

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 4, 1974

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this evening, I'd like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 members of the 1st Westwood Scouts under the direction of Mr. Gordon Thompson. The scout group is here as guests of Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all the honourable members I would like to bid you welcome this evening.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at 5:30 I was dealing with matters that had been raised by the Minister during the course of his remarks, and I was particularly dealing at that moment with the question of his policy in providing incentives to increase hog production in this province, and pointing out that although the policy might have been noble in its intent, the timing and the manner in which the Minister applied the policy was nothing short of a waste of the taxpayers' money because under those circumstances it couldn't possibly hope to achieve what the Minister had set out for it to achieve, and that once again is in my view a reflection of the capability and the ability of the Minister to administer his department.

There's no question that over the past few months there has been ample demonstration on the part of many farmers throughout this province of a lack of confidence in the Minister. Earlier in the fall there was a meeting of cattlemen dealing with the question of AI, and then there was a referendum held a little later on by the AI users themselves, which a total of about 98 percent of those people who were polled, voted against the present policy. Notwithstanding that, the Minister will persist in his monopolistic control over the industry. . .

A MEMBER: They should call a referendum on the liberalization of artificial sex.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . an indication that the Minister has a one track mind when it comes to matters concerning agriculture, notwithstanding his assertion on repeated occasions that there is a great deal of democracy in the Agriculture Department. If there's so much, then I wonder why the Minister doesn't listen to the people who are the recipients of the kind of programs that he's attempting to impose on the agricultural industry.

Then there was the rapeseed vote - another demonstration of an attitude on the part of farmers that is not consistent with the views of the Minister.

A MEMBER: But who's wrong? The farmers.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then more recently a vote that was conducted by his own department, with all of the trappings of the kind of democracy that the Minister himself wishes to impose, notwithstanding the fact that he conducted the - or his department conducted the referendum themselves, the farmers still voted it down. And if one were to talk to a number of the producers across this province, you'd get an idea of the reasons why; it's very obvious, they just don't trust the Minister.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: They don't take him at his word, because they don't believe that his word means anything any more. After . . .

A MEMBER: We've proven that. We've proven that.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, after what happened in the Hog Marketing Board, can you blame them? And here, Sir, I'm quoting from the Tribune of the 10th of December, 1971, and that was at a meeting that was held in the Ramada Inn - the one that the Minister claims that the Member for Lakeside and I should not ever attend because we're an evil influence on the pork producers of this province. I might point out to the Minister that the people at those meetings are independent-minded people and no amount of coercion and cajoling on the part of the Member for Lakeside and myself could ever ever change their minds on anything if they ever made up their minds, and so his claim that our presence at farm meetings throughout parts of this province acts as an evil influence, is laughable to say the least.

But at that meeting, and it was the Minister himself who spoke to the dinner during the course of the evening, and the headlines of the Tribune report - and I want to emphasize the fact that it was a report that came from the Tribune, because I know my honourable friends

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . opposite would regard with some suspicion anything that was printed in the Winnipeg Free Press. The headline said: "Producers Promised a Voice on the New Hog Marketing Board," and the first paragraph reads: "The Hog Producers Marketing Board has been appointed to set up districts to enable producers to elect board members within a year," . . .

A MEMBER: Hear hear. That's what he said.

MR. JORGENSEN: "Agriculture Minister, Sam Uskiw, said Thursday." Now on December 1, 1973 . . .

A MEMBER: What did he say?

MR. JORGENSEN: This is what the press of that date stated, and again they're referring to a meeting of the Pork Producers Association. It said: "The meeting also castigated the government for not fulfilling a promise made in 1971 that the board would be fully elected by now. Mr. Uskiw claimed no such promise had been made, and that because of the political game playing he has half a mind to abolish the idea of an elected board."

Sir, is it any wonder that the producers of this province are a little skeptical about the promises made by this Minister? Is it any wonder that when they go to the polls to vote on issues, even one that is an important to the livestock men of this province as a check-off, which is something they've been asking for for years, that instead of placing their votes on the basis of whether or not they wanted a check-off, they had in the back of their minds the gnawing fear that the same thing would happen to them as what happened to the pork producers of this province. And, Sir, Sir, that is precisely the reason why that referendum was turned down, simply because they're not going to take the Minister at his word.

A MEMBER: They're independent.

MR. JORGENSEN: They're independent people, and that's the way they wish to remain, and by passing a vote in favour of a compulsory check-off, they felt that they might be taking the first step towards the Minister doing to them what he did to the pork producers. The Minister asked the question, the Minister asked the question, what are we doing? And that is really what we've been trying to elicit from the Minister for the last two years, exactly what he is doing to the pork producers. They'd like to know that themselves, and are unable to find out; and the Minister uses every device he can possibly lay his hands to to prevent them from finding out precisely what he is doing to them. They have a suspicion, they have a strong suspicion of what is happening, but unless they can get some facts and some figures, which the Minister refuses to give to them, there's no way that they're going to find out. And that's almost exactly the way the Minister wants it. I'm rather interested in the Minister's comments about his parents coming over here to escape the feudal system in Austria, and there were a lot of people who escaped from Europe in the past hundred years to come to this country to escape that very same thing. But the thing that strikes me as rather strange, is that his father must have been unable to communicate with him, because what he is intending to do, and what he is doing, is setting up the very thing that those people escaped from . . .

SOME MEMBERS: Hear hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . a sort of a feudal system.

Now, the Minister - the final indictment against the Minister - no, I shouldn't say it's the final one, but a further indictment against the Minister was his comment that he made, and it reveals his mentality. It reveals the very things that he intends to do; it reveals his philosophy. And more than anything, the Minister need not be surprised when the farmers are suspicious of him and if they are mistrustful of his action. He goes on to say, and this is a statement that was made to the press following the reading of the speech from the Throne in Ottawa just recently, and this is what he said: "However, Mr. Uskiw suspects that the new plan" - they're speaking of the stabilization plan that Ottawa hopes to introduce, he said "Mr. Uskiw suspects that the new plan will be voluntary," and heaven forbid that anything should be voluntary as far as this Minister is concerned. He said: "This raises the question of how effective a voluntary plan will be. . . "

A MEMBER: You have to learn to obey orders, not to enjoy it.

MR. JORGENSEN: And get this, get this. Since the better farmers will look for other investment opportunities that offer higher returns in order to stabilize their incomes. God forbid that a farmer, one farmer in this country take advantage of an opportunity to look after himself. That the Minister doesn't want. It's obvious from that statement that he wants every

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd). . . farmer in this country to be subservient to him, every farmer to be dependent upon him, every farmer to come to him on bended knee asking for alms and hand-outs.

A MEMBER: Pay his annual lease on the land.

MR. JORGENSON: In that way I suppose the Minister feels, having reduced the farmer to that position, he is able then to control it. Now that is the only conclusion that one can draw from the statement that he made concerning the Speech from the Throne. Then a little while earlier, on October 20th last year there was an article that appeared, and again the Minister will refute all this because it appeared in the Free Press, I hate to even mention the name in this Chamber. The article was written by Frances Russell, one of the reporters in the gallery who cannot be accused of being partisan one way or the other. Miss Russell's articles are usually scrupulously fair and articles that are intended to reveal situations as she sees them. We may tend to disagree from time to time depending on our own point of view but I don't think anyone in the House can accuse her of being unfair in her criticism, be that the government or the opposition. But she goes on to say this, and she's speaking about conversations that she's had with people working within the department, and it's the same sort of feeling that we get in talking to those same officials. "This department should be in the business of agricultural development and production technology," this is from one of the civil servants, "providing every scope for the innovative farmer to produce competitively. We must keep in mind that we are competing in international markets and we will become non-competitive in terms of cost and productivity if we say that we are only responsible for a certain classification of farmers." And what the article goes on to point out is that the people within the agricultural department are becoming very disenchanted because the civil servants are being used as social workers and that the Department of Agriculture instead of being the once proud department that it was in providing assistance without discrimination to all farmers now is very selective in its approach to assistance to certain farmers, and there are certain farmers that are excluded from any assistance on the part of the Agriculture Department. It has become nothing more than a social welfare program; indeed, if you examine the policies of most of the departments of government that's precisely what they are becoming, one big social development or social welfare program.

