and indeed on the moment it looked like the wise political thing to do. One party in the House opposed it. And that's why I said, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes leadership is being able to stand-up for a position when there's all kinds of hysteria against that position. In the very next election the Liberals went down to 109 seats in the House, the New Democrats which were the only party that opposed the legislation went from 20 seats to 31 seats, and Bob Stanfield, to his credit, says that the one moment of his political life that he regrets the most is that he did not have the courage to stand up with Tommy Douglas and oppose the War Measures Act. That's what he said.

So I do not go with my honourable friend. I think that he's a lot smarter than he's letting us on to believe. I don't think that he's not dealing with this matter in what he says is a slashing political way because he is more interested in solving the problems than getting rid of this government. I believe that the reason that he has behaved the way he did, which essentially in all its salient points, is to confirm what this government is doing is correct, and that adopting suggestions that there be either government intervention to solve this strike or legislation which immediately rectifies this matter, but merely that the government should try to meet with the parties, which I know that the Minister of Labour has done, and if he saw any validity to it will continue to do, and that's essentially the suggestion that the honourable member is making, and that's essentially what this government has done. And we will do it, and have done it, in the face of some pretty irrational criticisms to the contrary which people say may put us into political difficulty. I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. If there's anything I don't do, it's to take a position which is above politics in order to lose votes and get diselected. I happen to think, Mr. Speaker, that the best position is the right position and that the right position is the best political position every time and therefore there is no need to look around and find out what happens to be getting approval, at one moment or another, from a particular place.

Now what is this question of overtime that someone said referred to slavery. And that's entirely aside from the strike because the Honourable Member for Fort Garry should know, and I have said in this House, it's the lesson of history, that not every industrial dispute will be settled. That some will never be settled. That in some cases the employees will suffer, in some cases the employer will suffer, in some cases both will suffer. But to undo that system which permits the freedom on both sides to determine the issue means that eventually they all will suffer and more often than if you permit the system to stay entrenched. And I believe that the Member for Fort Garry agrees with that. I really believe that he does. So then let's discuss the issue of overtime. Mr. Speaker, overtime in this

jurisdiction, as I understand it, and in most other jurisdictions, means and has always meant only one thing: That an employer and an employee will come to agreement as to the number of hours worked and anything over forty will be paid at premium time, or when it was forty-four, will be paid at premium time. That the notion that there is compulsory overtime in the Province of Manitoba is false. That it is much more likely that without any other agreement, and I say more likely that in the absence of agreement to the contrary, that overtime over forty hours is voluntary throughout the Province of Manitoba is now the law. As a matter of fact, the workers at Griffin Steel got a decision to that effect. So forty hours is now the normal work week and anything beyond that is something that is either voluntary or is the result of a separate agreement between the employer and the employee.

Now the real question here is whether you are going to prohibit such an agreement because overtime differs from minimum wages, Mr. Speaker. Under minimum wages neither the employer nor the employee is entitled to make a separate agreement regarding minimum wages. They can't work for less and the employer can't pay less. It would be an offence under the Statute. The same thing is true, Mr. Speaker, with the rate of time-and-a-half for overtime. There can be no separate agreement that one will work overtime for time-and-a-quarter. You must not work for less than time-and-a-half. It's an offence on the part of the employee. It's an offence on the part of the employer and a separate agreement is contrary to the law. And that is the case with those minimum standards. It has never been the case with overtime. As to whether it should or should not be the case is something that one may consider but let nobody suggest that it has been the case, or that it is now compulsory overtime in the province of Manitoba. The law in the province of Manitoba at the present time, which seems to accommodate the large number of employers and employees, is that forty hours is the normal work week and that anything beyond that they will work by agreement between themselves. Some have agreed to guarantee to their employer a certain measure of work beyond forty hours. Others have not. And, Mr. Speaker, anybody who calls that slavery doesn't understand what is the essential element of slavery. The essential element of slavery is that a relationship between an employer, on the one side, and an employee, on the other side, will have the enforcement of the state of law. And that they will be kept together at the force of the state. There is nothing in the overtime relationship which requires the employee to work for certain conditions or which requires the employer to abandon his request that they work and try to get an agreement to that effect.

Now I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that that's the right position. What I do know is that it is entirely in accord with what I know from the trade union movement to be the meaning of free collective bargaining, that some people have bargained for more, some people have bargained for less. I further know, Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to make this a prediction, that in areas where it is not specific and an employee is asked to work more than forty hours he can refuse to do so and that the chances are that he will be upheld by an arbitration board. That's what happened in Griffin Steel.

The next question is, should we prohibit working over forty hours? Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the trade union movement would never permit us to forbid it because the overtime hours are sometimes some of the best hours. So we are in a dilemma, Mr. Speaker, the overtime hours are desired. There has to be some understanding, and I suggest that there is, despite what some people in this House have said, that an employer can't work somebody twenty-four hours a day. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case, that the employer cannot, if he is a party to a collective agreement, work an employee unreasonably; that an employee could even not work the first four hours, if he has reasonable cause for so doing, and that after eight hours he would have a good case before an arbitration board, as he did in Griffin Steel.

So we are left, Mr. Speaker, with one problem. And honourable members should be aware of it. Should there be, in the province of Manitoba, and it won't decide this strike . . . Should there be in the province of Manitoba a law which prohibits an employer and an employee from agreeing that more overtime will be worked? Because without such a law the notion of voluntary overtime is just not practical, for 70 percent of the workers who are unorganized. If an agreement is permitted then the person who doesn't agree . . . There is no security for a non-organized worker. His employer can give him notice and, in a week's time, he's no longer working. Where a collective agreement is in force, Mr. Speaker, where a collective agreement is in force, unless you prohibit overtime after forty hours and make a law against it, you are stuck to the position, Mr. Speaker, . . . I'll be through in two minutes. I wonder if my honourable friends will give me two minutes. In the case where agreement is permitted, the employer can always take the position that he will not employ, or sign a collective agreement, unless such a provision is there. And, Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to go to strike on that issue, he could go to strike on it and nothing in the Province of Manitoba's laws requires an employer to enter into a collective agreement with anybody.

So we're back to the same thing, Mr. Speaker. And those people who say that this is a simple issue and that one can only have one view of it, or if he has another view it must demonstrate that he is against a particular union, merely have not examined or understood the issue. Because people who say that, they themselves have collective agreements with their employers which have extended

overtime in them. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the best way of settling this, despite the hysteria of the moment, freedom works best. Freedom works best especially in the area of labour relations. Do not interfere with the freedom of either side. If there has to be some law *vis-a-vis* the understanding of extended hours of overtime, and I am not convinced that there need be, but if there has to be it must be a law which protects both the interests of the employer and the interests of the employee and not a law which permits the employee to use a voluntary position as a means of interfering with the bargaining relationship that exists after a collective agreement has been signed. We are prepared to look at that type of thing, Mr. Speaker, but let nobody be deluded that it will solve the existing, or any future, industrial dispute in the province of Manitoba. Such disputes will occur as they must occur if you are to maintain a free society.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is to go into Committee of Supply.

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 - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I would refer honourable members to page 22, resolution 51, section (n) Bureau de l'Éducation Française: (1) Salaries \$454,400. Passed? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, at the hour of adjournment on Tuesday, I had asked for certain information relating to the amounts receivable from Ottawa for the Bureau Française and the Minister had indicated that he could get me this information in order that I could proceed with one or two other questions relating in that area. But first, Mr. Chairman, I might remind the Minister of an earlier question which he also took as notice and agreed that he would have some information. And that was the question relating to the number of new courses and programs of instruction that had been written by the staff of the Bureau since April 1st, 1974.

