

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 8 May, 1981

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, report of committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make to the House today in regard to the proclamation of Arbor Day, today, May 8th. This year, to mark the occasion . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Can you wait until the copies are distributed?

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** This year, to mark the occasion, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources will plant a Japanese Elm tree on the grounds of the Legislative Buildings at 12:30 this afternoon.

I feel the planting of an elm tree is fitting considering the problems we've encountered with the onslaught of the Dutch Elm disease which has threatened the province's elm trees.

May I say that this year, as in the past, we must not forget the responsibility to keep up the fight against the spread of Dutch Elm disease within the province.

Responsibility for the Dutch Elm disease control program has been shifted from Manitoba Agriculture to the Natural Resources Department. However, provincial surveillance crews will be continuing in their efforts to identify and remove infected trees.

In the meantime it remains up to each and every Manitoban to be on the alert and to look for early warning signs of the disease's presence, like wilting of branches, so that infected trees can be in fact removed before healthy ones around are affected.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we give some formal recognition, as we do each year on Arbor Day, to the importance of planting trees.

It is equally important that we impress upon all Manitobans the need to plant trees and maintain

them so that ourselves and our future generations may enjoy them. We need only to look outside these walls on the grounds of the Legislature to fully appreciate the aesthetic value of trees. Our landscapes would indeed be barren without them.

In the meantime, in the country, Mr. Speaker, trees that have been planted in the shelter-belt areas have played a very important and useful function in the reduction of soil erosion. Mr. Speaker, I think especially during last year's drought and again this spring when we experienced some particularly windy days, shelter-belts have certainly proven their worth.

I hope that I can count on the support of all those in the House in proclaiming today Arbor Day and in expressing the hope that all Manitobans do their part to conserve and care for trees.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the galleries where we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing from the Tuxedo Shaftesbury High School, under the direction of Mr. Sematuk and Mr. Van Benthem. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister of the Province.

We have 35 students of Grade 9 standing from the Reston Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Brockman. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

We have 31 students of Grade 5 standing and eight adults from the St. Alphonsus School, under the direction of Mrs. Dziedzic. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Mr. Speaker, since it was in 1977 that the present government, while in Opposition, with a great deal of fanfare, made a promise to the people of Manitoba they would facilitate home purchases, and at that time the prime interest rate was in the neighbourhood of 10 percent, and since as a result of yesterday's announcement the prime interest rate is now 19.5 percent, and there is acknowledged acceptance of the fact that increasing numbers of Canadians and Manitobans will have very severe problems in retaining home ownership, and since this government has undertaken no programs of any significance to ensure that their promise has been maintained of 1977, can the Minister now advise whether belatedly after three years and eight months, this government is finally getting around to some

steps in order to ensure that they retain some credibility in respect to the commitment that they made back in October of 1977?

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

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition well knows, there have been many initiatives taken by this government to ensure that not only new Manitobans can buy houses but that existing Manitobans can stay in their homes by reducing the impact of property taxes on Manitobans through increased property tax credit, through special increases in property tax credits to the elderly, senior citizens, and so on and so forth.

But, Mr. Speaker, obviously the matter of high interests rates is of grave concern to not only all Manitobans but to all Canadians. It's a concern that has to be dealt with on a much broader basis than just by the resources available to the Provincial Government. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition in his future campaigning is going to come up with a very creative and inventive plan that will relieve the people that he says he's concerned about from these high interest rates.

But we are continuing to do what we can, and I know that through the core area initiatives programs there are a number of elements that will serve to assist Manitobans to purchase homes through a variety of programs in that particular group. I know that the Minister of Urban Affairs has referred to that and those are things that we are doing in a positive sense to help with the problem, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, since the Minister suggested that he was looking forward to some creative program that we would bring up, we are talking about the supposed creative program that the Conservatives promised back in 1977. Mr. Speaker, what we're calling upon the Minister responsible for Housing is to advise us as to what creative program did he and his colleagues have in mind in 1977, which obviously they have put on the back shelves. At this point with a prime interest rate of 19.5, when is the Minister responsible for Housing going to pull from the shelves that creative program that they promised Manitobans in 1977, that they would provide to Manitobans in respect to home ownership? When is the Minister responsible for Housing going to undertake some action?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I find it rather amusing, if not amazing, to see the Leader of the Opposition protesting so loudly about it when it was his federal counterparts who joined with the Liberal Government to defeat the mortgage interest deductibility proposal of the Federal Conservative Government of Joe Clark that would have brought some real relief to homeowners from the high interest rates, but they wanted no part of it. Now they're professing that they're very very concerned after their counterparts defeated such a proposal which would have helped substantially, homeowners in Canada.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, obviously, on a point of clarification, I was not referring to Joe Clark's promises, I was referring to the promises of his leader, Sterling Lyon, in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister, is the Minister prepared to confirm that indeed, in the last four years we've had continued foreclosure rates at levels in excess of any in the history of the Province of Manitoba, that those foreclosure increases have taken place under his government's four-year term during a time space in which they had promised they would assist and make easier home ownership in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, we brought a variety of meaningful programs into place that are helping people to continue to live in their own homes and a recent front page story in the Free Press indicated that Manitobans are better off in the total tax bases than all other provinces save one, and I think that these programs and these policies have been far more effective than anything that the Leader of the Opposition has suggested so far.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, now I'd like to address a new question to the Minister of Economic Development. Since the Minister of Economic Development . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe there were other members that indicated they wanted to ask questions. If the honourable member is on a new question, I think I should give consideration to others.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization. Could the Minister tell us please what hours the telephone is answered at the Emergency Measures Organization?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, EMO has a 24-hour service.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a strangely ambivalent answer. Is the Minister interested in the fact that during the evening the answering services —(Interjection)— this is a question, to whoever is yapping away over there, Mr. Speaker, — is the Minister interested in the fact that in the evening the telephone is answered by a recorded referral to 944-2211 which is the Legislative Building switchboard number where there is no answer?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, during the day hours, there is a regular operator at EMO. During the evening it is switched to a telephone answering service which connects the caller to whatever person happens to be on duty at that particular time depending on the nature of the emergency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest we received a misleading answer from the Minister, who said there was a 24-hour answering service at this number.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the Minister has ever checked out his responsibility in this area because we have checked it out, Mr. Speaker, we've had seven or eight phone calls. I wonder if the Minister will ensure that that phone is going to be answered because there is no answer at 944-2211 in the evening hours. And what are people to do if they have an emergency? What are the people in Morris to do if there's a tornado coming, as has happened in the not-too-distant past? What are the people in the north end of the city to do, and this is how this came to my attention?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I appreciate the honourable member's speech but this is the question period.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, one can't help but wonder what kind of an emergency that my honourable friend has experienced that has exercised her so much. But I repeat, there is a 24-hour answering service for the Emergency Measures Organization during the daylight hours. It is a regular operator on duty and during the evening hours there is an answering service that refers them to whoever is on duty at that particular time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a further question.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The emergency that has exercised me so much is the fact that somebody in the north end of the city who was aware of noxious fumes coming from a refinery was trying to obtain information, and that exercises me, Mr. Speaker. I wish the Minister would get a little more interested in the problems of the city. Will the Minister assure the House that he will have this investigated or is he just going to sit there in his self-righteous way passing off misleading information to the House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend had the courtesy to explain the nature of that emergency in the first instance I would have indicated to her, as I'm indicating to her now, that I will certainly have the matter investigated because there is an answering service that is on duty 24 hours a day and if that is not functioning I want to know the reason why.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance and ask the Minister of Finance whether he or the Premier or some representative of the Government of Manitoba either has or is prepared now to protest in the strongest terms to Prime Minister Trudeau and the Federal Government against the monetary policies of the Bank of Canada and the Federal Government which are going to lead this country down the path of economic ruin? Is this government prepared to do something to stand

up on its hind legs and to protest to Ottawa today if they haven't done so already?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Brandon East rightly identifies where the responsibility for the present interest rate situation lies and that is squarely with the Federal Government and that we are now reaping the benefits, if we can use that term, Mr. Speaker, of so many years of fiscal extravagance on the part of the Federal Government and on a recent full year, or more than a year, of ignoring the economic problems of this country while they are concentrating on a divisive constitutional issue.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Honourable Minister of Finance did not answer my question. My question is, specifically what is this government's view on the tight monetary policy being exercised by the Bank of Canada and supported by the Federal Minister of Finance, and I believe not very much different from the policies that Mr. John Crosbie had when he was Minister of Finance?

Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Canada is following a high interest rate policy to presumably protect the value of the Canadian dollar. Where does this government stand, where does this Minister of Finance stand on this issue? Is he supportive of these high interest rates in Ottawa? If he is not, is he prepared on behalf of his government and the people of Manitoba to now stand up and protest against this insane interest policy?