Sir, that may be fine from the point of view of those who sit opposite, but I warn the Minister now, as I cautioned him about his farm diversification program, he was not going to be able to make instant farmers across this province and today it's being proved that you can't. That you can't discriminate and you can't isolate those farmers who have a natural tendency to be successful and expect them to continue to produce because those are the very farmers that are going to leave production. They are the farmers that are going to move out of agriculture because if there's going to be no opportunities for them and if they're not going to be provided with the opportunity of using their own God-given skills, their ability and their experience, in order to make at least a minimum profit and do the thing that comes very natural to them, they're going to get out of the business.

Miss Russell's article goes on to point out that she in discussing with a representative, by someone in Agri-business who works in all three prairie provinces, said this: "This is the most unhappy agriculture department I've seen" - speaking of the Manitoba department. There's an incredible amount of politics being played here." And you know notwithstanding the protestations of the government that they wouldn't think of doing such a thing. Then he goes on to say "they are hurting the healthy farmer to help the poor one." Well, Sir, we have no objection to the Minister helping the poor farmers. We have no objection to the Minister providing assistance to the agricultural industry but that assistance should be made available to all farmers and not just to an isolated few. To do otherwise is to discourage those who have the capacity and the ability to wind up in agriculture with those who do not have the capacity, with those who do not have the ability, and the result is inevitable; the result will be lower food production, higher food costs and the ability of this country to take its rightful place in the world of providing food to the hungry nations of this world at costs that they can afford to pay.

Sir, we have an obligation with the resources that we have at our disposal to make our contribution to feeding a hungry world. I say that the policy being followed by this Minister is going to destroy our capacity to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm taking this opportunity to speak on the Minister's salary having been informed that this afternoon the Honourable Member for Pembina in speaking raised the question of Manitoba Mineral Acreage Tax Act. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the Conservative Party would have enough conscience, enough of a feeling of responsibility to have made the attack that they did before the session opened, to have made it possibly shortly after the session opened, but then to have realized that they were being dishonest with themselves and with their constituents when they continue to insist that they and the people of Manitoba had been misled. I thought they would have the guts and the honesty, the depth of integrity to have stopped talking the way they did once it was pointed out to them the entire history of what transpired some two years ago.

But when I found that they not only didn't have that conscience but actually went on to repeat the lie and to repeat it, as I suppose all of us today received the Manitoba Co-operator, and we find a paid advertisement by the caucus of the Conservative Party of Manitoba with the list, and I assume the signature of every member, and I didn't count them --(Interjection)-- not everyone, I'm pleased to know that; not the one who signs therefore or his name appears Mr. Bud Sherman, Fort Garry. Not he, he would not lend himself to this advertisement; but his name is right here, his name and his constituency is right here. Are there any others on the Conservative side who would not have their name associated with this kind of flagrant, blatant deception? If there are let me check if their name is present.

Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Well on reconsideration, Mr. Chairman, I may have a point of privilege later on, I'll just check on something first.

MR. CHERNIACK: I think it would be well, and I would hope that every member of the Conservative Caucus would check on something, because, Mr. Chairman, I felt, I don't recall - there's several things that I do remember in the short time I've been in this Legislature. One is the sense of bitterness that exists after an election and I've been here four occasions after an election and I recall a certain continuing resentment that follows after the bitterness of an election. And I understand it and I have been party to it. I'm no more free of that kind of recollection and bitterness than other members present.

But concurrently, Mr. Chairman, I don't recall off-hand and even after some thought, an occasion when there has been more participation in the Legislature in the designing, developing, variation and change in a bill as I do the Mineral Acreage Tax Act. It is very seldom that a party or the government party - and I speak now of some 12 years of experience in this House - where the government party has produced a bill which was discussed at length by the House and in Committee and changed after debate and changed after recognition that part of the parliamentary process is an exchange, and then to conclude the bill and have the members opposite, members of the opposition express their satisfaction with the process it went through. This does not happen very often, Mr. Chairman, and in this case it happened. And in this case, as I recall, it was the Member for Morris first, that I was told, that earlier this year, or maybe it was late last year, calendar year, started talking about deception. And he was the second last person who should have talked the way he did. The last person as I recall it, did not, or at least I don't remember hearing that the Member for Lakeside made any public statements on attacking the government or attacking me in connection with this. He would have been the last to have done so, I think, with any sense of integrity. The Member for Morris should have been the second last but he wasn't. And I wouldn't be surprised if when the Member for Fort Garry makes his investigation that he will find that he doesn't have to look much beyond his left hand to find out who may have been responsible for this advertisement. Because, Mr. Chairman, it uses language that was used here before.

It starts out, it says the Acreage Tax Act is cruel. Well if it's cruel who was party to making it cruel? Or, could it be that the members opposite who participated in this and who in the words of the Member for Morris who said, and I quote, "The Minister was kind enough to distribute copies of the amendments, proposed amendment early this afternoon," end quote. Were so blind to the cruelty in the amendments in the legislation that they could not comprehend what they were doing, that they were so stunned by possibly the lateness of the season or of the hour, that they didn't have the understanding of what was being done? Then they ought to go back to their electorates and tell their electorates, "We failed you because we didn't know what

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . we were doing." Say that if you want to be honest. If you want to say it's cruel, say we didn't realize, we were so dumb, we were so unaware, we were so un-knowledgeable and we were so unable to comprehend the principles - which as I recall it were possibly best enunciated by the Leader of the Liberal Party at the time of the debate. And for them now to have the, you know I used harsh language, now he's saying who had the nerve, the nerve to go out to the people who read the Manitoba Co-operator, and I don't know how many other places they put the advertisement . . .

A MEMBER: 35,000.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . 35,000 people read the Manitoba Co-operator? I don't know, it may be in the Winnipeg Free Press, it may be in the Tribune, it may be in other publications. Chances are it is. To have the nerve to attack the bill in which they participated, and which there's no recorded vote on, to say this is cruel. All right, they now realize this is cruel. So they say that the caucus - and when somebody speaks for caucus surely he has the authority to speak - so the caucus, the Progressive-Conservative caucus wants the assistance of the readers in forcing the NDP Government to remove the inequities contained in the Mineral Acreage Tax Act. They need help from the readers. And they say members of the Manitoba Legislature and the people of Manitoba have been deceived by the Schreyer administration regarding this Act and the government's intent in passing this legislation. Now they make their confession. We, that is the Progressive-Conservative caucus, members of the Manitoba Legislature, have been deceived by the Schreyer administration, and they'll say well we were misled, somebody there will say the Minister of Finance was so smooth he just talked us into it in some way, we were deceived. If they are capable of being deceived in that way, they have no business representing the people who elected them.

Then they go on, and Mr. Chairman, this is the big lie by innuendo. On July 6, 1972, Finance Minister, Saul Cherniack, told members during discussions of Bill "that the tax charge would be on mineral rights held by corporations, not by individuals". The Minister also stated that "three-quarters of the province's mineral rights are held by individuals and it is not proposed to tax those at all." Then they say, "despite this assurance from the Minister individuals have received tax notices. Your Conservative members of the Legislature want these inequities in the Act removed."

Mr. Chairman the quotations of my speech are correct and if the people of Manitoba were to be misled, then they would be misled by the half truths which is worse than a lie, and the half truth is that on July 6th I made this statement and the whole lie is that thereafter there was much debate, there was distribution of amendments, there were discussions, there were variations, there were changes, which resulted in a development of the concept, and therefore there were changes in the Act. And for the Conservative Party to go out in public print and not to tell the whole truth, is to tell a flagrant lie, because that's what a half truth is. And now the advertisement ends that they want to be called upon, we are voicing your concern as well as ours in the Legislature, we'll continue to do so until the government changes this cruel act. Let us know of your concern. Write or telephone your Progressive Conservative MLA. There's an address, there's a phone number, and in case they're in doubt, let them get hold of the Member from Fort Garry, because his name is here and call him, because he has asked through his caucus that he be called and informed about the injustice. And he's not alone. There's the Member for LaVerendrye, the Member for Swan River, Member for Minnedosa, Member for Rhineland, Member for Riel, Rock Lake, Lakeside, all points in every direction other than the righteous one. Every member of the caucus as far as I can tell is listed here to be appealed to.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this at a time when I really hoped that honourable members opposite - and I mean the Conservative Party in this case - would have the integrity within themselves to stop spreading the big lie by the half truth. And when I spoke on February 5th last, and now I look at Hansard, Page 107, I said then - I mentioned that certain honourable members during that debate in 1972 had urged that the tax be increased beyond 10 cents, and I now quote from what I said, February 5, 1974: I said "I would like to keep it at ten cents to keep it minimal, so that after the experience of a year of acquiring knowledge then we will be able to reassess our position and come back to report on what the position should be. That I am prepared to do; that I will do. We are still acquiring information. But it doesn't help to have misleading statements broadcast over the province when the people present participated in the variation that took place in the bill in the changes that did, participated and concurred."

