

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 1, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 16 Girl Guides under the direction of their leader Mrs. Anderson. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of John Donald McNairnay and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the St. Andrews River Heights Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make the following statement on the negotiations with the Manitoba Medical Association and government-employed physicians.

The Manitoba Medical Association has made public statements in respect to negotiations between the Government of Manitoba and the physicians employed by the government.

Negotiations are currently in progress with this organization and while I have no wish to intervene in the negotiating process, I feel that correct information to the public in this negotiating process is warranted in view of the M. M. A. statement.

The breakdown in negotiations referred to by Mr. Sprague consists of a postponement of a response by government negotiators to representations made by the MMA at a negotiating meeting on Wednesday, March 26th. The government negotiators asked that a meeting, which the MMA representative insisted should be held on Thursday, March 27th, be deferred in order that preparation of a further response could be prepared with respect to the items on which settlement had not been agreed.

It is my understanding that a further meeting is scheduled for today. The MMA statement is so designed as to attempt to cause concern over the prospect of serious infectious disease epidemics and lack of treatment for mentally disturbed people.

I sincerely hope that physicians in public service will fulfill their professional obligation in any circumstances of collective bargaining to see that patients in need of care are not abandoned.

The position of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba was made clear on this issue during the previous end of May negotiations last year. It is my understanding that professional ethics requires similar conduct by physicians no matter whether employed by government or in private practice, and no matter whether paid on salary or fee for service.

That a physician must not abandon his patients in a long standing ethical principle which I feel sure will be honoured in Manitoba.

I wish to set the records straight on the progress of negotiations to date. This is a complex matter and I will try to simplify the issue in a fashion which sets out the facts.

The current salary scale for physicians in public service ranges from \$19,000 to some \$37,000 plus Civil Service fringe benefits, including pension, sick leave, etc. These physicians have no overhead expenses. The minimum current salary is nearly \$25,000. It is recognized that the lower end of the salary scale is irrelevant in the current competitive salary . . . for physicians in Manitoba.

It is for that reason that the initial offer of the government to the MMA involved increases which were higher at the lower end of the salary scale than at the upper end. The initial offer was designed to reduce some major inequities in the current salary system. For example, the initial offer included maximum salaries in the several classification scales of 30 to 41 thousand dollars along with additional pay for extra duties. A 19 percent increase was offered in the maximum salary for a junior position. Public Health physician salaries in the initial

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) offer were to be increased to a maximum of 17 percent for some senior medical officers of out in field service.

The people of Manitoba should be aware that the presentation by the MMA asked for salary increases for physicians in public service of between 53 and 70 percent in one year. I wish to say that this request cannot be met. The people of Manitoba are faced with collective bargaining in many spheres of public service. We have recently witnessed a major salary increase for nurses in hospital service. We are anticipating a large salary increase request for civil servants and the ramifications of large settlements in an inflation-torn economy can be severe.

It is not possible to be irresponsible in this matter without serious secondary effects throughout our economy. I do not wish to give any impression of underestimation or under-valuation of the work of physicians in public service. Indeed I wish to be on record as acknowledging, and proudly so, the fine work of our Public Health and Psychiatric Medical Staff as part of our complex of health-care service in the province. I've asked our negotiators to prepare a revised financial offer to the MMA negotiators for physicians in public service. The offer will I believe be considered by the people of Manitoba to be a generous one. It will I believe recognize the importance of medical public service as an important and equal component of health-care as private medical service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are very pleased that negotiations are continuing with the Manitoba Medical Association. We were rather concerned about some of the statements that were made in the press and that they would not be able to look after an outbreak of infectious disease, and so on, but because the government was negotiating on this matter we did not ask any questions on this, and I think that we were acting in a responsible manner. We are very pleased to see that negotiations are continuing, and we're also very pleased to see that the government is acting in a responsible way and that they have offered more than the 3.5 percent increase which was mentioned in the press, which of course was entirely unacceptable.

I still believe that one of the biggest problems however, Mr. Speaker, is that these doctors and providers of health-care are usually not consulted when major changes are being made in health programs. And this certainly is one of the reasons why there are difficulties with the Manitoba Medical Association, and I hope that this is going to be rectified in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member state his point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: My honourable friend made a statement that the people are not consulted. I think he should remember - just a minute Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's not a Point of Order. --(Interjection)-- Order please. Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Social Development. I understand that at the present time there is a serious shortage of medical doctors and psychologists on the staff of the Brandon Mental Health Centre. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not this has come to his attention and if so, what steps his department are taking to correct this difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member who gave me notice of this. Mind you, it's only about ten minutes ago, so I don't know if I'll be able to provide all the information that he wants.

First of all there is no shortage of psychologists at all. The shortage is in - and there is indeed a shortage of a general medical staff. I think that first of all we should realize that the population of the institution went down from 1,600 to approximately 800, but that doesn't mean there is no shortage, there is still a shortage. The department is constantly recruiting and we are looking at about 30 names now, 30 applications. I want to make sure that I'm not misleading the members here, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't mean that we will have 30 new

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) doctors, some of them probably will not qualify, and so on. I think that this is not only to the Brandon region. We had a difficulty . . . this is a problem we are certainly wrestling with and trying to solve. There is a general shortage of medical officers, medical staff, not only those working for government but in the private sector also, every part of the province except in the area of Winnipeg, in the city.

So this is something that as I say, we'll keep on recruiting, we want to discuss this with the College of Physicians, and I hope that I'll have more information and be able to some day soon, be able to say that there is no shortage.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the staffing of medical doctors at the present time is about approximately one-half of the staff which the normal complement would normally entail.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think we'll have time to get all these answers. I think that there are approximately ten medical officers at Brandon. I think one is sick. Two of them left not too long ago, and are still serving the people of Brandon; they are in private practice. To say that the normal, what will the normal . . . I don't think that we know right now. We can tell you what the normal complement would be because you know the policy of the government is to try to reduce the population, as I said earlier, of the establishment, of the institution, where there used to be over 1,600 and now it's around 800. We hope that some of these people go back in their communities and be looked after there. But I must admit there is a shortage. I think we could use another four or five doctors.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, is this shortage at Brandon Brandon Mental Health Centre, which I believe is somewhat chronic, is it due to the fact that the salary scale being offered is not attracting doctors to this area of the province?

MR. DESJARDINS: I told my honourable friend, I informed the House that we have applications and we were looking at about 30 applications now. It is a very difficult question to answer. I think that money certainly is a factor, could be a factor in somebody looking for employment, but I choose to think that you have to be motivated to do this work. There is no doubt that it is much easier in this field especially to be in private practice, and you look at certain patients and then the tough cases, the difficult cases then are sent to either Brandon or Selkirk. We are trying to change this system and this program. So, in all fairness I think he'd have to ask every single individual if the salary or the lack of salary is a factor. This is something that we're looking at now. We recognize that we have to be competitive, and our negotiator, as I said earlier in my statement, will be informed to try and come in line. But this is something that we will be competing with the private practice constantly.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister. Is the standard of mental health care at the Brandon Mental Health Centre being maintained in spite of the serious shortage of medical staff?

MR. DESJARDINS: I would say so. It's not something that just happened last week, or today. It's something that we know we can increase the staff. So I think that standards are still pretty high with the . . . we have some very good people there.

Maybe I should add to the previous question, that if my friend wants to find out to see if it is just a question of pay for incentive, I think that there is a shortage of doctors all across Manitoba, and even in specialists, especially outside of Winnipeg, and I think that probably the City of Brandon could use more of these people also who are on fee for service.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister in charge of MDC. I wonder, in view of the recent statement by the chairman of MDC Corporation that the backlog of buses has been cleared. I wonder if the Minister could advise of the outstanding orders in Flyer prior to the strike, how many of these outstanding orders have been completed, and how many, if any, have been cancelled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, that's a question which I will consider best answered at the meeting of the Committee on Economic Development where details of Crown corporations, when they do not interfere with the security of commercial operations, will be given by the chairman.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister. Would the Honourable Minister advise the House if the chairman has advised him that the backlog of buses has been cleared at Flyer?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the specific advice in that connection. The matter is discussed in general terms between the chairman and myself from time to time. I believe I read a statement to that effect in one of the newspapers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs can indicate to the House if he had any discussions with the City of Winnipeg, where the City of Winnipeg would take over the ownership of land occupied by private golf clubs and curling clubs, and this would release or exempt these clubs from paying the high realty tax at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been no discussions, at least not at the political level. I know there have been some, perhaps some discussion at the municipal level itself. I don't recall it ever surfacing to the level of the Urban Affairs Committee.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Is the Minister or the government considering making any financial assistance to the recreation clubs such as golf courses and curling clubs?

MR. MILLER: No. Mr. Speaker, there are certain public facilities and they are being used within the City of Winnipeg. If the City of Winnipeg wants to make certain concessions to other private clubs within the City of Winnipeg, that is something that the City of Winnipeg will have to deal with directly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder, in view of the letting of the contract by Manitoba Hydro to Brown Boveri for the \$90 million of electronic equipment, whether he can advise the House of what the prospects now are for Canadian General Electric to set up their plant in Brandon.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we are in a position to advise the House on that matter. I could only say that for many a year, for many a year CGE has been the recipient, and this goes back for many years, of contracts from Manitoba Hydro, and I do think that long-term suppliers of any utility in Manitoba, particularly if it's on a continuing basis, should consider at some time to locate a plant in Manitoba. But this should not be related to any specific contract of course.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could direct the question more directly to him. Is there still a prospect of CGE setting up in view of the fact they did not gain the contract from Manitoba Hydro?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion on the possibility of CGE setting up a plant in Manitoba for a long period of time, unrelated to any specific contract. So I can only say, Mr. Speaker, hope springs eternal.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can direct a further question to the Minister, and ask him whether a feasibility study was done by the government of the proposed products and general plant facilities that Canadian General Electric were proposing to set up in Brandon, including those components going to Manitoba Hydro.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government per se did not do any such feasibility study, but I do know that the company, Canadian General Electric, has done a considerable amount of research with regard to various kinds of products, some entirely unrelated to hydro developments in Manitoba that might possibly be manufactured in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and it relates to the information that mortgage rates are to rise in Canada. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department has undertaken any studies to determine whether mortgage money is as easily available in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Manitoba as it was in a previous year with respect to requirements for housing, industrial and commercial undertakings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services)

(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, that kind of question would be most suitably taken as an Order for Return. At the moment, I don't think there is any ongoing systematic study of interest rates being conducted. The reason for that, sir, is that when the Consumer Affairs Act was first considered back in 1967 or 1968, and certainly in 1969, real property was excluded, that whole category of transactions was excluded from the Consumer Protection Act. Consequently I have not deemed mortgage interest rates to be a direct concern to the Consumers Bureau. However, if he's seeking information, I can take it as Order for Return; if he's seeking the establishment of such a study, then I can always attempt to convince my colleagues that the money should be allocated for more civil servants to conduct a kind of ongoing study.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate that he considers that his responsibility is only the Consumer Protection Act or on behalf of the consumers of Manitoba, in which case . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll frame the question in a different way.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SPIVAK: Does the Minister consider that it's within his terms of reference of his department to in fact study the situation of funds that are available for the private sector, particularly in the question of housing, commercial and industrial undertakings?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, in this department I suppose every matter in which a consumer becomes involved, every purchase of every commodity of every service, could be considered to be within the purview of the department. Certainly in this particular matter I have certain information, personal information, but there is no task force, no study group assigned specifically to monitor mortgage rates and report on a systematic basis. Now I assume that was the intent of the Leader of the Opposition's question. If he's talking about an ad hoc review of mortgage rates, that certainly is undertaken.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether a rise in the interest rates on the mortgage money will have a significant rise on the cost of living in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's asking for an opinion. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In view of the fact that the rise in housing costs in Manitoba was the most significant for the last year in Canada, I wonder if the Minister's in a position to indicate what the effect will be on the cost of living in Manitoba if mortgage rates are to increase.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question's hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. I would like to ask him if he could advise the House if there are any consultations taking place from time to time with the MMA regarding the delivery of health services in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement reached over a year ago, and there is a consultative committee of the members representing the MMA and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and they prepare their own agenda, and so on, so I'm sure that this consultation does exist with the MMA.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and it relates to a question I asked yesterday in connection with a young child. --(Interjection)-- Well, I gather he hasn't the information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister indicate if the Manitoba Flood Assistance Board has completed the processing of claims, the flood claims of last year?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'll get my honourable friend the question. I believe that they are substantially completed but there are still some claims that may be outstanding.