**MR. RANSOM:** Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to and we are protesting the handling of the national economy by the Federal Government. What the honourable member is doing is attempting to isolate the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada from the fiscal policy of the Federal Government and that is not possible.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to disagree with the Minister of Finance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I don't believe we are into a debate here. If the honourable member has a question, let him proceed.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he is prepared to zero in on a possibility at least of reducing interest rates or giving some preferential rates for small business people and for farmers as has been indicated in a recent report from Ottawa in line with concerns expressed by the Federal Minister of Agriculture. There is a possibility of some easing there at least. Is the Minister prepared to use his offices, to use the position of the government of Manitoba to encourage the Federal Government at least to pursue this line, to perhaps give some relief to that sector of the economy that is very vulnerable to very high interest rates?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the point raised by the honourable member deserves careful

attention. We cannot over emphasize the impact that these sorts of interest rates are having, especially on small businesses and upon farmers. We had an opportunity when the western Finance Ministers met in Victoria earlier this week to discuss the question of interest rates and it was the consensus of the four western Ministers that it is neither the responsibility nor is it within the fiscal capacity of provinces to attempt to offset the interest rates which have risen on an national and international scale. For example, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated, it's a rough estimate, that the loans that are out through the banking system in Manitoba, to business and farmers, are of such a scale that a 1 percent rise in interest rates amounts to approximately \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply not within the capacity of the province to offset that kind of an increase, nor should it be the responsibility of a province to try and counter the results of national policies and if the Federal Government wishes to entertain the possibility of providing offsets or subsidies in some specific cases, Mr. Speaker, I think that should be examined. But if I might return for a moment to the previous question that the honourable member tried to isolate the monetary policies of the Federal Government from their fiscal policies, the best advice that is available today is that the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada is basically sound. As difficult as the consequences of that might be, Mr. Speaker, what is lacking has been a responsible fiscal policy on the part of the Federal Government and those two things must go hand in hand and we are now seeing the results of several years of federal mismanagement of the economy.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Minister of Finance has indicated that the main problem in the Canadian economy is the absence of good fiscal policy on the part of the Canadian Nation, I wonder if he can elaborate for us just what the Government of Canada ought to be doing to bring that fiscal policy into line with his thinking?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** It's not only what the Federal Government should be doing now, Mr. Speaker, it's what the Federal Government should have been doing over the past decade or more, and that now we are in the situation we are, which has taken some period of time to arrive at, obviously it's not going to be an easy one to resolve. I have never said that we have all the answers or that any other provincial government has the answers. What I have said is that surely it is time that the Federal Government put their attention to this problem and instead of continuing to pursue their divisive constitutional issues, and that the Federal Minister of Finance should call together the Provincial Ministers of Finance and they should sit down together so that the provinces can be aware of what the strategy of the Federal Government is; what information is available to the Federal Government which is not available to us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet asked what is a very significant question and the nature of his question was that it required, and I believe he asked me to elaborate on it. The Member for Fort Rouge doesn't seem to be interested in hearing the answer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I find it rather difficult to hear the answer of the Honourable Minister. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a supplementary question.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this Government has enunciated on many occasions that the rate of expenditures of the country ought to be less than what it is, and given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the rate of increase in expenditures in Manitoba this year is greater than the increase of the national government, I want the Minister of Finance to clarify his position on national fiscal policy.

**MR. RANSOM:** Surely the nature of the question is such that it requires a rather elaborate answer and I'm sure that before I get into the question at all, there will be cries from the Opposition. The commitment that was made by all provinces and by the Federal Government in February of 1978 was that government expenditures should not rise faster than the rate of growth in the economy.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that conclusion was arrived at perhaps a decade too late, but it was finally arrived at. During our period of government the expenditures of our government have not risen faster than the growth in the economy over the period of three-and-a-half and the year that we are now into. As opposed, Mr. Speaker, to a situation where at least during the last four years of the previous administration, government expenditures were rising at more than four percentage points above the growth in the economy, so that party when they were in government were taking a larger and larger proportion of the gross provincial product and spending it. The Federal Government was doing the same thing at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and only belatedly have they come to the point where they recognize the necessity to control their expenditures. Unfortunately they seem to be opting, although we don't have the definite proposals on the table, they seem to be opting simply to try and cut their transfers of money to the provinces rather than to control their own expenditures.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Minister of Finance is advocating a much greater balance in public spending in balance with the national economy, can the Minister then explain why in this particular year his government has assumed the largest deficit Budget in the history of this province?

**MR. RANSOM:** Let me correct the last part of the statement, Mr. Speaker. This is the largest projected deficit. The previous administration, of course, simply didn't project the magnitude of the deficit they were going to have, which when we took over government even in 1977 dollars, was larger than the deficit that is being projected today without consideration for inflation, Mr. Speaker. We have said in the

introduction of our spending Estimates and the introduction of the Budget that we did not believe that it was appropriate at this time for this year to have to be raising taxes and taking money out of people's hands at a time when people need to be investing money to create the kind of economic activity that is necessary to revive the economy of this province and this country back to where it was a decade or two decades ago.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the Minister of Finance very specifically. Is he prepared today to pick up the telephone, phone the Minister of Finance in Ottawa and protest against the insane high interest rate policies, Mr. Speaker, or is he soft and agrees with this insane high interest rate policy which has nothing to do with the rate of expenditure by the Federal Government? I haven't heard of anything so stupid in all my life. Totally stupid]

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Brandon East is advocating that we engage in what is commonly known as Fed bashing. Mr. Speaker, this government is genuinely not interested in creating further divisions between the provinces and the Federal Government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. RANSOM:** The members opposite find that humorous. I find a number of their positions humorous. We are interested in seeing an extremely serious problem addressed and it requires that the Federal Government devote its attention to it, and it should devote by far the greatest majority of its attention to that issue now. We along with other provincial Finance Ministers have been asking the Federal Government to sit down for months now, for months, to sit down together and face this issue so that the provinces can have some sort of input into what the Federal Government is proposing.

They have refused to sit down with the provinces and discuss it. They persist instead in going ahead with their issues of the confrontation on the Constitution and on the National Energy Policy. They're not finished, Mr. Speaker, they're not finished. We continue . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Order please. I would like to listen to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Finance if no one else does.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, when the Western Finance Ministers met in Victoria earlier this week we issued a communique following that meeting saying that if Federal-Provincial relations are to be improved, then the Federal Government and the provinces are going to have to sit down and discuss these issues. We were referring more specifically then to the questions of equalization and EPF funding, etc., and until the Federal Government is

prepared to lay its policies on the table; to lay its intentions on the table and to have meaningful discussion with the provinces, then we are going to continue to be faced with problems on this nature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never heard as many excuses in all my life for doing nothing, for doing nothing. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Finance in relation to interest rates.

Has the Minister asked his staff to re-examine the projected growth rate for this province for the year 1981, inasmuch as the interest rates have gone higher and are anticipated to continue to be high and maybe even higher, and in light of the fact that we are expected to have the lowest growth rate of all the provinces in Canada this year and in light of the fact that since 1977, we've actually declined — minus 0.4? In the light of the fact of our very poor and weak economic growth picture, will the Minister re-examine the figures and see whether or not these high interest rates will have a dampening effect? I'm sure the answer will be yes, but to what extent does he expect the growth rate to be even poorer because of these extraordinarily, very unusually, historically high interest rates?

**MR. RANSOM:** I should think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be evident to anyone, including the Member for Brandon East, that the sorts of interest rates that we are facing today are going to have a dampening effect on the economy.

I pointed out the magnitude of a 1 percent rise in interest rates on the amount of money that's simply loaned through the banking system alone, obviously it is going to have an impact. It is probably going to have a relatively greater impact on Manitoba than it will have on many of the other provinces, because of the nature of the businesses in this province that have a lot of capital loan borrowed. It is certainly going to have a very serious impact and yes, Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge that the level of growth in this province has not been high, to say the least, over the past three-and-one-half years. I point out again to the Honourable Member for Brandon East where the growth rate of this province was when they left after eight years; that it was down to 0.8 percent in the last year, Mr. Speaker, that's where we started from; at the end of eight years of NDP Government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour and follows upon the presentation of the unemployment statistics for this month. I'd ask the Minister what action his government is going to be taking, in respect to the job slump, which this province has seen over the past year and the fact that we have had the second lowest growth in the labour force out of all ten provinces over the last year and the second lowest increase in the number of jobs over the last year according to the figures that were released today?

What sort of long-term or even short-term activity does the Minister plan in order to encourage job

creation in the province, given the disastrous record of that government over the past 12 months?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I'll try to answer the last part first and the first part last; the last part being, the member is aware that certain segments of society, the industrial part of it, in the Province of Manitoba are definitely on the upward swing. He knows that. He knows that there are some major projects that are in the offing in the future of Manitoba.

The members opposite want to use the word "mega", I'm quite satisfied with that word, it doesn't bother me at all.

The member also, if he's been doing his research and I suspect he has, knows that I've said on many occasions that you don't take a month, over a month, to get an indicator of where you're going. It's best to use the entire year, but just for information's sake and because of curiosity I thought we'd use a third of a year, the first four months this year versus the first four months last year, and I ask the member to get those figures and he can check mine.

In the first four months last year we were averaging 4,500 new jobs in Manitoba, in the first four months of 1980; not spectacular but certainly acceptable. This year in the first four months we were averaging 6,700. Mr. Speaker, that again may not be spectacular, but we're averaging an increase; an average in four months is something I think he could be reasonably acceptable to accept as something reasonably credible. So for the first third of a year in 1980 there was 4,500 on an average created in the Province of Manitoba; this year in those same four months there was 6,700. We hope that increases; that's not the four prime months of the year, Mr. Speaker, which will ultimately give you a year's average, but it is encouraging. At least it is encouraging for me to see an average of an additional 500 jobs a month this year of an increase over last year.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I find the Minister's figures confusing and I find them contradictory to the figures presented by Statistics Canada.

I'd ask the Minister how he reconciles the fact that according to the seasonally adjusted figures, which are those figures that are most often used when quoting employment statistics, that in January, as of January 17th, 1981, there were 463,000 employed Manitobans and as of April 18th, 1981 there were 463,000 employed Manitobans; an increase of zilch, of nothing, at the time when the labour force grew by 2,000 persons on a seasonally adjusted basis.

Now how does he reconcile the fact we've had no growth; those 2,000 people coming into the labour force have not been able to find jobs and yet he tries to tell us that at this time that his figures this year are better than the figures for the year previous, which just is not the fact, if one uses seasonally adjusted figures.