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, I said that a bare month ago and I apologize to members on this side, my colleagues, for apparently having planted in somebody's mind the idea when I said "It doesn't help to have misleading statements broadcast over the province" because now, maybe because of what I said somebody got the brain wave, well fine - let's spread that misleading statement. Let's make it broader, wider, and spread it, and spread it and people will believe it because the more we spread it and the more we lie the more they'll see it, and the more they'll believe it. And then they came along with the paid advertisement. At least I assumed it was paid, I imagine that the Party at least would, if not have the integrity, the intellectual integrity, would have the financial integrity to pay for this advertisement, which I say is a flagrant lie. And is even in contradiction of the statement I made voluntarily a month ago to the effect that we do want to study it; that we didn't then want to make the tax one that is too harmful to any individual because that way we can acquire information. And we are acquiring information.

The important thing that we did then - and frankly it could be a matter for debate as to whether there should be any exemptions but the exemption that was agreed upon was to exclude farmers. And we said what farmers were and I've explained - elaborated on how my department is recognizing a farmer - a person who works the land which he owns, who grows and uses that land which he owns, on which mineral rights exist. That's what a farmer is. And members opposite had pointed out at that time that they were corporate farmers and that they had not been exempted in the Act, and we exempted corporate farmers. It was members opposite who participated, but members opposite are now prepared to continue to talk about something which I said a month ago we want to look at again. But to then come along with this kind of an advertisement I think is one which begs, which begs rejection. Well I think that our party and our government and my colleagues have much more integrity than to slap down an idea just because of the distortions presented by the members opposite.

We will continue to study, we will continue to consider, once we get the information we will discuss it in caucus. But, Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much if we'll discuss it very much with the members opposite because they have shown that they are not entitled to have a discussion take place in attempting to arrive at an understanding and attempting to arrive at a proper sensible, logical fair basis for taxation. I think we are going to have to discuss it in our own group, then we're going to have to come and tell the Conservative caucus we have made this decision gentlemen. But I don't - yes in this respect we could tell the Liberals, we can discuss it with the Liberals, but I have lost, really, really I have lost any desire or inclination to discuss matters of this type on an intellectual or rational level with members opposite because I am convinced that the bitterness that they acquired last June is still so much within them that they have lost respect. . . I'm glad, I'm glad I now hear from the Member from Charleswood agree that the bitterness within him is such that makes it impossible for him to participate in a rational discussion.

You know I think he's nodding his head, I can't believe it, I can't believe that he would let me make that statement and accept it. He's still applauding my statement. Mr. Chairman I really think that the respect that I've had for the vast majority, let me put it that way - the majority of members of the Conservative Party, is rapidly dissipating when the Member for Lakeside - while I must admit that the Member for Charleswood never did succeed too much in acquiring our respect, but many of his colleagues did - and the Member for Lakeside who is the one that actually made a point, made a point of recognizing the debate that took place, the fact that we went to the pains of going beyond the normal and distributing the information and who commended us - I believe he has not attacked us on it yet, I'm looking forward - I have the impression that he's getting ready to respond, we're both looking at the clock and I think he's going to be the next speaker that you may recognize, I may be wrong about that - and when he does I am looking forward to having, I hope, an honest answer to what I believe a rather strong attack which I have just completed. If not, the debate will continue no doubt, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat to break up this entertaining rehash of old election issues but I wanted to take the opportunity to pursue an issue that the Minister of Agriculture just opened up a slight crack this afternoon but which one certainly from this group in the House were very intrigued by because we have been trying

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . with some effort to also open an issue in the House of the last two weeks, and that is basically the question of the ownership of land in the Province of Manitoba and particularly the question of non-resident ownership, and we were very pleased to see that there is at least one member of the cabinet, across the way from us, who has come to recognize the kinds of dangers and the kinds of concerns that we have also been trying to express in this House; namely that at the present moment in the province of Manitoba as in other provinces throughout Canada, there is an accelerating development of large scale acquisition by major corporations and by major land holding companies from abroad of agricultural and in some cases recreation land, and certainly members would recognize that that is the basic thrust of the resolution presented by the Member of Portage la Prairie, was to try to draw attention to that fact, that among other issues related to the use of land in the province, among others - one of the issues, an important one, is this question of the degree to which land is increasingly being bought for both speculative and for productive purposes by large land holding non-resident operations, and the point that we are interested to hear from the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon was to hear from him that he expresses that same concern. It's very important I think that that particular concern be well established in this House and we would certainly like to hear the Minister of Agriculture elaborate more upon the facts and data because obviously he has an advantage that we don't have as he has a very large scale massive department which can do much of the research into land titles and so on, that we on this side of the House don't have access to, at least at the present moment. And therefore we would certainly be interested in hearing more from the Minister exactly what is the particular situation at the present moment, how it is developing and particularly on the question of the implications that it has for the ability of future generations of young farmers in the province to be able to acquire land for their own use and not simply become the handyman for a large non-resident owned organization.

Now the Minister did mention that he felt that perhaps the way to solve that problem was not simply by penalizing members or non-resident owners, but also to just look at the basic question of absentee uses of land, and I agree that in some cases that is a very worthwhile idea to look at as well. I think where it has been practised it has some very difficult technical aspects in terms of definitions as to who is absentee and who isn't and exactly what kind of penalties would be imposed.

But it raises I think a larger issue, Mr. Chairman, and that is that we are basically in serious deficiency in this House at the present moment, because while we are increasingly coming to recognize that the issue of land and its use in the Province of Manitoba is becoming in the forefront, one of the No. 1 priorities, as a Chamber we have not really singled in on that particular issue with any real zeal or certainly with any real intelligence in the way of data and information that we require. We have tried in other estimates, particularly in the Minister of Public Works, to glean from him certain information about land purchase and land acquisition policies of the government, and I would set the other side on notice than when Manitoba Housing and Renewal comes up for debate and when the Urban Affairs Ministry comes up for debate, equal questions will be asked about what are they doing in this field of land reform.

But let me raise another question with the Minister of Agriculture concerning this use of land. It is becoming increasingly clear that on the fringe areas of Winnipeg, by fringe I mean an area that may extend 30 to 40 miles beyond the area, which is presently engaged in I think very productive and highly useful agricultural purposes, there's increasingly major problems being faced of the purchase of land, in some cases purely for holding action, which contributes to the speculative spiral that we are now facing in Manitoba. It raises this basic problem, not just simply of who owns the land, but also the planning of the use of that land, the zoning that's applied to it, the taxation system that is applied to it, and as the Minister would recognize, in many cases there is a real dilemma in choice between the issue of the farmer who still tried to use his land for productive purposes, wants to maintain a low assessment to keep his costs as low as possible, and the fact is that around him large parcels of land are being bought up by non-farm owners, that forces the market value up and all of a sudden you begin to get changes in assessment and so you are creating very serious and significant problems as the impact of the urban situation moves beyond it. I would, before the Attorney-General leaves point out that in his own municipality of St. Andrews some studies that we have conducted indicate that the price of rural land jumped and doubled in one year, and that's putting a particular

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . hardship on the farmer who wants to buy more land for productive purposes or transfer land to his son or whoever it may be. And yet, when you look at the kind of planning control, the kind of zoning regulation, the kind of tax system that's applied in the rural municipality of St. Andrews, as in others, it is virtually ineffectual in dealing with that kind of problem, and yet unquestionably there are farmers in that area who are concerned, as there are farmers concerned in the municipality of Richot and others in the adjacent area to Winnipeg. That's I think another factor, another facet of the land problem in rural Manitoba.