MR. PATRICK: I thank the Minister for taking the question as notice. Perhaps I can give him a supplementary. Can he indicate to the House, or find out what will happen to the employees that were assigned to do that work. Will they be transferred to other government departments or will their employment be terminated?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, they will be transferred to other departments only if there is work available in other departments; otherwise if the work in which they are employed is terminated, they will not be employed to continue the work which has been terminated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I'd like to proceed with the adjourned debates on second readings in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 3. Proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Can I have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

Bill No. 11. Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Could we have this matter stand too, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14. Proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Estimate Books, Page 4. I wonder if I could just . . . order please. Before we proceed, I would ask the honourable members' co-operation that they don't speak before the Chair recognizes them, because the recorder, Mr. Sly, is having difficulty, especially when questions and answers are coming quite rapidly, with the result that sometimes in Hansard part of what the member is saying is being cut off, because the Chair is speaking and it gets a garbled version. So I wish you would just try and co-operate, I'll recognize you, and then proceed, because parts of the members' speeches are being omitted through a garbling of two or three voices. Thank you.

Resolution 11(a) -- The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, he was on 10. I think we are on . . . we had just passed No. 9, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I beg your pardon.

MR. JORGENSEN: But I wonder if before we go on to No. 10, I wonder if the Minister now has the information that was requested by the Member for Brandon, in respect to the herds at Headingley, and as promised by the First Minister answers would be provided and opportunity to further question the Minister on that particular item, before we go on to Item No. 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering whether the procedure is right in that we are now off that subject, but would be back on it during the consideration of my salary, so I really leave it up to you, sir, to decide as to how we should proceed on that question.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . I wanted to raise last night to ensure that we would not lose the opportunity of asking the Minister further questions when the answers were provided, and the First Minister made the suggestion, which was accepted by this side of the House, that by leave of the House at that time that we could proceed with the answers being given, and then if there are any further questions to be asked on that particular item, then we could ask them, then move on as if it was just simply a continuation of the original consideration of that item.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I presume that the House concurs that we proceed in that way. I want to advise the members opposite that the decision that was made relative to the sale of the purebred stock from the Headingley farm had to do with a joint arrangement between the Correctional Services Department and the Department of Agriculture in the way in which the disposition of those animals would be carried out. As I said yesterday, it was decided that we would want to make it possible for our farm diversification clients to acquire these animals for herd improvement purposes, and the matter was referred to the staff of the department who were in charge of the Farm Diversification Program, and who requested from the field staff the names of our clients that would be interested in herd expansion and herd improvement. On the recommendation of our farm advisers throughout the regions, the allocation was made with a limitation of no more than five head to any one individual, and I believe in most cases it was two or three. So that covers the point that the Member for Brandon raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the partial explanation that he has given me. He has indicated that the Minister of Corrections is now jointly involved with the Minister of Agriculture in this matter, so I assume that he has to bear part of the responsibility for the way in which the herd was dispersed. What I really wanted to get from the Minister was: first, why did the Minister depart from the principle established over the years of disposing of public assets by means of, (a) tender, or (b) public auction, and I still haven't really understood why this procedure was terminated in this particular instance and we reverted to a special private sale for special customers.

I asked the Minister if he would provide me with the names of those people who had bought the animals, and also the prices that were paid, and whether the prices paid in any way deviated from the prices that were established by a member of his department as being reasonable for the sale of these animals.

I would also like to know if those prices were established on the purebred qualities of the herd, or simply on their market value as dairy animals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why it is that staff from the department is not here yet. I'm wondering whether one of my colleagues would call my office. The details as to the persons who purchased these cattle and the prices at which they were purchased are available, and I'm awaiting the arrival of my deputy with that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could proceed then with the item and return to that item. Oh, the Honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Corrections.

HON. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): As was pointed out by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture this was a joint decision. I would just like to put on record, it was with reluctance that we reached this decision because over the years the farm at Headingley had served us well. As I recall it though the herd management because of the average length of stay - we'll be discussing this probably under my own estimates - but the average length of stay last year was 45 days, and really as part of the corrective process or therapeutic process it didn't serve us as well as it did in the past. But as I recall it in the herd management there had been some deterioration of the herd, and as I understand it the sale was based on the production records of the individual animals within the herd. But regardless, as the Member for Brandon West points out, I bear the responsibility but I concur with the Minister on the procedure that he followed in this instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Can I ask the Honourable Minister of Corrections a couple of simple questions. First of all, is the Minister trying to tell us that the people that are at Headingly first of all didn't want to maintain the machinery and milk the cows; and secondly, is milk not consumed there any longer?

MR. BOYCE: Well, really Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be out of order. It's a legitimate question asked by the Member for Roblin.

The farm and that part of the institution was built as you probably recall in 1928, and it was built to be labour-intensive, everything was done by hand. When you say machinery you know all the manure and everything else had to be removed by hand, so the decision was whether we should upgrade it to be a more or less viable operation so it could serve as a training school for people who wanted to come into dairying. But as I pointed out, as part of the correctional process the people who wanted to work were being sent to Bannick Point - I'm sorry it burned down - and Spruce Hill and Birds Hill Park, so that the people that were left there really didn't lend themselves too well to that type of work.

MR. MCKENZIE: I think the question is logical then, so basically the problems the Honourable Minister found there relate to the shortage of farm labour as we have in this province today. They just don't want to get involved with the looking after a dairy herd.

MR. BOYCE: Perhaps the member and I are just holding the floor for the Minister's staff. What the member says is correct relative to those people that are there, but it's a very small segment of the society, and hopefully we can go into this in some depth when my estimates are up for consideration, because the procedures being followed in the present day are to try and divert as many people out of the correctional institutions as possible and have them meaningfully involved in some type of production.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): I'd like to know, what was the average price for each of these cows? You could just take the total figure and divide by the number. Do you know the average price received for each of these purebred cows?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I expect the information specifically being available for the members opposite, as I promised the Member for Brandon West, so that when that arrives I will read it into the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed then with resolution. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I just wanted one further question along the lines of the questioning of my colleague from Roblin. The farm labour end of it was used I think to a large extent as a means of therapy, and many schools throughout the province now that are springing up to handle the various retardates in that particular area are taking the opportunity of acquiring some acreage, and teaching them gardening skills and farming skills in order that they will be able to go out and take their place in society and do some small work that will enable them to probably pay for their keep. So this would seem to not be in line with the argument that he's advancing for disposing of the farm enterprise at the Mental Hospital in Brandon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: You know, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that, you know, we could go into this perhaps better under my estimates.

Headingley Institution is a maximum security institution, and a goodly percentage of your population are in there under remand, they're waiting trial and sentence, and these people can't be involved in a work activity project under, you know, the law as it is at the moment. So that reduces, you know, your population who would be eligible for it. And 45 days is the average length of stay, and you know yourself if you take some of the people who are not used to handling front end loaders and the rest of the type of equipment that is being used by farmers in the present day, they just don't know how to handle it. So you have perhaps five or six people involved at any one time, and you have to have six staff to look after them. So it really didn't make sense to have that type of an operation at Headingley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have a list of those people who purchased the livestock in question, and if members opposite wish I would read it into the record.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

There were some 67 head altogether involved in the sales. And Mr. T. Dyback from Steinbach bought five; W. H. Brook from Dugald bought five; John Stefkovic from Dugald bought five; Lambert from St. Claude - G. F. Lambert bought four; C. Phillips from Inwood bought five; Abe Wiebe from Carman bought two; Frank E. Dyck from Roseisle bought two; L. Robidoux from St. Malo bought five; G. W. Penner from Roseisle bought two; J. C. . . from East Selkirk bought five, two of which are bull calves, I believe; Ben Loeppky from Roseisle bought four; Abe Rempel from Winkler bought two; Mel Heppner from Morden bought two; Isaac Heppner from Morder bought two; M. K. . . - now I don't know where the place is - Portage la Prairie, bought four; John Froese from Altona bought two; Mel Heppner from Morden bought three; and they were sold as recommended by Ray Chandler the former institutional farm manager at prices that he predetermined. There were six culls out of the total of 67. --(Interjection)-- Oh, five were sold through Manitoba Pool Livestock Yard, that's the co-op that is referred to; and one was sold to an employee, I believe, of Headingley Jail for slaughter. That gives you the total number. --(Interjection)-- Oh, and the prices, would you like the prices? I have them here. Most of them are in the 550 range. Here I'll give you the breakdown: 34 head were sold to Farm Diversification clients; 10 to farmers under MACC credit arrangements; six were culled and sold for slaughter; 17 were sold to other farmers; maximum number were - number of cows sold to any one farmer was five; prices 15 cows, 550 each; one at 525; five at 500; 15 at 400 to 475; eight at 300 to 375; remainder between 100 and 300, for a total of \$24,000, well round figures, \$24,171.15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that information. In his summary of the sales he said 17 were sold to other farmers. How were the other farmers established? Was this by some private means of communication, or was there a public announcement of the sale?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the field staff that were involved handled all of these transactions and they were handled on their recommendation.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, then I take it there was no public announcement of the sale, no advance information given to anybody about the sale, is that correct?

MR. USKIW: The information I have is that our field staff that were responsible caused the information to be made available in their respective areas and they were the ones that were responsible for filtering that back to the system in order to make the allocations.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, in view of that explanation I'd like to put the question to the Minister of Agriculture, does he feel that this is a proper and fair manner to dispose of public assets?

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the Honourable Member is putting the question on the basis that he thinks everyone should have had a right to bid on those animals, then on that assumption of course it wouldn't be. But on the assumption that we wanted to be directional as far as the disposition of these animals are concerned, and directional in the sense of assisting a group of people that are on government programs, I think it's a very good approach.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister indicate who the other farmers were who were not benefitting from the Farm Diversification Program or who were not being penalized under the MACC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Those were all read out, Mr. Chairman, all of the names that purchased cattle were read into the record.

MR. GRAHAM: No, but the Minister indicated that some were under the Farm Diversification Program; 10 were under MACC, and there was about 35 percent of them, or 17, were just sold to other farmers. Could the Minister indicate who those other farmers were?

MR. USKIW: Well, the names I have here, Mr. Chairman, is the same as what I read into the record. Now I can recite them and separate them if the members opposite wish.