My question, specifically, was how many new courses had been written since that date?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased to return to the tranquil debate on education, after the last few days devoted to other matters during this time. The Member for Brandon is quite correct in reminding me of my undertaking to provide him with additional information.

I want to say to him that, in regard to the last point that he raised, that the Bureau of French Education has made a number of efforts in the last while to develop a program for children in our province whose parents are interested in exercising their rights under Bill No. 113. The major efforts since 1976 have been in immersion French as a second language in kindergarten and in grade one, grammar in grades seven, eight, and nine, social sciences in grades one to six. Since 1974 the Bureau of French Education has placed more emphasis on working with teachers at the local level in dealing with problems encountered in the application of the programs of study. Through teacher in-services offered mostly at the school or divisional levels, efforts are being made to equip teachers with that which is necessary to meet the needs of their students.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasise that the point here, that I am making, really relates to the question raised by, I believe, the Member for Brandon West, about whether the Bureau is continuing the policy, carrying out the policy, of the department with regard to decentralization. In this regard, clearly, the Bureau is doing just that. Through these teacher in-services, at divisional levels, and through the work that it's doing in developing courses, it is carrying out that policy.

The new programs of study in the public schools between 1974 and 1976 are as follows. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and the Member for Brandon West, other members interested in this debate and those in the gallery whose language I may not know well, will forgive me. Because the school system that I attended when I was in school was so bad in its teaching of French that although I studied French for many years, in the way they taught it then, I never did learn to speak the language well. I studied French from grade seven through twelve, through First and Second year University and through my Masters course in terms of becoming proficient in reading the language in order to get a Masters degree in Political Science.

However, if I make errors in pronunciation in French I hope that all will forgive me. I do not blame the school system of the day, of course, totally although it was partly responsible. These new programs of study in the year 1974-76 are: English, Grades 7, 8 and 9, three; English, Grades 10, 11 and 12, three; Arts, that is Drawing, Grades 7, 8 and 9, three; Arts, Grades 10, 11 and 12, three. Dramatic Arts 305.

Course No. 1, Typing —I will not attempt to pronounce that in French—that is Typing 102, one; a Guide for Physical Education in Grades 4, 5 and 6, three; Française 1 to 6—this is really a skills list—one; Française 305, one; Française Supplement, Kindergarten, Grades 1 and 2, one; Française Supplement, Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, one; Française Supplement, Grades 7 to 12, one; Mathematics, 7, 8, 9, three; Mathematics 101, one; Mathematics 100, one; Mathematics 200, one; Mathematics 300, one;

Music Supplement, Singing, one; Science, Grade 5, one; Science, Grade 6, one; Science Grade 7, 8, and 9, three.

Introduction to Physical Sciences, one; Biology 201 to 301, two; Biology 200, 300, —this is modern biology, I'm not sure what the difference is between modern biology and old biology— two; Biology 200, 300, two; Chemistry 200, 300, two; Physics 200, 300, two.

Social Sciences, one; aptitudes, one; Social Sciences 1 to 6, in terms of completion of text material, one; Social Sciences History and Geography 7, Course, one; Social Sciences History and Geography, Grade 8, one; Social Sciences History and Geography, Grade 9, one; Social Sciences, Grades 7, 8 and 9, Supplement to program, one.

Canadian Problems, Grade 10, 11, and 12, —with emphasis on Canadian content— one; Social Sciences 200; History of Canada, one; Initiation a la Politique Canadienne 200 Supplement, one; Human Geography 300, one; Social Sciences 300, one; Social Sciences . . . tables Kindergarten to Grade 6, one. Total Courses, 59, in the years that the member asked for this information to be provided.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, that is a significant amount of work and I commend staff of BEF and others involved in completing it. The others involved of course, I believe, being teachers in the field because BEF does work in a decentralized way with individuals in the field. I think the Member for Brandon West would agree, it's an impressive list.

Now, the member wanted me to give him an accounting reconciliation of various things. The other night, or day, whenever it was we were discussing my Estimates last on this appropriation, I did not make a point of order in terms of trying to limit the debate to the appropriation immediately before us, believing as I do that freewheeling debate is the best that can occur here; however I think for purposes of clarification, not only the clarification of the Member for Brandon West but for my own, that today, Mr. Chairman, we should try to keep this discussion limited to the resolution now before us which is 51(4)(n).

The figure shown there in terms of Recoverable from Canada is \$872,500. This is made up — I think he wanted the reconciliation from last year — Recoverable from Canada last year, '76-'77 total \$418,900. Of that amount last year we had additional recoveries for 1977-78, additional recoveries over the previous year of \$146,600 plus the \$307,000 I mentioned when we last were on this item, making a total of \$453,600. If he adds the two together the \$418,900 and the \$453,600 he will come to this year's recoverable figure of \$872,500. That is the amount recoverable for the operations of BEF and for the annexes which I listed for the Member for Brandon West the last time we discussed it. I believe those answers deal with the question that the member had.

Now I point out to him that there are other recoveries under the Grants portion of the program and I would like, Mr. Chairman, to reserve debate on that portion until we get to that appropriation. I think the Member for Brandon West knows the appropriation I'm referring to. It is Appropriation 53(a). In there we have \$167 million and of that amount a sum is for Grants, for Bilingual or Française Immersion Education and for French Conversation Courses as we call it. To attempt to bring the two together now would not only be out of order, Mr. Chairman, but I think it would lead to lack of clarity and understanding what the recoveries are for different portions of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n) The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the list of the programs he has given me. I am dealing with the earlier question first. That is an impressive list and I just wanted to confirm, Mr. Chairman, that these were new courses and programs that had been written by BEF. The question was placed in that way and I would just want to insure that he is not giving me a list of new courses which may have been obtained from some other area but he has given me a list which consists completely and solely of those courses which have been written by the staff of BEF.

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, these are courses which the staff of BEF involving teachers in the field have prepared; they have initiated and revised and prepared and, I gather, implemented as well; is the total number of courses that the staff have been involved in in this period of time. Now, I hope we are not going to get into a debate on copyright as to who began a particular idea or scheme in a particular course. I don't think that really is the intention of the Member for Brandon West but I'm told these are courses prepared, reviewed, initiated, implemented by BEF in co-operation with teaching staff.

MR. MCGILL: Well really the point of difference there, Mr. Chairman, was the Minister used all the words except "written." Were they authored by staff members of BEF as opposed to courses which may have been obtained from other jurisdictions and might have been and reworded? amended .

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the point the member is getting at, I assume, is that before BEF was formally established was there any work done on these courses before that time. May I clarify his question for him? Is that what he means?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about since April 1974.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, in education nothing is cut and dried. Things never stay the same. Some of these courses have been initiated before perhaps the precise date that the member asked for but they have all been worked on — written is the term he is seeking — written by members

of BEF and the teachers in the field. And as I say they have been reviewed, they have been modified, they have been implemented, they have been prepared, whatever term he wants to use. It's the work of the department and the teachers in the field.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, proceeding to the question of the total amount of money — I think the question that I left with the Minister and for which he was, at that time, agreeable to obtaining an answer for me, was: What was the total amount of money received from Ottawa or receivable for the 1976-77 fiscal year and that related to the fiscal arrangements on the federal Minority and Second Language program in Manitoba. So what I was asking for was how much money came to the Department of Education. Some of it may certainly be paid to divisions and some go to BEF for their work but I was wanting to know what kind of a total fund we were having to work with in this area and then from then I was leading into the other questions which the House Leader asked me about and I said, yes, I have some questions which relate to the answer of that question. So I was under the impression that the Minister was able to provide that answer.