I would refer to some discussions that I can recall having with rural members of the Environmental Advisory Council when I served on that board as a chairman, people from the area of Dauphin and from the southwestern part of the province who again indicated that with the development in agriculture towards large feedlots it again creates a dilemma between the large agri-business type of consolidation of land purchases versus the small farmer who tries to retain small lots. Again they point out that the feedlot contains within it certain problems related to pollution, to environmental damage, and to the basic question again of the maintenance of open spaces and the maintenance of other kinds of rural land uses, and it was the considered opinion of officials of the ministry of mines, natural resources and environmental management that the number one environmental problem in the Province of Manitoba is land. So the question I raise is what are we doing about it? We have tried on many instances over the last month to ask what's being done about the question of the use of land both in the urban area and the rural area, and all we're able to get from the Minister is for the odd time a little glimmer of information, the odd idea that comes back, but generally it seems a strange paradox that a lot of people who are knowledgeable and concerned are walking around saying, lookit, this is becoming a significant and serious problem both in rural and in urban Manitoba, and yet the fact of the matter is that this Legislature from every evidence that we can see is not prepared, at least in this session to do anything about it.

We looked in vain for any record in the Throne Speech that the government was prepared to act, there was nothing there. We have looked in vain for other announcements because I gather that's the pattern we get in now, the Throne Speech really doesn't tell us what the government's doing, that it wasn't there. I looked for something to be said in the Minister's own presentation of his own Estimates, but aside from a defense of the land-lease program, which I think he would concede is not the sole answer to that problem but only one instrument within it, again there wasn't an answer that at the present moment there is being prepared any comprehensive integrated approach to the investigation of land-use in the Province of Manitoba and how that land use can be done in a most equitable, economic and environmentally proper manner possible. And so I raise the question of the Minister this, that I expect he has more influence with his cabinet colleagues than members on this side of the House, certainly myself. Certainly he has more influence with the First Minister. And I would recommend to him that he has lots of information about these things that we don't have, but there are also lots of ideas. I've heard some interesting ideas being proposed by the members to the right of me; I think this caucus itself has developed a number of proposals; but the point that I'm trying to make is that there is nowhere where these ideas can ever be focused.

So I'm wondering if the Minister of Agriculture, as we debate his salary and as a man who I think is interested in earning every cent of that salary, would take it upon himself to recommend to the First Minister that a special committee of this Legislature be established to investigate or undertake an inquiry into the problems of the use of land in the Province of Manitoba, and I would recommend to his use the kind of studies that were done, for example, in the Province of Prince Edward Island. Now they have one benefit we don't have in Manitoba, they have a Liberal government, but aside from that they in 1971 did undertake a special investigation into the questions of the resident, non-resident ownership of land, the problem of transactions in the use of land, the problem of the municipal planning and application of land, and most importantly, the application of the property tax and its effect upon inducing speculation in the land on the urban fringe, providing ways of providing tax allowances, and certainly to provide complementary instruments to a land-lease program to ensure that the productive use of agricultural land, which by all accounts is of finite qualities or finite amounts in the Province of Manitoba, would be retained for the use of Manitoba.

At that point I would just like to make one exception. I find it a little disturbing in part,

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . the reaction I get from some members from this side of the House, who questioned both the Member for Portage la Prairie and the Member for Assiniboia, when he raised that it may be important from time to time to consider the ownership of land for Canadians. And there was a great phoo—all about, well, isn't that being nationalistic? Well, I don't happen to regard my sort of Canadian nationalism as anything to be ashamed of, nor do I think it's anything to be ashamed of to try and defend the future prerogatives and rights of other Canadians, and I think that one of those prerogatives is the ability and the right to make use of their own lands and not to have that land being bought up by non-residents. And I would point out to them one of the results of the Prince Edward Island study is that Canada, almost alone amongst western nations, has the largest percentage of non-resident-owned farm land, that certainly the Americans don't allow the things that we allow, the Mexicans don't allow it, and the British don't allow it, and the Dutch don't allow it and the Germans don't allow it, and all those people who either . . . the review system to make sure that purchases and transactions in the sale of land are in some way reserved for first choice to non-resident owners.

Now that, I'm trying to make the point, is only one aspect. We will agree to introduce the resolution simply to focus on the problem and suggest to this government that, along with other questions related to land, the question of non-resident ownership is an important one, and the corollary question providing options to buy back and to return is also important. Because I would be very much afraid that if we relied solely upon the government's position, which right now is to try to buy it back totally through its land lease program, that you're going to get yourself into a bidding game that's right out of your league; that the kind of surplus available capital that is now available to move into Canada to buy land is simply so astronomical and so related to inflated values of land elsewhere that we will simply impoverish the Manitoba taxpayer if we try to compete with any realistic sense.

So it's simply not enough, as the Minister of Mines and Resources has blathered about, to buy public ownership of all lands. That simply is a game we can't get into because we can't afford to get into it and we'll pauper ourselves if we try. What it does need is a combination of new rules of the game, of different tax laws, of looking at the zoning and planning applications in both rural and urban municipalities, and setting up some basic concepts of land planning in the Province of Manitoba, and then attach the kind of control, regulation and policy that's required. And I don't think we're going to come to that, Mr. Chairman, and I would particularly point to the Minister of Agriculture until the initiative is taken by this government to either set up a special committee on land inquiry so that we can bring the different minds of the members of this side of the House who have a concern and members of that side in from this group, to bring together the different points to get the best information available, because I think we should be talking to people in different parts of Manitoba, I think we should be asking the real estate agents what is going on. We should be putting some requirement to get the proper information to make those plans available. Rather than trying to debate this issue in snips and bits, rather than trying to debate it by letting the odd Minister split the . . . fact, we should be focusing directly, and if this government is not prepared to set up a special committee then let's use one of the existing committees.

The Member from Morris a week or so ago recommended that we reorganize the committee system in the House, which I think is a good idea. But reorganizing also means putting it to a better use, and a better use would be to undertake that kind of investigation of which I speak, and in my own experience with some of the committees in Ottawa, which have been used in fields like consumer affairs and electoral reform and so on, where there was a multi-partisan approach or an approach which translated partisan lines and brought together the interests and outlooks of different members in different groups in the Legislative Chamber, has produced I think in many cases, not only valuable information, but the basis for which we can undertake a major land reform and land inquiry and land planning in the Province of Manitoba. And I think this is something that could be developed with a fair degree of consensus, because all of us see the issues of coming of importance.

And so I would simply like to raise this issue with the Minister to ask him if he is prepared to take to his colleagues the recommendation for this special committee or an existing standing committee of the House be used for that specific purpose, and to also see that if we can't even reach that stage, if he would be prepared to table in this House and to provide the information that he has, concerning the acquisition of ownership by large land owners, the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . problems faced by farmers in the urban fringe of Winnipeg and other matters related to it, so that we will all have an equal amount of information to bring the House so that they can be conducted at least on an equal level of information. So I would ask the Minister if he would consider that recommendation and response to it; and furthermore, I would suggest that when the resolution comes up for debate next time we would certainly welcome his approval and participation at debate, because I think in this case we are of like mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the time hardly permits but I only rise at this occasion to indicate to the Honourable Minister of Finance that it certainly would have been my hope to have responded to his rather impassioned speech of just a few moments ago, but you, Sir, either deliberately or otherwise, chose to diffuse the debate at that particular moment and recognize a member of the other party, other splinter party, rather than look for an official response from the Official Opposition on a matter I think that was close to the Minister of Finance's heart, and I will have to choose some other occasion to make that response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should respond to my honourable friend from Morris again, because he chose to pick on a group of farmers in this province who are trying to make a change in their farming enterprise and he chose to do it in what I would consider to be almost an either overly sympathetic way or an overly vindictive way, I don't know which, Mr. Chairman. Maybe out of sympathy he was saying, "Don't get them into any trouble; don't give them a penny. Tell them to get out of agriculture." I don't know whether that's the message he was trying to leave them. Or, he was trying to preserve the wealth of the land for the few at the top. One could get one of those two interpretations, or both interpretations could apply, Mr. Chairman.

