

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 29, 1973

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, this deals with rural development, and if we discuss rural development I think this covers a wide subject. I happen to have a copy of an address that was given at the seminar here on Canadian International Grains Institute and it is quite interesting as to what they have to say. But I want to particularly dwell on two points, and one has to do with the matter of transportation, rail line abandonment, because we find -- and I'd like to read one paragraph here and this says: "The current focus of activity in the area of transportation and handling of grains relates of course to the current efforts to achieve improvements through rationalization and modernization of their overall system, particularly in western Canada," and it has quite a bit to say on the matter of transportation. It says: "Under the national Transportation Act (1967) methods were established for dealing with uneconomic branch lines. A costing of the line takes place to determine if the line is uneconomic and once this has been established the Canadian Transport Commission can decide if the line is required in the public interest. If it is the CTC provides the railway with a payment related to the losses occurring in that line, and for traffic originating from or consigned to that line. If it is determined that the line is not required in the public interest the railway is ordered to abandon it. In exchange for prohibiting branch line abandonments until after January 1st, 1975, the railways have been receiving payments on branch line losses since 1967."

I'm sure that the Minister must be conversant with the whole thing and must have information on this matter of branch line abandonment and I think when we talk of rural development certainly this is a very key item in my opinion because once we lose the railways many communities will be abandoned. This afternoon I had the pleasure of attending an opening of a housing unit at Gretna and this village, too, if it wasn't for the railway, for the grain elevators, and such housing units as is build now, and the schools, where would it be? There would be nothing left. Therefore I feel that this matter of grain rationalization at the elevators and rail line abandonment I think is a very important one, and I feel that we should have some comments from the Minister as to what is being planned, how many rail lines do we have in Manitoba that are uneconomic for which the grain, or the railways are being paid today, and what is the future? --(Interjection)-- Well maybe I should have but I think we had quite a discussion of that and I will leave that when we come to the matter of water resources. But as far as rural development, I think if we lose the railways certainly we've lost a great deal in connection with rural development and I would hope to hear from the Minister on this very matter.

The same holds true for the Churchill harbour. Here again this same report is dealing with that as well. What is the situation today in that respect? Has our province any say in the thing? Is this purely federal? Under federal control? Certainly I think as a province and this being our only harbour that we should have a say in this matter, whether it is being developed or not, and here again I feel very strongly too that it should be developed. The Federal Government or the particular commission that is in charge of the various harbours in Canada I don't think gives enough importance to the Churchill port and that other ports are receiving preference and we're not getting our share. What is this government doing in trying to develop that port and in this way have development in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, I am not a farmer, and I never was, but I was on the Agriculture Committee and I'd like to say a few words of my impressions on the committee, especially since I have two friends from the north come down to hear me speak. I'll introduce them to you. Miss Pat Weise and Mrs. Hazel Barrow in the audience. I'd like to speak on the small farmers their attitude of one to the other. As a miner we visited this small farm, and we're related to them, and during one of our visits their Hereford cow, the milk cow, a very close friend of the family was very very ill, and we went to the barn to see what was wrong with Molly or Bessy, or whatever her name was, and they were injecting large quantities of penicillin, or whatever, to get her on her feet again. But I don't know what happened to the cow. But two weeks later we went down and asked the farmer what happened to your milk cow. Oh, we sold her to a young farmer. This is the attitude of one farmer to another.

During the Agricultural Committee meetings with farmers, and I'm strong labour, and

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) of course I believe strong in labour organization, and they'd all say to me, "We would organize but our neighbour won't," and I think the whole secret of the small farmer is to organize. If they don't get prices for the crops, don't sell. And what really impressed me, Mr. Chairman, was the riot, or the meeting here of 5,000 farmers and the placards was, "Eggs, 6 Cents a Dozen, Half a Cent for One Egg." Now think of the anxiety and the sweat of that one hen for half a cent a day. Where's the Minister of Labour with his \$1.75 an hour on this thing, half a cent a day for one egg. --(Interjection)-- Quiet, fish face. Now that same egg on the menu at the St. Regis is 75 cents. Look at the menu -- 75 cents one egg. What concerns me is what happens to that egg from the time it leaves the hen till it comes to the St. Regis? --(Interjection)-- Very graphic but unprintable. Who's putting it on to who? --(Interjection)-- You over hitch again, "Mr. Mugg "? The one who is the biggest detriment to the small farmer is the big farmer. The small farmer has to sell because his loans have such big interest that he can't afford to hold; the big farmer he laughs at this process, and hopefully we'll be able to organize the small farmer to have the guts to speak up and demand a fair price for his market produce. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye); Mr. Chairman, I shall not be long, I'm sorry I had to miss the marketing part of the Agriculture Estimates but I am fully agreed with the Member for Flin Flon that if he thinks the hen is sweating badly, he should see what the farmer looks like after he's fed those chickens. I can't help but -- well I don't think this is the time to relate some of the stories that some of these farmers have to go through but I was rather disturbed when the Minister mentioned the fact that the government was ready and willing to supply farmers with pesticides or grasshopper kill, and I am wondering when he says that the government can sell these materials for around \$11.00 a gallon and if the farmer is really saving money, I am happy to hear this.

MR. USKIW: I'm wondering whether we're in order. We are now at a point of debating the rural development division which has nothing to do with production and marketing but I notice that our speeches are going back to the production and marketing section. So we're not going to --(Interjection)-- While I think the same criticism would apply there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, all I'm trying to point out, that these dealers that exist in rural Manitoba, that come under rural development, are hit pretty bad with some of the products for example, pesticides and insecticides, and some of the other items that they sell, they're hurt pretty bad, and that's the part I'm referring to as far as rural development's concerned.

Now again if he says that the dealers must charge around \$25.00 or so, which I am sure are the correct figures, but I'm wondering what items are taken into consideration? Are freight for example, or are the time that some of the civil servants have to put into the task of getting these pesticides to the farmer, are they included in the cost of \$11.00. I have nothing against the farmer saving money, if that would be the case but only if the overall savings are not just part, if the savings are part of the total price, there is a big difference to take into consideration. Also, and I really think it has something to do with rural development, I asked the Minister after his opening remarks, what about our cheese position, or cheese factors, and other factors like them, are part of our rural development, and I didn't get an answer. They tell me that manufactured milk is going down from 30 to 20 cents a gallon, as late as last week, and I'm sure that -- I wish the Minister could give us an idea what is happening in this respect.

So, Mr. Chairman, as far as rural development is concerned, I'm happy to see that the department has undertaken to probably spend to the tune of about \$900,000 more. I think it is a worthwhile place. I have to agree with the member for --(Interjection)-- the Member for Rhineland. I happened to be at the same opening that he was this afternoon and I guess we kind of got that rural feeling while we were attending that meeting. And it is important that ways and means are being found whereby our community and family programs can be kept up, and if this is the intention I wish the Minister would elaborate more on this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman I was born and brought up in the city and really, really have nothing to say about agriculture except this, Mr. Chairman, Some weeks ago the Member for La Verendrye, who has suggested to us about the problem he

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) sees in rural development, brought to the House I believe and distributed to the Members here some whole wheat and I would just like to tell him, and the people who milled that wheat, that it makes darn fine pancakes which my family and I enjoy on a Saturday morning, and I'd like through him and in this public way, thank both the millers and the operators of that mill and the people in his area for that good Canadian product.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, we're on Rural Development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rural Development, Resolution 10(a) (1).