He has given me a rework on the question that we asked right at the beginning of our BEF debate and I accept those figures. But on the Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for not revealing the total federal appropriation for French and second language programs at this time so that we can consider the amount that is being administered by BEF and so on.

MR. TURNBULL: It's just that we are going to have a repetition in debate, Mr. Chairman. We are going to go from here to the appropriation of grants and we are going to have another debate and similar questions.

If we take the total amount of money, that is the \$872,000 that I mentioned to him I can reveal to him the figure, if he wants me to reveal it to him, and I will. But I want you to know, Sir, that we're not in order. \$872,000 was the figure that I gave him as recoverable from Canada for the operations of BEF under Resolution 51(4N). That's in that appropriation there.

In the grants' package, recoverable on grants, which is Vote 21(3)(a), we have \$1,976,000. — (Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. I think if the Honourable Member for Brandon West can contain himself, we just have one more item in here. The item now that the honourable member is requesting is under Resolution 50 (a), and Other Recoverable from Canada is another figure. I think it will be the next item up and under there he can find out the requirements that he needs. I think that we should stick to the item which is under consideration which is the money that is recoverable from Canada for the operation of the Bureau and the other grants I think you can ask under 50 (a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling in this matter. The questions that I will put then, and I could just give notice to the Minister at this time so that when we get to this next item which should be fairly soon, I would like to know how much for the BEF for administration is taken from this grant, how much goes to the divisions for Française, and how much goes to the divisions for French as a second language, and what is the per-pupil amount received by the divisions for Française students and for FSL students? So Mr. Chairman, those are the questions that I might just give as notice to the Minister that we might be able to deal with at a subsequent time.

Mr. Chairman, let me then ask him too if he could confirm some figures relating to the number of students in these programs. Would he be able to tell me now that there are approximately 11,000 students in the Française area and about 65,000 in French as a second language? Is that about the approximation of the student count in those programs now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder while the Minister is trying to find the answer to the last question, if I could participate in this debate. It is unusual, I guess, for members of the Cabinet to participate too often in the Estimates of other departments but I think it is a well-known fact that I'm quite interested in this particular subject, so I am sure that it will be recognized that I should participate, but only as the Member for St. Boniface, as a member interested in this particular section.

I think that it is very important to deal with the education of French as a teaching language. It was something that took a number of years to come; it is here now. I am very pleased to see how much has changed and the political climate of change. I heard certain statements by the members of the opposition that I welcome. I certainly will not imply any motives to them at all, especially the member who is serving as the Health critic for the opposition. I think his word has always been good, certainly as far as I'm concerned, and as I say, I am pleased to see that these things are changing. I think it's not perfect. I think that we are in a pretty critical position and it might be that the people will have to understand the policy of the government, the policy of the Department of Education a little better, even if it is only to state again to the interpretation of Bill No. 113 or the present legislation that we have.

I would like to go back a bit when this started, where legislation made it possible for French to be used as a teaching language, a language of instruction. That was in 1967 where Bill No. 59 was brought in and that bill allowed the education in French to a maximum of 50 percent. Now the next

point I consider very important if we are going to understand where we're at now. It was an option of the school division. The school division had to agree with the course, had to submit it for the approval of the Minister and the Minister had much power. It was accepted unanimously at the time by the members of this House and I think Dr. Johnson, the then-Minister of Education, brought it in. But it was something that was an option of the school division and it had to be approved by the Cabinet. I would hope — I think that I had some part to play in getting Bill No. 113 ready — the intent was not changed that much. I think that we very much care to preserve the parental rights in education and the right of parents. I would hope and I believe that this is the case. What Bill No. 113 did, Bill No. 113 went a little further. It recognized French as a teaching language on a par with the English language. The only difference was that English as a subject had to be taught from grade 4 on. And I would hope and I would think that maybe the department should consider, the Minister should consider, the possibility of making this really on a par, the two languages on a par with each other, and that is maybe as suggested by some members of the opposition, maybe introduce French as a compulsory language in the schools of Manitoba. I think that this would go a long way in creating this unity and understanding each other better. As a subject, I said.

Bill No. 113, I think, Mr. Chairman, has served us well. It is a fair bill. It allows the use of French as a teaching language in the classes but it goes a little further than Bill No. 59, that it is no longer an option of the division or even of the Minister, it is something that the parents can request, providing of course it is reasonable, and providing of course they're subject to, I think, the Section 258, subsection 8 - 13 or something like that, where it provides that a certain number for each class is necessary before they can open these classes.

That has been going on. There has been an area, maybe a little less certain, who decides on the percentage of French that should be used as a language. The bill states French or English, so if you looked at only the bill you would feel that the 50 percent would be wiped out. But then the regulation changes that because it has recognized the administration of schools and so on. I certainly would like to see the right of parents to determine, providing of course there are not 38 or a hundred different programs or percentage from one percent to a hundred percent. I think it has to be realistic. And of course there's that safeguard that they have to have so many pupils to form a class - so I think there is a safeguard. So therefore I would encourage the parental right, the choice of the parents, without coercion, but I must add / this, that any programs in the Department of Education should be under constant review and evaluation. And it might be that what the courses are set up for might not do the trick and I think that then the department would have to review and to look at the situation, remembering of course that the parents don't necessarily all want the same thing. Some people are satisfied with some knowledge of French where others feel when you're talking about bilingual people and truly bilingual people, they certainly must know how to speak French correctly and that's not that easy in Manitoba with a minority.

I would certainly insist also that the regulations or the laws of Manitoba are made for all Manitobans and I think that is very important. There should be no difference between those whose mother tongue is French or English. That was tried before and to his credit, Dr. Johnson, again reviewed this and changed that and modified that, it didn't work. So therefore there should not be schools just with the idea that if your parents were French, fine, if your parents were English, you go somewhere else. But having said that, I'm not advocating that any group because of little knowledge or no knowledge should pull the other group down, the majority down. So therefore if you're going to have a complete package, I think that you should very much have total immersion schools. I don't know how we look at these immersion schools now. I would see them as such, total immersion schools are where the people enrolling in this would realize and accept that it's just like any one of us, if we really want to learn a language fast, we'll go to Mexico or St. Pierre de Miquelon or somewhere with a family and talk nothing else. And that has to be accepted and all the administration and everything would have to be done in French if we have French total immersion schools. And from there those whose mother tongue was English and so on would be ready to then plug in or transfer to the mainstream of education, either 100 percent French, as much as the bill allows, Bill No. 113 allows, or if they are satisfied with 50 percent or if they want to go to an English school - I'm talking predominantly of English students now - and take French, well this would be their right. But I think that your whole program is not complete if you haven't got these total immersion schools. If you make no difference, the laws are for everybody but if you don't provide means for these people to go ahead in most cases, as I say, where the parents are English, to take these courses that should be offered for all Manitobans

There has been the this question of that, "Well, what is the best. Is it 100 percent or 50 percent?" Well, I'm certainly not an educator or an expert but I have no hesitation at all to say that in Manitoba here when we have a minority the way we have where very few families will speak French to their children at all times, you're working in an English media, the working language is English, the language in this House is English, the language of the courts is English, the newspaper, the television, the radio (although you have some French ones) I don't think there is any chance

that the people, no matter what course they take, will not be able to learn English properly. I think there is enough safeguard in there.

I think, and after all this is what we meant by Bill No. 113 and this was approved unanimously by the members of this House, I think we if really meant that we were going to make French a teaching language on a par with English that we must have these French schools. We must encourage that. The people of Manitoba must know what we mean. There has got to be less bickering between the groups and so on because we should come out clearly and state it.