I want to point out to the Member for Morris that in the last six months' period -- well, it's more than six about eight months -- that there were just under 1,500 loans approved for livestock purchases in this province under the farm diversification program, both through ARDA and through the regular program, and for the Member for Morris to imply that all of these people, Mr. Chairman, are misfits in agriculture and we shouldn't be providing that kind of service, is the most incredible statement, Mr. Chairman, one could hear. Because if you look at the statistics and if you use the rule book, the yardstick that my honourable friend applies, then Mr. Chairman, you have to knock out over 80 percent of our farmers. You have to say to 80 percent of them or better, Mr. Chairman, that they have no room in Manitoba agriculture and I don't believe for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend was prepared to make that statement six months ago.

Six months ago we had another event in this province wherein he wouldn't dare talk like that, Mr. Chairman. His Leader went out on the hustings and he said we must have a policy to maintain 30,000 farm units, a massive conversion from the TED Report which recommended only 20. And now six months later, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris is now again back on the TED Report, in fact he's gone beyond it. He's saying, let's not have these kind of programs. Let us tell those 80 percent of our farm community who had very low gross incomes up until this year, or last year, that there really isn't room for them in agriculture in this province; that they really should look elsewhere; they should become displaced persons; they should be forced to migrate away from their habitats, from their present environments to look for new opportunities, Mr. Chairman. New opportunities where? Toronto? Vancouver? Winnipeg? I don't know where my honourable friend wants to relocate 80 percent of our farm communities, and I don't know how many towns he wants to wipe out with relocation of that number of farmers throughout Manitoba. I don't know whether he feels that there is nothing wrong with phasing out the existence of a number of important rural service centres because obviously, if you follow his philosophy, Mr. Chairman, you have to also abandon the town and community water services program. There's just no point in pouring tens of millions of dollars into community infrastructure when we know that we're going to phase out 80 percent of our farmers in any event within a period of time if we adopt the policies of the Conservative Party, and indeed the policies of the Member for Morris. So I have to take that particular suggestion Mr. Chairman, with a grain of salt, yes.

Now the member suggests that part of our problems in the industry stem from the fact that these people are not qualified to be in the industry and that's why we now have livestock

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . problems, starvation problems, and so forth. Mr. Chairman, if there was more time this evening I could illustrate for my honourable friend that that is not the case, that there are people that are very knowledgeable in the enterprise, the livestock enterprise that are having problems this year because of the peculiar quality of forage that was harvested last year due to the kind of weather conditions that prevailed through different parts of the province, and some people did not quite respect the seriousness of that situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour - Resolutions. First item, Resolution 9. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

CORRECTION - HANSARD

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. On March 1st, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood stood up to correct a statement which was attributed to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the correction was made, but another mistake was made on page 948 and the correction was attributed to the Honourable Member for Gladstone. It should be the Honourable Member for Crescentwood who made the correction and had made the statement on page 879 and not the others as mentioned.

Continued on next page.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 9

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia,

WHEREAS abandoned derelict vehicles have become an obnoxious problem in both the urban and rural areas of our province; and

WHEREAS junkyards, wherever located in our province, become a serious visual blight on an otherwise pleasant landscape; and

WHEREAS significant efforts are being made throughout our land to curb pollution in all its forms so that our citizens may continue to enjoy a pleasant and healthy environment; and

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba, because it derives considerable revenue from the sale of motor vehicles, the registration of these same vehicles and the sale of gasoline and oil products to propel these conveniences, has an overall responsibility to eliminate the unsatisfactory situation that exists;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of enacting legislation to

- a) penalize those registered owners which abandon a motor vehicle on private, not their own, or public property;
- b) establish time limits providing firms engaged in auto wrecking the necessary delay to strip vehicles of usable parts, after which the remaining hulk would be transported by the wrecker to a central recycling storage compound;
- c) establish in the said legislation maximum areas permitted and visual barriers required for private and public owner derelict vehicle compounds;
- d) ensure the gathering of abandoned vehicles throughout the province and the transportation of same to a central recycling storage compound;
- e) levy a charge against each motor vehicle registration which would, when consolidated be equal to the difference between the salvage income received and the recycling costs incurred to ensure that this pollution control operation would be provided without cost to Manitobans that do not operate motor vehicles.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm indeed grateful, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to speak to this resolution, for a number of reasons, basically, of course, the reason being that in the past four years I have been more than aware of the blight created on the landscape in our province, more particularly of course in the Winnipeg area, of derelict vehicles. I think that there are other reasons that I will probably broach as I make my case, and I trust that I shall make the case of one that is not partisan in the least and one which every member of this House can support.

I think that the energy crisis also has had an effect on my reason for being pleased to bring this resolution before the House at this time. I think that it was the First Minister who mentioned that now that we are faced with a shortage of fossil fuels, we should analyze the uses and misuses of those products and realize the reasons why we are faced with these shortages and also accept the fact that we are in large part responsible for these shortages because of the misuse.

I think that there is an analogy between that comment, and I paraphrase the First Minister, between that comment and the case that I would like to build with respect to the disposal of derelict vehicles. I think that we live in an area, Mr. Speaker, of where anti-pollution measures are paramount. I think that we are all aware - and when I say all aware, I mean governments, corporate citizens and private citizens. I think that governments be they federal, provincial or municipal, have shown in varying degrees the wish to co-operate in any and all anti-pollution measures. It is a fact that the Federal Government have set up a ministry for the environment; it is a fact that that ministry is costing the ratepayer a great deal of money; but if it is capable of bringing about a better environment I am certain that the citizens of Canada will not be unhappy with the measures and the costs of that department.

I think that the same can be said of the Provincial Government of Manitoba. It has certainly been very active in anti-pollution measures and I would not hesitate to compliment them where they have been effective. I know that we have a minister who heads up - part of his ministry is dedicated to environmental control and they have been extremely effective. I can't help but think of the anti-litter fund that was set up valued at roughly a million dollars and which

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. MARION cont'd) have been dispensed, not lavishly but it has been dispensed to curb some of the littering that goes around in the province.

In my constituency, Sir, we have been the benefactors on the Seine River of some \$5,000 in making sure that derelict vehicles exactly the subject that I'm bringing before the House tonight, could be picked up along with other steel and garbage that's dumped on that little river, and I'm indeed grateful for that measure. There are to date, I don't know the entire amount that has been spent but I notice that the City of Winnipeg has received from that anti-litter program better than \$236,000.00. So I think, Sir, that the Provincial Government too have been playing an important role in curbing pollution.

I think that the municipal government have on a number of occasions tried to play its role, limited as it is, both financially and legislatively to curb the derelict vehicle pollution problem in the City of Winnipeg. I recall that exactly a year ago today, when I was part of that council, there was a resolution adopted that really has never been very effective because of the funds required to fund the resolution, and it was dealing with derelict vehicles, --(Interjection)--that's another pollution factor. From the Tribune of the 22nd I notice that there is a councillor that is still unhappy with the way that the City of Winnipeg is going about its resolution with respect to derelict vehicles, and he's unhappy only because the Executive Policy Committee of the City have not to this date talked with the provincial authorities to come up with a combined program that could be effective for the City of Winnipeg.

I think, and I have thought all along, Sir, that any measures that are taken in this area should be the sole responsibility, as I state in the resolution, of the Provincial Government and not of the City of Winnipeg. I say that because in essence all of the incomes derived from the Motor Vehicle Licensing and for the fuel consumed in these vehicles, is a benefit, or a landfall if I can use that expression, and I don't use it derogatorily, is a windfall or a tax revenue source that the province alone enjoys, and I feel that if this is the level of government that enjoys that revenue, it should be the one to lead, perhaps it shouldn't be a single government battle but it should lead the battle with respect to the curbing of derelict vehicle pollution.

I mentioned that governments have played a role. I think it's fair also to talk a bit about some of our corporate citizens in the City of Winnipeg, and I hate to name any of them, but there is an example that comes to mind, because I was reading a report - and if it comes to mind it's probably as a testimony to the public relations of that corporation - but there is an oil firm that published a report in the areas of Elmwood and St. Boniface with respect to what it was doing to curb the pollution effect of its cracking plant in the area. I thought that it was a well documented report and it showed that that corporate citizen was spending millions of dollars on being a good corporate citizen to insure that this province and the City of Winnipeg are a good place to live in today and for the ensuing generations. I think that they are--(Interjection)--millions, millions? - well I will accept the Minister's correction but I think that if all is compiled the plan was a, if I remember rightly, a multi-million dollar plan in its entirety. So I think that if we've not gone through all of the phases, I stand corrected.