MR. WATT: I just want to make a few comments. I'd like to ask the Member for Flin Flon -- who is not in his chair now -- since he thinks that the small farmer is at the mercy of the big farmer, I'm just wondering if the small labourer in his opinion was at the mercy of the labour bosses?

I just want to make a few comments very shortly. I notice that Rural Development salaries are down by \$22,000 -- on Rural Development now. I'd like the Minister to give us some explanation on this reduction in salaries which I assume would involve personnel and work insofar as Rural Development is concerned, and if he would give us some explanation in light of the fact that the Minister has already told the House that it is his policy actually to decentralize and to bring more development, and more personnel opportunities to meet with the department out in rural Manitoba, and in the light of the reduction in salaries in regard to rural development division, I wonder if we could have some explanation from the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10 (a) The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go over the comments that were already made. The Member for Rhineland indicated some concern about where we are in transportation and rationalization of grain handling facilities, and so on. I want to explain to him that the province is involved in many discussions at many levels on this question; more specifically however we are involved in a joint committee with the two other prairie provinces through membership in a Three-Prairie-Province Committee which is working on submissions, and so on, that will be presented at some point in time, and no doubt the Prairie Economic Council of the Western Premiers will be involved in these kinds of discussions. There is nothing concrete to report other than we are very much involved in the area of analysis and a development of recommendations, and so on.

It's somewhat early in this stage of the game to be more specific than that, because we have the grains group involved in their own series of studies, meetings, hearings, and so on. The Federal Government is very much involved in a number of areas related to transportation and grain handling.

So at some point in the future, there will be more to report in that connection but not at this point in time.

The Member for Arthur is concerned about salaries, reduction in salaries in the Rural Development Division. It's really a shuffling of staff that has taken place, as members will recognize the estimates as they are shown in this year's book is much different from, in fact completely different from years in the past. It reflects the regionalization and program shuffles that had to take place resulting therefrom, and in this particular instance we had moved one person into an ARDA position, but nevertheless the staff complement is still there.

The Member for La Verendrye wanted to discuss something about cheese marketing and I thought I -- and -- milk prices -- and I thought I'd covered ground in this area the other day in particular on milk prices. I don't know that repetition would be worthwhile at this point in time, other than I'm hopeful that there will be some effort to do something about milk prices through organizational efforts of the manufactured milk producers, and so on.

With respect to marketing of cheese of course, we recognize that there are problems within that industry. We have to recognize that many of these are independent operators, they are not entrepreneurs that we can take some direct control over or involved in some direct promotion with; it's got to be an industry approach.

Now a lot of these are contracts. Some are doing well and others are having some difficulty because of quality problems and so on. I think it can be said however that what seems to be required is perhaps a more centralized approach to marketing of those products, perhaps some sort of a federated system that would handle the marketing for all of the producers within the province or those at least that are having some difficulty, and we are looking at that

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) particular problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10 (a) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (a) -- passed (b) (1) -- the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, We find that there's a considerable increase in the allocation of funds for this department and it's coming at a time when the Minister, I understand, has ceased the community schools' program which was previously funded under the Department of Agriculture, a program which, Mr. Chairman, I may say met with considerable favour in my part of the province, and in fact we are sorry to see that this program is being stopped at this time, and yet we find that there is a doubling of allocation in this particular field, and I would ask the Minister if he has cancelled the Community Schools Program, what other program he intends to institute, to use the larger expenditures.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, basically the major increase, almost all of the increases in this particular area, is related to the rural Manpower program, the pilot project that we have announced some time ago wherein we will be setting up a Manpower office for the provision of services to people who wish to be employed in the agricultural industry, and for farmers who wish to use that service. Now a lot of that will be recoverable through service charges, but that is an allocation of funds to set up the Manpower office for this year.

MR. GRAHAM: When the Minister says that money will be recovered; will that be recoverable from the federal treasury, or will it be recovered by service charges on those that use the services that the Minister is bringing out?

MR. USKIW: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that there will be some small recovery, from the Government of Canada towards that program in the order of 60 or 70 thousand dollars. The bulk of that however will be recovered through service charges to the farm community. In other words, if we are involved in providing a pool of manpower, which will be available to the farmers of Manitoba, we will be charging for certain services including wages on a per day or per week basis, so that there will be 100 percent recovery in that category.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it seem rather strange to have a setup where a farmer then has farm labour but he is not allowed to pay that farm labour, but in its place he has to pay the Province of Manitoba. Is this what the Minister is trying to tell us?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, the farmer who can find farm labour without this kind of assistance will continue to do so as he has in the past, but what we are trying to do is mobilize a lot of people that are available for short periods of time, and wherein there is some problem of bookkeeping with respect to unemployment insurance, income tax deductions, Canada Pension Plan, and wherein one individual may be employed on several farms in a given short period of time, rather than have the farmers look after all of these details, the manpower pool office will provide that service for those that wish to use it, and they will charge certain fees for that service if the farmer wants them to do it. At some point, if people want to graduate from a casual labour force, into a more permanent arrangement with the farmer, then of course he simply transfers over to an arrangement as between himself and the farmer. But this is a program designed to pull in a lot of labour that is available for short-term periods, that may be experienced -- that information has to be collected on, and passed on to the farm community for whatever use they want to make of it.

MR. GRAHAM: Well would the farmer then subscribe to this? Would it be a necessary stipulation that he had to do his accounting through Canfarm, or something of that nature?

MR. USKIW: No it's not connected with that at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when I saw a news release on this matter, I was very interested. In fact, in thinking about it, I didn't know just how they were going to operate it. What are going to be the hourly rates, and are we going to import labour from other provinces for this, or is this just Manitoba labour that we are going to pool? I think these are questions that should be answered because, Mr. Chairman, I still recall the days when some 25 years ago, when during threshing time people were brought in from other provinces to help us out. Some of these couldn't even harness a horse, and I'm just wondering what kind of people are we going to draw into this pool. Will they have any experience? --(Interjection)-- No that's probably right, they won't -- but certainly a farmer with a \$25,000 tractor will not want to put someone on that tractor who has had no experience in handling it, and probably ruining it.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) Surely enough I would like to know. I'll probably need some labour myself this year and it is getting scarce, I know that, but how are we going to get reliable help, and what is the government going to charge for this type of labour?

MR. USKIW: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat what I said before. This is a pilot project and certainly we are going to be in a position to learn from the project itself. It is hopeful that it will become a successful program ongoing after this year.

Now it's going to provide for opportunities to people that want to get into these jobs as well as for farmers that wish to draw from this source to fill their labour needs. The office will attempt to match up the farm labourer and the farmer as best they can. In other words, they will try to determine the qualifications or eligibility for certain types of work, and there will be variations in the pay schedule according to experience. But we have not yet provided that information to the farm community. It will be released fairly soon. But again, it's experimental in nature so that we are almost prepared to attempt any mix of manpower programming here to try to develop something for a more permanent program for the following year. But it's certainly throwing a dart, Mr. Chairman, to say the least.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker in the debate on this particular matter, I was wondering if the Honourable the Minister can indicate to the House what numbers of skilled farm labour are available in this province today?