I'd ask the Minister what action he is going to be taking to ensure that those 2,000 persons that were unable to find jobs are able to find jobs in a growing economy instead of excuses and promises of mega projects, which they so casually toss about, and yet

people are still being unemployed and there are more people on a seasonally adjusted basis unemployed today than there were on January 17th, 1981? What action is he going to take besides promises, besides those held out assurances of mega projects of which we see no action and no jobs being created?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, again we'll talk about the last part of the question first and the first part second. It is only a few months ago that the members opposite were saying that the mega projects were just something in fantasy land. Now I see, Mr. Speaker, that they have now decided to have a look at the possibility of those very seriously, even though they object to them they are starting to come out with some opinions. It's interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition's opinion and the more he talks the better off we are, so I hope that he keeps making his position, whatever it may be from day to day, and try to make it reasonably clear.

I ask the member if he would be kind enough to precisely look at the amount of increased employment in the first four months of last year, just simply do that at his leisure or any other time, and look at the amount of increased employment in the first four months this year; that simple, get the numbers, have a look at it, average it out like we have always tried to talk about, and he'll find that it averaged in the first four months last year 4,500 jobs, and he'll find this year that it averaged 6,700 jobs, an increase of 2,000 in four months, 4 into 2,000 is 500. That's good general round indications of where we are going with the employment growth in Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can't remember the exact words of the First Minister, something like weasel, oil and slime your way out of answering, but if ever there was an attempt to accomplish that sort of manipulation of statistics, the Minister of Labour has given us the most classic example at this Session. I'd ask the Minister of Labour . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I find it difficult to hear the question by the Honourable Member for Churchill.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was yelling as loudly as I could. I would ask the Minister if he is going to take some action in view of the fact that when one compares the January figures with the April figures, we are the only province out of all ten provinces to have shown an increase in the unemployment rate. We are the only one out of all ten provinces. Is the Minister going to take a new look at the statistics and try to do it without being so selective so that he can get an overview and come up with some sort of positive program instead of promising us mega projects and delivering to us mega disasters like Swifts, the Tribune, and a list that's too long to present at this time?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I deliberately was not trying to be selective. I have asked the members

opposite the same as I have asked my own caucus and I have said publicly and to the press that you shouldn't feel too elated when you have an exceptionally good month because it doesn't indicate a trend. I don't think you should feel too depressed if you have a poor month. You have to have a series of months to compare it. So I'm not being selective. If the members opposite will take those first four months, take the first four months this year, it's quite simple, very simple, and he'll find that there's an average of 500 more jobs per month being created in the Province of Manitoba this year than there was last year. That's simple.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services. Is he aware that some of the members of his staff take exception to clients getting in touch with the MLA for assistance, and he can take my word for it that this is the case, I'm sure he does know? My second question is, will he take steps to make sure that this is not repeated, to inform all staff that this is the right of every Manitoban to get in touch with the MLA and they owe him the same courtesy in their dealing even if they do that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the situation that the Honourable Member describes and I will investigate it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to what the situation is in regard to rail traffic to the town of Churchill? Could he inform the House whether there's a hearing going to be held as to whether there's a possibility of removing that traffic?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I assume the Member for Rock Lake is referring to passenger rail traffic, and yes indeed, it is my understanding that the railroads are making application to reduce certain levels of service and we are following that up very closely, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Time for question period has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion in my name on page 3?

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SPEED-UP MOTION

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on this motion. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have —(Interjection)— We have to have clowns in this Chamber, I realize. I realized the circus is in town but I didn't realize one of them had got into this Chamber namely in the person of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, but if we have to have clowns, well, we have to have clowns. That's fine, I accept that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I find it very difficult to hear the comments of the Honourable Member for Logan with a lot of conversation going on. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's all right, those clowns over there don't bother me too much.

Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on . . .

**MR. RANSOM:** On a point of order. I believe that the Member for Logan referred to the members over here as clowns. I believe that's unparliamentary and he should withdraw that remark.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the clowns that are appearing here in the Shrine Circus this weekend I apologize for making that reference that they would be allied to those people on the other side of this House, therefore I withdraw that remark.

To get back to the motion that is before us, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Members will have a chance to take part in this debate if they are willing to wait their turn. The Honourable Member for Logan presently has the floor.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've not changed my mind as far as the necessity of having to have a Speed-up motion. I have consistently over the years spoken against it and most times have voted against it.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we don't have very much work before this House. There isn't the amount of legislation; there's 62 bills I think, 60 some odd bills. Of those only approximately 30 are Government Bills — the Government House Leader is going to tell me that the numerous Private Members' Bills that we see in the name of members of the Assembly on that side of the House are Government Bills in disguise, then I would have to say that perhaps are more bills. But the workload, Mr. Speaker, is not that heavy. There is no heavy workload as before this Chamber this year; this is an exceptionally light year in the legislative sense.

There are members who work for this Assembly: the Clerk; the Deputy Clerk; Sergeant-at-Arms; the recorder; the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms; the other

staff that all work in this Assembly and work very hard on behalf of the honourable members of this Assembly. They just can't walk in here when the bells ring or walk out of here when we adjourn, their work starts long before we come here and carries on long after we leave here.

**MR. DOERN:** They need a union.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, the Member for Elmwood is right. I think these people do need a union. They do need some better hours and I think that we have to really look at the way we're treating our hired help. I don't excuse ourselves when we were in Government, because we did some of the same things, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that people cannot operate in this Chamber under long hours. We make mistakes in legislation; the Attorney-General has already tabled one bill which we have sent to Committee that was full of mistakes, correcting mistakes that we made last year because we were in Speed-up and you know, Mr. Speaker, we've had no guarantee from the Attorney-General, even though he was questioned yesterday by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns.

On the Private Members' side of the Order Paper that is remaining to us there are a number of Private Members' Bills. Now the Attorney-General, if his motion goes through and I'm not saying that it's not going to go through, because I know it's going to go through; but government business will take precedence over all other business.

That means that my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, who has a Private Members' Bill on the Order Paper, which he wishes to have discussed, but the Attorney-General, the Government House Leader, once this bill is passed and he has not promised, he has not promised once this resolution is passed; he can be very selective; he can go to the Private Members' section of this Order Paper and say well, we'll take bill — alright let's see here just some for example — we'll take, ah, yes here we are — Adjourned Debates, he'll take the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland; that's one, that's one Private Members' Bill; he'll take 18 which is another one; he'll take 20, 21, 22, but will he call number five?

Now that has been standing on the Order Paper for some time. Once this resolution is passed there is no way, if the Government House Leader doesn't wish to, has no inclination to call that bill so that bill will be discussed. Even if you're not going to vote for it at least discuss it. Vote against it, do something, but let it die on the Order Paper and that's a slick trick. We did it, you've done, everybody's done it, who has ever been government has done it. The odd time, sometimes the Order Paper is cleared.

So I say to the Attorney-General that surely you must be able to give us some guarantee that you're going to call these Private Members' Bills that are standing in names of members who are on this side of the House, because once we give you this authority under the Speed-up Motion, government business takes precedence over everything else and you will call the shots. You know we've had this argument by the First Minister, we had this argument by the Member for Inkster that you are the people who are protecting our rights. Well I want some guarantee that you're going to protect my rights. My

rights to hear our bills called and I don't believe you, I don't believe you . . .

**MR. ENNS:** That's where you're wrong.

**MR. JENKINS:** . . . because you've got to show me, you've got to show me.

**MR. ENNS:** You can put your complete faith and trust in us.

**MR. JENKINS:** In fact I would want it in writing from the First Minister or from the Attorney-General that he does intend to call these bills before I would give him my vote. I want it in writing. I'm not that naive that I'm going to believe that the Attorney-General is going to get up and tell me that he's prepared to call these bills, because I don't think he is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if these people over there are anxious to go out to meet their fate on the hustings, if you can assure me then I'll vote for this resolution, so you can get out. I'll expedite the business so you can get out of here if you want to call an election, but if you're just going to go out of here to have a holiday, then you might just as well spend another week or two and do the legislation properly, so that you don't make mistakes. You expect the people in Legislative counsel downstairs to work and make amendments to your bills under pressure.

Work at a leisurely pace and you can get the legislation through. Like I said, Mr. Speaker, there is not that much work here that requires this House to sit morning, noon and night, Monday to Saturday. There isn't the work here, Mr. Speaker, and you know this is perhaps the last time that you're going to really need a Speed-up Motion in this House, because I would imagine that with the setup that you have now, the bill that you passed earlier on this session for the payment of MLAs, that they will be paid on a bi-weekly basis. There is no need for calling a session and completing it and if you want to have a second session that you have to pass special legislation in order to pay the MLAs for the time that they spent in this Chamber; because now MLAs will be on a yearly basis, they will be here and they will be expected to be here.

I visualize that the Chambers of the future, and I think it's a good one, will be operating on a much longer basis than what we have in the past. We are one of the few, I think we and Prince Edward Island, are the only ones left, I believe they meet on this sessional basis of just having a session and running it completely through. Others have now a spring session and they have a fall session, and the members are paid on a yearly basis. So, if this Order Paper was heavy I would vote for your Speed-up Motion. I would vote for your Speed-up Motion, but your legislative program, it's light. It's a very light one and any of the Bills that you have are really not that controversial. Most of them are amendments. They are generally in the main, housekeeping bills. There are no bills here of any great philosophical difference.

**MR. DOERN:** Name one.

**A MEMBER:** Take a look at 36; take a hard look at 36, that's a heavy one.

**MR. JENKINS:** I don't know if the Minister of Government Services is having one of his funny



jokes again or his funny half-hours but, as I have said, there is nothing of any great consequence before the Legislature and if the members of this Assembly feel they want to get out of this House — and I realize that it's not this side of the House that's going to call an election — it's that side.