I think that it's evident that a number of individual citizens who act collectively and advise the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management, I think that they show their interest in pollution measures, anti-pollution measures, and I think that generally speaking our citizenry is well aware of the importance of curbing pollution in all of its forms, and I know that automobiles being one of the most eyesore and most evident kinds of junk or scrap pollution that man knows, I am sure that they have at one time or another addressed themselves to the subject when talking to the Minister.

I think that it is important to note I congratulated the government on some of its activities in this field, but I would like to claim that perhaps at this stage of the game it is being much too timid. I would like to quote from the annual report from the Minister with respect, --(Interjection)--very Conservative yes--with respect to the program on derelict vehicles. I would like to--(Interjection)--they always were? Ah yes, yes I think that that was brought forth by the Honourable Member for Radisson awhile ago.

The program as listed by the Minister in his report reads as follows: "A program has been prepared for implementation during the upcoming year to deal with the problem of abandoned automobiles in the province. There are four parallel efforts upon which the department's energies will focus. (1) A pilot project will be sponsored by the province in co-operation with the City of Brandon to clean up all of the abandoned autos from Brandon and the immediate

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. MARION cont'd) vicinity. A central compound will be established for receipt of such vehicles which will ultimately be shipped to Winnipeg for use in the making of steel. " I think that that's basically all I wanted to read from the report because there is no doubt that it's vivid in the mind of the Minister and his government that there is a problem and this is a pilot project that should be attempted. I think that the viability and now I come to - we have ascertained a problem, I would like to talk about the possibilities as they are today, not as they were even a year ago, on how we can tackle this problem and the viability of tackling it. I think that it's a known fact that the major complaint a year ago and longer was that financially it was not possible to pick up, to accumulate all of the scrap vehicles that litter the entire Manitoba landscape and bring them to a central location for processing.

Sir, I submit to you that to date this is no longer the case. The shortage of steel being what it is and the price that is now being paid for these hulks make the viability of this project assured. Now I think that we talk about the possibility of recovering from a motor vehicle upwards of \$160.00 when it is whole, that's when it hasn't been stripped. Now the process of pick-up is probably the only process today where government intervention would be required and that even on a minimal base the kind of subsidies that I had first envisaged when I formulated the resolution are no longer really a necessity but only a very minimal kind of subsidy for the accumulation.

Now I've had in some of my talks with the scrap people, been assured that with respect to the immediate Winnipeg area there is no problem of accumulating and of bringing to a central location for processing, the automobile hulks. There is no problem financially, yet there is not that impetus, there is not that rapid move by the scrap dealers or other people of getting off their haunches and getting on with the show, at least freeing immediately, if not sooner, the Winnipeg area, because there is a demand for steel and I would think that this is where perhaps the provincial government through its auspices, by entering into direct negotiations the next time that the official delegation of the City of Winnipeg comes in to see them, tackling the type of by-laws that would insure that the scrapyards people, the derelict heaped yards that are strewn all over, that are no longer under the aegis of a scrap dealer or a used parts dealer, if by-laws can be framed under the auspices of the two groups to insure that immediate action is taken there, then the government could research further what measures it can take, and it has already proposed to take some measures in the Brandon area, there are other outlying areas where because of the numbers of vehicles available, it can take action without subsidy.

I suppose that this is probably the best way of proceeding now, to remove where vehicles are in large numbers and where the process of crushing and stacking and moving to the central location for processing into No. 2 kind of steel, if this can be done now, then this would give a breathing spell of some months I would suppose, whereby the problem where the numbers are lesser and where the financial difficulty is encountered, then there could be active participation by the provincial government and I would think that this is the area that perhaps can be left as a third step.

I'm more than pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have had the opportunity of placing this case. I have seen the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management listen intently and he nods with agreement, I would think that I don't have to build my case any further. I will be pleased to hear him participate in this debate and tell us how far the provincial government is ready and willing to go to make this resolution come to pass.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, it's wonderful to get support from the Member for St. Boniface for something I've been working on for a considerable length of time.

Just to take the member back a little, how I got involved in this particular thing was in Municipal Affairs Committee and the definition of a derelict vehicle, and what is a derelict vehicle, what is an abandoned vehicle? And as a result of you know, trying to define this and trying to rationalize this, my colleagues buried me in garbage, they assigned me the whole thing; in fact I thought they were going to set up a new portfolio and make me the Minister in charge of garbage collection.

But it seemed strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that after listening to the Member for Fort Rouge a few moments ago with reference to land, that implicit in his remarks at this time were that we set up a provincial development plan, because really this is implicit in his

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) remarks, and here again is implicit in this particular presentation is that we superimpose from Winnipeg a plan for dealing with derelict vehicles.

I would disagree that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is timid, his kids called him that, he's a Socialist which is even worse than being timid I guess in some peoples' books. But there has over the past four years evolved a program and they are a little slower than I would personally like to see them proceed, because I dumped in his lap - even tied up with green ribbon - a logistical system for the control of solid waste for the whole province, but being the type of person that he is, he insisted--(Interjection)--well at least the Minister of Mines and Resources when he proceeds in an area in which I'm interested consults me. Some other Ministers build urinals in my constituency and don't bother to ask.

But, Mr. Speaker, this highly kabubilized (?) system that we developed British Columbia came and stole it from us. In fact, before Barrett got in there they implemented the plan holus bolus in British Columbia, and in fact, in Saskatchewan they implemented a plan pretty well except the profits there are accruing to Ipsco. And the Minister here once again, with all due respect, he said we'll go slowly and we'll develop this in keeping with the people in these communities and this is why you see in that particular brochure that he announced a pilot project in Brandon.

Now just addressing myself for a few moments to the broader picture of solid waste control, because the member did allude to pollution, it's a much broader problem than is even suggested by the member. If you look at such things as mercury; now what's that got to do with what we're talking about at the moment? About 20 percent of the mercury which is produced goes into battery production, and if you think of down around Melita, down around that area where you have a terrific movement of underwater, or underground water systems--you just have to drive a standpipe down around there and you get water. Well, just see people going down the road, you know, a little transistor battery, for example, they turf it out the window. Well, it's a metallic case, it oxidizes, and the mercury is leaked out and it gets into the water system and moves off. So really what we have to address ourselves to is not only just this obvious problem of the car which sticks out in the scenery, but the much more subtle problem of the control of toxic and hazardous materials and all the rest of it.

For the edification of the member who is interested in this particular area, one of the best studies that I have seen which you could transfer most of the information to our area, is a study done by the State of Minnesota on the control of solid waste and toxic and hazardous materials. If you look at the two geographical locations, you will see that in our area, if you take the triangle from The Pas down to the Ontario-Manitoba border, or American border and across the American border and back up, that about 95 percent of our population lives in this particular area, so its analogous to the situation in Minnesota and that is one of the better studies. And hopefully we will move in the direction of establishing, in co-operation with the municipalities, and here again I'd like to see the member mention that in co-operation with the City of Winnipeg we can perhaps do something, but nevertheless in the City of Winnipeg Act under the responsibilities assigned to the Environment Committee, they have at the present time, in my view, the authority to act.

Now the member says in his resolution that we should earmark tax dollars for a specific purpose. I personally in this area thought this might be a good idea and I had suggested that the government retain \$1.00 of the \$2.00 charge for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. We had a surcharge on licenses which carried over until last year, I think it was, because you know, they had to build up that fund a little, so I had asked the Minister if he would consider retaining \$1.00 of that which would come up with a kitty of perhaps \$435,000.00. The Minister of Finance in other areas has argued against this identification of tax dollars. There's a trap in it, with the Minister of Finance--I hope I'm not getting him into hot water but he has argued this way - he can get out of it if I do - that there's a danger in saying, you know, that you should earmark gasoline tax to build roads, or the profits from alcohol should be related to the treatment of alcoholics, or that derelict vehicles should be attributed to the car.

Now I know in some states they do this. They have - I think it averages in Minnesota-- at the time I was involved in this two years ago I think it came out to a \$3.85 charge on the new cars. The economists and statisticians, you know, come to grips with it and they say the life expectancy of a car is so many years and everybody who has owned that has contributed to its obsolescence, so they rationalize it. But I would just say that there is a danger in doing that

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) because, under our system of government, you're responsible for implementing many programs and you come up with a final number of dollars that you are going to need, and when you're raising these taxes you try to raise them as best you can. If you get into that box of identifying too many dollars to specific programs, I would suggest it's not in the best interests.

Now, roughly in that brochure that the member referred to, it gave in brief form what the program was, what they were doing at Brandon. It was a program to see if people would move on a voluntary basis, and when your group said, you know, self-control not state control, you know, I believe that, so don't push me that I should enact legislation to force people to take these cars in . . . The voluntary aspect of it was--and here again it reflects the Minister of Mines who is the Minister responsible in this area, his idea of law as I understand him over the years is there is no sense in passing a law if you can't help people comply with it, so that if you say okay, people shouldn't clutter, in fact, the first clause of the BE IT RESOLVED says "penalize those registered owners who abandon a motor vehicle on private or public property." Well there's laws, I would suggest, that are on the books that you could prosecute anybody now under nuisance or, you know, a number of laws that you could prosecute somebody if somebody wanted to sue somebody for that, so that there is on the statute books now several laws which would solve it. Nevertheless, if you don't make it easy for somebody to get rid of a problem, then of course, once the old car gives up the ghost what are you going to do with it? It's no problem if you live next door to the shredder. It's no problem if you live--if the price of steel at any particular time is high enough, it's no problem if you're 50 miles away. If the price of steel goes farther up there's no difference if you are 150 miles, and if it still goes higher, 300 miles. So there is a relationship between how far people can be expected to move their cars into a recycling process.

Now over the past years the Minister and the Minister of Highways have tried to make it as easy as possible for people to move cars that are kaput, into a recycling system. They had a process that they let people haul derelict vehicles on a T plate plus \$10.00 a month if they were hauling cars to the shredder. Then in the past year or so they are subsidizing cars beyond 150 miles. For example, if you were moving cars for a distance of 300 miles, then 150 miles of that 300 miles would be subsidized, so that there has been some efforts to resolve what the member would like us to address our attention to.

On the control of establishing time limits, providing firms engaged in auto wrecking with the necessary delay to strip vehicles of usable parts, after which the remaining hulks would be transported by wrecker to the central recycling storage compound. Well, in this area of recycling and salvage I would suggest that we even have to move further than this, in talking about derelict and abandoned vehicles and cars that, you know, shouldn't be on the road, that there's a relationship between what you're referring to in this particular resolution and cars which are written off under Autopac. In my view it is not in the public interest that automobiles which are damaged to the extent that they should not be repaired, they too should go through, you know, a comparable disposal facility. You take if a car is badly damaged and the frame is twisted, and we auction those things off and some individual buys it and sprays on some dirt remover and puts it back out on the road, you know I don't think this is in our best public interest, so that perhaps there's a relationship between what the member is suggesting in this resolution, and maybe I can prevail upon the Minister responsible for Autopac to look at an Autopac salvage operation in this sense, that the write-off, the insurance write-offs actually go through the salvage operation which would be more of a control than just selling them at a public auction, I understand which is the practice at the moment.

So, Mr. Speaker, we on this side have no difficulty accepting the resolution - this may come as a surprise to the Leader of the Liberal Party - but I would just repeat for the Member for Fort Rouge in this regard, and I made the reference a few moments ago to there being implicit in the member's remarks a few moments ago about the necessity of setting up plans, that actually we are moving closer to the people in these regions to develop municipal impounds and recycling facilities, not only for automobiles but other things.

So with these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that we on this side have no hesitation in supporting it even for those people who will come back and say, you know, the Liberals did it. We've been working away at this poor thing for four years and I am inclined

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) once in awhile, Mr. Speaker, to think that because of some of the resolutions, I think generally the Liberal Party made an error--(Interjection)--The Minister of Labour has made one of his brightest remarks--in that they filed the resolutions before the Throne Speech came in. If the people on this side of the House had no integrity at all, they would have gone down to the Clerk's Office and read all your resolutions and included them in the Throne Speech and, you know, the Speaker would have had absolutely no choice but to rule them out of order. But my colleagues, being men of integrity, they didn't do this, so in this particular case we admit that it is a problem. The Minister has initiated programs and those of us on his back bench on this side appreciate the support of the Liberal Party in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have a few notes here and I don't know - I jotted a few things down while the Member for St. Boniface was speaking and then I jotted some more down while the Member for Winnipeg Centre was speaking and now I'm confused. But at any rate, I wish I had stood up before the Member for Winnipeg Centre had. He says that he's been working quite some time to move derelict vehicles and solve the problem in the Province of Manitoba. Well I have as well. I've been working on it for possibly longer than he's been elected in public office.

But at any rate I think that the Member for St. Boniface has come in with a real good resolution and it's something that needs the support of all sides of this House regardless of whether it's worded just the way we like to see it worded or not. It's got to be brought back in here in the form of a Bill by the government and I suppose at that time it will be something that will warrant more debate and more criticism. But at the present time I think anybody that lives in the City of Winnipeg that's travelled anywhere 50 miles outside the city knows the problem and the reason for this resolution being brought in.

It seems that some of our auto wreckers out-guessed what this government was going to set for boundaries for the City of Winnipeg, because if you just go east on Trans Canada Highway a few miles you'll find great acres of them. You go west on Trans Canada Highway, you'll find them piled up 15', 20' high and acres of them there - many acres of them - and I think that some of the cars have been sitting there for 20-25 years. I had a bus that was remodelled for hunting, it was a 46 model bus and it was built of component parts that came out of a 1936 Ford. So you can imagine why an auto wrecking dealer doesn't want to throw away a car regardless if it's 15 or 20 years old because there's always somebody coming around paying an arm and a leg for a speedometer or something that matches, that's rebuilt out of component parts that were left over by the Ford Motor Company or GM or whatever it happens to be. But those people have to be ruled on and laws are going to have to be passed to make them move those derelicts out of the area after they're a certain amount of years old or they strip the parts off that they want to salvage and move the bodies out immediately to the recycling plant. Our river banks, creeks, ditches, a lot of areas, hay meadows and all are just covered with them and is certainly becoming an eyesore to the whole city and throughout the province. Any town you go to, practically every town, and alongside the highways and all it's a real mess.

We in Charleswood, in 1969 we passed a bylaw and it was a very simple one and it worked. We moved 2,000 cars out of there in a year and a half and that was with a population of 8,000 people. Mind you a suburban area like Charleswood or Assiniboia is faster to collect cars than what the City of Winnipeg proper was at that time, because if anybody was trading an old car in and they didn't think they were getting what it was worth, they wouldn't trade it, they would get a little cash discount then they would park their car at their friend's place in a place like Charleswood where he had a larger lot and there was room for two cars, then those cars sat there for 8 or 10 years until such times as they just became worthless and then they were moved out. But we passed a bylaw, it was a simple bylaw, a one-page bylaw and you weren't allowed to park a derelict vehicle on private property with or without the consent of the owner unless you obtained a license for that car, kept it currently licensed. The first year we passed that bylaw they had to have it I think by the 15th of May or the end of May whatever day that--the beginning of May I should say when the first discount came off the license plates. And it worked good and then we had to amend the bylaw the second year saying that they had till the first of June as long as they had it licensed the previous year. This bylaw worked real good.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

Now the City of Winnipeg has also passed a bylaw that I think is far too lengthy and it was passed I think in December of this year - this last year, September 5th, '73. It's a lengthy bylaw and I didn't have a chance, I just got it today I didn't have a chance to go through it. It seems rather confusing but I know they're trying to cover the many auto wreckers there is in the city. So they had more of a problem than we had at the time we passed ours. I think that the resolution that's brought here in front of us tonight is heading down the right line, it's just a matter, as I say, of the government picking it up and putting it together and bringing it in so that we can debate it in here. But certainly, Sir, I would see things wrong with it, such as the last clause where they levy a charge against the motor vehicle registration. I think that the province picks up enough in taxes off the sale of gas and oil products, etc. that's mentioned in the fourth whereas, and I see no reason to burden those purchasing the license for registration of their vehicles to anything further to get rid of derelict vehicles

As far as the derelict vehicle is concerned, in the bylaw we had in Charleswood all we specified was that if it had a license on it it wasn't derelict, and if it was a car that wasn't being licensed they could pay a fee of \$10.00 a year into the municipality for the privilege of leaving it parked outside; and if it was inside a garage or undercover well then nobody bothered with it because it didn't have any detrimental effects to the area. So I think, Sir, that we are in favour of it, apart from Clause (e) of the resolution. Thank you.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to prolong the debate, I think that everything that needs to be said has been said. The problem is one which I believe has been recognized. I believe that the problem diminishes when the price of steel goes up because by itself the market forces then get it to places where it is dealt with. However, we are dealing with the matter on the basis not that the problem is diminishing but that it will stay with us for all time.