MR. USKIW: Well I don't know. As I look across the way, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how I would categorize all of the friends opposite who hail from the countryside. Some are better than others I might say, even in debate that could be true, so that it's a matter of degree, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I asked a very serious question of the Honourable the Minister, and I'm really serious of what I am talking about. There is no skilled farm labour available out in Roblin constituency. I am asking him as he has any figures that can give me some indication, or the members of this House, how many people are available, skilled farm labour in this province today?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, obviously the member missed the point. The purpose of the office will be to collect information and to relate that information to the community that wants it, whether it be the labour people on one side or the farmers on the other side. If you have a problem in Roblin, we might take some labour from Birtle-Russell to fulfill your demands, or vice versa. I don't know what information will arise through the operation of this facility, but hopefully over a period of time the facility will become sophisticated enough to provide an ideal service for the rural people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Then I take from the Minister's answer, Mr. Chairman, that he has no figures available of the skilled labour that's available in this province for farm labour today. Thank you.

MR. USKIW: right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a question of the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture that is more important than probably some people realize. The heading is Community and Family Planning, and we are talking about, just about \$600,000 which is an item in the total picture of the Agriculture Estimates. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, we are not getting anywhere with the Minister of Agriculture on the questions we are presenting to him this evening, and I am one of those who want to be a constructive critic, and I want to know when he talks about Community and Family Planning, whether this is something like has gone on in Russia over the many years, there are motivations here that I am very dubious about.

MR. USKIW: On a point of order, I think I should correct the Member for Rock Lake, it's Community and Family Programs, not planning.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, from what we have seen from this government and its operations, I fail to decipher too much difference in the meaning of planning and programs.

Mr. Chairman I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that I have had quite a number of criticisms and I use this criticism because I want to draw the Minister out to find out whether this is applicable to the Resolution for which we are dealing with and the thing I want to say to

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) the Minister is this that, is he seeking young people or middle-aged people who are not employed and who are seeking jobs and he's trying to find work for them on farms in the rural parts of Manitoba? I want to cite an example to him that a young fellow who was born and raised on a farm is being employed by another farmer, and is being paid by the farmer whom he is working for and being paid by the Department of Agriculture. Here's an example, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister if this is a fact?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before the Minister gets up to speak, I think there are a number of questions that should be answered. I put the question before whether we were going to import people into Manitoba under this program. I think this is important, and it's also the rates that are going to be called for that the farmers are to pay. I think this is another important thing. Otherwise the farmer is not the type that can afford too expensive help.

Then he mentioned before that, certainly these people that would be employed, would be under Unemployment Insurance, and so on. Is it -- is the idea behind this program that when these people join the labour pool and are not employed, that they will be drawing Unemployment? Is this the idea behind this? Or how does the government feature a labour pool of this type when they are not being used? Who will pay them, and at what rate? Certainly, I think these are questions that should be answered and need answering if we are supposed to give approval to the expenditure of -- what is it, about \$800,000.00? --(Interjection)-- the total is \$1,200,000. I think we are talking in large figures here for a program of this type.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the problem of my honourable friends opposite in trying to interpret the new estimates, or the change in the estimates as they are presented, but in effect the item being debated at the present time has to do with a number of programs that have been with us for many years, and one or two new ones, and the farm labour pool is one of them, and the farm STEP program, the Student Employment Program for this summer, is also within these estimates. The other items are Home Ec, 4H, the Agricultural Centre at Brandon and the Agri-Manitoba Program, which was already touched on, which is phasing out. So that in essence it covers a whole range of old programs plus a couple of new thrusts, namely Student Employment and the Manpower Pool.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. If Honourable Members could just tone down the conversation a bit.

MR. USKIW: Now the Member for Rhineland would know whether people from out of province would be involved and I would say to the extent that the facility of this office is available to people within the province, it's likewise available to anyone wanting to seek employment through it from out of province. It's an open door program, and hopefully it will result in a much improved and meaningful permanent employment system for the following years . . . the experience we have in this first year. It will have to be a matter of trial and error for a period of time to determine, to determine the course of action and policy decision that might be undertaken at a later date. Now I think it's a matter of launching into something new that has not been tried by the department before, and hopefully it will result in the upgrading of the ability of people to perform these services. It may very much tie in with other Manpower training programs as we move along with this program, and if that is the case, Mr. Chairman, it certainly should provide for a much more co-ordinated and well-rounded program the following year.

I might point out to the Member for Roblin that quite often you have within a region, many semi-retired or retired farmers that are able to handle machinery. It's a matter of having an office that would collect the names and refer them on or have farmers apply for these kinds of people, it's a matter of matching them up, it's a placement service to a large extent. And to the extent that this kind of information is available hopefully it will assist our people during the crisis periods as far as the labour shortages are concerned in the countryside during harvest and seeding in particular.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, one of the more serious problems that agriculture is facing today is the whole question of farm labour. The Minister in his speech delivered some time earlier this year cautioned farmers that no longer were they going to be able to get labour on the basis that they had been getting labour in the past. That from now on they were going to be paid according to the government standards and that they were no longer going

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) to be working 16 hour days. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of privilege has been raised.

MR. USKIW: The honourable member knows that he is not speaking the truth and I would ask him to withdraw that.

MR. JORGENSON: I just don't happen to have the particular quotation in front of me at the present time but I'll get it for my honourable friend because we can keep this thing going till 9:00 o'clock very easily.

MR. USKIW: I made no such statement to anyone.

MR. JORGENSON: It was reported -- my honourable friend is going to be able to answer me when his turn comes . If he'll sit down till I'm finished he'll have an opportunity to reply.

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JORGENSON: He's going to have an opportunity to reply when the time comes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Point of order or questions raised with -- I'm going to read this for the benefit of all members. We've had quite a number of points of order, points of privilege.

Points of order are raised with a view of calling attention to any departure from the standing orders or customary modes of proceeding in debate or in conduct of legislative business, and may be raised at any time by any member whether he has previously spoken or not. Citation Beauchesne 4th Edition, Page 59, Citation 70.

Point of order may be raised with respect to the use of unparliamentary expressions and the appropriate citation from Beauchesne. If a point of order consists of putting a question to a member speaking it is a mere interruption; if it is effected for other reasons the Speaker will sharply rule it out. A point of order cannot be raised on a point of order. Our rule 5(1) provides the Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and enforce the rules and shall decide all questions of order subject to appeal of the House. 5(2) In explaining the point of order, the Speaker shall state the authority applicable to the case. See our rules 29, 36 and 40.

We've also had matters of privilege raised and I'll read what matters of privilege are. Members sometimes raise so-called questions of privilege on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections either in debate or in proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in the Legislature. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose reparation or to apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House as well as the members individually. Wilful disobedience to orders and rules of parliament in the exercise of its constitutional functions, insults and obstructions during debate are breaches of the privileges of the House. Libel upon members and aspersions upon them in relation to parliament or any interference of any kind with their official duties are breaches of the privileges of members. But a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege. Therefore there is no point of order, no point of privilege before the House.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister, one of the problems that is faced by the agriculture community is the whole question of farm labour. And the Minister in a speech, I believe it was in Brandon, where he told a group of farmers that no longer were they going to be able to acquire labour on the basis that they have been getting labour in the past. No more 16 hours a day and no more low wages. They were going to be paying wages according to the terms that he was going to lay down rather than what a farmer could afford to pay -- rather the terms were going to be arrived at between the farmer who will be employing the labourer and the labourer who will be working.

We don't want any more of that stuff. What's going to happen is that the farmer, or the government are going to make the decision as to who is going to work on the farms and on what conditions they were going to work. Now that certainly was the interpretation that came through in the message that I got in the paper -- the particular correspondence that was written in the newspapers. I don't know what kind of labour that the Minister has intended to be working on farms. What happens --(Interjection)-- Well, Sir, again we have these interruptions, we have these interruptions on only points of privilege. -- (Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Point of order has been raised by the Honourable Minister of Labour. State your point of order, please.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was rising on a point of order, I have now a point of privilege. There is no licence as I understand any rule in parliamentary procedure, for the Member for Morris to indicate that I am rising on a phoney point of order of such . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . is not a past experience. The Honourable Minister of Labour is just as knowledgeable of the rules of procedure in this House as the little red hen from Morris.