If you really want to go out to the people you just give us the word and we'll clear you out of this House; we'll clear the Order Paper very quick. But, if you're not prepared to do that, you're just prepared to want to get out of here for the sake of getting out of here, hurrying up the business, then I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to vote for this Resolution and I will be voting against it because there is nothing, as I have said, and I'll reiterate it again, there is nothing of any heavy consequence on this Order Paper. There are only 60 Bills and of those approximately only 30 are Government Bills, the remainder are Private Members' Bills and they won't all be dealt with. So, you've got a light Order Paper. If you want out of here it's very simple to do, you don't have to sit here Monday to Saturday from morning, noon until night because the Order Paper is so light that it's almost negligible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** We will support the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Before we move the adjournment, perhaps, he would give me the courtesy of having the opportunity of making a few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we've listened now to several speakers from the other side of the House who incidentally have indicated that they've always been opposed to this measure. I find that rather curious because there was no manifestation of that Opposition when they were on this side of the House. They kept it very quietly to themselves if they were indeed opposed to the Speed-up Motion. And, what is the essence of the Motion, Mr. Speaker? It's designed, as it always has been, to complete the business of the Session in as expeditious a manner as possible.

Now I don't know what happened here prior to 1969. I hear some horrible tales about how Premier Roblin use to keep them here at all hours of the day and all hours of the night.

Now, it happened on a couple of occasions, since I've been here, that we sat late hours but that has not been the case since 1974; and what has happened and the significance that seems to have escaped my honourable friends is that in 1974 there was a rather significant change made in the Rules of this House and the manner in which we dealt with Estimates, the manner in which we dealt with the

business of the House, which changed the whole manner in which we approach our business. My honourable friends seem to have a tendency to erupt themselves in the Thirties. This is suppose to be a — (Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to point out to the Minister that he, in addressing this side, is making the assumption that we are all of one opinion and I want him to be corrected on that point.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, I didn't make that assumption, as a matter of fact, I referred to the ones that have spoken and they spoke in opposition to the measure. As I, with the exception of course of the speech that was just delivered by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, which was a modicum of brevity, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Speed-up Motion, after the manner in which we're dealing with the Estimates and the manner in which we're dealing with the business of the House, comes as somewhat of a relieve. And, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was you, yourself, who made the suggestion which was acted upon and has proven to be a very useful suggestion, that we sit in the House two sessions a day, in the morning and the afternoon and then we reserve Committee hearings for the evening. That relieves a large percentage of the membership of the House. They actually have a night off and if you judiciously alternate members of the Committee it gives everybody an opportunity to get an evening off and maybe two or three evenings off a week. I don't find that an onerous burden at all.

Now mention has been made of the clerical staff, the people who work in this House, and I must admit that during the years that my honourable friends were in government that was rather an onerous burden to be placed upon them to be sitting here night after night. The staff of the Clerk's office has been increased to the extent that they even get a night off once in awhile now, and they have during the course of the session. The burden is not nearly as great as it use to be. So, the arguments that my honourable friends are using in opposition to this particular motion are non-arguments; they don't exist. They are figments of their imagination based on experiences in the distant past; they bear no relationship whatsoever to what is happening today.

? — ?

But, notwithstanding what has taken place over the years; notwithstanding the changes that have taken place and the membership in this House; the addition to the staff so that the burden that they now face is somewhat lightened; notwithstanding the hours that we now sit when we're in Speed-up; notwithstanding the fact that those hours have been lessened considerably and made a lot easier, they still persist in the argument that they're opposed to it. One can only assume that they're opposed to it on a matter of principle. They'd rather sit here for two more months than cleaning up the business of the House in one week which is what we're capable of doing when we are in Speed-up.

It is not a design on the part of the Government to ram things down the throat of the Opposition; it is an agreement between the Opposition and the

Government that they will attempt to deal with the business of the House in as an expeditious a manner as possible. Mr. Speaker, I checked the record, from 1974 to 1977, the last four years that we were on that side of the House, this resolution passed with one, sometimes two speakers. There was only one occasion during that period when it was held over from one day to the next, and that was because the Leader of the Liberal Party chose to adjourn the debate and he spoke the following day, I believe it was, and the motion passed. (Interjection)—Gordon Johnson. Why now? Why now this sudden interest in obstructing this particular measure. I find it difficult to understand the positions that are being taken by honourable gentlemen opposite.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks in view of the statement made by the Minister. My position has never changed on the Speed-up resolution; I have always been opposed to one provision or one component of it, and that is the after 10:00 p.m. open-ended sessions. The Minister knows very well that when one is in government and positions are debated, the people take their positions and eventually a consensus or a position is arrived at, and then that's normally the way it goes. It's a block vote.

I have always spoken in this House whenever I — well whenever I have spoken I have opposed the late night provision, and I have done that in Cabinet and in Caucus and will always continue to do that because I regard that as utter madness, especially at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the House is sitting three times a day, six days a week. I see no need for that.

You know, I have sat here, I think along with other members in the last 15 years often past midnight, once I think till 7:00 in the morning, once till 5:45, 3:00 or 4:00. Last year, it seems like a long time ago, the Attorney-General and I and others sat till 4:30 on the Election Bills, partly because the Attorney-General wanted to finish the debate. He almost finished all of us in the process, including himself. But I regard that, as my colleague says, as stupid, it is not a rational approach. It's a steamroller approach and an attempt to basically break the Opposition physically. And the government can do that because of the weight of numbers.

I don't to unduly criticize this government for the Speed-up resolution, because all governments, I think, require the Speed-up resolution, but I want to plead with the Attorney-General, who I think has some influence in this matter, to consider that when the session is going into Speed-up and when we're in three times a day sessions and have to be here every morning, afternoon and evening, that it makes no sense to run late hours, and to me once you go beyond the 10:00 o'clock closing, you get into 11:00 or 12:00, that's enough, that's more than enough. The tone of the debate and the quality of the debate deteriorates significantly late at night, after midnight for some, and by the time you get home and so on it becomes, I think, an exercise in futility.

Now I have always tried, Mr. Speaker, as an Opposition critic and a Minister to end at 10:00 o'clock, and I have had very good success with this. I have spoken to the Attorney-General last night and

we came to an agreement and it went a little longer than anticipated, but that was a reasonable approach. The Minister of Education has been reasonable with his Estimates, and I'm talking about my own experiences. I have talked to the Minister of Government Services and he made certain allowances in that regard, and the Minister of Cultural Affairs. So I don't have any complaints, because my policy is let's stop at a reasonable hour. I have often made concessions to achieve that, and so has the other side.

But I simply say that I don't like to put myself in a position of giving the government a club and then begging for mercy. This is an old saying of the New Democratic administration, "Never give your enemy a club and then plead for mercy, because they might beat you into the ground. You put them at your judgment and in their hands."

I simply say that my opposition to this resolution is on the after 10:00 provision, and I think the Legislature has moved very well this year; I think we've made good progress; and I think there's a very good possibility, Mr. Speaker, of ending in one to two weeks. I think that all of us see that it is possible that we could end at the end of next week, or given that it's a long week-end, without problem some time between Tuesday and Friday of the following week.

So given those conditions, I don't think there is any need for the government to get tough with the Opposition. Now they haven't really done that yet, but I'm simply saying to them in advance, when the time comes bear in mind that everybody has to go home and have some rest so that they can be fresh the next day.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned, if there are no other speakers.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call adjourned debates on second reading from Bills 12 to 58. I wonder if there could be perhaps leave given to proceed with Bill 58 first. The Member for Morris, the Minister of Government Services has a speaking engagement later on. If you could call Bill 58 first and then 12 down to 56.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 58, AN ACT TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL LANDS PROTECTION ACT

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** By leave, Bill 58, An Act to amend The Agricultural Lands Protection Act. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, when the debate was called the other night because of the adjournment hour, I had just briefly began my

remarks with respect to the provisions of this particular bill.

The Member for St. Johns had just concluded his remarks and made a few observations that I feel constrained to comment upon. His first observation that farming is a way of life is one that would lead to me to believe that he has not kept pace with the developments in the agricultural industry in the last number of years. It is fast becoming a highly technical business rather than a way of life.

It requires a great deal more in the way of ability to understand cash flow, to be a market analyst, to be a financier, and to be a number of other things which has always been a characteristic of farming. But the new generation of farmers are not the stereotyped people that my honourable friends seem to believe that they are. The new generation of farmers are a well educated, university trained group of young people who in many instances have taken over the farms from their parents and have a very thorough understanding of all of the things that are necessary to operate a modern successful farm including some of the characteristics that I mentioned earlier such as the ability to understand cash flow, finance, etc., etc. So they are now being run as professional enterprises rather than as a way of life as my honourable friend from St. Johns seemed to indicate that they were and that in itself has changed the nature of farming to a significant extent.

Now the problem that my honourable friends seem to perceive in the amendments that are now being proposed to this particular piece of legislation stem from their ideological hang-up with respect to the ownership of land. They have indicated on more than one occasion as recently as when the constitutional debate was taking place in the House of Commons, when they made it very clear that in no way did they want included in a provision of a Charter of Rights a clause that would even dare to suggest that Canadians should have the right to own land, over and over again. They've made that statement in the House and the Member for St. Johns made a statement when he was on this side of the House, that he didn't believe that there should be even home ownership, that the government should own all the homes as well and rent them out. That statement has been made over and over again and it has been manifested by some of their actions.