MR. GRAHAM: That was what I was asking the Minister. I only wanted the name of the 17 farmers that were not benefitting from the Farm Diversification Program, or those 10 that were being penalized under MACC.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. USKIW: Of the names that I read into the record, John Stefkovic from Dugald is one of the non-FDP clients or customers; J.W. Penner from Roseisle is one; Ben Loeppky from Roseisle; Abe Rempel from Winkler; Isaac Heppner from Morden; John Froese from Altona; that's it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Another question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there no Farm Diversification Program available to the farmers in Manitoba west of Portage.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's available across the province.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate whether these animals were advertised throughout the entire province or just in the Red River Valley in the one area?

MR. USKIW: Well Mr. Chairman, they were advertised through the personnel of the department that were involved in the Farm Diversification Program, and I would take it from that, that that would be provincewide. Now it wouldn't be in the form of a public advertisement in a newspaper, but certainly the people that are working with these farmers were very much involved.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate, maybe - does he know if there are any dairy farmers west of Portage then that might have been interested.

MR. USKIW: Well, no Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't know specifically. You know I wasn't personally involved in the program. If the honourable member wants that kind of specific information, I'd have to try and get it for him.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate whether the Ag Reps were told just to tell certain farmers or were they told to tell all farmers?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that kind of question is unworthy of response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. Pass -- The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I just have a couple of brief questions of the Honourable the Minister. I am wondering regarding the credit corporation, if the Honourable Minister can advise the House what interest, if any, the banks are taking today in providing credit for the young farmers of this province and others that are interested in borrowing money. Are they . . . extended their terms of credit to the younger farmers, or has the Minister any information that would lead us to believe, which I'm told from several sources, that the banks are expressing considerable more interest in the livelihood and the money for young people in our province today, especially farmers. If the Minister has been in touch with the banks and has had some consultations with them, can he give us some advice regarding that subject matter.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that everyone is aware that a number of banking institutions have expressed a desire to get much more involved in the area of agricultural financing and many of them have announced certain programs, and I think the honourable friend has access to that information as much as I do.

MR. McKENZIE: The more important part of my question, and I apologize if I didn't phrase it correctly for the Honourable Minister. Has the Minister sat down with the banks and hopefully resolved jointly, his department and the banks of this province, providing credit for the younger farmers?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister doesn't make it a habit of sitting down with banks to resolve government policy. I think he should know that. We relate to all sectors of the community but certainly it is not incumbent on the government to sit down with the banks to develop government policy.

MR. McKENZIE: May I ask then the Honourable Minister, if he's sat down with any of the credit unions in the province and discussed financing of the young farmers that are looking for capital in this province?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the banking institutions, the banks and the credit unions have been involved with the MACC for a number of years, and so that is the information that I have to relate. There have always been communications and discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Min . . . order please. Now I ask the honourable members not to speak before I recognize them because otherwise we're going to have difficulty with our recording. If we're not going to get co-operation, I'm going to ask Mr. Sly to turn the mikes off until I do recognize you. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for my haste in phrasing another question. Then, am I to assume that the Minister of Agriculture of this province has

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) never sat down with the banking institutions, he's never sat down with the credit unions or any other financial institution, to help the young farmers of this province create some credit to promote their interest in the farming industry, as long as he's been Minister?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think the member should be aware that the MACC organization is not a new one. It's been there for many years and our relationships with the banking community have been established many years ago, and have been altered from time to time, and the communication has been between the corporation and the various banks with respect to a number of programs. But, specifically, no I haven't sat down with bank managers to determine public policy. That is not the way in which I think public policy should be determined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister. Has the Minister ever been approached by the banks or bank representatives with regard to reinstating the kind of arrangement that prevailed between 1967 and 1969, wherein MACC provided guarantees for bank loans which were provided by the banks? Have banks or representatives of banks approached the Minister for this kind of arrangement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that the banking institutions would always feel more comfortable if the province would be willing, or the Federal Government would be willing to underwrite all the loans that they make. That is something that one cannot be surprised at. And from time to time, Mr. Chairman, the banks have expressed a desire for a more secure arrangement, so that they may enter into higher risk areas in the agricultural credit field, but we have resisted that to quite a degree, although we have entered into some guaranteed loan programs. But we are not emphasizing that aspect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel that I should ask another question or two of the Minister in view of the question from the Member for St. Matthews which was a stupid question to start with. I would like to ask the Minister if he could give me some indication of the loss ratio of the loans that have been guaranteed by governments that have been made by chartered banks and credit unions over the years. If he could give me the loss ratio on those loans. And that's a pretty interesting figure, I'll tell you. It's less than one percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Okay, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask my question to do with the Land Lease program. We have the figures to the end of March of 1974. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the figures would be under Land Purchase and Lease back to March 31st of 1975.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on the Land Lease part of the MACC program, there were 174 purchases approved, and 154 leases approved. Was that the question?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. Was that to the end of March 31st, 1975? And how many acres did this entail?

MR. USKIW: No this, Mr. Chairman, is to January 31st of 1975, and it involves some 72,898 acres to that date for a value of \$5,000,830.

MR. FERGUSON: Do I take it then, Mr. Minister, that 154 farms were leased back. . . And while I'm on my feet, I'll ask another couple of questions, it will save us both jumping up and down, and ask, who will be assessing this land when it . . . in the event the five year leases are up? We started this program I guess in 1973. Who will be assessing the value of that land? Will it be a municipal assessor, or will it be someone that's been appointed by the board?

MR. USKIW: Well, the normal assessment process of the province applies. The lease program doesn't alter the assessment laws of this province.

MR. FERGUSON: I take it that it will be then a municipal assessor that will assess it?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, whatever the present arrangements are in terms of assessment for taxation, those arrangements shall continue.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. FERGUSON: One other question. Has an appeal board been established yet to look after any arguments that are coming up?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we have an advisory committee that has been set up, but it will be formalized when we introduce the amendments to the MACC Act during this session. There is not now a provision in the legislation for an appeal board, as such; it has no legal status. But one is set up; it's an advisory board at the moment but which shall be formalized when the amendments are introduced at this session.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On the same subject, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Has any of the 72,000-odd acres that has been purchased under the program of land leasing, has any of this land been sold, or is every acre that's been purchased so far been put out to lease only?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Portage, it is a lease-option program and the option to purchase doesn't arise until the fifth year, so that really it is too early in the program to discuss the number of sales. It will take another three years before we get into that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question to the Minister, in regards to farm loan incentives. Last year it was a \$1,500,000, it has now dropped by one million. Could he explain those incentives and the reason for the reduction?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well members opposite, Mr. Chairman, would recall that late last fall we announced the suspension of the incentive program for beef production and that we then launched the stocker program wherein there was a substantial re-allocation of funds, and that explains, for the coming year also, the fact that we have not budgeted for the reinstatement of that program. In other words there is no program other than for dairy cattle purchases. So the difference now is \$1,500,000 being allocated towards dairy cow purchases only.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a further . . . as I understand it the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation spent over five and half million dollars for farmers in the province in the budget for last year, yet only \$3.6 million for the administration, for that corporation in the province was spent. I was wondering where are they getting their funding for capitalization so far as the land lease or the land purchase program is concerned?

MR. USKIW: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rock Lake would recall that each year we have a capital supply item which is debated separate from the estimates, which provide the funding for the MACC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions regarding the land-lease program. Does the Minister have information on the exact nature of the purchasing program? Does MACC approach prospective sellers of land, or does it wait for prospective sellers to approach the corporation? In other words who takes the initiative, the corporation or the person who is in the market for sale of his land? A second question. I'd like some information on the exact nature of the purchasing arrangements. A second question. How many applications for sales have been made to the corporation, and how many have been turned down, or haven't been accepted or have been withdrawn? Could the Minister give us the number and also the percentage?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, is there any instances or examples of whether the government owns the land and leases it to the people through MACC, and still helps with the Farm Diversification Program in the way of purchase of livestock as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I am wondering whether the Member would repeat that question?

MR. HENDERSON: Is there any cases where you have . . . where you own the land that the person is working as well as owning the livestock that's on that farm, completely?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that there are situations where a person who is in the land-lease program is also involved through Farm Diversification Programs where cattle are financed through the MACC as well. Once you have security of tenure, I should

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) advise members opposite, it then opens up a line of credit, a complete line of credit with the MACC. So if you have a land base, you then have the basis on which to borrow money for buildings, equipment, livestock purchases, the whole range of credit becomes available to you.

MR. HENDERSON: If the Minister honestly believes that it is better if the farm is owned by the man who is farming it, why did they not put it into their program that whoever is leasing it can purchase it at any time within the five years?

MR. USKIW: One of the considerations, and we have considered that, Mr. Chairman, is that we don't want the corporation to be used as a real estate agency, or for a temporary hold on land for people that really don't have to use the corporation whatever but who have their own means, and to get away from the nuisance activities as one reason, and the other, that most clients fall into this category are people that may not be proven in that field and it may be desirable to have them on the lease program for at least a five year period, so that they can determine for themselves, and the corporation can determine their performance, before a contract is entered into on a much longer term basis.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, you have firmly said many times you believe it is better for the person to own it. According to the regulations in owning it, he must pay for it as well within the six months if he takes it from you. In this case he shouldn't be a nuisance value at all, he should be becoming a permanent owner, and I don't see how you can associate him any other way than becoming a permanent farmer at that time when he pays you all the money.

MR. USKIW: Well, I think members opposite should know that one of the eligibility criteris for entry into the program is financial distress. There are people who have mortgages now, and who are in trouble with those mortgages, who enter the lease program as their way of staying on that farm without having to face the . . . so they don't have to face the prospect of foreclosure. Now, if you are suggesting that on year two of an agreement, that the lessee buy the land, you know, it's quite possible that in year five he may be the one client in financial distress that will come back into the lease program because he moved to the purchase too soon, far before he was able to handle a very substantial mortgage.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, by the same token it could be that a person would lease this land and that through death or something he could inherit money and he could pay for it all, and be . . . clear.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, if he was a wise individual he probably wouldn't want to take the moneys that he inherited and apply it against the land in that there are advantages in carrying out the lease program to its fifth year.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I have to differ with you because at the end of five years he can't purchase it at whatever he's been subsidized. He can't purchase it at that, he has to make up all the extra money and then if that isn't higher than market value, he has to pay market value on that date. So it could be far more costly for him. And if he thought there was going to be inflation, he'd be better to purchase it right now rather than wait the five years.

MR. USKIW: On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, he could ride out the inflationary period and buy it at a different period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question to the Minister. Out of these 154 farms leased back to farmers, would the Minister inform the House as to how many of those were leased back to people who were in financial difficulty, who sold their farm to MACC, and then leased it back?

MR. USKIW: I don't believe that there are any in that figure. I believe I have a separate accounting of that situation, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to take a moment to find the right page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to that question then. Would the Minister say that the majority of farms bought by MACC in the last year have been from people who are either liquidating their assets or selling it, and that it is not, the majority is not from people who are in financial difficulty.

MR. USKIW: The question?

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. BANMAN: Would the Minister say that the majority of people that have sold their land to the MACC in the last year have been people who are liquidating assets, or who are either selling their farm lands and not the people that are in financial difficulty as far as the farming industry is concerned?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the statistics would indicate that there are varying reasons why people want to sell their land. Some people wish to retire, other people wish to transfer properties to next of kin but who are unable to raise mortgage funds, and so the lease program becomes a vehicle through which they can transfer these properties to their next of kin. Others are - two neighbors, one selling out, the other one wanting to establish a larger farming operation - by and large in most instances, we have a situation where people are enlarging their farming operation, where they are increasing their acreage through the purchase of additional land under the lease program. So that in essence we are creating more viable farm units through that program.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you. A further question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. Would the Minister also confirm that MACC has taken a rather aggressive approach with regards to advertising and different programs that have been implemented, to try and purchase as much farm land as possible?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have not been involved in advertising for the purchase of lands whatever.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, following on the tenor of the remarks of the Member for Pembina where he feels the government should encourage ownership at the same time as leasing, if the Minister could answer the question. What is the target for this year's appropriation? In other words, how many acres do you hope to buy, to lease back? You have one half million, I believe, in the appropriation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn to the pamphlet that's put out by the Land Lease Program, and it bears out the suspicions of the Member for Pembina and other members on this side, that the government is deliberately by intent trying to attract a certain type of thinking farmer who is encouraged to think along the lines - and I'll quote parts of the pamphlet: "The young farmer in Manitoba means land lease." That's all - just "means land lease". I suppose the intention of the pamphlet is to encourage certain young farmers who are only interested in land leasing, not in purchasing. When you turn the pamphlet around - it's on the same double page - it says: "A land lease option is a real stay option." Not one word about purchasing, not a word. In other words, they're encouraging the young farmer only to think that he should be renting from Big Brother, the government.

Another page in the pamphlet says: "You don't have to buy land to be a farmer." Again not a word of encouragement to the young farmer to say, well lease for awhile and then try to set your sights to buy your own land.

Another page says: "Time to retire? Sell to MACC. And you name our tenant, Manitoba Land Lease Program."

Mr. Chairman, not a word about encouraging the farmer about the next step. If he can't afford now, lease for a year or two and then buy. But the whole aim of the pamphlet that I see is to encourage the thinking of our young people - and it's aimed at the young farmers - is to lease land, not to encourage them to buy at all. I think this is damaging; it's a subtle type of propaganda, and it's automatically going to discourage some who would like to take on the program with the idea of buying.

The Minister has just said that they don't want to be a turnover agency, or somewhat like a real estate agency. In other words, he's openly admitted that they want to get a hold of the land and hang on to it for a minimum of five years, no matter whether or not that young farmer has a very good crop and can purchase it in the second or third or fourth year. He can't do it. And this is one of the bad points of the program, I believe. I believe that that pamphlet should be scrapped and that another pamphlet should be drawn up encouraging the farmer, or at least showing him that he has a choice, showing him that he has a choice, not get him to think only that this program is only for him to lease land; that he should be encouraged to lease and buy, to lease and buy, in one, two, three, four, five years or whatever, but not to be locked into five years of leasing and then his chance comes. Surely if he's proving himself and he's successful and he has one or two excellent crops, and he has

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) the cash, he should be able to buy that land and get out from under the control of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes. I'd like to know the largest farm that has been purchased under the MACC and leased back to one individual - the largest purchase for one individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to add a couple of questions to those that have been asked. Could the Minister tell us the exact number of months, or the exact time in which the Land-Lease Program has been in operation? And what percentage of the total agricultural acreage in the province, what percentage does 72,000 acres constitute? In other words, what percentage of the agricultural acreage in the province does MACC now have under the Land-Lease Program? And would he also inform us when he provides that information, if MACC followed its current pattern of acquisition, its current rate of acquisition. How many years would it take MACC to acquire all of the farm land in the province?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question put by the Member for St. Matthews, it's somewhere in the order of one-third of one percent of the acreage has been purchased through the program. Obviously the second question has to be weighted by a very important factor, namely, that if one was to presume that no one would ever exercise his option to purchase, then I haven't worked it out, and the department hasn't, but it would likely be in excess of 400 years at that rate of acquisition before the province would acquire all of the agricultural land that is now available in this province.--(Interjection)--That assumes of course, that no one will ever opt to buy after five years, and that's quite an assumption. I don't know that anyone on that side is prepared to predict what will happen in that connection.

The Member for Pembina wanted to know the largest size of a farm purchased under this program. That I can't give him, I don't have the statistics in that way. The average is 490 acres - 19, I'm sorry - so that that gives him sort of a bench mark of what's going on. There have been purchases far in excess of 1,000 acres, and I believe there are some leases ranging in that area, depending on the kind of land, and so forth. You might expect for example that where we are dealing with groups of people, that those acreages would be larger, and I make reference to St. Ambroise Co-operative, where the Metis people have leased some - I believe it's some 5,000 acres, that was bought for that purpose. So that would be about the largest single transaction I would think, but that land was leased to a community, the St. Ambroise Community. So I think that's the best I can do with specific information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I understood the Minister a few moments ago to say that the department had not been doing any advertising in the field of land purchasing. I wonder if he agreed to the advertising of a meeting on the subject in Swan River and elsewhere, and these meetings were addressed by Max Hofford, the Chairman of MACC?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I really have very little patience with my friends opposite when it comes to that kind of a point, because the assumption is that government should keep its programs secret so that no one would know, so that the people wouldn't know that we have a program. Obviously, if a program is made available to the community at large, the community has to become aware of it, but we are not placing ads in the paper asking people to list their farms if they wish to sell with us. That is something a little different, Mr. Chairman. But we do make people aware that the program is there for their use, whether they are sellers or whether they are prospective lessees. And the normal situation, or the average situation, is where we have a prospective lessee that wants to acquire a land holding, and usually the prospective lessee and the lender come in together to convince the MACC that that arrangement is a good one, and that they should proceed to acquire and lease back. So that's usually the way it occurs, it's usually an arrangement between two people that already know each other and where the vendor has a preference as to who the lessee will be.

MR. BILTON: Well, I take it that the Minister is denying the fact that the chairman of that board is not going around this province encouraging people to take advantage of this legislation?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the chairman of the corporation is doing

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) an adequate job of providing the information that is necessary on the part of the people of Manitoba. I'm sure the people of Manitoba want to be informed of the program, so in that connection there are no apologies to be made, except to say that not enough information has gone out; that is the only apology that I would make, is that we haven't had enough publicity on the program, because if we did, all of the misinformation that we find in the countryside, and which quite often is alleged that the information came from members opposite, that would not be the case today if we had adequately explained that particular program. Now members opposite may from time to time wish to distort the intentions of the program, you know, that's fine, that is up to them, but it makes it more difficult for the corporation to respond to people when the information that is provided is distorted in that way. So to the extent that members opposite want to engage in that kind of thing, then we will have to have more rural meetings and more information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose another question to the Minister by reading some information into the record, and having done that, my question is, I want to ask him if this is government policy? And I'm going to quote from this article: "In the past 12 months, the province has bought 93 farms" - this is as of last October, thereabouts. I will repeat: "In the past 12 months, the province has bought 93 farms and is dickering for another 320. Mr. Hofford says the program has not caught on as well as he had hoped, but concedes that it is bucking a long-established practice of individual land ownership, a practice he does not think the government will break easily. However, given the existence of about 19,000 viable farms in Manitoba, and if all the deals now under consideration are completed, the possible acquisition of about 400 farms in the first year cannot be considered a failure. If the government farms are located with skill, they could block expansion of existing successful farming operations and bring pressure on owners to sell the government still more land." Mr. Chairman, and I think that in view of the questions that have been posed to the Minister in the last 20 minutes or so, I believe that this comment is appropriate, and I now ask the Minister, is this policy in his department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the honourable member is alleging, or alluding to; I have no information in that connection.

MR. EINARSON: Then, Mr. Chairman, I see the Minister does not want to admit whether it's policy or it's not policy. Of the total number of farms that are now operated under his control, that is those farmers who are leasing land owned by the government, can he tell us, of that total number, how many of those farmers have never had any experience farming from the day they took possession, of leasing of the very individual farm lands?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the criteria which makes one eligible is spelled out, and if members opposite want to define, I could give them the - well there's some definition here in any event - the scope of the program. I'm wondering whether these could be distributed. The criteria has been spelled out, and where people are eligible under that criteria, they may participate in the program, and the expertise that they possess has to be determined by the corporation, by the field representative, and the Board of Directors. So that is as it should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, when the MACC has land listed for sale by different individuals, is it available to other people in the community who come in and want to buy land?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, unless I didn't understand the member, the MACC doesn't have a listing of land for sale.

MR. HENDERSON: I'll put it in another way. Supposing there were three people wanted to sell their land and they went down and listed it with the MACC, and he has the list there in his office, and how many acres there is and so forth, is this list available to anybody who might come in and ask if they have land for sale? Whether he intends to lease it or whether he intends to purchase it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I would expect that where information like that is collected that anyone having a desire to enter the program may ask the question as to whether there is land available in whatever area they have an interest, and that I'm sure the MACC agents would respond accordingly.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. HENDERSON: But you didn't make it clear, as if the person that came in and made the enquiry wanted to purchase it on his own, with his own money, and not be leasing it from the MACC, whether he would be eligible to do it or not.

MR. USKIW: Well, again Mr. Chairman, I just can't get the point that my honourable friend is trying to make here. I presume that the lessee, the potential lessee and the vendor, or potential vendor, have access to all of the MACC offices where they may wish to leave information; and that information is used in such a way as to facilitate the program. Some people have land to offer, other people have a desire to lease that land, and there must be a matching-up; and there is always a situation where there is not an even number of acres offered versus the acres requested for lease. So there has to be some filing and inventory of information.

MR. HENDERSON: Supposing the office in Morden had several farms listed with it by farmers who wanted to sell, can an independent person like myself come in and ask if they have any land listed for sale in that area; and if they do, can they purchase it outright, or has it got to be bought by the MACC and then leased?

MR. USKIW: Well the program is not designed to facilitate people that want to gain information for purposes other than land-lease. No, that is not the purpose of the collection of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware that private money is available for the purchase of farm land in Manitoba whereby they will sign back a five-year lease, they will pay the taxes and pay a third of the commercial fertilizers and chemicals, and the farmer farms it on a one-third, two-third crop-share basis. How does he see this affecting the MACC program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I don't think it has any relevance, Mr. Chairman, in that the MACC program is one which provides the best of all options for those individuals interested in leasing land.

I don't believe there are private lease arrangements which would ensure lifetime leases, which would ensure the interests of the lessee and in his desire to have the lease transferred on to his next of kin at the end of a lifetime. I don't think there are such provisions in private leases, although there may be that I'm not aware of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of brief questions to ask the Minister. I thank him for the document. First of all, I've had several people in my area tell me that the policy that the Minister has related is a Biblical type of policy, I think can be found in Leviticus, I think it's the 25th Chapter and Verse 23 where it says: "That the land shall not be sold forever." Now, can the Minister advise the House that he's walking around with the Bible in one hand and a policy in the other as related to this land-lease program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't be embarrassed if this program happened to coincide with some reference in the Bible. That would not be a source of embarrassment to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple more questions for the Minister regarding the land-lease program. The Minister has stated that as of January 31st there were 154 leases that had been approved, and I'm interested in finding out in view of all that has transpired over the last while, how many of those leases that were approved are located in Tory constituencies? We have been told time after time that members opposite represent areas where people don't believe in government ownership of land, don't approve of this program; I'd like to know and I'm not asking for the information necessarily today, but I would like to know exactly how many people in Tory constituencies have entered into land-lease with MACC?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can break it down in that way. I could break it down by region, you know, and I could give an indication there. In the Interlake Region we

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) have sixteen leases which represents approximately 10 percent of the total or some 3,987 acres cultivated land, and 3,627 of non-cultivated land, for a total value of \$330,379. Average value per acre in the Interlake was \$43.00. In Eastern Manitoba we have eight leases which represents about 5 percent - I believe the brackets are 5 percent, are they not? - yes, cultivated acres, 2,254, non-cultivated 277, for a value of \$209,000, an average price of \$83.00.

In the Central Region we have fifty leases, representing 33 percent of the total program; 13,208 cultivated acres, 8,113 non-cultivated, for a value of 1.923 million dollars, 614,000, at an average price of \$90.00 per acre.

In the Southwestern Region we have 39 leases, representing 25 percent of the total; 12,580 acres of cultivated land, 5,703 non-cultivated, for a value of \$1,366,630 representing an average price of \$75.00 per acre.

In the Northwestern Region we have 41 leases, representing 27 percent; cultivated acres 11,052; non-cultivated 5,922, for a total value of \$1,070,362, at an average price of \$63.00 per acre. And of course you have the total average for the province at \$73.00 per acre.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. WALDING): The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: I realize that it might take a little bit of work, but I still would like a breakdown, and I would like to find out of those 154 exactly how many are located in Tory constituencies.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, just judging by the statistics that I have just read into the record I would suspect that - oh, the number would be in the area of 130 of the 154.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. . . . had you a remark?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well I wanted to ask him a question . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . following along the lines that the Member for St. Matthews has been asking. In the report In Search of a Land Policy, I wonder if the Minister would undertake - and I wouldn't expect it would be possible for him to do it right now - but I wonder if he would undertake to supply the committee with the information that is contained in this statistical appendix which lists the municipalities in which people own land, the acreage, the assessed value, and the sworn value. I wonder if the Minister would complete that statistical table to include the land that is owned now by the government - or that has been purchased and leased. It would then complete this statistical table so that we would have not only the land that was owned locally, the land that is owned by people who are resident in Winnipeg, the land companies, West Germany, the United States, etc., but we would also have land owned by the Crown, or at least purchased and then released by the Crown. I wonder if that would be possible to just send around a completed statistical table so we can add it to this one and then have the complete picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I don't believe that there is any problem in accommodating the request from the Member for Morris. I think we can attempt to do that, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: When you have land listed for sale I understand you have an appraiser go round to appraise it. Do you tie up the man who listed it for any period of time when he lists it for you during that time, so as he can't sell it to any other person, and how long is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the agreement for sale that is entered into runs about 90 days which locks in the offer at whatever value is agreed to at that time. After that 90 days of course anything can happen. It can be renewed or the individual in question, or the MACC can drop the whole issue.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister, of the 154 parcels or transactions that have taken place to date could he advise what percentage have been transactions that has involved next of kin, father and son transactions. And I would also like to know, of the total acreage that has been purchased to date, what percentage of transactions transpired where there have been three parties involved, that is the MACC, the seller and the lessee that - what I'm trying to find out is how many, if any, acres of land is laying idle and waiting for prospective lessees.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the percentage figure on the next of kin relationships here is some 16 percent of the total volume of business. In terms of whether we're land-banking, the policy is not to land bank. Of course you can never be precise, there has to be some variation from time to time for practical purposes.

I would hazard a guess that there's virtually--(Interjection)--Oh, I'm advised that there's some 6,000 acres out of the 72 or 73 thousand that are in the process of allocation but have not yet been completed.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of those 6,000 acres can the Minister indicate how many of them have had taxes paid on them and by whom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't give the honourable member that specific information. That is something I would have to do some research on.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, then, could the Minister indicate what the policy of the government is towards the payment of taxes on land that they have purchased and have not as yet leased; and if the burden of taxes is paid by the province is that passed on to the lessee as an added tax or an added penalty to the signing of this lease?

MR. USKIW: To the extent that on occasion there is a tax situation arising, the payment of those taxes on the part of MACC is then added to the capital cost of the land on which the rental rates are based.

MR. GRAHAM: Has the MACC in fact paid any taxes on land that they have held to date?

MR. USKIW: Well all municipal taxes must be paid by someone, whether it's the original owner or the MACC or a combination of both. But municipal taxes are always paid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, in my conversations with municipal officials in which the government does own land and has not yet been leased, I am told that they have had instructions that that land bears no taxes, that the government does not pay taxes on that land. Now I wonder if the Minister could clarify that particular point because his opinions now, or at least his statement now seems to be at variance with what I have been told by municipal secretaries in areas where government does own land and is not leasing the land at the moment.

MR. USKIW: I think, Mr. Chairman, that that confusion would arise out of other Crown lands, the traditional Crown lands that have been held for decades, the right of the Crown, and which are different from the lease program that we are now discussing. I am not aware, in fact I am certain that there's been no policy of government denying the right of municipal levies on land that is bought under this program.

MR. JORGENSEN: When I spoke to the municipal secretary of one particular municipality in which I knew that the government had made pretty substantial purchases of land, the question that I posed to him specifically dealt with the land that the government had bought under the MACC land-lease program, not Crown lands, and his answer was that he had been instructed that that particular land would be tax free. In other words, there would be no tax paid at all. I want to make sure that the Minister clarifies that point so that we understand very clearly that the government is paying the taxes on land that the government holds and is not yet leasing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that information is incorrect. Other than in the historical areas where we have had Crown land under grazing permits or leases or whatever, that is a different ball of wax altogether and it is something that does not at all relate or compare to the program that we are now discussing. Under this program municipal taxes must be paid by the corporation or the lessee or whatever arrangement, but notwithstanding, they must be paid to the municipality.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Then we can assure the secretaries of the municipalities that the taxes will be paid, and can the Minister indicate to what address the municipality shall send their tax notices and their bills for unpaid taxes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had - I don't recall anyway, any requests or any

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) complaints from municipal people on this question, and therefore I have to assume that it hasn't arisen. Now if members opposite are aware of some misunderstanding on the part of some municipal officials then I would suggest that he advise them to communicate with the Department either of Agriculture or Municipal Affairs.

MR. GRAHAM: Then the Minister is suggesting they write direct to the Minister of Agriculture on this matter? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't answer my question when I asked what was the target acreage-wise for the land-lease program for this year, and I have difficulty in his ascertaining the amount of money that's been appropriated for that particular purpose in the Resolution No. 10. It seems to me at one of the land-use hearings the Minister made the statement that he thought it wouldn't be a bad idea if the province ended up owning 10,000 of the province's farms, and I want to know what is the target in the number of acres for this year and the amount expended on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, I should like to correct the impressions of the Member for Portage. I have never stated that there were a certain number of acres that I would have hoped that the Crown would own, or numbers of farms. That is something that belongs to the imagination of some people. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Chairman, we don't have a figure in mind in terms of the number of farms or acres that we would want to purchase in any given year. The program is response oriented and to the extent that we have capital supply available, of course, we are able to respond, and you will notice from last year's program, in fact since its inception, we have spent something like \$5 million. So that indicates the scope of the activities based on a response oriented approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Just a question, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister on this particular subject of taxes. It is my understanding that the lessee pays the taxes for the five year duration. Should the lessee walk away from that lease and the taxes are not paid for that five years, as I understand it the municipality under no circumstances can put that land up for tax sale. What happens then, Mr. Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, legally as I understand it, the owner is responsible for the payment of taxes, and I suppose if we run into a situation as the Member for Swan River suggests, it might be that we may have to alter the program, that is to assume the responsibility of tax collection to a rental payment. But that is something that I think we will develop if necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: That which I have just outlined to the Minister has been related to me and there is some anxiety in the municipalities under this heading. I hope he'll take note of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question earlier about the qualifications of anyone who was interested in leasing land purchased by the government, and I was asking him if, you know, if they had to have any farming experience. But one of the qualifications as he's handed out to us, information here, Mr. Chairman, is that it reads, "who's net assets do not exceed \$60,000 at the time of application to lease." I would like to ask the Minister if a person who is in a position where he has no assets at all, would he qualify for leasing a farm that is available?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That would depend on the applicant, Mr. Chairman. One has to assess the capability of the individual before one can make that decision, so I really can't respond in a way other than that.

The Member for Minnedosa wanted to know what the loss ratio was on guaranteed loans. The figure I have here is 2.15 percent. Not a bad record. The Member for . . . well, I'm not sure I believe it was the Member for La Verendrye, wanted to know the numbers of farms that reverted back to the corporation under foreclosure or quit claim, and the total since 1959 is 15. Fifteen farms were foreclosed to date. At least up to January 31, 1975.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask the Minister a question

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) relative to the taxes on Crown lands and I'm just wondering under what heading, or what section can I ask that question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That would come under crop production, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes. Mr. Speaker, what I'm concerned about is this 90-day period that a person is locked in for that lists their land, and I'll give an example and I wish you could clarify it by that. If the land was listed at \$100,000 and your appraiser only appraised it at \$90,000, and if in between an independent person came along who would give that man \$100,000, is he not free to sell it to him for a period of three months?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, as I understand the agreements for sale, they actually lock the parties in. I may be wrong but I believe that one can require that one fulfill that commitment. It's a negotiation that takes place, an agreement is entered into and is binding for a period of time. It's a mutual agreement obviously, and therefore I believe the corporation has the full length of that agreement to exercise its right of purchase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: A person who had a farm that he wanted to sell for \$100,000 and he could miss the sale completely by being locked in for the period of 90 days, because the other person who was going to give him \$100,000 might not wait to the end of the 90 days before he could . . . he wouldn't just wait that long. So, I don't see that's very fair.

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Chairman, the agreement is entered into by both parties, so therefore presumably both are wide awake and haven't consumed too much when they've entered into the agreement.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes. I want to ask the Minister a question arising out of the questions asked by the Member for Pembina. Would not this arrangement of the 90 days, would that not be similar to what is done in the private industry or private real estate agents?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that any agreement entered into has to be a valid agreement if it's a legal document, and it could be for 30 days or 130 days or for 10 years if that is the wish of the two parties. So I think that is a very open position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: On that very point, I think I should clear it up. Under the private way of selling land it would not be held for 90 days. He could sell to whoever he liked as long as he got his price but he'd have to pay the commission. It would not be held for 90 days. No sale would be lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions for the Minister relating to the guarantee of bank loans policy which prevailed during 1967 to 1969. Could the Minister provide us with information on how much in bank loans was guaranteed by MACC between 1967 and 1969? And I'd like a breakdown too by bank, if possible, of how much was guaranteed by MACC during that period.

I would also like, Mr. Chairman, some breakdown on the direct credit program which MACC has carried on. Could the Minister let us know both by region and - not by constituency - I'd like a breakdown by region of the loans. I want to know where the MACC loans went, and I would also like to know, of the loans, the direct loans that were made by MACC, how much went into the free enterprise Tory area. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the detailed operations of the Minister's department. I have some questions of detail that would be of interest to me and I think at least some members of this House. Some members don't seem to want to know about it, but some members here do. So would the Minister please tell us, of the direct loans made by MACC, how much went into that free enterprise loving area which is represented by the Tories. Now, if it takes a day or so to get the breakdown, I'm willing to wait, but I'm very interested in getting those figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I can't really respond in that way. I don't have all of that detail and it would take some collecting of information to be able to give it in that precise form.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) But I would bring members up to date as of December 31st, 1974, wherein we still have some \$886,287 outstanding under the guaranteed loans program and where we have paid some \$87,000 in claims. And the breakdown of the original loans - heavens there are a number of banks and credit unions, I don't know that it's worthy of exercise other than to recite the total perhaps. It's in excess of \$4 million, of which \$886 are still outstanding under Part IV. Under Part III, where we have 100 percent guarantees, total loans made under Part III was \$2,000,499, there is still some \$105,000 outstanding there. That's about as close as I can come to that request at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what the policy of the present government is towards the disposal of Crown land when MACC is involved? Is MACC given first choice at the purchase or is the land sold to the highest bidder?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Birtle-Russell should know that there have been no sales of Crown lands for many many years. In fact, I would think it dates back to a good number of years when they were the government and they did not provide for the sale of Crown lands. So we really don't have that kind of a situation arising.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, I would like to refresh the Minister's memory then, and I refer specifically to a particular piece of Crown land, and that was the Indian Residential School in Birtle. And was the land sold to the highest bidder or was MACC protected in their purchase?

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman. That's the Federal Government's land that the member is alluding to, and I believe the Crown Asset Disposal Corporation handled the transaction for the Government of Canada and the MACC having expressed an interest in it, may have received some preference, although I'm not sure.

MR. GRAHAM: I'm not too sure either, but I believe that the Crown Asset Disposal sold it to the Province of Manitoba for \$1.00. I'm not too sure.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's somewhere in the area of 70 some odd thousand dollars that was paid for the properties at Birtle.

MR. GRAHAM: It was \$72,000 that was paid by MACC for that land but I believe that was not the highest offer that was made for it. And I thought the offer was made to the Province of Manitoba, not to Crown Asset Disposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the event that this land is bought at the end of the five years, what will happen to the mineral rights in the event that they are sold to the government at the time of the sale, will they go with the land when it's purchased?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, the mineral rights are retained by the Crown on resale.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution . . . the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I have a couple of very brief . . . what's the definition of farm?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think we came up with 100 definitions depending on the --(Interjection)--I don't know what the honourable member is trying to suggest, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McKENZIE: Under the land-lease program, what is the definition of a farm?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the definition would be where one is trying to derive a livelihood from the farming operation.

MR. McKENZIE: I will ask the Honourable Minister about off-farm income. Those that are utilizing other industries besides farming to make a living and have an off-farm income, do they qualify?

MR. USKIW: As I recall it, I believe they would qualify but there is an income criteria that is taken into account.

MR. GREEN: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, I'm interrupting the proceedings of the committee in accordance with our House Rule 19.2 for Private Members' Hour. Will return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour Tuesday. The first item is Private Bills, Private Bill No. 10. The Honourable Member for Morris.

BILL NO. 10 - CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY ACT AMENDMENT

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I wasn't listening, but I presume that we're on Bill No. 10 and I simply want to say, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the honourable member introduce it first as a motion.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well sir, I don't introduce the bill, I took the adjournment from Bill No. 10, and I am now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes, I'm sorry.

MR. JORGENSEN: And I'm now speaking to that particular bill. It was a bill introduced by the Member for St. Johns, and I was about to say, sir, that in keeping with a suggestion made by the House Leader to attempt to expedite the business of the House wherever that is possible, I'm prepared to do that right now and hope that the government will . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . member puts me into a position . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . from which it will be impossible to extricate himself or myself. May I suggest that we deal with Bill No. 9 first because I'm not going to have conditions thrown at me, and I am not able to bind every honourable member in this House, and furthermore I would expect the honourable member to sort of wait until at least he is once, shall I say, deceived before he thinks that something unusual may happen. But if he wishes to call No. 9 first, and if that is the general disposition of the House, I have no objections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In respect to procedure on the matter that the House Leader raised. I believe this is Private Members' Hour, and I'm just following the agenda as it was laid out and No. 10 was the first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour, and the honourable member has the floor.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with Bill No. 10 right now, and I want to assure the House Leader that I intend to impose no conditions, that I do not intend to place him into any difficulty whatsoever. I simply want to respond to a request that he made, that we try to expedite the business of the House as quickly as possible. I am simply, in good faith, attempting to respond to that request, because I happen to believe the same thing he does, that we should attempt to expedite the business of the House. So on that condition, on that condition alone, Mr. Speaker, and in order to set a good example, and no other reason, I want to say that we're prepared to allow this bill - at least those of us in the Official Opposition - we're prepared to allow this bill to proceed to committee at the earliest possible opportunity.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 9 - BRANDON CHARTER ACT AMENDMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on behalf of the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Morris may - and if this is a luxury that he needs, he can have it. He can say that the Honourable House Leader learns by example, that's up to him. I had no intention of not expediting the work of the House. I hope that the example, as it has been passed on to me, and as I have learned, that others will also show the same propensity to learn and that it will proceed this way with other measures. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention of not having this bill go to committee as soon as the House desires it. I'd like it to go as quickly as possible.

I do want to tell the Honourable Member for Brandon that I'm going to be asking some questions at committee, because I have no intention of trying to avoid a public golf course in the City of Brandon. Do they have one now? They don't have a public course and we have a public course at Kildonan, we have a public course at Windsor, we have a public course at John Blumberg, we have a public course at Crescentwood, and I am certainly hopeful that there will be a public course in Brandon. And if that means what I understand it to mean, that

BILL 9

(MR. GREEN cont'd) is, that the course will be completely open to the public, that the green fees will be established on the basis that the average man can use it, and that it not be merely the public purchasing a course which is then available to the elite who no longer wish to pay for their own golf course, then . . .--(Interjection)-- the middle class or upper class, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, the fact is that there is now a tendency for the elite golf courses in the City of Winnipeg to want their fees . . .

A MEMBER: Glendale.

MR. GREEN: Glendale, yes. I'll absolutely oppose Glendale, as I will oppose St. Charles, as I will oppose the others who want the public to subsidize their elite golf courses, yes. I will oppose that. And I give notice that if that is what is intended here, I will oppose it. But if we are opening up a public golf course in the tradition of Kildonan, in the tradition of Windsor, in the tradition of Blumberg, I will be all for it. And that is the only questions that I want the City of Brandon to know that I as one member will be asking at committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West shall be closing debate.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate, I'd just like to reply briefly to the Minister of Mines and assure him that my understanding is that the purpose of this bill is to enable the City to buy a golf course and make it a public golf course. It's a property, and of course it has been a private course, but the City is now entertaining the idea of making it a municipal or public golf course. They did have one some years ago, but the property was not eminently suited for a golf course and it was later sold for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I should also mention that there has been a free exchange and a meeting between the City of Brandon and the Municipality of Cornwallis, because the property under consideration falls within both of the jurisdictions, and there seems to be complete agreement between the City and the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis, but there is some minor change in wording which I would propose to bring to committee and it does not change in any way the intent of the bill. So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I would recommend this bill to the House.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Public Bill No. 4. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Could I have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Public Bill No. 12. The Honourable Member for Morris.

BILL NO. 12 - FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT

MR. JORGENSON presented Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Financial Administration Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is now before the House is not a new one, it was introduced during the course of the last session, and I don't wish to cover all of the ground that was covered during the discussion of this debate during the course of the last session, but I do want to remind honourable members the purpose of this amendment, and the circumstances under which the amendment has been proposed.

Members will recall that during the course of Interim Supply during the last session of this Legislature, the members of the Opposition felt that there were matters that had been raised in this House that were deserving of some attention. And we used what we felt was a right of members of the Opposition in this Chamber to pursue the government on this particular issue, as has been done in the past. I recall, looking over the debates on second reading of this bill during the course of the last session, the then Minister of Finance made the statement that he didn't think that the Opposition at any time had ever used the Interim Supply in the manner in which it was used during the course of the last session. I want to assure him that on several occasions in the House of Commons the Opposition parties have used Interim Supply for the purpose of pursuing a particular issue in the House, and making it uncomfortable for the government.

I just can't visualize a parliament that is nothing more than a stereotyped, rubber-stamp, which says that the government has the right to do whatever it wishes without any due consideration at all to the feelings of minority groups - and the Official Opposition is a minority group - without any regard to the purposes for which parliament was set up in the first place,

BILL 12

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) and without any regard for their own responsibilities in ensuring that matters that are brought to their attention are looked into and some reasonable answers provided. And it is one of the prime functions of the Opposition to carry on that kind of an examination of the government.

I want to say this, that in the limited experience that we have now had with the change in the rules, I can say to honourable members of the government that from our point of view this experience in the rules has given us an opportunity to probe, and to examine, and to get answers to questions that we've never had the opportunity of getting answers before. And it is a new experience in this House. It, I think, has resulted in a shortening of the question period, not because of the time limitation that is imposed on it, but simply because members now know that during the course of the examination of the government on the estimates, or in Committee of Supply, there's an opportunity to ask those questions that would otherwise be relegated to what I think is a very inappropriate time for examining government, and that is during the question period. The question period has a particular role in itself, and I am a firm believer that it should be kept in that particular role, that the democratic government is something more than just a . . . Mr. Diefenbaker used to define it as a sausage machine, where you put the ingredients in one end and the finished product comes out the other. There is a great deal more to responsible and to democratic government than that mechanical operation. As Governor-General Lord Tweedsmuir said, it's a spiritual testament; it implied a number of vitally important beliefs and traditions which have been woven into the democratic fabric and have become quite inseparable from it. Among those are a tolerance of a proper consideration for the opinions of others, freedom of discussion and criticism, freedom of religious beliefs, a respect for law, a regard for the rights of majority and the various minority groups into which the people are divided. --(Interjection)-- And this is really the purpose for which we are gathered here, to give members the opportunity to express themselves without interference from members who continuously interrupt you while you're speaking.

Parliament in the Canadian tradition consists of checks and balances that are unique in Parliament, and there is often the mistake made that we can compare the system of checks and balances that exist in the United States, which are written right into their constitution, to the kind of checks and balances we have here in the Canadian Parliament - and that is not the case. We have only one check and one balance in our constitution, or in our system of government, and that is right here in this Legislature. And you, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, play a very important role in ensuring that those balances are maintained.

But I detect amongst honourable members opposite - I shouldn't say all honourable members, but in the attitude and the expressions made by some members opposite - that there is a feeling that Parliament or the Legislature is just a nuisance to be disposed of as quickly as possible and put out of the way. And never was that feeling more evident, or more apparent, than in the words that were expressed by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday during the course of the consideration of his estimates during the latter part of the afternoon, when he indulged himself in one of his ideological tirades and made the statements that the government is people. You know, nothing, nothing could be further from the truth, when you consider what governments will do as a government, as opposed to what those same individuals will do as individuals.

You know, I don't know of any gentlemen opposite who would tell their neighbors as to whether or not they should contribute money to the ballet, or whether they should contribute to the baseball, or to football or to hockey; or whether they should go to the ballet or go to the opera instead of going to football games and baseball games. They don't do that as individuals. But we as governments, we make that decision. We tell a person how his child should be educated. We don't do that as an individual. So to suggest for a minute that just because you are in that magic circle of government that you represent the thinking of everybody in this province, does not necessarily hold true.

And nothing is more evident than when a government starts to assume a role that I believe a government is never intended to assume, and that is when the government starts getting into business. And I won't get into that, because it's perhaps I think a little bit aside from the amendment that is before the House. But I do want to say that if this institution is to remain as a watch dog, as a balance against the arrogance, and when I use the word "arrogance" in government, I don't necessarily suggest that it applies to my honourable friends opposite, I

BILL 12

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) think that any government, any government that is in power for some time becomes arrogant. I've never known one yet that remained humble. The very exercise of power seems to instill in members of the Privy Council the feeling that they know best, and it is only by constant reminding and sometimes the odd threat and the odd possibility that they could be tumbled in this Chamber, that makes governments pay heed to the expressions of opinion that they hear from time to time.

And it is on this occasion, on the Interim Supply Bill, and it is perhaps the only one during the entire course of the Legislative sitting, that an Opposition has an opportunity to flex its muscles if it feels that there's something important enough to draw to the attention of the people of this province. We felt that last year during the consideration of estimates, or of Interim Supply, we felt it strongly enough that we were prepared to take the responsibility of pushing it beyond what was normally considered the time that a discussion on Interim Supply should take place. I know that practice has been in the past that Interim Supply is one of those measures that goes through as a routine measure, but there never was anything in the rules, or in the traditions, that suggested that it could not be used for a purpose if that occasion arose. We felt that occasion arose, and we used it.

Now this year we passed it. And I would suspect that maybe in many of the years to come, it will pass, but the weapon should be there, and it should be the responsibility of the government, if they feel that the Opposition has carried it beyond the point where they can allow it to go, then they have the authority to invoke a rule of this Chamber that has been on the statute books for a good many years, and that is to cut off debate. We have no reluctance to pursue a debate when we feel that the end result is going to be better government, or at least a recognition on the part of government that there is something amiss and that there are some things that the government is doing that is wrong. We'll continue to do that.

But I think that the most disturbing feature of this whole process is the manner in which this particular clause was put into the Financial Administration Act. I checked through the procedure that was followed. The clause itself was listed almost word for word from the Treasury Act in the House of Commons. In the House of Commons the phrase that "when the House is in Session" is contained in that particular piece of legislation.

Now the Minister of Labour and the Member for St. Johns both commented on the fact that that particular clause when it was dropped from the Financial Administration Act when it was introduced into this Chamber, was done so with the knowledge of the Minister that was introducing it, and he quoted a section of the notes that were prepared for the Minister in introducing, in which they said that it was removed simply because it was a nuisance. That wasn't the word that he used but it was removed because the bureaucrats, the civil service felt that at times when it was necessary to get an additional expenditure for some particular purpose that the right and the freedom to do that should be contained in the legislation. I feel that is wrong.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: I feel that the only time a special warrant should be used, that the only time that the government should have the privilege of using special warrants is when the House is not in Session, because the Legislature itself provides them the opportunity of getting money when an emergency arises.

But when one looks at the number of special warrants that are being passed, and the amount of money that is involved in special warrants today, just a few years ago that would have represented almost the entire budget. Today special warrants by the millions, 30, 40, 50 million dollars, and the phrase that is contained in the Financial Administration Act dealing with special warrants simply says that they should be allowed only when there is an emergency that has arisen or when there's no opportunity to find money to carry on a purpose for which a provision had not been allowed in the presentation of the estimates. But that is not the case with special warrants any more. And it may be as a result of tremendous amount of inflation that this takes place. But, you know, the payments of salaries was not intended at one time to be a reason why special warrants are passed. Special warrants were to be passed when there were emergencies that arose and additional funds were required to carry on. Such an emergency and an example that was given to me was, for example, and they knew that when they presented that example to me that it would strike home, they said, "Well, supposing there's a flood and you need sandbags in a hurry." I said, "Do you mean to tell me that an opposition

BILL 12

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) would be so craftily stupid as to prevent the government from getting money when the House is in Session, for sandbags? I've seen bills passed in 15 minutes when they become necessary. This House can move, and any parliament can move when the occasion demands it and when the emergency does arise.

So the excuse that it is necessary to have that particular clause in that section of the Financial Administration Act in my opinion does not hold water.

I believe, sir, that we should attempt to live, not only by the letter of the legislation but by the spirit of the legislation, the reason it was intended. And I suggest, sir, that the returning of that particular phrase in the Financial Administration Act will bring us back to the spirit and intents of that Act and the purpose of parliament. I hope that honourable gentlemen opposite will look at it in that light because I feel that it is one of those provisions that insures that the government will be held accountable. Because what is the point of suggesting that you can hold a government accountable if you have no tools, no teeth whatsoever in which to hold the government accountable. You can do it with that particular section of the Act, if the occasion demands it. I don't say that every year that will happen, as has been demonstrated over the years.

Sir, I hope with those few remarks that the government will see fit to adopt this provision to insure that we have a return to responsible parliamentary government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside wish to go on to questions?

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): No, I'm wondering if the Honourable Speaker would permit further debate on the bill prior to adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to support the remarks made by the mover of the Bill. I say this in the context of the interest of all of us in this Chamber. We have as elected members a feeling of growing responsibility about the effectiveness that we as elected members have in this Chamber. This is one Bill presented before us, you know, which I would hope that we could regard in a relatively non-partisan kind of a way, it's been a piece of - as a result of the kind of accusations that were thrown across to us as a result of a particularly acrimonious debate last Session, that we were - that is the Conservative Party were partly responsible for enabling, you know, or being responsible for the measure in the Financial Administration Act that made it possible for a government to do what that government did, namely, to circumvent parliament, circumvent the Legislature, and pass the warrants that they thought that they required, without recall to the House.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you, sir, and I call upon a kind of a recognition to all of us as . . . forgetting for a moment whatever party we may represent in this House, but there is no question in my mind that the most serious challenge to the democratic system is simply this - is that all too many people, an increasing number of people don't believe in it any more.

I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, in sitting in this cafeteria in this building and having soup and sandwiches with a number of senior civil servants who no longer believe in what we're doing up here in this Chamber. They believe this is all an exercise of fantasy, and of polemics, of rhetoric and of grandstanding here. And it bothers me, it bothers me very much, that I can sit in this Chamber, I can sit down and have a bowl of soup in this House and listen to senior civil servants tell me that they do not believe in what's happening in this Chamber up above. And that's happening right now. Every day, you know. You know, they believe that this is all an exercise of futility. That this is all rhetoric and this is all grandstanding and nonsense that we go through here in this Chamber right now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that there is a reason for that kind of concern, and part of that reason was demonstrated a year ago when the Minister of Finance of this province so skilfully and with such ease, you know, skated past this whole Chamber and said that, "If I want 50 million dollars or 80 million dollars I can have it without this Chamber's consent. It's no problem, no problem." I mean we are really all just puppets on a string. I mean there is Mr. Sidney Green of the New Democratic Party, there's Harry Enns . . . of the Progressive-Conservative Party, we dance our little tunes but the mandarins . . .

BILL 12

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the honourable member is aware of the rule he refers to members of this House by their constituency.

MR. ENNS: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I concur with your admonition. What I was trying to say is that, you know, there is this kind of - and I'm concerned about - that there's this kind of foreboding and ongoing scene that the whole democratic system cannot work, you know. That's why the Portugese people have given up on us. That's why the Chilean people have given up on us. --(Interjection)-- Oh they had a brief chance at it, they had a brief chance at it. But the choices weren't there, it wasn't attractive enough to them.

And what I'm telling you is that if we can't make the decisions in this Chamber how \$50 million are going to be spent, if it can be made behind closed doors in a Cabinet Chamber, you know, then what the hell are we doing here? What are we doing here? So if you hide behind a mistake made by a previous administration, a Conservative administration, that my friend from Morris is now trying to correct, that my friend from Morris is now trying to correct, and saying that there is just no plausible and explainable reason why a democratic government if it needs extra funds, and when the Assembly is assembled as we are now assembled, can't bring that request to the House, on the floor of this House and say, lookit, we need \$5 million, because we got a flood in Carman or in Morris or in Whitemouth or in Beausejour, and we need that money. Do you mean to tell me that we can't decide collectively the wisdom of, you know, of acknowledging the necessity of those funds being accrued to that situation? Is that really what you're saying? Is that really what you're saying? Are you saying that it has to be, you know, denied us, as reasonably intelligent representatives of the people, that we can't acknowledge the immediate, in fact the emergency needs of people to vote those necessary funds? Well, I don't really think that that is what's being said.

You know, I think what the Conservative Party is demonstrating right now in the bill that's before you, you know, that I think it's rather historical, and it's one of the reasons why I can speak right now, is that the Conservative Party is saying to you right now, is that we have moved in the direction too far and we're prepared to move back and restore a degree of democracy back to the people's representative where it belongs. If we were responsible for putting this act or this measure into the Financial Administration Act that made it possible for you to circumvent this House, then at least we - and when I say "we", I'm saying the Member for Morris, is man enough to put into this bill, into this House, in this Legislature, to say okay, then let's retract, let's bring back a degree of responsible government into this Chamber, and let the people's representatives decide - when they are assembled and when they can deal with whatever current emergency situations arise to spend the necessary funds that any government, any government needs from time to time for that purpose. And to say otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is to simply support that ongoing, you know, blooming growth of bureaucracy which the little people of this country, this province of Canada, indeed the very people that are elected to represent these people, have more and more difficulty in reaching and in controlling.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it took a certain amount of courage on the part of the Member for Morris, it took a certain amount of courage on the part of the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba, you know, to put forward this particular amendment at this particular time, that we recognize that it was under our jurisdiction when this amendment, you know, came in. What we're trying to demonstrate is that we were prepared to recognize, you know, obviously a misgiving or failure, and we're prepared to correct it. Will it be judged in this Chamber on partisan politics? Will it be judged on the basis that it came from a Conservative Member from Morris? Or will it be judged on the basis of what is important to this Chamber? Will it be judged on the pre-eminence, on the rights of this Chamber, as members of the Chamber, regardless of politics? That is the basis I hope the bill will be judged on. I'm not sure that it will be, I'm not that sure at all, because I rather suspect that unknowingly we, at the time that we passed the bill, only aided and abetted that kind of centralized control, centralized decision-making that my friends opposite welcome only too much.

They have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on this particular bill, it's not that important. You know, what are we talking about? We're talking about whether or not when we are assembled as a legislative body, shall we pass certain amounts of money for certain needs. That's a pretty reasonable request. That all 57 of us, we're elected here by our people regardless of political denomination to answer for the way and wherefor how we spend public funds. Is the Member for St. Vital, is the Member for St. Matthews, is the Member for Emerson, is the Member for

BILL 12

(MR. ENNS cont'd) St. George or the Member from Ste. Rose prepared to say that he should not have a reasonable say, you know, other than those constitutional decisions that we arrive at, you know, when we decide that the Minister of Agriculture can spend \$25 million for his department, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can spend \$30 million for his department, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation can spend X number of dollars for his department - I mean, we pass that in order here in this Chamber as we go through the estimates.

Now are you really prepared to abrogate your rights as individual members representing your people to say that we collectively should not be responsible for deciding, well now, should we spend an extra million dollars or \$300,000 to meet this emergency session - when we're in session? There's no argument about the rights of the Ministers, of the Treasury Bench Ministers to make that decision when we are not in session, when we're not in session. And you know, they make these decisions every day when we're not in session. But what we're talking about is when this Legislative Assembly is in session, and that there's a need to pass additional moneys other than those contained in our estimates, are we not individually, you know, 1/57th responsible for the moneys that we pass? For the moneys that we impose on our taxpayers? Is there any reason why we would not stand up and make that argument, and make it honestly and correctly for the benefit and in the public purview for open scrutiny?