I'm not blaming anybody. The bill was clear as far as classes were concerned, but not schools. That must be left to the school division with some flexibility. There is no doubt because they are building the schools, unless the government wants to set up some designated schools and that would cause problems. But I think and I would hope, through you to the Minister, that the Minister would make it quite clear to the school division that this is the intent, that whenever there are enough classes, because according to the bill the parents are the only one that decide, when there are enough classes in a program to justify these schools, well then, the school division should do everything possible to provide these schools. Now there has to be some flexibility, as I say. There is a school in St. Vital that works quite well. It is an English school and a French school separated by a gym. That might be the best place. The busing is easier. In another place it's more difficult.

The danger right now that we are facing is that the department might say that it is up to the school division, it is up to the boards to decide. I don't think that's good enough. I think that we have to bend over backwards to make sure that some of these schools, some of these French schools — when I say French schools, I'm talking about where everything is in French except English as a teaching language, where the ambience and the administration and so on French — I think that nothing should stand in the way of the Minister and the department and of course the school division. We should bend over backwards if need be. We should work, we should be ready, although as I say it is the responsibility of school division, but the government should work hand-in-hand with these divisions to try to help them solve some of these problems.

I happened to read the Globe and Mail today and they had the same situation in Ontario and again unanimously the House approved the decision of the Government of Ontario, where the Minister apologized in a way for interfering, if it was considered interfering, but he felt that this was needed and they were going to bring legislation to see that these schools would be open.

So again I say that I believe in parental rights. And the only thing that would stop it, if there's not enough people, fine. Well, if the people don't want it, fine. I don't think it is the role of the government to promote. I think it is the role of the government who had made certain legislation to make possible full usage of what is allowed under Bill No. 113.

I think that the BEF, we're talking about the BEF here, that is another story, of course they're not Legislature, they're civil servants. I don't think that they should set up the policies but there is no doubt in my mind that as experts, as educators and so on, especially when they're asked and so on, that they should give the right advice. And if they feel that this is the best course to provide true bilingualism and knowledge of the French language, well then they should say it without fear. I think of course that because the school division are responsible for the course, if the school division wants different programs completely in French, well then the BEF should respond, it should prepare these courses. And if their courses are a maximum of 50 percent in French, well then again, BEF should do everything possible to provide this information.

Now we have in certain areas — in my constituency it's a difficult situation, because you have had people who have had three years' headstart who have, satisfied with Bill No. 59, are using French as a teaching language to a maximum of 50 percent of the time. They have their schools and so on. And then there's the other group who came later who want to take full advantage of Bill No. 113. And as I say to the Minister, I would like to advise the Minister for what it's worth through you, Mr. Chairman, that I would hope that we do everything possible to make these schools because the bill doesn't talk about those schools and it is a waste of time. We must go a little further now. If we just worry about classrooms, we've passed that point, I think we've got to do everything possible to provide these French schools here in Manitoba when there is a need and a request.

Now there has to be flexibility. The bill provides for more than one school division to get together to help each other to offer certain courses for two divisions or more and I think that should be looked into also, Mr. Chairman.

I think my time is practically up. I would hope that we will respect the right of the parent and also to make it possible to really exercise the right guaranteed under Bill No. 113 and as I say, I hope the Minister will make the position sometime somewhere during the session or some other time to clarify what he feels his understanding is of Bill No. 113. And as I say, the last thing that I think very important is that we must bend over backwards if need be to provide when there is a need a school where French will be used at all times. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51 (n)(1). The Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West did want some additional information. He does ask the most detailed questions and doesn't give me a chance to make any fiery speeches as I did last night. It's just as well because I don't think my fists can take any more table pounding as it happened last night. You wanted, the Member for Brandon West, some total students involved in programs and I do have that.

For the benefit of the Member for Brandon West, I will do it this way. I will give him the division school in the left-hand column, in the second column what is referred to as the français program, in the third column what is referred to as the immersion program, and then the total.

Under column number one, Winnipeg School Division No. 1, no français; under immersion, 645, for a total of 645. St. Boniface No. 4, français, 2,129; immersion, 238, for a total of 2,367. St. Vital No. 6, under the second column, 419; under the third column, 64, for a total of 483. Norwood No. 8, under the second column, 630; under the third column, 32, for a total of 662. Transcona No. 12, under the second column, 0; under the third column, 195, total of 195. Agassiz School Division, second column 149; third column, 0; total of 149. Seine River, second column, 1,864; third column, 20, for a total of 1,884. Red River, in the second column, 1,385; in the third column, 0, for a total of the same. Turtle River, in the second column, 236; 0 in the third, for a total of the same. Birdtail, in the first column, 230; in the third column, 0, for a total of 230. White Horse Plains, in the second column, 760; third column, 0, for a total of 760. Mountain School Division, second column 1,028; third column, 0, for a total of 1,028. Brandon, second column, 0; third column, 69; total the same. Turtle Mountain, second column, 14; third column, 0, for a total of 14. That gives us a total in the second column of 8,884; in the third column, 1,263; and in the fourth column, 10,107.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51 (n)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the detailed answer was really more than I had asked for. I asked to confirm roughly the totals that I had suggested as being correct, that is, about 11,000, and I see they are not too far out on the français. But how many students are taking French as a second language? I don't think we really got that figure.

MR. TURNBULL: Oh, in fact I could read out all the numbers in every school division for the Member for Brandon West. The total in French conversation courses is 84,552.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I was rather hoping the Minister might comment on the remarks of the Minister of Health which I thought were thoughtful and very sincere on this subject and I would like to pursue some of the areas in which the Minister was giving some opinions — that is, the Minister of Health. He mentioned the various programs and the percentages of the français programs. I believe that there are two français programs, A and B. There may be more, but program A I think is 90 percent French and 10 percent English. And there is a B program, perhaps it has about 50-50. And there may be shades of variations of percentages in between, but my question to the Minister would be arising out of that, the observations of the Minister of Health. Does the Minister approve of the use of the A program only in a school, that is, the 90 percent French and 10 percent English?

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I have something of the same nature of questions for the Minister of Education based upon the comments made by the Member for St. Boniface and going back to the discussion we had on Tuesday evening, I believe it was. The Minister at that time announced to this House that he was preparing a draft paper on the use of French language in the schools and announced, I think, in a somewhat pre-emptory tone, at least to me, that I could — I think it was damn well wait until the draft paper was ready before those questions would be answered. I think that was about the tone that it was so expressed. I am wondering in regard to that, taking into account some of the presentation made by the Member for St. Boniface, if the Minister might elaborate on that draft paper. I would be interested in knowing if and how the consultation is going on with those school divisions which presently have French programs with them, whether the Minister is specifically meeting with superintendents, school boards, to discuss what that draft paper might contain. I say it for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that subsequent to the discussion we had Tuesday night, speaking with some of those involved in school divisions where there are fairly major French programs, they indicate a degree of frustration at being unable to gain from the Minister, including the new Minister, not just the old one, and his department, any clear guidelines or indication from that department as to how they should proceed. Someone commented to me that programs follow grants or programs follow money and that when it has been requested from the Department of Education as to what recommendation or direction should be pursued by school divisions, that the answer has been basically, "It's your problem - you figure it out." And it seems to me that, Mr. Chairman, again in this context where there are a number of the important questions raised and well-put by the Member for St. Boniface that that isn't sufficient and if in the course of developing his draft paper, which is probably a proper way to proceed, whether there shouldn't be some interim steps being taken to ensure that there isn't increasing confusion in the field, and

Secondly, is that that draft paper is being prepared, that it's being done, with a fair degree of involvement of those who are directly concerned and have very strong interests in the pursuance of

Thursday, March 10, 1977

French language instruction. So I wonder if the Minister could comment on those aspects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's approximately 4:30.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I believe 4:29.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister can make his reply in one minute. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the process of consultation has indeed gone on, not only with staff and individuals in the field in school divisions, but also between staff and groups interested in this particular area of education. Consultation has gone on between myself and those same groups and indeed there has been consultation provided between me and the Advisory Committee established by statute. So the consultative process has been undertaken and the draft paper when I have it ready will be certainly circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19 (2) of our House Rules I'm interrupting proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour, and shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The first item Thursday is Public Bills by Private Members. We have one. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, Bill No. 9.