A MEMBER: How about the point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: Now the point of order is simply this, Mr. Speaker, and I refer you to Beauchesne Citation 113. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Do you want to take part in this debate then get up off your butt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, Would the Honourable Minister state his point of order. ORDER PLEASE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER! Will all the members please sit down. It is a point of order. When one member is on the floor speaking another member should not interrupt him and I think that's well known in our House rules. A member is on the floor now on a point of order and I would ask the Honourable Member from Swan River to desist. If he wishes to speak on a point of order afterwards I'll recognize him. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't make my point because of the crackling across the other side of the House. But if you will refer Sir, to Citation 113, about half way down the paragraph: "A dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege." --(Interjection)-- That's right. Now read on. "An attack in a newspaper article is not a breach of privilege unless it comes within the definition of privileges above given. Then a member is bound." -- and note this very particularly. "Then a member is bound to lay on the table the newspaper in which the article complained of appears." The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture -- or the Member for Morris referred to a newspaper article, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture denied the allegations levied at him. So on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the article complained of appears, and if he cannot do it then I suggest that he's out of order in proceeding with his complaint.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the same point of order?

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I really think that we should be able to proceed with the debates on the department without unnecessary delay. But on that same point of order, it is common practice in this House that that ruling that the Honourable former House Leader just read to us applies when in fact reference is made to a newspaper article when you're holding it in your hand or when you're reading from it, then the demand is made from the members opposite to lay it on the table or to table that document. A passing reference, a suggestion of an interpretation of what a member has from what he has read at some time hardly comes under the application of the ruling that the Honourable former House Leader just indicated; and that is only what the Member for Morris did. He referred to some reading material that he had in his hand some time in the past, it is a question, a matter of interpretation, an opinion that the Member for Morris has. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will have ample opportunity to challenge that opinion or indeed that interpretation.

MR. PAULLEY: Sir, if I may on that very point. Anyone could read anything from memory. But in this particular case -- and it must have been, and I agree that it could have been by memory by the Honourable Member for Morris, and memories can be out in the outside of the ball park, but he did refer to a newspaper article or a contents of a newspaper. And all I am asking as a member of this Assembly, on a point of privilege, is for the Honourable Member for Morris to lay on the table in accordance with Citation 113 the newspaper article to which he is referring.

And further, Mr. Chairman, in this Citation, I read further. It was decided by Mr. Speaker Brand in 1878, that a member having failed to take that course -- that is the course of laying on the table the newspaper article referred to -- and having brought up cuttings from newspaper instead, the question of privilege which he had brought forward could not be entered upon because of the cuttings. Incriminating passages from a newspaper should be read in the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) House by the Clerk and then a charge should be made that they constitute a breach of privilege.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is clearly enunciated in this rule that when the honourable member makes reference to a newspaper article imputing motives or suggesting statements made by another honourable member of the House, be he Minister or backbencher on either side of the House, then it is an obligation of the member who raised the point to lay on the table of the House, when requested, the article referred to.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue now with my speech . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the point is well taken.

MR. JORGENSEN: I expected it would be well taken by you, Sir, because that normally is the course, that normally is the double standard that is applied in this House.

A MEMBER: . . . reflecting on the Chair now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well my honourable friend is going to get more than just a reflection if he continues in his manner. Mr. Chairman, in a speech in Brandon the Minister made reference to farm labour, and I'll satisfy my honourable friend because it's not going to be difficult to keep this going till 9:00 o'clock, I don't have the newspaper clipping in front of me now but I will have it when this House next meets, and I can assure my honourable friend the Minister of Labour I will have that clipping. In the meantime, in the meantime I want to continue with my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I now rise on another point of order.

A MEMBER: A phoney business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. Would the honourable member please sit down. --(Interjection)--

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm speaking on the point of order . . . now, and if I may I will quote . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, Order, please, Order, please. ORDER please! I heard the honourable member say he was going to continue with his speech. A point of order has been raised by the Honourable House Leader, or the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! --(Interjection)-- (Interjection)--

MR. JORGENSEN: Just a second, I'll tell you right now on a point of order that it is my intention to introduce to this House a motion of censure against you at the earliest opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the honourable member's privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, possibly in quiet reflection the honourable member will reflect on his last statement. I rose on a point of order . . .

A MEMBER: A phoney one!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: You haven't heard it and there are none so deaf that don't open their ears. My point, Mr. Chairman, was the statement made by the Honourable Member for Morris in the reference to the alleged newspaper article. I raised the point of order because he was speaking on it without it being before him. My honourable friend said then or a little while later that it would be his intention to introduce that into the debate in the House in order, in order to substantiate the position that he has taken. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all well. The Honourable Member for Morris has every right so to do at that time. But I, in all due respect, Mr. Chairman, to him do not suggest that he has the right to continue the way he was continuing in reference to this particular article until and unless he was in possession of it so that the rest of us in this House could have the benefit of the article to which he refers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: If I can be of some assistance. Mr. Chairman, you gave the Minister of Labour the privilege of rising on a point of order. He spoke on that point of order and in my humble opinion the Honourable Member for Morris got up to speak on the same point of order . . . --(Interjection)-- Order, please.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, while the member is stating his point of order.

MR. BILTON: . . . which he had a perfect right to do, Sir. You ruled him out of order and you allowed the Minister of Labour to get up again on a second point of order without hearing the opinion of the Honourable Member for Morris. And with due respect, Sir, I offer that opinion for your consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Same point of order. I would like to know from you, Sir, whether it's in order for a person to allege certain things having occurred basis of a newspaper report without having to file that document and whether the House should be subjected, Mr. Chairman, to accusations, accusations from a person who may not have all his faculties.

MR. BILTON: Until you come to some decision, Sir, I think the Minister of Agriculture is taking advantage of a situation until you determine on the opinion I've just given you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, am I going to be muzzled in this House or am I going to be given an opportunity to continue my speech?

As I was saying and I'll say again, the Minister of Agriculture made a speech in Brandon in which he cautioned farmers that no longer were they going to be able to continue employing labour as they had been in the past, and I will return when this debate resumes at the earliest opportunity and produce the newspaper account of that meeting, and I can only go by the newspaper account since we don't get copies of the Minister's speeches, so I can only go by the newspaper account. If he wants to deny that he will have full opportunity to do it in this House. In the meantime, I have the right to refer to that article and debate it.

And what I am suggesting, Sir, is that the Minister of Agriculture -- what we're trying to find out is what kind of labour, what does he have in his mind in the way of labour for agriculture? Who does he intend to employ? The Member for Flin Flon who earlier got up here and described Hereford cow as a milk cow, is that the sort of thing that he is going to have working on farms? Is it going to be that trained kind of labour that is going to working from the Minister's department on farms in this province? Are their wages going to be determined by the Minister of Agriculture, or are the farmers themselves going to be given an opportunity of negotiating with someone who wishes to work on a farm to determine what the wages will be? Is he going to take away the right of the farmer to make that determination and the right of the labourer to come to an agreement with the farmer? Is there going to be collective agreements?