Their refusal to remove the inheritance tax was a pretty good indication of what they had in mind. As a matter of fact, one member on this side of the House during those years when they were on this side of the House went so far as to state that if he had his way they would tax all estates away. There would be nothing left. If a person died the farm would go with it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of privilege. (Interjection)—

**MR. CHERNIACK:** On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and the member should know that a matter of privilege cannot be interrupted. He should know that, the Speaker just told us that just a couple of days ago, and he is supposed to speak only when the Speaker recognizes him.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman has time and again misread what I said and has misinterpreted what I

said time and again to the extent where it has become a falsehood in his mouth to keep repeating statements which he knows because he has the speech in his desk — I'm sure of that — which he knows to be false and I demand, Mr. Speaker, that he retract the statement that he made just recently that time and time again I said that land should be owned by the government and rented to the people. It's not true. I demand that he withdraw that statement or prove it and I know he can't.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I made no such statement, Mr. Speaker. What I said, and my honourable friend knows it's a fact, was a statement that he made several years ago when he said that he didn't believe that home ownership was such a good thing — (Interjection)— Well, if my honourable friends says it's not true, I'll get the reference — I don't have it with me — but I'll get the reference for my honourable friend and he rises on a phony question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, because I made no such statement. The statement that I made was in reference to the question of home ownership.

He comes dashing in the House here like a wet hen rising on a question of privilege which isn't a question of privilege because I didn't make that statement.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order now.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** It's privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On a point of privilege.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes. The Minister for Transportation stated that I was a comrade of the Russians. Mr. Speaker, I reject and resent that statement as being not only false but imputing motives that imply that I have something to do with representing the Russians here. You know it's false, Mr. Speaker, I demand he withdraw that statement.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** To the honourable member, I am not aware of the statement being made in the House. —(Interjections)— The Honourable Minister of Government Services has the floor.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Speaking on the point of privilege that has been raised, Mr. Speaker, I think you can find people in this House who are willing to testify that they heard the comment that was the subject of the matter of privilege, and I for one heard that. I have also heard other equally insulting remarks from that same Minister time after time, Mr. Speaker, and I frankly think it's time he was brought to order by the Chair.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If the Honourable Minister of Highways is prepared to accept that this is what was said and withdraw his remarks, I would be happy to acknowledge the Honourable Minister of Highways. If he does not wish to do so at this point, I

am not in the position to demand his withdrawing the remarks. They were not heard by the Chair.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services has the floor. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** You have not dealt with the purported question of privilege and I was waiting for you to deal with that so I could resume my remarks and not be interrupted by these constant interjections by the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, to the honourable members on the matter of privilege. I wasn't aware that the remarks that the Honourable Member for St. Johns had attributed to the Honourable Minister of Government Services were in fact so and therefore I cannot rule on whether it's a matter of privilege. The only thing I can suggest is that after reading Hansard that a decision will be made on whether a matter of privilege was in fact so.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns is one of those who continuously sits in his seat and interjects and when somebody else is on his feet to speak, those interjections come flowing across the Chamber all the time; and when he is on his feet if someone even makes a comment to his seat mate then he will complain bitterly because everybody is interjecting his remarks. I wish the honourable member would extend the same kind of courtesy to other members that he expects from this side of the House.

Now I am not in the habit, Mr. Speaker, of interjecting when other people are making remarks in this House and I would like a little bit of that courtesy myself but I don't expect it from the Member for St. Johns who is completely lacking in courtesy.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, she is getting an excellent student from the Member for Fort Rouge who seems to be learning the lessons from the Member for St. Johns very adeptly.

Mr. Speaker, a comment has been made during the course of this debate . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to take part in debate when she is recognized by the Chair. At this time I recognize the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that I will be able to reply to that in light of it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member should know that it's highly improper to ask a direct question of the Speaker.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** And this honourable member has been in this Chamber long enough to also that she has an opportunity to speak . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. We cannot carry on the business of this Chamber in a proper manner if there is constant interjections from members in this Chamber. There is a matter that

does occur from time to time where there are very good interjections, but they are done usually in the manner to promote and stimulate debate rather than of a personal nature.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to proceed now without the from-the-seat interjections from the Member for St. Johns and the Member for Fort Rouge, I will try to do so. Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— you see, Mr. Speaker, there we have it again. He simply is incapable of containing himself. Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Apparently members wish to proceed in their own manner without recognizing or being recognized by the Chair. At this time I have recognized the Honourable Minister of Government Services and no one else in this Chamber.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was attempting to point out in response to some comments that were made on the other side of the House during the course of this debate, the honourable gentlemen opposite seem to be of the opinion that this bill should contain provisions that would hold land prices down — that seems to be the burden of their argument — that a bill of this nature it would be possible to keep land prices down. Mr. Speaker, we know that is not possible, we cannot live in isolation in this province.

I cannot refrain from recounting the experience in British Columbia when the Barrett government decided that they would freeze all land sales and I can understand British Columbia having a bit of a problem. Their land resource base is somewhat limited for the population that they have and they decided it would be prudent to attempt to reserve as much of that land as possible for agricultural purposes; a policy I find very little to quarrel with.

So in the freezing of land, the people who lived in the periphery of the city of Vancouver were agitated to the extent where they stormed the Legislative Buildings. They rioted and they paraded and they demonstrated simply because the action of the government would have the effect of denying them the opportunity of selling their land to the developers who were moving eastward from the city of Vancouver; it was a rather difficult situation for the government at that time.

But what actually happened as a result of that move turned out to be the law of the unexpected returns. What happened was that farmers in those areas suddenly found that there was another market for that land and within a matter of months land prices skyrocketed up to about \$10,000 an acre, and I don't think even today, Sir, that you can find an acre of land outside the city of Vancouver within a 50 mile radius that will sell for less than \$10,000 an acre. Here is what happened.

As soon as the government passed the legislation decreeing that land would be used and sold only for agricultural purposes, the very people that the Barrett Government were attempting to prevent from buying up land were the ones that were given the opportunity to buy the land — the rich people. They moved out from the City of Vancouver, bought these

farms, built their homes in the centre of the farm and then rented the farmland out for agricultural purposes. There was not a violation of the edict that had been issued and so what you find is that these estates cropped up on the eastern edge of the City of Vancouver.

So an effort to attempt to control land prices had the opposite effect of increasing land prices dramatically in a very short period of time. Some mention was made the other day of the fact that land prices have increased considerably in all the countries in the Western World and that is a fact. People of German extraction are coming to this part of the country, buying land for prices that are far below what they're selling land for in Germany. They can sell a quarter of a section and buy two sections here and that is the nature of land transactions and one that is very difficult to deal with.

Legislation has been demonstrated in, as has been demonstrated in British Columbia, legislation will not cure that problem because it's a market situation that will find its level, regardless of what kind of legislation that you have on the books.

What the government in this instance is attempting to do and what we have indicated that we feel is the responsibility for us to do and that's to treat all Canadians alike; we cannot live in isolation. If we're going to be Canadian then we've got to act like it. I don't see how, if we believe in being Canadians, that we can restrict land ownership to people who just happen to live in another province or happen to live in the city. Why the prohibition against a Canadian to own something that he wants to own? There is no prohibition against a farmer coming in here and buying all the lots, buying up the whole City of Winnipeg, no prohibition against that at all. Why should there be a prohibition against people who live in the City going out to buy land on farms?

The fact is that the whole complexity of this situation is changing from day to day and farmers are recognizing this and farmers are accepting it. What's the difference if they rent from a neighbour or if they rent from somebody who owns land who lives in the City. The situation is no different as far as they're concerned. Preferably they'd want to own the land themselves; preferably they would like to continue farming it and that is something that my honourable friends opposite were opposed to. That was demonstrated by their refusal to remove, as I said earlier, that inheritance tax. There's nothing that has helped the transfer of land from one farmer to another, from father to son, more than the removal of that tax and I can tell my honourable friends opposite farmers understand that and they understand it very well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was amused at some of the comments that were being made because as usual they're made in the context that there has been no change on the farm in the last 50 years. My honourable friends are so fond of going back to the Thirties that I think they prefer to live in the Thirties because they continually base their arguments on circumstances and situations that existed at that period of time.

The arguments just recently on the resolution that was introduced to this House were based on a concept of this place that no longer exists and I wish my honourable friends would start to recognize the

situation that exists at this particular time, rather than as they would like it to exist 30 years ago. It shouldn't be difficult for them to do that. My honourable friend, I see the Member for Ste. Rose is poised and ready for the attack and I presume that he'll be making his cogent and pungent comments in this House in a few moments.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one comment to the remarks that were made by the Member for St. George and he said, "we say that farmland in Manitoba" — and he's referring to the honourable gentlemen opposite — "should effectively be owned and operated by residents living on the farmland. That should be the main thrust of the legislation".

Mr. Speaker, that is telling farmers where they should live. That is again directing farmers what they should do with their own lives and how they should live their own lives. We reject that, Mr. Speaker. We believe that this country was born in freedom and should remain in freedom. We don't believe that the government should be directing people where and how they should live. What we've done in this legislation is attempt to get a handle on the transactions that are taking place; we tempt to limit the purchase of farmland by foreigners because every other country is doing it, I think with the possible exception of the United States and they're moving in that direction as well because I read some articles recently to the effect that was going to happen in the United States.

That is not an unusual or a singular thing to attempt to retain people who live in this country, and I might add that there is no prohibition against the sale of any farmland to anybody that wants to take up a residence in this country and become a landed immigrant.

So we welcome, as a matter of fact, those people with their capital and their knowledge of farming. Quite a number of those so-called German immigrants have settled in my constituency. They happen to be excellent farmers; they brought a lot of skills to agriculture that we weren't even aware of; they have contributed a great deal to the agricultural community and we welcome them here in this country and anybody that wants to come to this country and live as a landed immigrant is free to purchase land just like any other farmer. Sir, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the bill that's before us here.

Mr. Speaker, I don't profess to be a farmer but I do know that the farms of today, regardless of what the member had just spoken, that the farms of today are a far different of the farms of 30 or 35 years ago. I know that the farms have changed. I don't know if this legislation, or even the legislation that we had, was going to protect the farmlands that we have. I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, something that disturbs me greatly, as a city dweller and as a citizen of this country and for my descendants in the future, we are not blessed with an overabundance of agricultural land in this fair land of ours. When you look across this country and see just how much agricultural land we do possess it is not as what one looks at a map, a vast area. If it was stretched out

from coast to coast I doubt that you would have a strip even approaching 60 miles from coast to coast, that is agricultural land in this country of ours.