MR. BARROW: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. We go on to Resolutions, Private Members.

RESOLUTIONS

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge: WHEREAS the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation purchases land from farmers, and WHEREAS the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation leases this land to qualifying farmers, and

WHEREAS a lessee or a lessor can terminate the lease at any time giving due notice, and WHEREAS the leasing of land from Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is subject to certain conditions, and

WHEREAS a lessee has the option to buy this land at any time after five years of leasing, and WHEREAS many farmers are understandably apprehensive about making improvements on rented land,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of amending the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation's Land Lease Program to allow the farmer to purchase the land at any time after one year of leasing, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House recommend that any municipal taxes lost as a result of the land purchase activity of the Corporation in the municipality, be made up by a grant in lieu of these taxes.

MATTER OF PROCEDURE

MR. SPEAKER: I have a matter of procedure before we proceed on this particular resolution.

I understand that there has been some assurance given because it was mentioned in the Throne Speech that this matter would be coming forward in the form of a bill. Now, I don't know what further discussion the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has had in this respect, but I am aware that it has been stated publicly by the Honourable Minister during the Debate on the Estimates, and in view of that I just wanted him to reconsider whether he really wants to proceed on this debate or whether we should have a further discussion on whether it's admissible as part of our procedure. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if I can speak to the Point of Order that you perhaps have raised without stating it. I've perused the Throne Speech and there's no mention that I can see that would indicate that the government was talking about this particular measure at all.

The second point is, and again I'm willing to accept your judgment, but this would mean a precedent will be set that any Minister anytime during the session can make an announcement of policy and that means then that a resolution be ruled Out of Order, and I wonder if that's the way we intend it to happen. Previously to this it was my understanding that any program that was mentioned in the Throne Speech and a Private Members' resolution was introduced indicating a similar action or program, then naturally that would be ruled Out of Order.

But it's unusual I think for a Minister to be able to make an announcement in Estimates that wasn't in the Throne Speech and that be taken as having been in the

Throne Speech. But I'd take your ruling on this.

MR. SPEAKER: If there's no further debate I would just . . . The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HONOURABLE J.R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Minister responsible for this particular thing is not in the House at this present time; but I am totally unaware of any government objection that it does impinge upon a bill to be presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment. I don't think the action taken by the government was included in the Throne Speech but was action that has been announced in the Estimates of Supply. However, the action taken only affects one-half of the resolution. The second half of the resolution deals with a fairly major question, that of grants in lieu of taxes.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair has no problem in accepting the resolution. The only thing was, that for the expeditious procedure of the House we shouldn't be debating the same issues twice.

The particular aspect is mentioned very vaguely in the Throne Speech, so therefore I was prepared to allow it. But I was also informed that a commitment had been given during the Estimates, and that's the only reason I brought up the subject. Now if the House is prepared to proceed with it, so am I; I have no problem. The Honourable Member for Morris wish to contribute?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the point that was made by the Member for Portage seemed to imply that simply because an announcement is made in the Committee of Supply, that would not be the same as mentioned in the Throne Speech. The fact is, that the announcement was made, and the very purpose for which the resolution is intended has now been achieved except for, as pointed out by the Member for Riel, the second portion of the resolution which, as near as I can make out in reading over the statement of the Minister, is not included.

I have no strong feelings one way or the other. If the Honourable Member for Portage wants to proceed with this resolution, to deal with the second part, then I feel that the House should give him permission to do so. But it seems that the first point that he raises in the resolution is redundant at this stage, because it's already been achieved, and indeed already has been at least partly debated in Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Just to shed some further light on the subject, Mr. Speaker, the second part of the resolution I don't believe has ever been in any contention at all because the subject matter has always been the case of — yes, I know I'm getting into the resolution — but the fact of the matter is, every member that spoke or got up to contribute something about whether the resolution or the matter is redundant or not, the second part is as well because I believe the subject matter has always been the fact in every case that there has been no loss of taxes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Minister has just indicated the difficulty of trying to deal with it on a point of order on the basis of whether or not it has been achieved. :

We have no objection to proceeding with the resolution, Mr. Speaker. So it could be recorded that it was done by consent if that's necessary, so that would prevent a precedent being established one way or the other; and if Your Honour is concerned that the House is doing something which you as Speaker would not normally permit, then I would think that we, raising no objection, would not preclude you making whatever ruling you felt disposed to make at another time. But we have no objection to proceeding with it as it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, since I'm at the disposal of the House moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the resolution as read. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

RESOLUTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief because it has been stated that the Minister of Agriculture has stated as a matter of policy under Estimates that he intends to carry out the intent of the first half of the resolution.

But if one considers the background and the history of the government proposal where they went into the land purchasing activity — farmland activity — in order to re-

lease the land out to farmers who qualified, and one of the initial regulations was that that farmer had to keep the land for five years before he could attempt to buy it.

Now last year I had a similar resolution before this House and there was a great deal of debate on all sides of the House - I thought about it but it wasn't that important to dig out Hansards and record the words of the members who violently opposed this on the government side of the House — and they had all kinds of reasons: that it was playing into the hands of real estate agents and bankers; that they didn't want to have a real estate company on their hands where the farmer would qualify one year for leasing and the following year perhaps be buying it. It seems rather strange now that all those reasons don't mean anything any more, they're not valid now, and I suppose they're not valid because the government was listening to what people were saying; that it should be just as easily available to buy the land after the first year as it is after the fifth or the tenth year, whatever.

So I'm glad to see that the government took some advice from my resolution last year. I hear a voice behind me saying: "And the Conservative Party."

It seems to me I recall the spokesman — I always thought he was the agricultural spokesman for the Conservative Party — stand up on this resolution and say they wanted nothing to do with it. They wanted nothing to do with it; they weren't going to support it; and he was quite indignant to even think that there'd be any support in the Conservative benches for this resolution.

But as I recall, I think common sense prevailed in the end and the Conservative members voted for this resolution, am I not correct in that, Mr. Speaker?

But I am amused to see that at a nominating convention a few days ago Mr. Lyon said that "This was Conservative policy." Well, I'm glad to see he's converted his members in the short time he's been the leader because the members on his side got up and made many speeches condemning the programs saying that it was no good, the government shouldn't be in that type of a procedure whatsoever.

I'm glad to see that the Leader of the Official Opposition has realized that there is some merit in the program and he's now calling it a Conservative policy, and I welcome his support in this regard.

As far as the second half of the resolution goes with respect to the taxation, I agree with the Minister for Municipal Affairs that this problem is being resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments after listening to the Member for Portage on this particular resolution. While some say because the government has now seen fit after five years of putting this policy that they initiated at that time to a test, I want to say on behalf of my colleagues that we never were in favour of that policy from Day One, not even one year let alone five years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EINARSON: So, Mr. Speaker, I can recall on the agricultural committee going around the province several years ago, and the question was asked and posed of many farmers how they felt about the government getting into the business of buying up farmland. If my memory serves me correctly I think by far the greatest majority said, "In no way do they agree with this government getting into buying up farmland that was of a commercial nature, where commercial farmers would have to lease from the government good cultivated land on which to make a living."

This Minister of Agriculture has so often tried to confuse the issue it was of a commercial nature, where commercial farmers would have to lease from the government good cultivated land on which to make a living. This Minister of Agriculture has so often tried to confuse the issue. When we talk about Crown lands, that is lands that have been under the Crown for all time, land that has reverted to the Crown because it was marginal, probably not the best of land, it was more for grazing than anything else and was reverted back to Crown for several reasons; and then lands that have gone into the Crown in the past five years where they have actually bought up good farm land — those three things have been confused to a great extent insofar as we are concerned on this side, Mr. Speaker.

I want it to be clearly stated for the record that our party never was in favour of the government getting into the business of buying up farm land and leasing it to farmers. And, you know, they were always saying that they were providing a choice or an option for, whether it be young fellows who want to get into the business or whether farmers who probably wanted to rent more land and add to what they already had.

A MEMBER: You know you are wrong now don't you . . . ?

MR. EINARSON: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I have been a farmer all my life and I can speak from personal experience, that I have never yet, nor in the community from where I come, known where anyone — if they wanted to rent land there was usually always land to be rented, farmers were prepared to rent their land. And so I say to this government that is not a valid reason for saying that was why they got into the business of buying up good farm land because it is just not true.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the record, while we welcome the fact that the government has now seen the light and, you know, we are facing an election in the next few months — we are facing an election in the next few months possibly, I would think, Mr. Speaker, unless the First Minister decides to change his mind and allow the time to go on a little longer.

A MEMBER: I hope you go till next year. That's a sure loss for you.

MR. EINARSON: But let it be known, Mr. Speaker, to the farmers of this province, that it is, I think, an election gimmick and nothing else. And we are concerned that if they do become the government again, what will be their actions after they have been returned to office again. I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, I have become very very concerned about this whole thing. They can change things just as easily as they did before, because we used to provide funds for farmers to be able to borrow money at a subsidized interest rate, and particularly those young fellows who were wanting to get into the business. And we didn't have the inflationary situation in those days that we have today. So, it is understandable that for all the more reason farmers are in need of further assistance today than they were say maybe five or ten years ago.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side have advocated very strongly and we criticize very strongly and I think rightfully so, that this government had no business getting into the business of buying up farm land. I want that to be made for the record, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie have a question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the speaker entertain a question? If your group formed the government after the next election, would you dismantle this program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I said to the Member for Portage la Prairie when he was in committee the other night and he got talking about the comments he made, he was reacting towards the Conservative Party far more than he was the NDP Party. I say his question is hypothetical. When the election is over and we become the government, then we will tell him what we will do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Rock Lake — I just can't let that sit because I was involved at the meetings of those committees also, which I thoroughly enjoyed. In fact, during the last election campaign one of the people out in the community sent me a small donation and he said he didn't agree with my politics or the party politics but he thought at least I was one member who had some slight understanding of the problems in the rural area.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, my good friend just demonstrated exactly how you can shape an answer by asking a question because I remember some of the times when my good friend did just ask that question and he knew full well what the response was. Do you want the government involved in buying land? He didn't say, "Do you want the government involved in some way in helping people who wanted to farm become involved in farming?" Because when I asked that question I got a different answer than he did. It is just the way that you frame the questions.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some disagreement. The Leader of the Opposition says it is a step in the right direction, that it is a good program, that it is some way of having people get back on the farm. I can't help but recall the targets for economic development in the province of Manitoba and some of the things that were left on the table when this group formed the government. The predictions were that the number of farmers would decrease and they had programs — they believed in the free enterprise system for sure, but nevertheless it was slanted so that by this time in history, had they pursued that particular course, you know, Brazilian light and power and Ogilvie Oats and all the rest of it, would have had their operation in place in Manitoba. But nevertheless there is some encouragement to see that the Conservatives have finally come to the point where they agree that all of our programs are good programs, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, at least the Opposition and the people of Manitoba

know where we stand as a party in regards to this program. I think that is a bit better than we can say for the PCP Party, where they stand. They are on the fence, it is as simple as that if we listen to the Member for Rock Lake. They don't say "yes," they don't say "no." You know, it's we didn't like the way it was; you accepted criticism and were blamed for that and then if we don't amend certain programs that were started by the previous administration and try to modify them, we're criticized. No matter what we do, we are criticized by that Opposition. What will they do, Mr. Speaker? Will they keep on being on the fence after 1977 or 1990 when they form the government in this province? They believe, Mr. Speaker, that they can be elected to form the administration of this province in 1977 in attacking what they started. Of all things, what they started. This was started by the Conservative Party in this province, in Manitoba, prior to 1969. Do they know that? Does the Member for Rock Lake know that?

A MEMBER: You were a Liberal in 1969.

MR. TOUPIN: I was not a Liberal. Why don't you get up from your seat and say what your policy is? I was never a Liberal, I was never a Conservative. I am not afraid to say what I believe in, Mr. Speaker, but obviously the Leader of the PCP Party can't say what he believes in. All he can say is that he is against things that were started by his party when he was a Minister of the Crown. That is all he can say.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Land Lease Program, we happen to believe that this is an option that should be available to farmers. I happen to represent the constituency of Springfield which is approximately 85 percent composed of farmers. I was born and raised on a farm. I lived on a farm for over twenty years. I used to milk cows, Mr. Speaker, all by hand, eleven cows morning and night. I took raw land with horses — and that's back in the late thirties and the beginning of the forties — and then with an old Case, and developed land. That's not what most of the farmers of this House experienced. I experienced that. Raw land, raw land.

Now, these honourable members, Mr. Speaker, would, according to the few words of the Member for Rock Lake, would not allow farmers to have this option. They would not allow farmers to have this option.

I can bring you, Mr. Speaker, literally dozens of young farmers in Springfield that benefited under this program. We continued and we activated the program that they started prior to 1969, I'd say about 1972. And I can talk about young farmers in Springfield that started to take advantage of this program in 1972, who, whether they liked it or not, couldn't afford to purchase the land that they leased. I happen to believe that some of the comments made by constituents of mine, by people in Manitoba — yes, by members of the Opposition, whether they be Liberals or PCP party supporters — were good and we should have looked at them and we have, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, during his Estimates, tabled a policy, a policy which amends the program, which I happen to believe in.

The second point that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie raises in his resolution is being done now. Can he tell me of any acreage that is owned by the Crown, by the people of Manitoba, that is not paying municipal taxes? To my knowledge there is not one according to what I am told by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Now, those are the points that are discussed in the resolution, the two THEREFORE be it resolved, are dealt with, Mr. Speaker. But we are criticized by the Member for Rock Lake because we accepted suggestions that he, that members of my constituency, that members from this side of the House, had indicated should be done in regards to a modified program of land lease. We have always said, Mr. Speaker, that the Land Lease Program pertaining to land that should be owned by farmers is an additional option. I happen to believe that the modifications made to the policy of the Land Lease Program are good, are better. But I equally happen to believe and I have said this on an ongoing basis, no one can say differently, I have spoken on the Land Lease Program in the House before, and I have always indicated a preference for the land be owned by farmers themselves. I happen to believe in that. I happen to believe in that but yet, if I go back to 1932, when my father started farming, came from the city and had to buy land at then \$6.00 an acre, could not borrow money from the Crown — there was not such an option open to him — couldn't get money from the bank, couldn't get money from credit unions because the credit unions only started in 1938; what was his option, Mr. Speaker? His option was to get land from his father-in-law, repayable over a period of twenty years. We are saying that the Crown is an instrument, like banks, like credit unions, for farmers that are wanting to go back to the land. We are not saying that the farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker, should go from 39,000 to 20,000 by 1980. We are saying that the

young farmers should go back to the land and we should make it more possible for them. We happen to believe in the type of policy that is being implemented here, based on recommendations, yes, because we happen to listen to people in case you don't.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to share a few remarks on this resolution as well, even though most of the items within the particular resolution have been implemented. I believe it is worthwhile to debate this issue and make this issue known and have it brought forward time and time again.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the changes that were announced about ownership of land, the previous agreement was that if one wished to purchase the land he could do so after five years. The change merely is after the first year. The fact of the matter is, if he didn't have the money at the first year, he certainly won't be able to purchase it after five years. It really doesn't change a heck of a lot. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in 1973, in this debate on land lease, was not an issue of ownership. It was an issue of fear, Mr. Speaker. An issue of fear in the last campaign, spread, not only by the debate but by the rumour-mongery put on by the members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. That campaign of fear . . . in fact, when I was in the constituency of Souris-Killarney this last by-election and I spoke to some of the retired farmers who still had some land, who were retired and living in the community of Killarney, you know what they asked me, Mr. Speaker? "You know, we really don't like your policy because we can't sell our land. You're not permitting us to sell our land under your program. That is why we oppose you." That is the kind of campaign of fear that has been spread around this province, Mr. Speaker, not on the issue of whether the public should own and the farmers should have an option in owning and farming their own land.

Now what is their farm policy? The Member for Rock Lake has indicated that they would have a policy of loaning money, loans to farmers, and they will own their own land. Mr. Speaker, that policy is really a reflection of the previous policy of CFI because regardless of the financial backup of a farmer, even if he has no means of repayment, no way of being able to repay them, they would pour that money in. They would pour that money in with no backup guarantee just the same way as they did in The Pas, Mr. Speaker. The same way they would promote that.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, loans are available. The Government of Canada through the Farm Credit Corporation has the loans available to farmers. That option is still available. The lending institutions, whether it be the credit unions or the bank, have that option.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a program, what kind of a policy, has the Conservative government, or if they aspire to be government, going to have? Continue the same thing that has happened and is happening now? Have they any idea or any alternatives to what is going on? They have no alternatives. Their farming policy or their issue of providing loans is the same as their housing policy. They say, "Why can you not provide home ownership for people?" For people that cannot afford even their basic shelter, they can't even afford the basic rent, they are saying, "Provide housing so that they can afford the housing." Is that what they are talking about? Mr. Speaker, it's really not even a matter of private ownership, of who owns the land. It's how well they farm the land, how well that land will be looked after.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is whether it be a Liberal resolution or not, the campaign of fear in the last election was not spread by the Liberal Party. It was spread by the Conservative Party of this Legislature, of this big hound or whatever, this monster standing over the Legislative Buildings who was going to seize all the land in this province.

A MEMBER: And the churches, Bill. And the churches.

MR. URUSKI: That is the type of campaign of fear that has been spread. — (Interjections)— That's exactly the point, Mr. Speaker. Now it's the land in the curling rinks. That is the type of campaign that will go on.

What has happened over the last four or five years? Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the last four or five years? What has this program done? It has assisted 300 to 400 farmers in this province many of whom were unable to sell their properties or be able to pass it on to their sons and daughters mainly because of lack of equity, that they just couldn't afford to turn it over. They didn't have a family member who was well to do and could stand the financial loss of not being able to have any money paid back to him on the transfer of the land. What has it done? What has happened? The fact of the matter is,

Mr. Speaker, many young farmers have been able to come back and farm. They have been given an option' an option which they never had before, Mr. Speaker. And I guess I happen to be the prime example of what was not available. If it had not been for a family of mine that were in a position that I was to be able to going farming with, I could not have afforded to go farming because I did not have the capital resources in order to purchase the land at the time.

This has created an option for many farmers who may have had a certain level of capital that they could have put into machinery and some investment but they could not have head into the large investment of the land. And that's the option that has been made available and frankly, Mr. Speaker, although some of the opposition members now don't like this policy because they feel that it is now too generous, well the fact of the matter is, I don't think anything has changed. The only difference that there is now is that the farm farmer is assured of what or knows what the value of the land is or may be. That is really the key difference of what the value of that resource is when he signs that lease. That is the only difference between the present program and the previous program. That is really the key difference, not whether or not he is now going to be able to own the land or not going to be able to own it. It hasn't changed at all because if he had the resources on Day One why would he even want to come to the government. Why would an individual, if he has the financial back-up on Day One, why would he even want to come to the government? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, because of the campaign of fear that they spread in the '73 election in the Souris-Killarney by-election, many of our rural people are still saying, "I can't really sell my land because you fellows may not give me the okay to sell my land." That is the kind of issue that has been spread, not whether or not they can afford to buy that land then or now, because if they can afford it on Day One they can use the resources that are available through either the Farm Credit Corporation, the banks or the credit unions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. **ADAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak on this resolution because it happens to be a farmer that represents the constituency of Ste. Rose and one who is primarily and very much interested in programs that will assist farmers not only this program but many others that have been introduced in the past few years.

In rising to speak to this resolution one has to complement the Member for Portage La Prairie and on the other hand it's unfortunate that the lack of research available to him or the lack of research that he undertook in coming up with this resolution turned the resolution into a poor one. The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is there are some discrepancies in the resolution as has been brought forward by some of my colleagues here.

For instance the third Whereas, where it says, "Whereas the lessee or the lessor can terminate the lease at any time giving due notice." This is an incorrect resolution. Only the lessee may terminate the agreement by giving notice. The lessor can only terminate the agreement if the lessee falls behind or fails to meet his agreement and his payments. So, therefore, that resolution is incorrect.

We go down to: "Whereas the lessee has an option to buy this land at any time after five years of leasing." Well, Mr. Speaker, now the lessee may buy at any time. There is no restriction. I am pleased, that at least, there is an option. He doesn't have to buy it. There is still an option. If he so chooses he doesn't have to buy at any time. He can keep on leasing it if he so desires but the option is there.

The last "Be it resolved" is also incorrect. It leaves the impression that there has been some municipal taxes lost because of this program and that is incorrect. At no time does the municipality lose any taxes because of this program. So, the resolution, while the intent was very very good and well meaning, if not anticipatory, well meaning but unfortunately not enough research went into it. And we're in a position where we have to almost amend the entire resolution because of its

But naccuracy. the program itself, I'm sure members will agree, — at least the Liberal members will agree if not the Conservatives — that it is a good program. It has assisted many farmers, young farmers in particular, to get into farming. It has enabled some farmers to sell their property to their sons or their nephews or their neighbours' nephews or their neighbours' sons and so forth and now while the Member for Rock Lake seems to be critical of the program he should talk to those people who are involved in the program and he will find a different story to those people who are involved. Up to this point in time the program has assisted 475 families to become established as farmers or to expand their operations so that they could remain viable.

So what's wrong with this? What is wrong with it? I've listened to the Member for

Rock Lake say that if you want to lease land you should go and lease it from a private individual. You know we have, on this side, great difficulty to understand this point of view and I see nothing wrong insofar as the program was only committed to farm operations up to a value of \$60,000. This has been increased I believe to \$90,000. So it was the more marginal type of farm operation — what is wrong with leasing land? I don't think the Honourable Member for Rock Lake or any other members of the opposition will argue with this, but there is nothing wrong with leasing land. Not at all, because the largest farmers in the province I believe lease more land than any other group. So this must be a paying proposition for them to lease rather than to buy; so if it's good for the big operator why shouldn't it be good for a smaller operator who wants to get into farming and who is unable to do so because of the lack of financial backing or for whatever reason?

Mr. Chairman, the position that the members take in the opposition is sometimes difficult to understand. However, I have received the revelation — I was unaware that the Conservative Party the groundwork for this program — and it comes to me as somewhat of a surprise because I would have never given them credit for that. I would never give them credit for that had I not been told this evening that they had laid the ground-work for this program. So I guess we do have to compliment them. It's difficult to believe. I would like to do some research on that. Maybe it could be called window-dressing, I don't know, or smokescreen. And, you know, the Leader of the Opposition Opposition, it really provoked some comments from the leader. The next day he wanted to know whether the government would now offer all the public housing to those who rent. And the only reason I mention this here is because the Leader of the Opposition tied it in with the land-lease program. And it just goes to show you how that little leader, with the beautiful red hair — if he had dark hair such as myself and the Member for Thompson, you know he would remind me of *Le Petit Corporal* on his way back from Moscow with his army in a shambles He reminds me of Napoleon on his way back from Moscow, as a loser.

When the Minister announced this change in the policy in his estimates, I was there and panic developed in the ranks of the opposition. Pandemonium reigned. It was a sight to see the Member for Rock Lake flustered. I have never seen him flustered in this House until the announcement was made that the agreement would be changed to a lease-purchase agreement. The Member for Pembina was so upset that he reversed his position from a year ago and two years ago, and three years ago, and he said that that was unfair. It was too generous. That these young farmers who were trying to get established with a \$60,000 farm should not be able to pick up that \$300,000 in capital gains.

A MEMBER: George said so?

MR. ADAM: Yes. Yes. The Member for Pembina was throwing figures around of \$300,000 capital gain and that was entirely unfair and that these young farmers, I assumed, were not entitled to this capital gain.

Now one of the reasons that there has been a policy change is that the escalating land values, over the last two or three years, certainly has become almost impossible for some of those young farmers to be able to purchase their land if they have to pay the escalated value. So therefore I think the change in policy is a good one, whereby they can earn this capital gain over a period of twenty years. And what is wrong with that? I don't see anything wrong with that. I think that that is the one point that will keep out the real estate people that the Member for Portage was so concerned about. So I think that section there will prevent this wholesale business of buying and next year selling and getting the capital gain. It will solve your problem. For the Member for Pembina' it should solve the problem. If a man stays for twenty years on the farm and there's a bit of capital gain, so let him have it. He has earned it.

You know, I remember, I was on the Land Hearing Committee that was set up to find a land policy and the hearings were turned into a against the government policy, the first year. And the opposition did use, in my opinion, this forum to try and condemn the government for something that had no relationship at all to foreign ownership or the ownership of land. I thought it was disgraceful. Nevertheless, if that is their position, that is their position.

When you look back at the TED Report, and I think that the Member for Springfield mentioned that the policy of the Conservative Party as outlined in the TED Report, was that the farm population should be reduced to 20,000 by 1980. And that the reduction in farm population should be faster than the natural rate of attrition. That you should bring in measures to reduce the number of farmers, artificially, do it faster than what the

natural rate of decline in the population would be.

So, Mr. Speaker, if there is any human rights involved here, certainly we do not have to go to the Conservatives in lessons on human rights. Yes, in the Souris-Killarney by-election I did hear some comments. I listened to one program on television, I believe it was, where they had three speakers at the same meeting. They each spoke their turn, and I was surprised that the Leader of the Official Opposition here hadn't spoken five minutes, less than five minutes, perhaps only two minutes, when he was already misrepresenting the facts. And he was talking about the NDP land-grabbing policies. I believe I'm paraphrasing him right to the word 'land-grabbing policies'. And you know it's too bad that this kind of statement goes unchallenged. And it's nothing but red-herring. That's all it is.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there is any use belabouring the point. We know it's a good program. It has helped a great many people, even in my area. There is more land for sale at the present time, there are more offers to buy than the government is prepared to buy. Land for sale at the present time. There are more offers to buy than the government is prepared to buy because in most cases, Mr. Speaker, there is three people involved. There is the seller. There is the buyer, the MACC. And there is the lessee who has an option to purchase, it was four years, now it is at any time. However, we are not taking the land that's being offered. If we were land grabbing we could buy half of this province. It's for sale. It's for sale. We could buy it all. I think the policy of holding back at this particular time of high inflated land prices is a good policy because we do not want to, first of all escalate further the cost of land or be buying land that may be too costly to the lessee, purchaser, to be able to be viable by the operation of that land. So, as I mentioned when I began, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the resolution was not better worded and I have to move, seconded by the Member for Point Douglas, that Resolution No. 8 by the Member for Portage La Prairie be amended by deleting everything following the fourth line and that the following be inserted:

WHEREAS the Land Lease Program has been beneficial to many Manitoba farmers; and

WHEREAS recent amendments announced by the Minister of Agriculture have further improved the program,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House commend the Minister of Agriculture for the achievements made under the Land Lease Program.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. Thank you. The amendment as read. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for . . . Pardon?

A MEMBER: The Motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that the resolution be amended by deleting everything following the fourth line, and the following be inserted:

WHEREAS the land lease program has been beneficial to many Manitoba farmers; and

WHEREAS recent amendments announced by the Minister of Agriculture have further improved the program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House commend the Minister of Agriculture for the achievements made under the Land Lease Program.

QUESTION put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have been moved to get up and speak. We now have the Member for Ste. Rose taking over for the Member for Radisson for the flowery beautiful comments and patting on the back of the ministers of this government. —(Interjection)— That's correct. You know I don't mind some ministers being complimented but the Minister of Agriculture in this province is the worst land-grabbing baron that ever was put on the face of God's green earth. When you want to change, when you want to take a situation that the Minister of Tourism I believe says that we had a good program, it was our program and you know what happens, since 1969, every good program that was being administered properly was taken over by this government and used to the benefit of getting control of property and people's lives. That's exactly what has happened in this province and never before have I had to go out in an election campaign and tell the people that in the Province of Manitoba young people should own their own land and should own their own house. We had to make them believe that that's the right thing after you fellows have gone around saying we should be the biggest landlords in the province.

Now if the Minister of Municipal Affairs —(Interjection)— No. If the Minister of

Municipal Affairs really believes that he thinks he can stand up here and change my mind when I'm campaigning, I'm going to tell him right now, I'm telling you right now I'm going to keep telling people that this government wants control over their lives, and they're still working to do it and the only reason you changed the program is because the people in the hearings that went on before throughout this country told you they didn't want the government to be the biggest land owner in this province. And we're getting to an election campaign so you changed it. Now it's as pure and as simple as that and all the beating around the bush that we've had from the government in the last twenty minutes or half an hour or so to defend the fact, to defend the fact that they changed for election purposes only, it's just straight phoney boloney and you won't sell it. You know what you look like? You look like a bunch of foolish people. You look like a bunch of people who don't stay by your convictions. Don't ever try to tell me that the convictions of this government are not to own more land, more property, more houses. They want to own houses, build houses, mainly to try to get control over the rents in the whole area. You know, that's one of the main features of the Manitoba Housing and Development Corporation is to get to control the rents that are paid out in this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen wonder why we get up and we get very concerned — the Minister talks about what's our policy — let me tell him, I think I said it once before in this House, you don't take a bad apple out of a barrel to replace it with something else; you take it out to save the rest of the apples in the barrel. If we don't get this government out we're not going. . . . We're going to have to get you out to save the rest of the people of Manitoba. It's just as simple as that and the people of Manitoba know it. You honestly believe that people are so naive as to think when you came out and made the change in this program right now that they don't know what you are doing? You look foolish.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30 the House is now recessed. We will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. in Committee of Supply.