These are the questions that are being asked by the Member for Roblin, the Member for Rock Lake and the Member for Birtle-Russell, and we are not getting answers, Sir. What we are getting is evasion, because the Minister of Agriculture has made a statement, he's made a speech in Brandon that to the best of my knowledge he received a great deal of criticism for. The criticism that came to him as a result of those comments in Brandon were such as to make him very sensitive on this particular point. I can well understand my honourable friend's reluctance to answer any questions on this particular subject as farmers across this province have become very uneasy about what the intentions of the government are insofar as farm labour is concerned. It's a problem, it's a problem that I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Labour doesn't have the answers to because most of the farmers don't have the answer to that problem. But the Minister of Agriculture tries to create the impression that this government have simply solutions to all the problems in this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 9 o'clock. Order please. The hour being 9 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and passed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Thursday night, Private Members' Hour. The first item is public bills, Bill No. 10 Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews,

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. If any member wishes to speak, I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: May we proceed on Bill 10. The Honourable Member for Thompson would be closing debate.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, how many times is a member allowed to filibuster a bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is very improper. Bill No. 21. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Swan River,

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of advising you that I stood this matter in the interests of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Surprise, eh?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak too long on this Bill because frankly I agree with the bill 100 percent. There is no question that while the debate on Bill 36 was going on in this House, there is no question that this side of the House, and we have been proved right, who were opposed to Bill 36 which is the structure of Winnipeg as it stands at the present time, can be anything but supporting this bill. Mr. Speaker, at that time, when the amendment was passed that the mayor be elected on one occasion, we came in and spoke, and my leader spoke and I spoke and several of us on this side of the House said if you are going to elect the mayor on the first occasion of the New City, you are going to have to elect the mayor forever, because the people demand that right.

We have had a lot of controversy about this subject and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why anybody would say that the mayor of a City should not be elected. Mr. Speaker, anywhere you go in the world, the mayor is the representative of the people of the City. He is elected by the people as such. When we had a Metro concept, Mr. Speaker, which was a form or a type of regional government, the Chairman was elected by the members of that council but the Metro concept was basically a management group to help cities and municipalities in the area and work with them on all of the things pertaining to what would be roads going through 4 or 5 cities, that type of situation.

Mr. Speaker, we should have a regional government today and if we had a regional type government with the City of Winnipeg at the present time or several cities within the city as we had before, which was sensible, less costly than we have at the present time, I would say that the regional government would have its chairman elected the same because they would be managing many of the overall concepts that had to be done in a large city; but when you use the name Mayor, the mayor is the representative of the people. Insult the Mayor of a town and you insult all the people, and I assure you that is his position. And I know that some of the members on the other side maybe not think that because I have seen the Provincial Government at times do things that would basically be insulting to the Mayor of a City, but that's beside the point. The Mayor is the peoples' representative and he is there to take care of that council, be the chief magistrate and be a person of respect.

Mr. Speaker, our party has asked me -- I'm speaking on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party -- and we are in complete support of this bill. So, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is not passed this time, I believe that the controversy that we are having around it now may be such that it might not pass again. We should take the bull by the horns now, pass this bill -- (Interjection) -- well as I said, Mr. Speaker, if the members on the other side want to compare a Mayor to a bull that's fine, and the Honourable Minister of Labour should know he was a mayor, he is a bit of a bull too, so there's no question about that.

But Mr. Speaker, it is now the time to pass this bill because we are not talking about regional government, which we should have, we are talking about the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, the peoples' representative, and so, Mr. Speaker, I would sincerely hope that this Bill passes this House this session. Thank you.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR
BILL 21

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting that this year we are having a discussion on the matter of whether or not to elect a mayor of the City of Winnipeg by popular vote. It seems to me if I recall last year, when I introduced this Bill that the government conveniently let the Bill sit on the Order Paper and let it die. There was not a vote. It was something that they hoped would go away and not come back to haunt them at a later time. So I await with interest, Mr. Speaker, the government's position now that debate has started on this bill.

Also it would have been quite interesting last year had this bill come to a vote, because there were certain members, the party of the member who has just spoken, who were violently opposed to any part of having a unified City in the Winnipeg Metropolitan area. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm not saying that they have double standards but I'm sure that in my thinking that there has been a change in thinking in the year that has just passed. But, Mr. Speaker, if I can just again reiterate my reasons for introducing the Bill last year, I believe that a Metropolitan area, a One City Complex should have the right to elect one person with which they can identify, whether they like what he's doing, and his council is doing; or if they don't like it they can raise their voice against the person who heads the administration, or they can re-establish their confidence by voting every three years for or against that person.

The way it is now, or the way it will be in the future, Mr. Speaker, is that we'll have 50 people being elected in wards of roughly 10 or 11,000 voters. Those 50 people will in turn elect a chairman, so that really the chairman under that concept will be responsible to 50 politicians. Now what happens? You know, it's human nature what would happen. We find that there's going to be certain committees established and there'll be heads of committees and vice-chairmen of committees and so on. So after the election is over, then comes the real political in fighting to see who should be chairman who should be chairmen of committees, who should be vice chairmen, who should sit on certain committees and so on, and I suggest to you, Sir, that this system is not truly democratic. In other words, it puts a barrier between the people who vote for an administration and the people who are put into the administration and then decide by a 50-person vote who should be chairman, vice-chairman, sub-chairman and so on. So this is the reason I brought in the bill last year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that a provincial government administration doesn't want to deal with one person who represents a half a million people in this province; so we may say this is practical politics, that it's very difficult and sometimes embarrassing for an administration of the province to have to deal with a person that has an extremely strong voice or extremely great deal of popularity with the people of the city that he represents. But, Mr. Speaker, this is no reason not to allow the complete democratic process to take place, to have an urban complex such as Winnipeg who have powers of self-government, to have all of the powers of self-government that they can have someone that they can take to account, if the administration doesn't suit them rather than have the criticism or the praise defused over 50 members at large who elect a chairman. So for that reason last year I brought in this Bill and for that reason again this year I support the same bill brought in by the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I just had one or two brief remarks to make, I think that any City, particularly the size of Winnipeg that was created by the Province should have a Mayor, I think it's expected that this Mayor should be elected at large and by all the people, certainly not put in from one community, such as Fort Garry, Charleswood or any other small area by 11,000 people and then when the deals start to be made, the jockeys for position be appointed by the group of 50. I think that the government was warned at the time they started putting this together they were creating a monster, I think they have that today. The City of Winnipeg Council is carrying the balance of power for the province and can dictate any manner which way they are going to have it go. I think the group of councillors today are unjustifiably criticized in every way for what they do, what they try to put forth, try to make the best of

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR
BILL 21

(MR. MOUG cont'd) what they have down at City Hall and it's making it impossible for them to operate, and now the province finds themselves that they don't know which way to move to overcome the problem they have created at City Hall.