We are, at the present time, net exporters of food but if we are not careful with the urban sprawl that is coming about and the use of —(Interjection)— But you know, we have in parts of Ontario where land is being gobbled up, prime agricultural land being gobbled up at 35 to 40 acres per minute, per minute. You know that is disturbing; that is very disturbing.

If we are going to have any kind of agricultural protection we should be making sure, as the Member for Morris said,, the former Barrett Government in B.C. tried to protect the diminishing amount of agricultural land. —(Interjection)— Well, regardless of what agriculture is still agriculture whether you grow apples, whether you grow oranges, whether you grow pears, peaches, or whether you grow wheat, barley, oats, rapeseed, whatever the product is. And you know the more that we diminish that stock — and that's a very small stock we have in this country — I, as an urban dweller, am very very disturbed when I see that very limited stock of agricultural land that we have going out of production. If we could have had our way when we settled this country we should have settled and built cities like Toronto up in the northern part of Ontario rather than down in the prime agricultural area. But unfortunately we were not able to do that because the settlement of our country was mainly by lakes, rivers and streams and so the most productive farm lands are situated near our large cities and the urban sprawl we're having today is one that, if it doesn't disturb agricultural members over there, I'll tell you it sure as hell disturbs me as an urban member because I can see the day, Mr. Speaker, we will wind up not being net exporters of food but wind up being net importers of food unless we protect the very valuable asset that we have.

I think our farmers, our people who work the land, are among the best producers of food in this whole world of ours. I say that The Agricultural Lands Protection Act, I'm not really concerned who owns the land one way or another. What I want to see is that the land remains in agricultural use. I don't want to see that land being turned into cement jungles covered with asphalt and concrete because we can't grow anything on that. When you go down and see what has happened in other parts of our country where we have not, we're just fortunate here in Western Canada but if the industrialization takes place, as it seems it is going to happen in Western Canada, we're going to have to be very careful with the lands we have in a very limited supply.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we are not careful as citizens of this country to protect a very limited heritage that has been passed on to us in trust, and that's all we do with land, Mr. Speaker, regardless of who owns the land one way or the other. You can all talk about who owns the land but don't pay your taxes for three years and they'll soon find out who owns the land; the Crown owns the land in the long run. Don't pay your taxes, the Crown takes it away from you; you have first option to buy it back. But it is a trust, Mr. Speaker, that we have as one generation to pass on to the other and it behooves us at this time to make sure that we protect our lands, not that they fall into somebody else's hands

one way or the other, but that they remain in production for agriculture for the benefit of the people of this country and for the benefit of the world.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to put a few comments on the record on this particular bill and the amendments that are proposed and the intent of those amendments. I want at the outset, Mr. Speaker, to gently if I might, comment on the Member for Logan's remarks in which he got somewhat astray from the intent of this bill. I think if he were to examine the bill, it's The Farmlands Protection Act, not Provincial Land Use Policies which he described because what the Member for Logan was concerned and exercised about, Mr. Speaker, was not the ownership of land but the use of that land.

I suppose in some small regard in his dissertation this morning, he displayed to us a rather inept understanding of how the country was developed, how a free country operates and how the free enterprise system works in this country. Going back some 250 years ago when this country was settled, Mr. Speaker, what drew people to Canada from Europe and from other parts of the world was a right and a freedom to own land and it was productive land. Naturally people coming to this country first off, it wasn't the cities that attracted people to Canada, it was the land itself.

Now naturally, Mr. Speaker, in the evolution of a country, the areas with the most productive land are going to be the areas first settled. You can see that, Mr. Speaker, looking at this province; looking at Saskatchewan; looking at Alberta and indeed looking at Ontario. The most productive land was the land which was first settled and that's only natural because the people that originally came to this country, our forefathers came here attracted by that magnet of the land — land which they had not the right and the opportunity to own in Europe and the countries from which they immigrated.

The cities that are now there today are a product of that productive land and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, are a product of the productivity of the people who settled the land; because without the incredible production ability of the farmers for generations passed, this country would have no cities. This country would have no transportation systems. This country would have no resource development because the first resource was the land and the first people to make use of that resource were the farm community and because of their tremendous success at that, Mr. Speaker, this country now has the Torontos, the Winnipegs, the Reginas, the Edmontons, and the Vancouvers. It's for no other reason than the basic commodity of land was developed efficiently, effectively and harnessed by our forefathers and from that efficient harnessing of the land as a resource to feed the world grew our cities.

It seems passing strange to follow the Member for Logan's logic that Toronto should have been up where Sudbury is because that's the proper place for cities and it wouldn't be taking up agricultural land, denies the fact that Toronto was there because of

the productive land in the first place. That's the only reason why the city grew up, it was because the land in that area fostered a farm economy that caused it to grow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have in this province — and I think they are a model for many other provinces — are some very efficient provincial land use policies. Certainly they have their problems, they have their drawbacks but the main and prime intent of those provincial land use policies are to protect for the future generations a very finite source, a first-class agricultural land. We are the caretakers of those provincial land use policies now and we intend to live by the intent of them. However in living by the intent of them you cannot thwart the development of Winnipeg; you cannot thwart the development of Carman; you cannot thwart the development of Russell; you cannot thwart the development of Portage la Prairie to develop on prime agriculture land because they were there in the first place.

Those communities can and will grow and where they are going to grow is unfortunately on good agricultural land. The alternative is to move everbody up north of the 53rd parallel but that is not a logical solution. So in the caretaking of our land resource we have to recognize that land is a resource not only for agriculture but for the support industries that are required by the agricultural community; the fertilizer manufacturing plants; the machinery manufacturing plants; the machinery depots; the grain elevators; the railroads; the roads needed to transport our agricultural commodities to export and to bring the inputs of the farming community to those farmers. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, or fortunately those plants, those industrial undertakings, those business undertakings have to be located on land. They cannot be located any place else.

So there is a competing and complementary use for the farm land that we have and we are fostering, Mr. Speaker, some good policies to make sure that land development takes place recognizing the needs of preserving agricultural land for the production of grain, production of food but also in recognizing that for our agricultural production system to remain efficient we must have land used for the business inputs that our farmers use today. They're competing and they're offset. They are competing and diametrically opposed use of that land but nevertheless both essential.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get on with my remarks about the Bill itself. —(Interjection)— It must be a good morning on the markets because there seems to be a very bullish mood in the House today. But, Mr. Speaker, to get on with my remarks on the Bill itself and not get distracted by the issues of land-use rather than the ownership of land as the Member for Logan did. In our first full session in this House we made some very dramatic improvements to The Agricultural Land Protection Act in that we reduced the size of holdings that foreign, non-resident land owners could assume. We limited it down to a very small portion of what it was under the previous administration. Mr. Speaker, quite frankly that was a very effective set of amendments at that time.

They stopped what was at that time a very rampant purchase of agricultural farm land by non-resident foreigners. I know because part of my constituency was very very heavily beset by foreign

absentee purchasers of land. Since that time as is always natural when you have circumstances as the Member for Morris pointed out where you have land in Europe selling for some seven, eight, nine, ten times the value of land in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, you have competition from those people and they want to buy Canadian farm land. So where there is that kind of a desire it doesn't matter what law you have in place.

There are people and there are investors and there is money that will find their way around those laws. Those troublesome areas have been identified. I must admit that those non-foreign land transactions today are a very small majority, a very small majority of the land transactions that have taken place in the last three years but nevertheless they do cause some concern. These amendments that the Minister of Agriculture is introducing today will attempt to address those concerns by amendment. Mr. Speaker, and I think we would all be less than honest with ourselves and to the people of Manitoba if we thought that was going to eliminate all of the participation by absentee foreign land owners because laws as some people say are made to be circumvented. There will be money and people in the legal profession in a position some two or three years from now to find ways to circumvent these new amendments. But by and large, Mr. Speaker, we have eliminated I believe and will eliminate to a greater degree the participation of the foreign land owner, the non-resident foreign land owner in Manitoba land sales.

I might point to members opposite that some very unique things do happen in rural Manitoba and those unique things are happening not because of foreign investment but because of our own Manitoba farmer investment in farm land. Prices of recent transactions of land close to where I live in south-central Manitoba, the price has been escalating. Mr. Speaker, it is not absentee foreign purchasers that are the buyers of this land; the buyers of that land are some of my neighbours who are family farms, who have established a viable business in farming and want to expand that viable business by expanding their land base and they are bidding top dollar for the land. They are not being outbid in the vast majority of cases by any absentee in foreign investment.

Farmers themselves have the same kind of desire to own land, to develop a land base, to develop a business base and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, to develop that land and farm base for their sons and their daughters who want to take over that land base in some year in the future when the farmers today decide that it's time to retire and withdraw from their farming business. The very essence of a vibrant and strong farm community is in that ability for farmers to purchase land and to own their own land.

Mr. Speaker, I can only echo the sentiments that the Member for Morris put on the record this morning that we have seen a very shameful and a very terrible thing happen in Ottawa in the course of the constitutional debate over the past several months. We have had a debate on the constitutional proposal and the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights. One of the basic freedoms which should be attributed to any free individual anywhere in the world, Mr. Speaker, I think should be the right to

own property. There should be no other freedom more important. If we go back to our forefathers and I will reiterate it for my friends in the New Democratic caucus and the lone Liberal in this House, that this country was built by people with the sole driving force to leave their homes in Europe and elsewhere in the world to come to North America and to come to Canada to do what? To own property, to own their own farms — a right and a privilege and an ability that they did not enjoy in the countries from which they immigrated from — Great Britain, from European countries, from the Ukraine, from what is now the USSR. Those people came to Canada to own land. After some 250 years of settlement in this country and 100 plus years of government in this country we have a man in Ottawa in the person of our current Prime Minister aided and abetted, Mr. Speaker, by the New Democratic party in Ottawa which when they're drawing up a Charter of Rights to protect the future freedoms of our individuals, refusing to place the right to own property in the Charter of Rights that will govern Canadians for generations and generations. That, Mr. Speaker, is shameful; it's despicable and it is not Canadian, it's not Canadian because that is not what built Canada.

I notice that the Member for Fort Rouger, the lone Liberal in this House laughs at that statement because I don't believe she —(Interjection)— she says the statement is stupid, Mr. Speaker, because I don't believe she understands what Canadian is, what this country was founded on, what this country what built by, what the aspirations of the people that moved to this country to settle it were. That main aspiration, Mr. Speaker, was then and is now for anybody that moves here to own property; that is a right that smilingly today the Member for Fort Rouge will support that man in Ottawa, the Prime Minister of the Liberal party of Canada — that Prime Minister — she will support that knowingly that she is refusing in the Charter of Rights for people, for Canadians, to have the right to own property. I think that is shameful, despicable and she says it's rubbish.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is the absolute truth. It is irrefutable truth and if she would sometime get beyond the perimeter of Winnipeg, get beyond the Perimeter Highway of Winnipeg and go out to the rest of Manitoba, to rural Manitoba, where the ownership of land and property is an important daily fact of life, she would not say that what I have said this morning is rubbish. She would understand, Mr. Speaker, what the mood of the country, what the mood of Western Canada is and she would reject outright that gang in Ottawa, the Prime Minister and the New Democratic party in Ottawa who do not want to entrench the ownership of land in a Bill of Rights that they so adequately want.

Now I would find it extremely difficult for the Member for Ste. Rose representing a rural constituency and one of the few ones in the New Democratic party on that side of the House and in the Opposition to ever say that he would not want to see land ownership entrenched in the Bill of Rights — because if he would I would like him to go to the town of Ste. Rose and tell a town meeting of farmers and of property owners in that area that he does not want them to have the constitutional right in an

entrenched Bill of Rights should we ever be so unfortunate as to have one — that he does not want to see that happen. I want him to stand up and say that in his rural constituency of Ste. Rose. As I've said before in this House, Mr. Speaker, if he were to tell the truth he wouldn't be the MLA for Ste. Rose after the next election because that issue alone would defeat him in his own riding if he had the constitutional fortitude to say what he believes and to support the New Democratic party line which refuses to allow Canadians the right to own property. Why, Mr. Speaker, do they refuse that right? They refuse it, Mr. Speaker, because it would interfere with their future plans to nationalize industries and that goes right in line with what we saw in eight years in the province of Manitoba under the New Democratic agricultural land ownership policies. They wanted, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

**MR. DOERN:** On a point of order. I've been listening to the Minister for the last five minutes; he's talking about the Constitution. I thought we're talking about another bill. If you want to permit a free discussion on the Constitution I think a number of us will joint in but I suggest to you, Sir, that this is not in order; that this would be better stated next week on the resolution and that the Minister should contain himself and restrain himself and deal with the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on the point of order.

**MR. DOWNEY:** On that same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Elmwood, whenever there gets to a sensitive area that would appear as if the truth is starting to come out he has to interrupt the fine speech that my colleague for Pembina is giving.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. I was listening to the debate, I did hear the Honourable Minister referring to the ownership of land which is the main purpose of this bill. The honourable member did not have a point of order.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, on the topic of the right to own property we saw adequately demonstrated in the latter part of the New Democratic regime in this province of what they thought about the ownership of private land in the Province of Manitoba. They would prefer, and I thank my colleague the Minister of Corrections and Community Services, the Leader of the Progressive party, the Member for Inkster, was probably one of the main proponents of their policy in agricultural land ownership during the latter part of their regime. But, Mr. Speaker, they did two things in their time; one was taxation, one was legislation.

The taxation aspect that they so heavily clung to and only now, when they've been defeated on that issue, did they say that we were thinking of changing it. That taxation issue was succession duties and gift taxes in the Province of Manitoba and those two taxation methods alone were preventing more transfer of farmland from generation to generation in



the family farm tradition that has been the foundation and the basis of Manitoba agriculture since 1870. They were on the verge of destroying it through succession duties and gift taxes, Mr. Speaker and they were destroying it deliberately and knowingly, Mr. Speaker, because the second aspect of their agricultural land policy, that being that only the Crown should own it and lease it to whomever they deemed worthy to farm it was the second leg of their agricultural land ownership policy.

That, Mr. Speaker, was not excepted by the farmers in Manitoba, by the rural community. It was rejected in 1977 and I hope that once again our honourable friends over there, the member for Ste. Rose et al, would truthfully tell the people of Manitoba, the farm community, that once again they're going to remove the first mortgage availability through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation that this Minister of Agriculture in this government is reinstated and replace it with the ownership of the land by the government of Manitoba, by a Socialist government of Manitoba, and choose whoever should lease it back. Tell the people of Manitoba that that's what you're going to do; that you're going to eliminate the ability to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to buy land, to own land in Manitoba through mortgages provided by MACC and replace it with ownership by the government and leasing back and turn farmers into perpetual tenants of the state. Tell the people of Manitoba that that is going to be your agricultural policy next time and the rural constituencies will vote the same as they did in 1977 only with larger majorities for the Conservative party who believes in the ownership of land by the individual farmer as he is the best tenant of that land for himself, for the province, for the country and for the future generations because nobody, Mr. Speaker has more vested interest in the proper tenure and stewardship of the land than a farmer who wants to make sure that land is available for his sons and his daughters to carry on the tradition of the family farm in Manitoba.

No one, no government ever created and struck in this world has ever been able to own land and get the production for future generations out of it that what this government has and this country has by free ownership of the land by the farmer for his future generations. That's proved time and time and time again but yet our Socialist friends, our Socialist friends over there will not admit to that. They want to hang on to the coat strings of state ownership and state control of all of the assets of production including farmland and if they tell the people honestly and truthfully, in the next election, if they tell the people of Manitoba honestly and truthfully they will be defeated as surely as they were defeated in 1977 because Manitobans and Canadians believe that the farmer is the best tenant and the best owner of the land resource of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

**MR. ADAM:** The member who was just speaking has been pointing his finger at me for the last 15 minutes. I wonder if he would point it somewhere else for awhile.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for consistently pointing to the Member for Ste. Rose

but I, as members on this side of the House, consider the Member for Ste. Rose to be the most sane and logical and the guiding light in the New Democratic party and we want to make sure that he receives the message from Manitobans so that in the next provincial election he can tell his caucus how to vote.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to the Honourable Minister having opinions of any kind he likes but when he categorically states that only one member on this side is sane then I take exception to it. I think it's time he learned how to debate properly and use the proper procedures of this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, the point raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan is well taken. I hope the Honourable Minister will get back to the subject matter of the bill.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take your admonition but I reiterate that the Member for Ste. Rose is the gentlemen that we count on on this side of the House to carry to the New Democratic party caucus for the next election the opinions of rural Manitoba and what rural Manitobans in the farm community, and the towns that are built on and survived by the farm community in Manitoba, want in terms of a government. We hope that he has the ability and his persuasive powers will prevail to make the Member for Selkirk realize that state ownership of land will not sell in Manitoba. It will not sell in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by congratulating the Minister of Agriculture on these amendments. They are good amendments; they will be effective amendments and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage and admonish on behalf of my constituents the young farmers in Pembina constituency who are trying to expand their farming operation. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture not only to continue with his MACC long-term loan policy providing first-mortgage money for young farmers in Manitoba at reduced interest rates, but I want the Minister of Agriculture to expand that program to make more money available so that our farm communities can be populated by young aggressive new farmers; that family farms can pass in the tradition of the last 113 years in this province, can pass from father to son with no interference by the state. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to assure that through MACC those policies are enhanced that have been so successful in the last three years and that he takes that message to the people in the next election that is going to enhance that MACC role of first mortgage money for the ownership of land by the individual and tell the people of Manitoba what the alternatives are from the NDP party; that it will be state ownership and control of the land and all farmers in Manitoba, should the Socialist prevail, would be tenants of the state; surfs of the state as we had in Scotland and now we have in Poland where they are hungry and unfed day by day; where the country of Poland cannot feed itself with an agricultural land base

equal to ours in Manitoba but they cannot feed themselves, Mr. Speaker, because the will to produce is not there because the state owns the land, Mr. Speaker.

That isn't what Manitobans want; that isn't what Canadians want; that isn't what built this country and that isn't what will make this country grow and thrive for the next decade, the next generation, the next century. Private ownership is still the vehicle by which this country was built. It is still the vehicle by which this country can grow and it is the vehicle by which Manitobans and Canadians can reach their aspirations for the betterment of themselves, their families and their country, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the points made by the Honourable Minister because I really believe that he's practising his election speech and I'd like to practise mine as well because the Minister is really setting up a whole series of strawmen, isn't he? He's trying to create a bunch of phony arguments about how the New Democratic party wants to take over all the land and all the property and all the inheritance, accumulate it all in one big pile and then tell everybody what to do; that is his basic argument. Mr. Speaker, nobody questions on this side of the House, or nobody in this House has ever questioned the right of people to own land or to own property; I have never heard that question. What the Conservatives are trying to do and they'll do this in the rural areas, they did it in 1977 this phony stuff about state land and the government taking over the land and all this sort of stuff, you know, they don't mind if the land is sold to big corporations or they don't mind if the land is sold to people outside of Canada but they are just concerned about whether the government might give loans to people for the purchase of land; that's what they are concerned about.