Ah, Mr. Speaker, I'm making more to-do about this than I intended to. I simply say that there is very little reason why this bill would not receive . . . why this bill would not correct - you know, for the last five years we've been hearing from members opposite of the errors of the ways of the previous administration - oh, we made so many mistakes, Mr. Speaker. We made so many errors. Why, Mr. Speaker, we even thought about, you know, drowning . . . you know, putting 30 feet of water on South Indian Lake when we should have been doing it on Nelson House, you know. We made all those kind of mistakes, and undoubtedly, you know, they keep reminding us about all the mistakes we made. What I'm saying to them right now is that one of the mistakes we made obviously was in allowing this change in the Financial Administration Act to be made that could afford a vehicle, or provide a vehicle to by-pass the Legislative Assembly, when it was assembled. Now we ask, through the courtesy of the Honourable Member from Morris . . . and through the wisdom of the Member from Morris we are trying to correct that mistake. And surely we can expect nothing but hosannas and wholehearted support from the honourable members opposite in passing this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside said that he is making more out of the matter than he intended to make out of it, and I can only proceed from there and say that he is making more of the matter than there is in it. And that's the reason he is making more than he intended to make of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will immediately concede that the circumstances under which a special warrant was issued last year, were unusual, that they were possibly unknown to parliamentary government prior to it occurring last year. I am not certain, but the Member for Morris is shaking his head in the direction of no, so possibly they are known, perhaps it was done previously. But that really is not germane to the argument that I'm going to make one way or the other. In the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, the weakness of the position of the honourable members is that they would believe, as I believe, and the Honourable Member for Morris in particular, that parliament is supreme. Except for the peculiar nature of Canadian Confederation which says that the judiciary has the right to declare certain legislation ultra vires because it lies within the sphere of the Federal Government as against the Provincial Government, the parliament of the country can pass whatever laws they wish to pass, and the law that was passed and under which the special warrant was enacted, was enacted by parliament, and I, unlike the Member for Lakeside, do not say that it was an error made by the Conservative administration, because I don't consider - well, you know, different people may have different views on this. But I don't consider a draft piece of legislation that was never presented to the House and not passed or introduced by a Minister of the Crown, which subsequently was picked up by us, to be an error of the previous administration. It's still our legislation, despite the fact that we can indicate that it might not show us to be villains, that the same thing was considered by nice people such as the Member for Lakeside and his colleagues doesn't in the last analysis relieve us of the responsibility of having passed the

BILL 12

(MR. GREEN cont'd) legislation. Nor, Mr. Speaker, does it relieve us of the responsibility of having passed the legislation, that the other members in the House stood silent on it or indeed voted for it. That it makes no difference. That they could have made a mistake in voting for it. But the responsibility for the legislation still rests on that administration which brought in the legislation as part of a government program. And, you know, if we go back to the mineral tax business. The fact that the opposition . . . it now says that they were ignorant and that they were misled and that they were beguiled and that they were seduced and all of the things which I did not know that we were capable of. I have never relied on the fact that they were for it in order to accept responsibility for the legislation because I believe that we are responsible for the legislation, and I believe it's good legislation.

Now, the honourable members have made a good deal out of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, which I would not adjudicate as easily in my own mind as the mineral legislation, that it is either good legislation or bad legislation. In other words, in looking at it with second thoughts as to whether I considered it was good or bad legislation, I'm not able to make a judgment as easily as I would with the mineral legislation. But I certainly believed that the honourable members, to use the Member for Lakeside's words, are making too much out of this. The reason, as I understand it, you know, I believe that I have as much feel for parliamentary and responsible democracy as some members on the other side. At least I try to, yes that is right. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is entitled to believe that he is a protector of parliamentary democracy. The Honourable Member for Morris is entitled to believe that he is a protector of parliamentary democracy, and I am entitled to the luxury of my own beliefs in the same way as they are entitled to the luxury of their beliefs. And I suggest that the reason the special warrants were not issued while the legislature was in session is because the legislature was there to provide the money, and that if a government wanted money while the legislature was in session it didn't need a special warrant. It could come to the legislature and ask for that money. --(Interjection)--Absolutely. Well, let me continue with the point. And the legislature could either regrant or refuse that money and ultimately the fact that a majority in the legislature was able to pass the motion, assured the government of getting the money. So the government was going to get the money, if it could get the support, and only if it could get the support, of a majority of the members of the legislature. Because even on interim supply the legislature could vote against the motion, which would cause the fall of the government according to parliamentary democracy. If they refused to give the government money the government would have to fall. And what would happen the next day, after the government fell. The Member for Morris knows what would happen the next day. A special warrant would be issued and the election would be called. The business of the province would continue and the money would be there. That's what would happen if supply was voted down, that that would almost ensure the warrant. So, knowing that the legislature would be available to advance those funds, a warrant was not necessary. What was necessary? It was necessary that the government, if it wanted the money by a certain time, institute whatever parliamentary rules were available to see to it that its majority passed the money, and it could never ever be sure of it. Because despite what the Honourable Member for Lakeside says, despite what the Honourable Member for Morris says, the members on this side of the House, like the members on that side of the House, are not puppets. Despite what the civil servant down there says about pulling the strings, I can assure you that there are men on this side of the House and there are men on that side of the House, and men will not have strings pulled to tell them what to do. And what always prevents a government from acting arbitrarily, and the Member for Morris knows this, is that there is a sense of outrage, no matter how partisan one is, there is a sense of outrage when a government merely runs roughshod through what he is talking about, being a minority group and I don't recognize the opposition as a minority group in the way which has been alluded to by the Honourable Member for Morris. I think that the members of parliament as a group are the House and that the House divides itself on political grounds but it never divides itself on the grounds of individuals who have a right to say that we will not be stepped on.

Now, the flaw in the Honourable Member for Morris' position is the following. That the government was always ready to face parliament. That before the House, when the special warrant was passed, there was a bill giving supplementary supply, and if what we did was so outrageous that it would appear as being as arbitrary, as arrogant and as outrageous as what he is making it, that outrage would have made itself felt in the community and would have made itself felt in this House, and on the very afternoon of the warrant having been granted in the

BILL 12

(MR. GREEN cont'd) morning, the Honourable Member for Morris, or any other honourable member who said that this outrage was felt would say today the government tried to destroy parliamentary democracy. We are sitting here debating parliamentary supply and they have issued a warrant saying that they are going to take the money whether supply is voted or not. I ask for an immediate vote bringing down this government. But, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't do that, because it was they who felt that parliament would support the government. Not that parliament would be against the government. And therefore, that sense of outrage wasn't there. And why was the sense of outrage not there? Because, Mr. Speaker, that is something so subtle that nobody in this House can ever answer for it.

The honourable member says that we have a parliamentary way of getting supply by invoking closure. I agree with him. And, Mr. Speaker, with me, I would have no difficulty whatsoever, on that debate, of having invoked closure. Some people say that that's a terrible thing, but I believe that there would be no sense of outrage with a vote of closure, because I thought that the public of Manitoba would say that the opposition is trying to uphold the debate, to make a point, that the government has to pay its employees and that in one day this will be debated out and the employees will be paid. That would be the effect of closure. So that was one effect, and I don't say that it would have caused any outrage.

But there was another means available, Mr. Speaker. And the means that were available were an act which could not override parliament, because parliament was sitting, and a vote could have been called, and if the outrage that was caused by that warrant was present in the minds of the members of parliament, they would have voted down the government. Now why was that outrage not there? Well, Mr. Speaker, it could have been one or the other, and in either case, the point is being made. In either case the parliamentary point, or the parliamentary position that is being argued by the opposition was available. Either they invoke closure, which we will then say is a terrible thing, or they will issue a warrant, which we would say is even a worse thing. And if you were right that there is outrage, that point would have been made, either on the closure motion or on the warrant motion. The difficulty, Mr. Speaker, with the honourable member's position is that there was no outrage either way, because the members of the public knew that the government that had passed that warrant had to walk into the House and get the support of the honourable members, and it was the opposition who was not willing to let parliament vote that same afternoon as to whether it would have sustained a government that did this terrible thing.

MR. ENNS: Call the vote.

MR. GREEN: We asked for the vote. Mr. Speaker, we asked for the vote.

MR. ENNS: All you have to do is call the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is either not understanding me or not understanding how you can stop Interim Supply. We asked for the vote on numerous occasions.

MR. JORGENSON: The sausage machine.

MR. GREEN: Pardon me.

MR. JORGENSON: The sausage machine.

MR. GREEN: The sausage - now the honourable member says the sausage machine.

Well I'm now going to admit to having made an error - I don't think it changes anything - having made an error in assessment as to what can be done and how the rules apply. You know, I will have to admit that I made a mistake in the reading of the rules. And I'm not going to blame anybody else, I'm not going to ask anybody to accept responsibility for it although I think we all made a mistake at one time. I was ready at that time to move that the question be put, that this question be now put at any time. The honourable member is shaking his head up and down. I went back to the previous page - I was sitting in my seat at the time, in the House, and it was pointed out to me by another parliamentarian that a motion that the question be now put is debatable. So then I had to go through 57 more speeches after I moved that the question be put. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that was not the way out, I had to move a closure motion which meant that the debate would continue until the next day. Now, Mr. Speaker, you could - you know, I have to use a Yiddish expression which says that "mou ken azoy, mou ken azoy". Means you can do it this way or you can do it that way. And the fact is that the rules say, the rules say, passed by the House, that you could have a special warrant,

BILL 12

(MR. GREEN cont'd) and in each case the position of the opposition relative to parliamentary democracy was sustained, because it is not the point that is being made or the issue of the warrant which would come the next day if the government fell or come the next day if closure was moved, that's not what the parliamentary process was intended to protect. The parliamentary process that you were intending to protect was the position vis-a-vis the question that you were debating. That is what you yourself say. That you were making that point. So the point could have been . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I am going to ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside to contain himself. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The question came up in the afternoon. In the afternoon when we came here out of the cabinet room, we had to come and face parliament. That's the flaw in the honourable member's argument. We had to face parliament, and before parliament, at 2:30 that afternoon, was a motion of non-confidence in the government. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is in an impossible position. Before parliament that afternoon was a motion of non-confidence in the government, and if he would have been in his seat a few moments ago, he would have indicated that I said that the position of the Opposition in the face of what they call an outrage, was to demand a vote counter to the government. That would have been the issue as to whether parliament accepted what was going on or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that it couldn't be done one way or done the other way with the same effect. I'm suggesting that the sense of outrage was not there. And the Honourable Member for Morris will know this better than anybody. A motion for closure is a legitimate motion. As a matter of fact, any majority that said that they would not do it ever, is either stupid, lying or don't understand the use of parliamentary power when it is necessary, because it may be absolutely necessary in order to express the will of the people, it may be necessary to move closure. Where did the closure motion get a bad name? What caused the sense of outrage? Because C. D. Howe got up in his seat and said, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for so and so, that Bill No. 8, an Act to facilitate Texas buccaneers from raping the Canadian people through the institution of the Trans Canada Pipeline, be now read a second time. And then he said, I move that the debate be closed. That's what he said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable gentleman will have four minutes the next time around. The hour of 5:30, the House is now recessed until 8:00 p. m. when it will go into Committee of Supply.