I think that if you take a man that's been elected by 11,000 people they expect representation at City Hall out of that man. If you make him the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg he has no time to look back in that ward and take care of those people. I think we have a good indication of that on the other side of the House; the people of Rossmere have no representation, their member is too busy looking after the balance of the province; it was indicated to us last September in the Federal Election the people in there are dissatisfied. I wouldn't want to see this happen in the City of Winnipeg and for that reason I am going to support the Bill hoping that we can have the Mayor of the City elected at large.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to rise because the position of our group has already been expressed by several, however, I see that the people's government on the other side is about to take the first step towards burying this bill and making sure that it does not see the light of day, so I would at least like to have the opportunity of making a few things clear for us and perhaps through the news media, the public.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment it's going to be one of those situations that we have all too often had demonstrated before for us; it will be a demonstration as to who actually controls and calls the shots as far as the New Democratic Party government is concerned. The First Minister of this government has indicated publicly that he has no fixed and firm position on this matter. He has indicated that the suggestion that the mayor should be voted at large is one that he is prepared to entertain, and I would suggest that if he takes the 7 or 8 thousand letters seriously that my honourable friend the Member from Rupertsland already has in his possession, then surely a reasonable and open-minded person like the First Minister of this province would tend to feel that that would be justification for him to consider the advisability of, in fact move forward on this particular bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you -- and it's my opportunity to make a prediction to you -- you see, Mr. Speaker, it was not unlike the attitude that the First Minister took when he first met a concerned group of automobile insurance agents some years ago and that he indicated to them that he was not particularly hung up on the doctrinaire position with respect to the necessity for government taking over the automobile insurance industry. He led them to believe that the commission that he would set up would in fact have an open mind on this subject matter and be prepared to look at the matter from all sides. Well of course, the history proved that in that particular instance the Premier was not in command of the troops he commanded and it was the power brokers of that party that ruled the day in no unmistakable manner.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this bill, this very straightforward simple bill put forward by the Member for Rupertsland, simply stating that the mayor of our largest city in this province should be voted by the population at large, that is that all people living in this particular city, the capital city of our province should have an opportunity to vote for their mayor, certainly is not one that's of any complex nature or one that requires any in-depth searching of one's conscience on this matter; clearly it's a bill that could be dealt with expeditiously and should be. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has different thoughts about the bill, shared by a few other members on that side, the Member from St. Matthews, the Member from St. Vital, a few other ministers, and that despite, despite what the Honourable the Premier of this Province may wish to do about it, despite what the growing number of people in this city are indicating through the letters that they are sending to the Member for Rupertsland, over 7,000, that this bill will be buried, this bill will not see the light of day in this Chamber and we will have once again an expression of people's power from the other side.

A MEMBER: Hear, Hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River has already spoken. Accordingly I cannot allow him to speak again. The honourable member has already spoken. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned. -- (Interjection) --

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR
BILL 21

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yeas and Nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now under Private Members' Resolutions. We are on Resolution No. 7 as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and amended by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

RESOLUTION NO. 7

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for some extra information that I wanted before I proceeded on this resolution but after the amendment was moved I can proceed now. I'm just not certain if the amendment is any different to what the main resolution, or what the resolution intended in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the other speakers and I would like to say that information in the last three years that has become available to many provinces has perhaps brought this to the forefront and this is why many provinces have taken some actions in respect to land, recreation land and farmland that is being purchased by non- or by foreigners. I understand that some of the provinces have initiated studies in this area and have come to the conclusion that there must be some legislation that must be drafted to protect recreation land.

Perhaps I could contain my remarks more to recreation land than farmland, I'm sure that some of the other members will cover that area quite capably, but the Member for Lakeside the other night did talk about the park system and the park land and perhaps I can turn back to that area for a little while. I believe it was under the Premier of D. L. Campbell, under his administration that the provincial park system was started in the Province of Manitoba. And as a result of the park system we have that beautiful park, the Falcon Lake area. (Hear, Hear.) And in this respect, I will come to that, I wish also to say that the next administration under the Roblin administration they continued with this development of the park system in the province and developed the Bird's Hill Park which in my opinion was the proper thing and perhaps is one of the finest assets that we have as close to a large urban centre as Winnipeg. I'm sure that many other cities would like to be in this position. Now the present government -- time will only tell what their record will be in respect to continue this development of parks in the Province of Manitoba. So it has put the province of Manitoba much further ahead than most provinces in Canada or some of the other provinces in Canada because some are only establishing provincial parks just in the last couple of years, or are beginning in that area just now. So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps in that respect we are more fortunate as far as the parks system and the recreation land is concerned.

But the provinces have started to take some action and to come to grips with the problem of losing much of their recreation and farmland. And as you have noticed this is what happened in B.C. this year, and of course the farmers were in strong opposition, or some of the farmers, and perhaps rightly so because the legislation wasn't properly drafted. You had the same instance happen in Saskatchewan, where the government again drafted legislation and said that no one can buy any land that does not reside in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I think this is going much too far than I believe any government should intend to do. So again, after considerable debate the legislation was withdrawn or stopped and the matter is continued to be studied in Saskatchewan.

The Province of Ontario I understand has had several studies in this area in respect to farmland and recreation land, had several studies, and I believe during this session of the Legislature I understand that it was referred to in the Throne Speech that the Premier will be moving in the area and presenting some legislation to control some of their recreation land and farmland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have to realize, and I would say this has to be done. This is not something new. Most other countries have this type of legislation. I understand Scandinavian countries, Japan, most European countries have this type of legislation. And even in the United States this was researched and at least half of the States in the Union have legislation that will preclude or will not allow foreigners to buy, or people who are not citizens of that country to buy their recreation land. So this is not new and this isn't in my opinion being anti-American, I think it should apply to anyone.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)

Now if you can relate what's happening in the Province of Ontario, in an area surrounding Sioux Ste. Marie, some of the lakefront recreational land is owned, in the percentage basis of 90 percent, is owned by non-Canadians, and this has become a great concern to those people in that area and they have come to the conclusion that something must be done. This is what is happening right across the country, right across Canada in every province. I don't believe that this is too far wrong, to be looking at this question in the Province of Manitoba and I hope that the government would not rush into it quickly but perhaps a Committee of the House could be established to look at it properly so that proper legislation is drafted.

I understand in some of those areas there

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader,

MR. GREEN: He indicated that 90 percent of certain lakeshore property was owned by private American citizens. Can he tell me whether it would be more comforting if that 90 percent was owned by private Canadian citizens, what the difference would be with regard to the people in the area?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, very much so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member,

MR. PATRICK: Because surely the reason we are Canadians because we enjoy the amenities of this country. We enjoy the lakes, we enjoy the spaces, we enjoy the land and maybe we haven't got all the benefits that some people in the other countries have, but certainly, certainly the people should enjoy those amenities that live in this country, the people that pay the taxes in here, the people that pay the income taxes in here, the property tax, that make a contribution to this country. Not someone that lives 2,000 miles away, makes no contribution to this country, should have the right to enjoy all the benefits and amenities in this country.

Perhaps I could make a reference, Mr. Speaker. There are two largest and biggest flyways in the North American continent for geese in this country, in the North American continent, through Saskatchewan and Manitoba, right over, say, Lake Manitoba. And is it right that this whole shoreline should be owned by somebody that doesn't live here, doesn't make any contribution, 14 miles of the shoreline, and it's closed and you can't hunt in there. Should this resort not belong to the people of Manitoba? Or people of Canada? Surely nobody would disagree with that. In fact when it would come to this point I would say I would agree with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when it comes to say, doesn't matter who it is, should he own the shoreline when it comes to hunting because I think that everybody who enjoys the sport should have access to it. But when he talks about shoreline or lakes -- ownership of shoreline and access to the lakes and cabins, surely he shouldn't say that the Attorney-General has no right to own 100 feet of lakeshore property somewhere in Manitoba while everybody else has the right that doesn't reside in this country, has no connection with this country and probably enjoys living in the country that he is living. So why should he come here for a couple of months' period and have the opportunity to have the benefits that I think belong to the Canadians? Surely I would agree with the Minister that we should allow public beaches, resorts for public beaches. That's not my argument. But I'm talking about, there's many lakes that we have in this country, in this province, many lakes that are leased to people whoever wants them, that can be sold to people, and my point is that I believe the people in this province should have the first opportunity to those lakeshores and should enjoy the amenities instead of someone that perhaps lives 5,000 miles away, has no connection, but should enjoy those amenities because he was able to afford to pay a little higher price for it. -- (Interjection) -- I wonder what the Member for Ste. Rose has to offer, I hope that he gets up and takes part in this debate. He seems to disagree completely. I wonder who he feels that this property should belong to, you know. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I disagree with him because I believe there's sufficient lakeshore properties in this country, that recreational property should belong to -- that the people in this province should have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of that instead of somebody that does not live in this country. This is my whole point.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't something new in this province; as I mentioned, some of the other provinces have changed their legislation, or drafted legislation. I understand that Quebec has done it, Ontario has had a few studies and is presenting legislation during their