What they're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, and what the Minister is trying to do and what he said over and over again he is trying to do is to play on the desire of some people to own and accumulate property. They think that this is the driving force of people in society, the almighty dollar; that if you talk dollars to people, if you tell them that they can own a bigger and bigger house and own 25 cars that's what people want. That's the main springs of human behaviour. They think it's greed, Mr. Speaker, that if you encourage people to accumulate and to buy and to make profits and to spend all their waking and sleeping hours thinking about how they can make more money, that they will vote Conservative. Mr. Speaker, I simply say to them that you can't take it with you. You can only eat so many meals a day; you can only live in so many houses; you can only drive so many cars and own so many boats and so on. Then I'm not sure that Lord Thompson, the almighty Lord Thompson who is now buying all the newspapers in Canada and all the businesses in Canada, or these other gentlemen that these Conservatives across the way so admire, I mean they think that the best thing that you could be is a billionaire, that those are the people that are making the biggest contribution to society.

Mr. Speaker, I have never thought that. I have never admired millionaires and billionaires like Howard Hughes. Those aren't the people that I think make the greatest contribution to society. I admire

people who have a social conscience; I admire people who are, say, selfless doctors who work in remote parts of the country, like Dr. Grenfell in Labrador and Newfoundland or the Sister in Calcutta, those are the kind of people that I admire; writers and people who are talented individuals, those are the kind of people I admire; people who work in education, I admire people like that. You know what? They don't make a lot of money; they don't make a lot of money. My friend the Minister of Economic Development he will admire billionaires, industrialists. He thinks that they make the biggest contribution to society and, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said — I want to tell the Minister that he's wrong when he says that people came to this country to accumulate property, that that was a driving force of people who came to Canada; that that's why they came here. I want to remind him, based on history, that a lot of people came here for political freedom, that a lot of people came here for that reason. You would know that, Mr. Speaker, you would appreciate that; that they didn't have the right in certain countries. Don't tell me those were socialist and communist countries. Did you ever hear of Czarist Russia, did you ever hear of the imperial powers around the world that were right-wing governments; conservative, monarchist governments; capitalist-oriented governments that didn't allow freedom of speech; fascist governments? Those are right-wing governments. It's not just the extreme of the left represented by the communists. The extreme of the right is just as bad.

There is as much freedom in the moderate socialist countries of the world as in any other country, Mr. Speaker. I want to remind my honourable friends that in England there have been in modern times as many socialist governments as Conservative governments; then in Germany there is a socialist government; and on Sunday there is going to be a socialist president named Mitterand elected in France; that all of these countries have a degree of socialism and they have what is called a mixed economy. The United States of America has elements in it that are not free enterprise and so does Canada.

The fact of the matter is we live in a mixed economy, Mr. Speaker, and the basic argument that's going to come down in this election and I'm going to debate with anybody in this House in their own ridings or not — although I will basically stay in the city, I'll hide within the perimeter where I feel safer and more comfortable and on stronger ground — is they're going to argue for passive government. They're going to say the government should play no role in the economy. They were saying that this morning and they were saying that yesterday, the Minister of Urban Affairs; we debated that until 11 o'clock at night. Hands off. Don't get involved. Keep out. That government is best which governs least. I don't understand that. (Interjection)— My friend the Member for Logan, who is a hard-headed, sensible, practical man says he can't understand why they even want to be in government. They really shouldn't. They really believe in anarchy, Mr. Speaker, anarchy in the classic sense, no government of any kind. I don't believe in that.

I believe the government should play a role, a significant role in the economy and in society. It

should play that role on behalf of large numbers of people who do not have the power to stand up to the big interests in our economy; those same big capitalists and some of those big landowners and the billionaires, the billionaires that the Member for Pembina, the Minister of Highways supports and admires. He wants them to have more power and I want countervailing power through the political process.

So I want to remind people when they want to talk about agricultural lands and protection, you don't have to worry; we're not going to take your land; we're not going to take your neighbour's land. We're not that interested in accumulating land or property, never were, are not now and never will be. That has never been the aim or the aspiration of members of the New Democratic party. You have nothing to fear, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— The Member for Pembina says and I point back at him, he says people came here to buy land. I say they came here for political freedom which they didn't have in many countries. They came for religious freedom, like the Mennonites came and the Puritans came to the United States. They came for the right of free speech which they didn't have in the extreme governments of the left or the extreme governments of the right. One of the reasons they came was to buy some land, they came to buy some land.

The early farmers were not the selfish individuals these gentlemen opposite say they were. They cooperated with one another; they believed in work bees and they helped each other thresh their land; they had quilting bees and all sorts of other bees, and honey bees. Mr. Speaker, they didn't just grab land and build houses and try to build the biggest house and so on, yes, some of them did that but a lot of them believed in co-operation. They believed in the brotherhood of man. They believed in their brother's keeper. When a man was sick, they would often go and help take the crops off and so on. It's probably still done today. —(Interjection)— They don't believe in communism? I don't believe in communism either. I certainly don't. —(Interjection)— That's the last place I would take you.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentlemen opposite, their version of history is cockeyed. My colleague tried to point that out, that the first people who came to this country were fur traders and fishermen, the first people were fishermen, weren't they? They came here and lived off the harvests of the sea and then the fur traders came. It was only much later the farmers came. You know the old story about the fights between the cattlemen, the farmers and so on, Mr. Speaker.

So I just want to say to the gentlemen opposite, and I want to say only to the rural members now, that they have a belief which was categorized 200 years ago and more in the 18th Century, it was called physiocracy, spelled with a "ph". I say that to my friend from Emerson. The physiocrats said that the only people in society who made a contribution — I hear this every day in this House, I have to find it somewhat amusing — the only people who make a contribution to society are farmers. It's the farmers who take these little seeds and put them in the ground, a big plant comes up, they cut it, sell it to the city slickers and they are the only ones that are doing any work.

Mr. Speaker, I don't deny that the farmers work. I don't deny that farmers make a contribution to society but so do a lot of other people. So do the trade unionists and the workers and the blue-collar labourers working in the factories in Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba. Those guys are making a contribution too, making the machines the farmers use, building the trucks the farmers use, the combines and all this other stuff, making all of that material they use and running the railways to transport the grain, building the airplanes and running the airports. Those people are all making a contribution. Who would deny that? Mr. Speaker, doesn't a teacher make a contribution? Doesn't somebody who is working with children all day make a contribution, or a nurse, or a doctor? How about the clergy? The holy father makes as great a contribution as any farmer, because it is not by bread alone that man must be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying I find it very peculiar to listen day after day in the House, day after day the speeches made by the rural members about how the farmers are the backbone of the economy. —(Interjection)— Well, if they're the backbone, then the vetebrae also include people who are blue-collar workers and white-collar workers. You're not going to argue that engineers don't make a contribution, are you? My friend from Steinbach is not going to argue that people who sell cars — that's an important thing. —(Interjection)— Oh, he is not as important as farmers, I see. Well, how about doctors? I ask the member, is a doctor as important as a farmer? No. I see. Is a clergyman as important as a farmer? —(Interjection)— I see. How about beverage-room operators?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):**

Now that we're finished with Twenty Questions, I would hope that the honourable members would allow the Honourable Member for Elmwood to continue without interruption.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to ask the Minister of Fitness questions and he's being very evasive. I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that

**A MEMBER:** He thinks he's a parasite.

**MR. DOERN:** He regards himself as a parasite. I'm trying to defend him. My colleague says he thinks of himself as a parasite. I'm trying to raise his own image in his own eyes, Mr. Speaker. Not all of us were farmers but most of us came from families that were farmers. My family farmed down in Overstone and in Stonewall, my grandfather farmed but some of my relatives were tailors and one of my uncles was the head x-ray technician at the Health Sciences Centre. My father worked in a plant and my uncles worked as printers and so on. They made a contribution. They paid their taxes, Mr. Speaker. So I simply want to say the notion that only farmers contribute and that the New Democratic party is trying to take that land away from those hard-working farmers is absolutely untrue, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to point out that many of the biggest corporations in this country were built with government money, with public money — like the CPR — the money was the up-front money, the

continuing money was put up there by the average person and by society as a whole. There were large giveaways and the people have not benefited from many of those particular examples.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, on this note on The Farmlands Protection Act —(Interjection)— I conclude by pointing out to the Minister that the irony of it all is that people are sending money over from West Germany, which has a socialist government, a socialist Premier, a socialist society and a prosperous society, they are doing so well under that form of government that they're able to accumulate large amounts of capital to invest in a capitalist society in a capitalist country. — (Interjection)— Well, a lot of them aren't fleeing, some of them are just sending their money. But they're doing so well under socialism they're able to come under a capitalist country and clean up with the proceeds.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that the arguments — I know this is what they're going to say; I know they're going to talk about the takeover and the Reds and free enterprise versus socialism, I know all of that I've heard it before — but you know what? It's not going to work. You know where it's going to work? It'll only work in Southwestern Manitoba where they've never seen a New Democrat, where they don't know what New Democrats look like, where they've only seen photographs of them and there it'll go over big. The Minister of Agriculture will get cheered down there. But if you truck that manure into the City of Winnipeg I can tell you, the people of Winnipeg won't buy it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We're almost at Private Members' Hour. If you want to just wait a moment, to the Honourable Minister.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The hour is now 12:30, Private Members' Hour. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a disposition not to proceed with Private Members' Hour. Just prior to moving adjournment, I'd like to indicate on Monday when we resume, I will call the Speed-up motion first and then the bills, Mr. Speaker, with a change in order. I think I'll start with Bill 12 and work down to Bill 58 and then go into Estimates.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development that this House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2 o'clock Monday afternoon.