I only rise to point out that I'd like to make it clear that the passing of the resolution means that there will be a consideration of the suggestions made. I would not like it to be recorded that these things are going to happen because I notice that when we have passed some resolution worded in the abstract form it has been represented to the public through the media that this thing has become a reality, which is a problem because then there is a misconception on the part of the public as to what is actually happening. So an abstract resolution worded in that form means that there is virtually unanimity as I see it on the part of members that this is a problem that is worthy of government consideration and the government will consider it. And in that respect I think that I should add that there is one part of it that is really quite unacceptable but rather than going through the motions of amending and deleting parts we prefer to leave it in as it is, giving you notice in advance that the Minister of Finance in particular is never happy with a resolution which earmarks a tax or earmarks a revenue for specific purpose and I sympathize with him in that respect.

I notice that the Member for Charleswood has also indicated that this should be paid for out of general revenues. Just so that there be no misunderstanding about that, that general revenues are also collected in some form of taxation and if the Member for Charleswood says that it should be paid for out of other public revenues let there be no misunderstanding that that too, comes from the public, and if there weren't enough public revenues and we added this program there would be some type of tax adjustment.

MR. CHERNIACK: No acreage tax.

MR. GREEN: Maybe in Charleswood they found a way of providing government programs which cost additional money without collecting government revenues and if the Member for Charleswood can give me that kind of alchemy to run the finances of the Province of Manitoba then I assure you that we would at least consider the advisability of using such supposed remedies.

So the --(Interjection)-- Petition senior government. Or junior government. Anybody, that's right. So the only point that I would like to emphasize for this and other resolutions, that where we pass an abstract resolution, which by definition is a resolution that says consider the advisability of doing a certain thing because it involves the expenditure of government revenue and the treasury benches are the only ones who can move a non-abstract resolution to that effect, that it should not be interpreted by the members nor should it be interpreted by the media as meaning that the government has adopted a program. The suggestions that have

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . been made are worthwhile ones. We indicate that we have been developing programs along this line and we're certainly prepared to consider the suggestions that have been made and that is the effect of what we are approving.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, fundamentally I would address myself to the last remarks of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I think all of us recognize that the adoption of a private members' resolution in the abstract form is a necessity foisted on all private members of this assembly by virtue of the law that says that no one but a treasury bench member can introduce a bill that would cause the treasury to spend money. However, I hope my honourable friend recognizes that while the adoption -- and I must say that I concur, I agree very clearly with his definition of the meaning of the passage of a private members resolution such as this but I think it goes a bit further, and that is, and I hope he'll concur with me, that in effect what's being said because of the, or in spite of the abstraction necessary, that the House unanimously or by majority as it were is expressing the desire to government and the government is concurring should that be the case in the principle that this should happen. --(Interjection)-- Well then, Mr. Speaker, I see him saying, I see, Mr. Speaker, I see that there is a difference of opinion on the interpretation of the passage. I don't propose to settle it or attempt to settle it, but, Mr. Speaker, it does disappoint me that the Minister takes that narrow view or astringent interpretation of the passage of a private members' bill, because as you will notice there is no private members bill that I can remember on the order paper this session so far that doesn't -- and I may be wrong, but if I'm wrong it will be by exception, it will be by the single one or two exceptions out of 20 some resolutions. All preface themselves by saying that this House consider, or the government rather consider the advisability of such and such and we've always certainly hoped the government took the passage of those instruments as being an indication that the House agrees in principle with a certain course of action. And, Mr. Speaker, the reason I draw this to his attention is because that was what was brought to my attention particularly I believe a year or two ago when the First Minister introduced his private members' resolution relative to aid to private schools and what was cited many times during that debate was the previous resolution on the same subject sponsored by the Member for Rhineland.

In any event I want to conclude by not trying to settle that issue, perhaps we'll have other other occasions for it, but to point out to the treasury bench that this resolution, and it appears headed for passage I would hope, is a resolution which in effect will not cost the treasury any money in any event but that it is a resolution which will save the treasury money and save the taxpayers of Manitoba money. I notice as the PEP grants and the Municipal Emergency Fund Grants are made we see from time to time grants are now being required to the rural municipalities and the towns of Manitoba who are trying to clean up their river banks, and because we don't have this kind of legislation on the books that requires the owners of vehicles to clean up those vehicles and get rid of them or at least provide the funding for it, we the public or the taxpayer is being required to pay for it one way or the other through riverbank cleanups particularly or abandoned derelict cleanup programs throughout the province.

So with that observation, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the treasury that the adoption of this and the actual implementation by government of it I would think the treasury will find, the Finance Minister may want to confirm that at some point, that properly done the implementation of this kind of resolution will be a net tax saving to the people of Manitoba. And on that note, Mr. Speaker, I commend the resolution to the House and ask for its unanimous passage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I hope to speak in such time that we can still vote on this matter unless other members want to speak.

There are many times when you impose a tax which in the end becomes a net tax saving and you may remove a tax which will be a net savings to a province too. I would think that when we removed the Medicare premium tax there was a net saving in that more people were able to live a fuller life and benefit from the fact that they weren't being taxed in a manner which was inconsistent with their ability to pay.

But I want to speak only on the matter of the form of an abstract resolution, Mr. Speaker. The one before us deals with levying a charge which means a taxation, means paying

RESOLUTION NO. 9

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . out grants, I think the honourable member who last spoke mentioned, it deals with financial administration. That is the prerogative of government. When government or when the legislature, the majority of legislature is in favour of a concept and agrees that government shall consider the advisability of enacting legislation, that's exactly what we're voting on. That we will consider.

I point out to the honourable member the example he gave was one of a resolution presented by the First Minister, was it last year or a couple of years ago? Was one which I recall I supported and I said then I want them to consider the advisability of it. It had to do with appointing a committee, and I was not in favour of blanket aid to private schools if that's the one he was referring to. I was in favour of a committee studying the whole problem and coming up with recommendations. But I need only recall to the Leader of the Liberal Party, Resolution No. 7 which was voted down, voted in the negative only in the last few days, certainly within the last week, where it said "that the government consider the advisability of" and it dealt with capital gains taxation.

The point is that this side of the House was not prepared to have government consider the advisability of and therefore voted against it. But in this case, as has been indicated, we are prepared to consider the advisability of enacting legislation, and that is only an indication that we are not rejecting the concept but rather accepting the thought that we shall consider the advisability of. So regardless of how it's interpreted by honourable members, I think it is clear on this side of the House and has been clear since I believe the first session we were in government, that by accepting a resolution that we consider the advisability of doing something, we meant it in those precise words of the English language which spelt out that we would wish to consider the advisability of and not feel bound to carry out that kind of legislation or indeed any legislation only to consider the advisability. Nevertheless, I don't want to throw too much cold water on this resolution as I have heard colleagues on this side, we are most interested in carrying forward the studies on this program.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM(Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not very often that I want to pre-empt my eminent colleague from Lakeside but having heard the words from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, also the words from the Minister of Finance, I now have considerable difficulty in voting for this resolution. I was totally prepared to accept and endorse this type of resolution, but when I hear members from the government side say that in effect this resolution is meaningless, that all they're going to do is consider the advisability, I say they have a moral obligation to accept once they say they consider the advisability, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason alone I am going to vote against his resolution.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we call it adjournment? The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)