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) session of the Legislature now. I had an opportunity to talk to two farm groups just this week and they're of the opinion very strongly that there should be some, some consideration given that all our better farmland is not sold to somebody that will not be farming it, that people will be buying it for speculative purposes. And I think they have a point. -- (Interjection) -- Well I believe the Canadians should have an opportunity before somebody else should have, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker, I believe that farmlands within a province are a very important ingredient, and it should be important in our interest, in Canadian interest. As well. same thing that recreation should be of interest to all of us because what some of the other provinces have gone through, what some of the other areas have gone through -- the Minister is saying you're splitting hairs. or the Member for Ste. Rose. I have just told him that at least 50 percent of the States in the United States do not allow people from outside the country to buy recreation land. So what is so different? I don't believe this is so much different. I told the House as I started to speak I was waiting for some extra information which I did not have but I decided to proceed with the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the railways in this country would have not been possible if it wouldn't have been for the land in this country, and I believe it was because of the farmers that made it possible because we needed them, so I believe that nobody will disagree that surely we the Canadians who live in this country, who perhaps maybe not enjoy as good a climate as some of the other people in some other countries, should have first opportunity to these amenities as far as recreation land is concerned and that I can leave it to the other members who can speak as far as the agricultural land is concerned.

I agree that consideration should be given not only to the people now but what about the people who come after us and our grandchildren. So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution in my opinion has some merit. Again I warn the government not to rush into it too quickly. to make sure that proper legislation is drafted and not something that was proposed in the Province of Saskatchewan but certainly this is not something new, this is something that every province has looked at in the whole of Canada, and there's legislation being drafted now and presented in some provinces and perhaps will be redrafted in the provinces that presented it and had it withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as most honourable members know I am keenly interested in the development of recreational potential in Manitoba, and although I'm not the Minister responsible for either the Department of Mines and Natural Resources or Tourism and Recreation, I have a very profound interest, as I think many members of this House have, in the facilities which we are proud of in Manitoba which provide recreational opportunities for the people of Manitoba and for the tourists who come here to take the benefit of our wonderful climate and our wonderful natural resources.

I share the concerns of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that for far too long we have in various areas of our country, and certainly of our province, allowed private ownership to effectively take away from the right of the individual citizen, to the advantages and benefits of our environment. and I too have experienced what he referred to in wondering at the tremendous amount of private ownership along the periphery of Lake Manitoba, particularly in the Delta region, and that is one of the reasons. Mr. Speaker, why in the Throne Speech, and why the Minister of Mines and Resources has provided for funding for a program to insure that there will be access corridors obtained which will allow for public utilization of lands which should be available to all of the people of Manitoba.

I certainly agree with the concerns that many have expressed that private ownership of lands that are vital to the sharing of sufficient of our public heritage for everyone should be safely programmed. Now I question however, whether the Honourable Member for Assiniboia really is being frank in his assessment of the question as to whether or not it's a problem of private ownership of far too much of our prime recreational facility, or whether there is a real bogey of foreign ownership of recreational facility. Because I think the honourable member, certainly his leader and others, would be the first to rise in their place and insist that in a Bill of Rights in this province there should be a right of individuals to own private property; and I'm sure that the honourable member would not want to take away the right of a Manitoba citizen to own property wherever he or she chooses to own private property, whether it be in

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Saskatchewan, or in England, or in United States, or wherever. I'm sure the Honourable Member would not like to deny to the Winnipeg Free Press, or the Winnipeg Tribune, the right to run the big ads that you see in the papers. There was one tonight by an American Corporation inviting the honourable member, and any other honourable member, to buy a lot in Sunny Florida, and I'm sure that many Canadians have done that, and I'm sure that there will be many Canadians in the future who will want sometime to sojourn elsewhere for a period of time in their life and own property. They may wish to retain their Canadian citizenship. Will we want to deny them that right? Would we want that other jurisdiction to deny them that right? And I think anyone who believes in fundamental rights, would want -- (Interjection) -- no when I'm finished I will answer your question -- would want to preserve that right to the individual and it is only when the practical utilization of the lands that belong to the people is threatened that I think that the Crown should intervene. The Crown should intervene in insuring that there is sufficient recreational land for our people; that there is sufficient arable land for farming retained; that there is sufficient land retained for the varied uses which the people of Manitoba wish to make of their land, their lakes and their streams. But surely, one of the sacred principles that the honourable members have been so concerned to voice is the right of the individual to own property, and surely they would want to re-think their position in being so negative about non-residents owning property.

Now I know that the honourable member, my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources was subjected to some severe criticism because of the probable threat of commercial interests in the hunting field, and I share that concern in respect to the encroachment of commercial hunting by the acquisition of land and access to recreational facilities, but surely there's another answer without denying the right of any individual non-resident to own land or property. We certainly can acquire that land, the Crown can expropriate the land; we have one of the fairest expropriation procedures anywhere and that Bill was passed by this government early in the history of our sessions and there's no reason to fear that the Crown will not exercise its right when we feel that public utilization of lands for recreation or for any other proper use is being jeopardized. So why should we raise the foreign ownership bogey. Surely a government which is concerned to satisfy the needs of its people need not fear individual commercial or individual private ownership of property. Certainly the honourable members would be the first to wish well to any foreign corporation that would want to set up shop in Manitoba and buy land and create jobs.

I have some hesitations about being enslaved to foreign corporations who just want to utilize our economy for tariff advantages and branch plant and tax economies, but my honourable friends on the opposite side, wouldn't bat an eyelash if a foreign corporation was wanting to buy extensive amounts of land in Manitoba. And I know for example, when -- I beg your pardon -- (Interjection) -- well I remember, for example, when the Aircraft firm in the west end of St. James -- and I'm just trying to recall the name of that firm -- Boeing -- when they were negotiating with our council there were great promises of a vast amount of jobs in a short time, and of course, jobs have a great attraction, you know, when you really want to have more secondary industry, and the Council of the City of St. James was quite anxious to see job creation and we sold a vast amount of land to that foreign corporation. Well they haven't developed many jobs yet, Mr. Speaker. We hope that they are going to expand. We realize there have been problems in the aircraft industry, but you know, we weren't at all skeptical, we weren't at all negative about that foreign corporation coming in and buying a sizeable amount of very prime commercial land.

Now surely if some honourable members on the other side are going to welcome that kind of participation, surely they are not going to be negative about an individual foreign resident who wants to have a summer home in Manitoba. I share the concerns; if those foreign residents take over our recreational lands, then that's a matter of serious concern, and as I say, the Crown would have to move to acquire a return to the public of this essential property for recreation or any other purpose. But I urge upon honourable members don't look at this question with blinkers on your eyes; there are problems in some parts of the country and the honourable member or some of them have referred to the Maritimes and other places, where the rivers and streams, the shorelines have been completely purchased by non-residents, and I say in those jurisdictions, the Crown has responsibility to move, to return to the public wheel the ownership of those properties, if access to the recreational values have been

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) jeopardized; but don't try to attack the problem by saying that people elsewhere can't own property in Manitoba and I urge that philosophy upon you gentlemen and a reconsideration of some of the arguments that you have addressed heretofore.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia wish to ask a question?

MR. PATRICK: I have a question. Can the Minister tell me, does he know or not if the State of Florida is at the present time in jeopardy because of losing its recreational land potential?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I think in all likelihood the State of Florida which practices a very vigorous form of the private enterprise philosophy, and I'm sure has very great concerns about individual rights and the rights to own property, is threatened with the congestion of its land and the erosion of its recreational potential, but that is a matter for the government of the State of Florida to deal with and I for one, if I were in the government in that State I would be most concerned to have proper planning for orderly growth of the use of that property, whether it be for the residents who live there now or others that would wish to come there, and I would be concerned about what seems to be the unregulated and unparalleled growth of the number of people wanting to reside in Florida and this kind of massive land scale development.

. Continued on next page.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Did you say order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, to the noise.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell too long on the first part of the resolution. In fact, I find I would be speaking very much the same as the Member for St. James, the Attorney-General. I seem to find that the previous speaker, the Member for Assiniboia was steering away from the part of the resolution that said farmland and and was leading us into recreation lands all the time, which makes a very different resolution out of this whereas here, or the . . .

Mr. Speaker, I certainly couldn't support the situation where a person who owns farmland and or land of any kind being ruled to say that you couldn't sell it to who you wanted to, Mr. Speaker, that's really all I wanted to say on that part of the resolution, but on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I'm not really in agreement with the amendment put forth by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, really I don't know how the Honourable Attorney-General can really, after what he said, can agree with that particular amendment when he says lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use of Manitobans, which puts the whole thing right back in the government's hands to decide or who's going to decide, what is the most beneficial use.

Mr. Speaker, something was delivered to my home tonight that would interest the Attorney-General and the Premier and possibly the Minister of, not Labour, but the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, his name's in it, and I can understand why the Member for Assiniboia, he keeps talking about Canadians and I think I also am a Canadian, in fact I know I am, and I tell you quite honestly that it surprises me, it doesn't surprise me to no end but I got this letter in the mail today and as a Canadian I don't think that people should be forced to be told where their land should be sold.

But I received this in the mail today, it says, "Upsurge with Asper"- it came in the Honourable Attorney-General's constituency where I happen to live mind you, -- mind you, he's a constituent of mine and you know we're talking about, you know, and it says Dear Constituent- did you know there was another member by the way. "Dear Constituent: I am a Canadian and I'm very proud of it. The Provincial Leader of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, I. H. Asper is a Canadian and he is very, very proud of that fact." So are some of us here. "This province is part of Canada"- now we've learned we're part of Canada -" but you wouldn't know it by the way the NDP government has kept selling Manitoba short. This province is part of Canada" now he's just told me that again -"but you wouldn't know it by the way Messrs. Green, Schreyer, Mackling and other NDP leaders are denying Manitoba and Manitobans of a strong voice in Confederation. It becomes even more clear the present NDP government has done nothing to keep this province an equal partner in the Confederation of Canada. Mr. Asper has been unduly attacked for his attempt to assure Manitobans are co-equal to other Canadians." I thought I was equal to other Canadians. "The Opposition Parties have gloried in attacking the Liberal Party in Manitoba under the able leadership of Izzie Asper, all because of our plea that the NDP give for Manitoba a strong and equal influence in Confederation. However, the Liberal Party in Manitoba is proud of Canadian citizenship, that is a specific reason Mr. Asper should be your next premier, - that is the specific reason I should be your representative in the St. James constituency." That's the only reason. "The Provincial Budget was brought down in the House last week. If it were not for such an astute man as Izzy Asper" mind you, "calling for fair share from Federal Government the benefits provided in the Budget would very well not have been possible. But can the NDP give us all the same benefits in '74, '75, '76." I think I'd ask that question too. "Can the NDP promise that there will be no tax increase of any kind? No honest NDP politician can and will promise that there will be tax increase of any kind. We will always remain the highest taxed province in this country if the present government remains in office."

Mr. Speaker, this last part of the letter is what really disturbs me. --(Interjection)-- No I didn't write it. No, no. "I pledge categorically to work hard for the constituents of St. James and the citizens of Manitoba. If I'm elected I pledge categorically to strive ever harder

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd). . . . to ensure that all Manitobans will become co-equal Canadians." You know it makes me damn mad for having somebody around to think I'm not now. "If we form the next Provincial Government you may be assured that Manitobans will have a stronger voice as equal Canadians. Join me, join the Asper upsurge. Let us become equal Canadians. Your constituency office at Ferry Road and Ness is open for your support. Help us make the expression on Canada's Coat of Arms "from sea to sea" a reality. Help us make Manitoba an equal partner in Canada." Signed, Mr. Michael Scholl. --(Interjection)-- Michael Scholl.

I'm quite willing to table the letter. I see, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't know why the Member for Assiniboia, and I guess it's his Liberal caucus has decided to make this decision that we are all Canadians and we shouldn't sell any land to anybody else and they're going to tell us we're all Canadians, but quite frankly, you know --Mr. Speaker, I'll go back to the resolution. I think a person should be able to sell his property to who he pleases. I think we should protect our recreational land for the people of not only Manitoba and Canada, but make them very well done so that everybody that comes to this country can enjoy them as well. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Is it not a fact, to the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the Conservative administration in 1966 practically gave away 40,000 square miles of northern Manitoba to Swiss interests for logging purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if it was practically given away, there's 800 people working, there's a \$250,000 swimming pool in The Pas, The Pas is growing, the Premier of the Province of Manitoba said the principle is good and we are thriving for and if the Liberal Party wants to keep that old egg going, we're perfectly willing to fight it.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really hadn't intended to get into this debate but I must confess a certain amount of sympathy with the Member for Assiniboia when he spoke this evening.

In reading over the resolution proposed by the Member for Portage la Prairie I notice a certain amount of confusion evident in it, an amount of confusion that seems to have rubbed off or be reflected by the Member for Assiniboia in the remarks that he made on it, particularly with two of the clauses contained in the resolution. If I read them it might become a little more obvious, Mr. Speaker. The fourth "whereas" is, "And whereas it is the responsibility constitutionally of the Provincial Government to regulate property rights within the province and is the obligation of the Provincial Government to protect those recreational lands from foreign takeover so that they will be available for Canadian residents as required." It says quite distinctly there "Canadian residents".

The following clause says: "And whereas the farmlands within the province are a vitally important ingredient in Canadian national interests and like our recreation lands must remain Canadian owned." And I presume what he means by that is owned by Canadians. So he's speaking there in two different clauses; in the one case about Canadian residents and in the next one about Canadian citizens. And finally in the Resolved portion it says that they should be reserved for Canadian residents.

I noticed amongst the remarks of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that he did seem to use these two expressions interchangeably, residents and citizens and not making the distinction there which is mentioned in the resolution that farmlands should be Canadian owned and the recreational land kept for Canadian residents. Now whether he meant this distinction to be there or not is really not too clear from his remarks, but the way he was using the two expressions suggested that really they meant the same thing as far as he was concerned. I notice that he doesn't get up to clarify it and I would assume that that remains to be the case. But as far as the residents is concerned . . .

MR. PATRICK: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning.