

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 7, 1976

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 50 students, Junior High standing, of the Dauphin Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Rita Fisher. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways.

We also have 30 students of the St. James Collegiate under the direction of Messrs. Bill Magus, Joe Grabys and Mr. Miller. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I really haven't got a Ministerial Statement or a Tabling of Report, but I have a document that I would like to have distributed to members of the Assembly dealing with Career Selectors. It's the first brochure of this nature that has been produced by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour and I would like approval, without any formal Ministerial Statement, for the distribution of the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have an up-to-date release concerning the water situation in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield) introduced Bill No. 49, The Regional Parks Assistance Act. (recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 47, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 48, an Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if Manitoba has been asked to take part in either the official opening ceremonies or the official closing ceremonies of the Olympic Games in Montreal this summer.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there's a joint invitation to my colleague's department who is responsible for fitness, amateur sports and myself to attend.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if it's true that the budget for taking part in the ceremonies will be approximately half a million dollars.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that as being a fact. It will have to be checked and returned to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. It was indicated by the Manitoba Health Services Commission that there will be a reduction of some \$2 million in the Health Budget to the rural hospitals. Can the Minister indicate to the House will there be any closing of hospitals in rural Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): We're not contemplating closing any hospital at this time. There certainly will be, as I stated yesterday, closing of acute beds in certain areas and opening and replacing by Personal Care beds.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will there be a reduction in any staff, and if there will be, what will be the reduction in staff?

MR. DESJARDINS: This is something that the boards of the different hospitals will be responsible for, but I don't think that we should scare the people if this is reported because there'll be enough need for staff to transfer them probably from the acute care hospital to the personal care.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will there be any conversions from acute care to personal care homes or for other medical uses?

MR. DESJARDINS: I just finished saying that. I did say that this would be the case. I don't know if my honourable friend is talking about a complete hospital from an acute care hospital - no, not at this time anyways, not contemplated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister advise whose responsibility it is to seal off the Fort Garry Court's fire victims' property prior to them claiming the same, and if it is the Minister, then a supplementary. Is the Minister going to accept any responsibility for this loss by theft?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: In answer to the second question first, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. If there are any complaints as to the disposal of assets, personal or otherwise, if they're drawn to my attention I will give consideration to the same at that particular time. I do not accept any responsibility in any fire for the disposal of personal effects.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Can we get recognized first? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I believe that the Minister misunderstood the question. The question that the Member for Virden was asking, was if the Minister had any responsibility for the thefts that have taken place with regards to personal effects that were left in the fire. There's been reported that there have been thefts, and the question was whether or not he was accepting the responsibility or whose responsibility was it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Morris is looking after my friend Morris from his constituency. I'm sure that my honourable friend could have explained further an explanation if I have misunderstood him, but that's really an aside. Apart from that, I reiterate that as far as I am concerned as the Minister responsible for the Fire Commissioner's Department we are not responsible for thievery one way or the other.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister could tell the House just who's responsibility is it to protect the property of others when a fire of that nature occurs.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter between the law enforcing agencies in any type of theft whether or not it's as a result of fire or any other involvement.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then perhaps I should direct the question to the Attorney-General since I seem to be unable to get an answer from the Minister of Labour. Could the Attorney-General tell the House whose responsibility it is for sealing off a building that has been gutted by fire and protecting the personal property of those people who have been forced to evacuate because of a fire.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're asking for a legal opinion here, and that's beyond the question period. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. With the announcement yesterday of the Ontario Budget and the increase in taxes, which would now indicate about the fourth or fifth province increasing taxes, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether Manitoba will reverse the trend when the Budget is presented?

MR. SPEAKER: Anticipatory question in respect to the Budget.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I am precluded by a long-standing tradition from revealing Budget secrets, except I would like to reinforce the position we have always taken that Manitoba is very much in the main-stream of Canadian events.

MR. SPIVAK: Is the First Minister in a position to indicate the day of the Budget?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is almost certain to be Tuesday evening. It would be perhaps slightly more convenient if it were Wednesday evening, but there is another important religious event on that day, and therefore to be completely accommodating on the matter, as I feel we should, it will be Tuesday evening.

MR. SPIVAK: By way of another question for the First Minister. I wonder now with the publication of the National Finances by the Canadian Tax Foundation, whether the Premier is in the position to indicate to the House at this point with the publication of the information of the amount to be received by Manitoba for individual income tax projected to be received, with the latest information, whether he is in a position to indicate now that the indexing that has occurred which was suggested to put Manitoba in a position where they would be saving less income has not in fact resulted in less income being received for income tax.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question is involved and is debatable, it's out of order. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if the Minister could confirm to the House that in recent days another break-in has occurred at Government House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then, in view of the Minister's assurances that additional security surveillance was being applied in the case of Government House as a result of a previous occurrence, what he can now tell the House in respect to additional precautions that he is taking to prevent this recurring crime?

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all we did in fact as of a year ago increase security provisions. I don't recall now whether the illumination has in fact been already improved or whether it's in the process of being improved; we have put patrols in the area and we intend to significantly step up that part of the surveillance. But in addition to that we're undertaking a study of the entire Government House complex to see about additional measures that we would take, which could be in a variety of ways. Ultimately we cannot guarantee there will not be any further break-ins, we can only attempt to minimize.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what action he has taken to correct the flooding conditions in southwest Manitoba, flooding that has resulted because of stoppage of No. 83 Highway and inadequate drainage through that highway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, in regards to any type of flooding, whether it's on 83 or anywhere else, I would imagine, or as a matter of fact we all know that it's dealt with first of all by EMO. What circumstances exist in that particular area I am not all that familiar with, except that if there is any flooding caused by the highway, then I think that this is to be looked at by the Highways as well as the municipality. I don't know what the recommendation really is, but I believe that if it is the intent to cut a ditch through the highway, then of course we will have to be very sure that people on the other side are not flooded in the meantime by letting the water through; if this is the case then, of course, the municipality would have to accept the responsibility for the flooding. This is the extent that I can answer the honourable member at the present time. I must say that I don't have the entire details of it, perhaps the honourable member can give me further details on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Is the Minister asking for further detail? Is he asking . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is the Question Period. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't quite hear for the disorder in the House, I couldn't quite get the answer that the Minister was giving.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Whatever the Minister asked it's out of order anyway. The Honourable Member for Arthur have another question?

MR. WATT: Yes, I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to be able to hear the answer of the Minister, if it's possible . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It will be in Hansard.

MR. WATT: . . . for order in the House. Mr. Speaker, I ask again the Minister of Highways, did he say that it was the responsibility of the municipality for the flooding, it was their responsibility for flooding, it was their responsibility for the cost of cutting the highways? I'm sorry, I didn't get his answer clear because of the rabble over on that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Now I am not sure whether I heard the honourable member correctly, because I don't think that I said that it is the responsibility of the municipality that a flood occurred. If that's what the honourable member is trying to imply, I don't think I said that. I will check in Hansard tomorrow. As a matter of fact, I'm pretty sure I didn't say that. But I would say this that if there is any request by anyone, and particularly by a municipality, to cut a highway through, we as the Highways Department have to be concerned about the fact that if the waters get across on the other side and somebody else gets flooded, who's going to accept the responsibility for that; and the policy has been that there has to be an agreement between the Highways or any other department and the municipalities, who is going to accept the responsibility. And that's where the thing stands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur have a supplementary?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister then, has the Minister had a request from the Municipality of Edward for assistance or for a drain to be cut or permission to cut a drain across No. 83 highway?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not had that request, but perhaps there was a request made of the district and perhaps the district engineer in that district had received the request, but I haven't personally, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) Honourable the Minister reporting to the House for the Clean Environment Commission. I would like to ask him notwithstanding who may or who may not be at fault for any delays will the Clean Environment Commission be in a position to act with a degree of high priority on the City of Winnipeg's application to get a larva sighting program under way?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I checked this out with my department yesterday and I am advised that there is nobody stopping the City of Winnipeg from conducting a larva sighting program, never was.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just so that we understand the Minister clearly, is he advising the House that the City of Winnipeg can proceed with a larva sighting program without making application to the Commission?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I am advised that nobody has ever stopped the City of Winnipeg from conducting a larva sighting program, nobody is stopping them at the present time.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do they still need to go through the application procedure?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am really unaware of the present state of things as between the City of Winnipeg and the attempts that they are making to shift responsibility of themselves to others. I am advised by my department that nobody is stopping the City of Winnipeg and nobody ever has stopped the City of Winnipeg from conducting a larva sighting program.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am really unaware as to the present state of things as between the City of Winnipeg and the attempts that they are making to shift responsibility of themselves to others. I am advised by my department that nobody is stopping the City of Winnipeg, nobody ever has stopped the City of Winnipeg from conducting a larva sighting program. They've been urged over the past four years to conduct larva sighting rather than spraying, which is a very questionable form of dealing with the problem. They have not done that kind of larva sighting that it has been recommended that they do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. Returning to the question about the Fort Garry Court fire, can the Minister confirm that there is a requirement for owners of fire damaged property to post in the newspaper in a reasonable time notice when tenants can come to receive goods that have been left behind in such damaged property.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am not aware of any such provision, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take the question of my honourable friend under advisement. And in doing so I think that it would only be proper for me to indicate to my honourable friend it's a question of safety, not only to the tenants and the public generally that we are involved with, but I certainly am prepared to take the question as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister perhaps as well take as notice whether his department or the Fire Commissioner's office have in the past received complaints about the problem of theft or the problem of retrieval of property from fire damaged properties and whether in fact there has been any indication of necessary changes in the obligations or requirements upon owners of fire damaged property.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't need to take that as notice. The answer to my honourable friend is, no, there have been no complaints directed to me as the Minister responsible to the Fire Commissioner's office since at least as long ago as 1969 when I became the Minister.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering the fairly serious or apparent abuse that occurred in the Fort Garry Court fire, would the Minister be prepared to undertake an investigation into the situation to determine why it was that the tenants of that particular fire damaged apartment were not able to retrieve their

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) goods for a period of over two months and therefore suffered very serious losses in theft?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I question the import of my honourable friend's question. He deals with the question of abuse and thievery. It is the responsibility of the local authority, the City of Winnipeg, and others to prevent accidents occurring where there was a fire. To me no complaint has been directed insofar as any thievery that has taken place. I would suggest that the officials concerned have conducted themselves properly to prevent any accidents occurring to former residents of Fort Garry Court. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend will realize that this particular fire took place in the middle of wintertime, that there were icicles all over the plant, and that in my opinion it would have been irresponsibility on the part of the authorities concerned to allow people to go into the demolished quarters where they may have been subjected to severe injuries as the result of collapsing parts of the building in view of the situation prevailing at the time of the fire and subsequently there-to.

MR. AXWORTHY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister confirm, though, that obviously someone did get inside the apartment because a lot of things were taken, and if in fact the complaints were registered, would he be prepared to investigate?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Question - the last part is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and would ask the Minister if he could confirm that consumers of natural gas in Manitoba will be faced with increased costs of up to 19 percent.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for me to confirm or deny the exact percentage of increase, but I think one thing is certain, it should be plain to all in Canada that the cost of natural gas is going to rise very sharply in the future. For one thing the price of natural gas is indexed to the cost of crude oil at the wellhead and, as we know, it is the Federal Government's policy to allow barrels of crude oil to increase in price, and we may be looking at another increase this forthcoming summer. So one thing is very certain, Mr. Speaker, and that is the cost of natural gas to Manitobans, indeed all Canadians, will be rising sharply in the months ahead.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House then whether this increase will be coupled along with approximately a 10 percent increase in gasoline prices?

MR. EVANS: The increase in gasoline price will emanate from any increase in the crude oil prices, Mr. Speaker, and as I have indicated there is every sign that the Federal Government and the Province of Alberta want to see the cost of crude oil increased in Canada. Should this come about, as I expect it will come about, then there is going to be an increase in the price of gasoline to Manitoba consumers.

MR. BANMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Manitoba Government going to be supporting Ontario's recommendations for a blended price?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe we made it known, that Manitoba and Ontario together at the last Energy Ministers Conference totally opposed the across-the-board zombie-like march that the Federal Government was taking towards increasing the price of Canadian crude oil to bring it up to world price levels. We agree with the blended approach, as a matter of fact the staff of our department is working with the staff of the Department of Energy in Ontario in putting forth what we consider to be a much more rational and equitable formula for pricing of oil in Canada.

MR. BANMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the Provincial Government is planning to implement a gas freeze such as they did last year?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of government policy and as usual will be announced if and when in due course.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Attorney-General and it relates to the previous questions in connection with the Fort Garry Court fire. Could he inform the House if the government will provide legal assistance to those fire victims who had a personal property floater or whatever in connection with their fire insurance policy and now claim theft losses under that policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, there would be no special provisions for legal assistance, if the particular individuals qualify for legal aid then they could apply to that source, but outside of that there would be no provision of free legal aid or assistance.

Yesterday the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge asked a question of me in connection with whether or not the Human Rights Commission was investigating charges made by the Canadian Civil Liberties Union in respect to welfare recipients being denied basic liberties. I'm informed by the Commission that they're not so investigating and they have not received a copy of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Corrections. I believe that a number of inmates of Headingley Jail escaped yesterday. I wonder if he is in a position to indicate whether he has received a report and report to the House in connection with that. And I believe that there is some suggestion now that some hostages at this point are being held, I'm not sure that that's a correct report, and I wonder if he is in a position to inform the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

HON. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, at approximately 7:55 this morning there were some inmates from a dormitory in Headingley Jail escaped by successfully separating the bars on the dormitory. The dormitory contained 14 inmates, 8 stayed behind and 6 left, 5 have been apprehended as of five minutes before I came into the House and I am waiting for further reports.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the other three are at this time in any way involved in holding anyone as hostage as had been alleged.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I said six had escaped and five had been apprehended.

MR. SPIVAK: Is the Minister in a position to indicate that there are no hostages at this point being held - you know, the information was supplied from the media.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I gave the House all the information I had up until five minutes before I came into the House; five had been apprehended, they had no line on the sixth person at that time.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the inmates that escaped from the security provisions within Headingley Jail or the area that is not secure, in which inmates more or less are on their honour.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of being brief, I try to contain myself with my answers. I said that from a dormitory of 14 people, 6 people escaped, 5 have been apprehended, the sixth person I don't know where he is at the moment and if I can get a further report I will leave the House and get it.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister advise the House as to the current level of the danger of Dutch Elm disease in the province following the break-up of the Red River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, that of course is a problem and has been with us now for at least two years, at least known to us for two years, and the department has had a program in effect over the last

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) year in trying to deal with it, that is through the cleaning up of trees, both live and dead trees. That program is going to continue but not financed by the Department of Agriculture, although under its supervision. The Department of Tourism is going to undertake the continuing monitoring and cleaning up of that problem, but under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture under which legislation it's to be governed.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister make any recommendation to individual home owners as to the value of injecting or spraying elm trees?

MR. USKIW: I think, Mr. Speaker, the best way to approach that would be to suggest to any individual inquiring of the department that they make personal contact with our horticulturalists in the department so that they can get the fullest of information and make that decision on their own. I think it is difficult for me to suggest that any recommended program would be a 100 percent success story, so the best I can say is they should get all of the information available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture to follow-up from the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and ask him if they are concerned about Dutch Elm disease in homes and yards in cities, are those people if they are spraying for someone else have to get a licence to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Rock Lake would be better advised to put that question to the Minister in charge of Environment.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought the Minister of Agriculture was taking over some of the problems of the Minister of Environment, so I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources if people in the City of Winnipeg who have elm trees and are faced with the Dutch Elm disease, will they, if they have to hire someone else to do the job for them in spraying, will that person have to get a licence to do that job?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe so. I'll take the question as notice.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Is it true that the staff at Autopac centres are either working to rule, or very close to working to rule, because of dissatisfaction about long hours and certain working conditions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of the Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the employees of the Corporation are in a collective bargaining agreement, and I presume that if there are dissatisfactions with the working conditions that there is a Management-Labour Relations Committee made up of staff of the union and of the Corporation, that these matters would be dealt with at that time.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Another question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the Autopac organization have an in-House investigating unit that reports on the actions of certain adjusters, and does the Minister receive these reports?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Corporation does have, and that has been reported to the House publically. Several years ago it was established, an investigative team to investigate fraud cases, arson, and any problems that may be raised within the Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In light of the Bank of Canada's report about the heavy increase in government borrowing, can the Minister indicate whether he has been in consultation with other Ministers of Finance in the other provinces to try and co-ordinate in a national way the borrowing programs of provincial and municipal governments prior to his Budget coming out next week?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is referring to has indeed been a matter of discussion at most of recent Finance Ministers Conferences in the past several years. Largely because, I would think, it originated as a suggestion of the Western Premiers Conference a couple of years ago, three years ago now, that in light of anticipated large scale energy development projects in Canada, that it would be highly desirable to co-ordinate capital borrowing on a national scale. Having said that, I also wish to point out to the Honourable Member that it is not a case of government borrowing so much in the case of Manitoba for general purposes, but rather borrowing for hydro electric and telephone development primarily. Other borrowings are off-market.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the historical information, but can he indicate whether as a result of those proposals made by western Premiers in discussions any progress has been made in establishing a form of co-ordinated or a combining of borrowing programs so that there is some rationalization of the borrowing programs of the provinces?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, here is where the honourable member could play a useful role. He has I would think a good pipeline of information with the Honourable Donald MacDonald, he is the one that would have to answer the question whether any real effort has been made to co-ordinate borrowings, Federal and inter-provincial, and if so with what success?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Minister of Highways I believe, took as notice questions that I asked relating to the flooding conditions in Waskada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I took no such question as notice. I believe that perhaps the Minister of Highways did, but I took no such question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did. I still don't have the information for the honourable member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to replace the Honourable Minister of Tourism with the Honourable Member from Gimli?

MR. SPEAKER: For what?

MR. BARROW: For the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) Orders for return. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have a whole series of Orders here by the Member for Wolseley, I wonder if we can taken them as read, provided they are printed.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. WILSON: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with respect to the Basic Annual Income Project:

(a) How many persons participated in the program during 1974-75?

(b) How many persons in the income bracket \$4000-\$6000 received benefits during 1973-74?

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

- (c) How many persons participated in the program during 1973-74?
- (d) How many persons in the income bracket \$4000-\$6000 received benefits during 1973-74?
- (e) What percentage of the total budget went to administration during 1973-74?
- (f) What percentage of the total budget went to administration during 1974-75?

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with respect to the Basic Annual Income Project for the fiscal year 1974-75:

- (a) What are the number of employees on salary?
- (b) What are the number of employees on "contract"?
- (c) What is the breakdown of professional fees in the Public Accounts?
- (d) What is the breakdown of the subsistence figure in the Public Accounts?

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with respect to:

1. The loan granted to Camperville Billiards Shop Ltd. by the Communities Economic Development Fund for the period April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What principal has been paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

2. The loan granted to Paul Jean Allard by the Communities Economic Development Fund for the period April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What principal has been paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

3. The loan granted to Grapentine Enterprises Co. Ltd. by the Communities Economic Development Fund for the period April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What principal has been paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

4. The loan granted to Ottavio Budai by the Communities Economic Development Fund for the period April 1, 1973 to March 31, 1974.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What principal has been paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with respect to:

1. The loan granted to Ilford Northern Construction Ltd. by the Communities Economic Development Fund for the period March 31, 1974 to March 31, 1975.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What was the amount of principal paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

2. The loan granted to Interlake Custom Killing Plant Ltd.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What was the amount of principal paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

3. The loan granted to Therrien Forest Products Ltd.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What was the amount of principal paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

4. The loan granted to R & M Construction Ltd.

- (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
- (b) What was the amount of principal paid?
- (c) What was the amount of the loan?

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

5. The loan granted to Carl Whiteway.
 - (a) What was the amount of interest paid?
 - (b) What was the amount of principal paid?
 - (c) What was the amount of the loan?

MR. SPEAKER: Are they also accepted?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker I believe that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well let's put it in reverse, are there any exceptions to being accepted?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that the Orders relative to the CEDF will be accepted. I am not by acceptance assuming that these loans have been made, but we will accept it. I also want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I would consider this a precedent for acceptance of any similar Orders by respecting loans to individual farmers under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The procedure agreed to? Order please. Is the procedure agreed to? Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on the procedure?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister said that he was going to accept this as a precedent for individual loans on the Agricultural Credit Corporation. I might point out to the Minister that the rules under the Communities Economic Development Fund, Section 25, says that this information will be printed and will be made public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that, we have indicated that we will make it public. There is now an Order for Return. I don't assume that there are any rules to the contrary in connection with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. I said that I would accept it as a precedent, I think that it would be a good precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, that ends the debate, the order and the procedure is accepted. Shall we carry on with debates on second reading to the House Leader? Bill No. 23 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

BILL NO. 23 - THE PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS CONTROL ACT

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I have stood this bill several times in order to try to confine my remarks as briefly as possible - I had about a 40-minute speech at one time - and in order to get a few points across as quickly as possible and not to hold up this bill any further, I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 23, An Act to control pesticides, insecticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, is a good bill. Herbicides and fertilizers, the use of chemical application to control weeds and pests of many varieties has now become a concern that is not confined to Manitoba. Nor is it confined to Canada, nor is it confined to the United States, but the use of chemicals to control is global.

This bill also includes the use of fertilizers and the control of fertilizers, which up to this point Mr. Speaker, has not been of any great concern to most people, but in my opinion may have far-reaching effects in the future. Far-reaching effects in the application particularly of nitrogen which, in order to produce more farm produce in the way of foods particularly, may be having an adverse effect on the production of natural foods in the world, particularly fish, Mr. Speaker. What it is doing to our streams and lakes would be hard to ascertain at this time, but it is evident that in the future there may be very adverse effects, not only on the fish but on our wildlife throughout the world. This should be studied and is being presently studied, but not to the extent that insecticides and pesticides and herbicides have been up to this point. The immediate concern facing the world is chemical control of weeds and of bugs and insects of all

BILL 23

(MR. WATT cont'd) kinds that affect the lives of people and of animals and of all aspects of plant life. Chemical control of mosquitoes for example has resulted in harmful residue in milk. There are examples, Mr. Speaker, of chemical controls that have affected the lives of people, different chemical controls of aphids, if you will, bugs of all kinds that affect trees and plants and our crops. Some of these have already been proven to be very harmful to human life; in some cases foetuses have been destroyed, pregnancies have been destroyed. It is now almost certain by studies that have been made all over the world, particularly in the United States, that it is causing or has been the cause of cancer as to the use of some particular chemicals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the studies that are going on at the present in Canada and in the United States have not completely established what harmful effects the use of and the continuing expanding use of chemicals just for our own personal comfort, particularly the mosquitoes that have been talked so much about in this House in the last few days. Mr. Speaker, I think it's well that these studies should be going on and that eventually that we should have some control. It is a fact that there is legislation now in Manitoba controlling to some extent herbicides, particularly pesticides. The Federal Government control of course has been sufficient up to this point, and while I have said this is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, at this point I cannot see the necessity for bringing further control, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Manitoba. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I could not support a bill that would give control of pesticides and herbicides, of insecticides and particularly fertilizers, to give control into the hands of a Minister of Agriculture who at this point has simply screwed up everything that he has put his hand to in the past six years.

Mr. Speaker I say again that the Minister is responsible, is solely responsible for the dislocation and for the complete destruction in some cases of some of the industry in the Province of Manitoba. But certainly we are in trouble now in many areas - not only the Department of Agriculture - because I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we delegate the authority to a particular Minister and in this case this bill is delegating the authority to the Minister of Agriculture, it is in fact delegating the authority to a government, to the present government of Manitoba who are responsible at this point for the situation that we are in now with the dairy industry, with the egg industry, with the feed grain industry, with Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Speaker; and with provincial roads; with industrial labour relations, which stands out so clearly now and was indicated by the Minister of Labour in the House the other day when he said that strikes were the order of the day, that industrial labour relations were worse as of now than they ever were before. And so, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we cannot see ourselves possibly further giving power to a government who have proven to be completely irresponsible in the legislation that they have brought forward and in a way that our natural resources and our production of foods and in the general well-being of our people has been in the past six years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak further on this bill, but simply to say that, again, the principle behind the bill, I see nothing wrong, that eventually that there will have to be some controls and particularly over herbicides and fertilizers. But at the moment, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote against this Bill No. 23.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 30, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): I'd like it to stand, Mr. Speaker, please.

BILL NO. 39 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT
and THE LIMITATIONS OF ACTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39. The Honourable Attorney-General to introduce.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 39, An Act to Amend the Fatal Accidents Act and the Limitation of Actions Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, these amendments to these Acts have been joined in one bill because the amendments to the Fatal Accidents Act and also the amendments to the Limitation of Actions Act are complementary.

The Limitation of Actions Act refers to actions brought under and by virtue of the Fatal Accidents Act. In effect an action under the Fatal Accidents Act can now be brought at any time within two years after the death of the deceased by reason of whose death the action is brought.

The Limitation of Actions Act sets a limitation period for actions for trespass or injury to chattels, whether direct or indirect, or for the taking away, conversion or detention of chattels as being within two years after the cause of action arose.

We have removed the taking away, conversion or detention of chattels from the existing provisions and introduced a new clause extending the limitation period for actions for the taking away, conversion or detention of chattels to within six years after the cause of action arose.

The purpose of these amendments is to meet the concerns expressed by the Law Reform Commission in its report which was received May 26, 1975. And this arose from areas of conflict as notices in two cases in Manitoba, namely the St. Vladimar College and Minor Seminary versus Champs Take-out Limited, and Johnson-Wiley-Mercury Sales Limited and Laronge, both reported in the 1975 Three Western Weekly Reports, page 83.

These cases point out the legislative inadvertence in that certain actions took place back in 1966 that were not really contemplated at that time to the extent that a period of limitation was reduced from six years to two, included in a general area of changes in limitations, and this particular one dealing with the actions for the conversion or detention of chattels had not been really contemplated at that time by the Legislature.

So that new clause now conforms with the Limitation of Actions Act and, as I mentioned, this was a matter of inadvertence in 1966 or 1967 when the Act was amended in accordance with the Law Reform Commission.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 40 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CORRECTIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 40. The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE presented Bill No. 40, an Act to Amend the Corrections Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that in 1938 an Order-in-Council was passed covering this subject matter and subsequently in 1945 the Order-in-Council was rescinded, and it really hasn't been covered as a procedure which I am advised should be covered by statute. It is relative to the examination of inmates in correctional institutions by proper authority.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 42 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL ALLOWANCES ACT
AND TO GIVE MANITOBA REGULATION 260/75 RETROACTIVE EFFECT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 42.

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 42, An Act to Amend the Social Allowances Act and to give Manitoba Regulation 260/75 Retroactive Effect, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Regulation 213/74 under the Social Services Administration Act respecting Child Day Care Services effective September 1, 1974 provides for full subsidy payments for specific billing periods on behalf of children who attend day care centres for 75 percent or more of the eligible days of those periods.

As of August 11, 1975 full subsidy payments have also been made on behalf of those children who have attended day care centres for less than 75 percent of the eligible days if the reason for the reduced attendance was acceptable by the Minister. This program extension to include full subsidy payments on behalf of children attending day care centres fewer than 75 percent of the approved days was made in recognition of the fact that since normal childhood illnesses, seasonal holidays and parents' vacations may cause children to be absent for more than 25 percent of his or her approved days, a withdrawal of full payments in situations of that nature would result in unjustifiable financial difficulties to day care centres.

Subsequently, Manitoba Regulation 213/74 has been amended effective December 29, 1975 and the authority for payments of full subsidy is now contained in subsection 3(4) of the amended regulation 260/75. However, in order to be able to cover these full subsidy payments made from August 11, 1975 to December 29, 1975 the Regulation 260/75 must have a retroactive effect of September 11, 1975 and the proposed amendment to the Social Services Administration Act is for the purpose of authorizing the making of such regulation with a retroactive effect.

Until recently clothing and personal needs' allowances under the Social Allowances Act have not been provided to eligible persons residing in general hospitals, extended treatment facilities and mental hospitals. These needs were met through a variety of ways including charitable donations, relatives, institutions themselves, etc. As of June 1, 1975 provisions under the Social Allowances Act have been extended to include clothing and personal allowances to those patients residing in the above mentioned institutions. The authority for that program expansion lies in Clause 5(1)(b) of the Social Allowances Act which provides that a social allowance is payable to a person who by reason of age or physical and mental capacity is unable to care for himself or requires to be cared for by another person or an institution.

This program expansion is also consistent with subsection 2(a) to the Canada Assistance Plan which provides for payments of comfort allowances and other prescribed needs of residents or patients in hospitals or other prescribed institutions. Hence any amount so granted is shareable under this Act. Clothing allowances have been provided to eligible persons in hospitals at the rate established under the Social Allowances Regulations for those living in the community. Personal allowances, however, have been provided at 75 percent of usual rates, as it was established that a person living in the above mentioned institutions did not require the same payments as others.

This method of payments of personal allowances at 75 percent of the usual rate requires an amendment to the Social Allowances Regulation and to cover payments made since June 1, 1975 such amendments must have retroactive effect to that date. To enable the making of regulations with a retroactive effect an amendment to the Social Allowances Act is required authorizing such regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do not leave the Chair and the House go into a Committee of Supply to

BILL 42

(MR. GREEN cont'd) consider 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.

GRIEVANCE - PRESS RELEASE, PATRONAGE IN NORTH

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRIDE (Minister for Northern Affairs) (The Pas):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this opportunity to take advantage of my grievance for this session.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am going to today use this important opportunity which a member only has a chance to use once per session, is because I cannot let pass without comments a headline in today's Winnipeg Tribune for fear that my silence would indicate that there is some element or some grain of truth in that particular headline.

The headline in today's Winnipeg Tribune, Mr. Speaker, says, "Patronage Running Rampant in North, Tories Complain." The story that goes on after that, the bulk or the majority of the story is not an inaccurate reflection of the discussion that took place in terms of the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs yesterday. However the leading sentences in the headline itself are the part that are certainly misleading, unreflective of what took place and untrue, Mr. Speaker. The comments that lead to this headline were made very briefly in the context of a long speech raising many points by the Member for St. James. But what has happened here, one particular sentence, which to my mind at the time, Mr. Speaker, was rather a minor or insignificant point in his overall comments and rather a silly side comment that he was making in terms of his remarks on the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs. Because of that I didn't even respond at all, Mr. Speaker, to those few sentences where he made these allegations. But then the member for some reason went outside the House to make further comment or to make further allegations in terms of the Estimates that were being considered inside the House. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why he didn't have the guts to raise these points while he was in the House and had to go outside the House to make them. But I suspect because he had nothing to substantiate what he was saying, they were unconfirmed allegations or rumours he had picked up somewhere along the line, but he had nothing to support those particular comments.

The article itself says that two Conservative MLAs claimed Tuesday patronage and incompetence. Well, Mr. Speaker, the headline itself makes it sound as if a number of Tories were raising this complaint or this particular concern, whereas my recollection of the entire discussion it was raised in passing by the Member for St. James. I think it would be a much more accurate reflection of yesterday's proceedings to say that there was a very good discussion of the Estimates and that yes, there were a few areas of disagreement but this was certainly not one of the main items discussed in this Legislature. But what is very disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority of people just read the headlines and pick up a general impression, whether that general impression is true or incorrect. Now as political people we have to deal with this type of situation all the time. Have you stopped beating your wife, or not beating your wife? It's very difficult to answer or deal with this kind of question.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the reporter in this particular case because the bulk of his story is correct. But it seems that the headline writers sometimes pick out what they want to emphasize and what they think is important, and therefore take everything out of context to what in fact happened in that particular case. I'm afraid that is what has happened before.

I have had certain negative experiences by deliberate misrepresentation or reporting by the Free Press in regard to winter roads a few seasons ago. But this is the second time in my case where a headline writer at the Tribune has distorted things very drastically and has caused a misleading headline to be left in the public mind. So, Mr. Speaker, if this is not corrected then I'm afraid that this untrue impression will go on unchallenged. So, Mr. Speaker, there are no specific allegations made, they were

GRIEVANCE - PRESS RELEASE, PATRONAGE IN NORTH

(MR. McBRIDE cont'd) made in such a general offhand way that I didn't even bother to comment on them. But I suppose I'm going to have to explain that I not only haven't stopped beating my wife, that I never started beating my wife.

Mr. Speaker, when this party was elected to govern Manitoba there was a very small Department of Northern Affairs with a fairly small staff. And that particular staff was either politically neutral or politically Conservative and, Mr. Speaker, I guess that that's not, you know, to be unusual or anything that we made an issue of or a point of. But the staff that was with the department at that time are all still with the Province of Manitoba save for one employee of the Department of Northern Affairs who is now a Conservative MP for the constituency of Churchill. And, Mr. Speaker, there has been no effort to deal with those people any differently because they happen to be conservative in their outlook, or because they happen to have no outlook at all in terms of the politics.

So, when I read this particular item, Mr. Speaker, and it mentions here "NDP card-carrying civil servants" as a quote from the Member for St. James, I tried to think of the over 400 staff within the Department of Northern Affairs, do I know any NDP card-carrying members. And, Mr. Speaker, of trying to review in my mind the 400 or more people that work with the department, I can think of perhaps three people that are probably NDP, and I have no idea if they carry cards or not, they are not people that show up at conventions. And, Mr. Speaker, I know of more Liberals and Conservatives within the department than the number I can think of.

You can't deal with this kind of general complaint because there's no specifics attached to it. But I don't want to leave any impression that this is the case as it exists or that I am in any way in agreement with that particular headline that appeared. The appointments that are made within the department are done through the regular mechanisms of the Civil Service procedure, and I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of in fact in the past two members, who I knew were card-carrying members of the NDP, that were appointed, and the Member for Thompson was one and the other one has since left the department. Those people were hired by regular process of who is the best person to fill that job, and the job was called a Union Liaison position with Northern Manpower Corps. The qualification was that they had an understanding and rapport of the Labour Union Movement in northern Manitoba so that they could work with the Labour Union movement in order to assist people to be placed in jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, all of the people that applied for that position were either involved in the union movement or the New Democratic Party. Nobody else applied because the nature of the position was related to a knowledge and understanding of the union movement in northern Manitoba. And it just so happens that most of the people in the union movement in northern Manitoba are related to the New Democratic Party.

So, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that I find very disturbing is that I as Minister and this government I think have bent over backwards to avoid this type of situation that is referred to in this headline. And it's very disappointing and I suppose very petty politics when this sort of thing is raised; it could be raised against any government that's in office, especially when there is no substantiation whatsoever for the particular complaint. So if members opposite are going to raise this issue they should raise it with specific examples or specific complaints or specific cases. But they failed to do so because in the past they have been found in every case to be incorrect in their allegations, and to be inaccurate in the allegations they have made in this House in the past. So they are afraid to do that and instead make this general charge, which I didn't even bother to deal with but which the Tribune headline writer decided to pick up and make into a major story.

The other thing that's very disturbing though, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it is an insult to those dedicated civil servants who are working within northern Manitoba and are doing a good job in northern Manitoba, and who have no political affiliation or don't expect a political affiliation if they have one at all. Their concern is to do the job and to do the job in the best way that they're capable of for the benefit of the people that are serving in the north. And this kind of headline, and the kind of allegations made by the Member for St. James do a real serious disservice to those people and I think is a real insult to some of the dedicated people we have working in northern Manitoba. So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, patronage was not running rampant even when the Conservative Party was in office; it is even less rampant now to the stage of being non-existent and this headline is completely incorrect.

QUESTION put and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY -
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer honourable members to Page 25 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 56(b), Welfare Advisory Committee (1) Salaries \$47,300. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, last night when we left I promised that I would try to bring some of the pamphlets that were mentioned re the Welfare Advisory Committee and there is another pamphlet here. I certainly have enough for the members that are in the House now so I wonder if the Page Boy can . . . And I also would like to answer the last questions that were left unanswered before we adjourned.

I'd like to say that these pamphlets outlining the right to appeal are distributed to all regional offices which keep them prominently displayed in their waiting rooms. These pamphlets are also available from the Welfare Appeal Board and in addition to the specific pamphlet on the right to appeal, a general pamphlet which you will be receiving also which explains the social allowances program, and the right to appeal is given to every individual enrolling in the program. These are also prominently displayed in all regional offices and distributed to any individual or agency upon request.

Prior to any appeal the individual is told of the decision of the Income Security staff person and the reasons for the decisions are explained to him. I'm sorry that the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge isn't here. The right to appeal is explained and the department advises the individual that any person may appeal with or on behalf of the individual. This frequently includes a personal services worker from the Department of Legal Aid representative or a clergyman, priest, friends or neighbours of the individual. In short, the Income Security staff person offers advice and counsel to assist the individual how best to present his or her case but must stop short of appearing as an advocate on behalf of the individual because they cannot represent both sides of the issue. Departmental files are not generally made available to the individual, although to my knowledge these have not been requested in the past. Even on a request, some information would not be made available, as I stated last night; this would include staff assessments, police and fraud reports and medical information. Medical information can be sought from the medical doctor directly.

With respect to the honourable member's question on welfare abuse, I have some specific data on this matter also. In 1975 with an average provincial assistance caseload of 25,000 the department investigated approximately 300 instances of alleged abuse. Of these 300 investigations, 91 cases were referred to the Attorney-General's Department. Of the 91 cases, 16 were not charged; 48 are under active investigation by the police; 15 received conditional discharges with restitutions; 4 received probation with restitution; 2 received jail terms; 6 were referred for civil litigation. I am sure that the honourable members appreciate that all welfare departments have to tread a very delicate and fine line. On one hand they have to ensure that the privacy and civil rights of the individual in receipt of welfare are not violated and on the other hand they have to ensure that the public purse is protected and that public funds are being administered responsibly. I feel that the Department of Health and Social Development has discharged this responsibility in a most exemplary fashion. I think that finishes what was unanswered last night, so I hope we will be able to pass this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EDARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, having a dual situation going on here in the House, the Minister started with his Estimates and I didn't have the opportunity of being here to listen to his comments. It's difficult to catch up on what was said in the past, but I listened to some of the figures that the Minister was giving insofar as welfare recipients in the province are concerned, and I'm wondering if I'm correct, if I heard him properly, he mentioned a figure of about 25,000 under the Welfare Advisory Committee. We're dealing in this (b) section on salaries and it composes our welfare situation insofar as applicants are concerned in the Province of Manitoba, and this is an area that concerns me, Mr. Chairman. In all municipal councils throughout the province, and I know particularly in rural areas, one councillor is elected as chairman

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) of the Welfare Advisory Board, and I'm wondering how many people have been on welfare on the municipal basis, then to find that the councillor who was responsible for welfare in his municipality has found this person a job, and this person in turn, rather than take the job, has refused it and as a result the municipality I think have their rights and jurisdictions by refusing welfare to this person. This having been done, the law is that that person can appeal to the Advisory or Appeal Board. I'm wondering, can the Minister indicate how many cases in the Province of Manitoba where people have gone on welfare on the municipal level, have been provided jobs but refused to accept them because they say I have a right of appeal to continue on welfare if I so wish? I wonder if the Minister can give me any figures on that particular area.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, some of this was covered last night. The last question - there's no way that I know that or that I could ever get that information, how many people were offered jobs. I know that if they have a chance to work and if they don't work that it will be pretty tough for them to receive welfare, but I can't tell my honourable friend how many. In the cases that we've talked about, in 1972 there were - or provincial financial assistance per caseload, not necessarily people, there were 27,814 in '72; it went down to 25,232 in '73; 23,619 in '74; 23,997 in '75. Those are caseloads.--(Interjection)--Excuse me, my honourable friend should know, in that we have -my friend George before he panics here - this welfare - there's mother allowances in there, the disabled people, the aged, the long-term and the temporary care, the student aid and general assistance, the whole category, that's everything. The mother allowance alone this year is 6,500, the aged 6,686.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe there was a ruling made last night by the Chairman when I was not here that discussions dealing with welfare would be made, I believe, under Income Security Program, so if the member wishes to discuss the Advisory Committee, that is right, but if he's discussing welfare per se then I would say he would have to wait until he reaches Resolution No. 60(c)(1)(2) Social Allowances. No. 60 on Page 30 - (c)(1).

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that this is clarified. The Welfare Appeal Board that is appointed by the Provincial Government, I'm wondering, is this not the Welfare Advisory Committee? It's the same thing, only you have a different wording here. That's the way I take it.--(Interjection)--Yes. Well that's the area which I want to discuss, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to read this, Mr. Chairman, as I understand this section, "Welfare Advisory Committee, which makes recommendations to the Minister on matters relating to the social and economic needs of residents of Manitoba; also provides appeal procedures respecting the application and receipt of social assistance from both municipal and provincial authorities."

I want to deal, Mr. Chairman, with a few cases that have come to my attention by the local council, and you know they all have a jurisdictional responsibility the same as we do. As I indicated there are councils in this province rurally - I'm expressing on their behalf - where one councillor becomes the chairman of the welfare cases. And I can think of a number of complaints that have come to my attention, Mr. Chairman, by those respective councillors - these are young people that have asked for welfare and received it from the municipality. In the meantime the councillor or one of the councillors in the municipality would find work for that person who was young, able bodied and capable of working, but this person has found it's very inducive and a kind of climate, Mr. Chairman, because of this government and the way they have stressed on having to help the poor and the unfortunate rather than trying to induce the work ethic. Mr. Chairman, while the Minister of Health doesn't agree with me, I want to say fairly emphatically and very strongly that this is the kind of thing that's been going on for years, a number of years, and it has been getting worse.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's not true.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister says it's not true or not, I'm going to tell him of a few cases, and I would invite him to come out to the country and I will prove to him. I will suggest too that the Minister should go with his Appeal

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) Board that he has appointed and listen to some of the comments that the chairman of that Appeal Board has made to the responsible councillors in the various municipalities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to register a complaint here, I think that it is very valid and very just insofar as the taxpayers of this province are concerned. Because when we look at the Estimates under Health, have gone from \$315 million to almost \$400 million. Mr. Chairman, I want to give one explanation of a particular case where this young man, and I'm not going to mention any names, appealed to the Appeal Board. And you know, a couple of people come from Brandon, a couple of people from Winnipeg, a couple of people from Portage la Prairie, and they emerged on one small town in the central part of the province. It's like a court hearing. The councillor in question came with the person who was seeking an appeal, and of course when that person entered the court room so to speak, wanted to plead his case, the board listened to that person and then asked the councillor what he had to say for himself. He gave his story, and you know, Mr. Chairman, what the chairman of the Appeal Board said to this councillor? That he should be ashamed of himself for bringing this young fellow in here, that he is responsible for his attitude and for the position he finds himself. And you know that Chairman of that Appeal Board said further, Mr. Chairman, and I've got to take the word of those people who were involved, that there's enough money to go around for every one in the Province of Manitoba. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of that Appeal Board was saying to my constituent that that person shouldn't have to go for want of need because there's a shortage of money and he shouldn't even have to work. Mr. Chairman, I give a case in point, I give a case in point - now the Minister of Health and Social Development doesn't believe me.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in an accusation as direct as that, that the chairman of the committee has said that the people do not have to work, I think you should be able to bring proof because that chairman would not be there very long. But I think it is false to make statements, that you don't want to name people, and say I'll go along with what this person said. I think this is cowardly and I don't think it is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member.

MR. EINARSON: I just thought of another instance, Mr. Chairman, where that same person spoke to the Union of Municipal Councillors in the Fort Garry Hotel, spoke to every municipal councillor in the Province of Manitoba, that is rurally, in the capacity as chairman of the Appeal Board, the Welfare Appeal Board of this province. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to this government and to the Minister of Health that there were a lot of mighty angry municipal councillors in the Province of Manitoba after listening to that speech.

I only, Mr. Chairman, in fairness I don't mention the first name, but after all they have responsibility the same as we do. If they're given the task of going out and trying to find out why these cases are so, but to chastise a municipal councillor, Mr. Chairman - and I will take the word of my municipal councillor and the total council of that particular municipality. I won't go into naming names because I've been chastised I can recall on more than one occasion by the Member for St. John's of dragging a person's name into this Chamber, so I won't do it today, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when I saw this headline, and this is one area I think in the Department of Health and Social Development - and as I said earlier it's because of the kind of philosophy this government has espoused across the province and the kind of attitude that they have left with people who felt that, why should I work if I can go on welfare and I can get it so easily. And, Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that we have. I don't know if the Minister, and this is why I'm putting these things to the Minister, I want to get his reaction, get his attitude. And I would like to find out also, when social workers are asked to go out and interview an individual who applies for welfare, does that social worker go to interview the local doctor, does that social worker go to interview the Mayor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the honourable member is starting to stray. We are sticking with the Appeal Board, not with the social workers, that item, Resolution 60.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know, maybe I'm off, but I

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) thought that the social worker was also involved in this whole matter of dealing with that individual before it reaches the Appeal Board.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . .now we're talking about the Appeal Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 60 . . .

MR. EINARSON: All right then, Mr. Chairman, we'll leave that until the proper resolution then. I would like to hear some comments from the Minister as to how many more - or has he heard any complaints of this kind? I'm registering one and I could register more, but this has happened in the past year or two. And I feel very concerned, Mr. Chairman, about this. That a local councillor is accepting his responsibility, but he's not being given credit for it by the Appeal Board or those members who are charged with that responsibility of investigating to find out whether that person who was applying for welfare, who has been on it and wants to continue on it, because it goes from the municipality to the province. This is an area, Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about and I would like to hear some comments from the Minister so that I know how to maybe react from his comments, depending on what he has to say.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this isn't the place to discuss these things and to say if there is any abuse. The part that I don't like is that my friend is making statements that he can't prove at all. You know he starts by saying strictly a political thing, this is because of this government and this is worse than ever. It isn't worse and if he had been here yesterday he could find out that things are going down. For instance in 1970 and 1971 the municipal welfare expenditure was \$11 million, now it's \$7 million. So it's not going up, it's going down.

Now, another statement that the Chairman of an Appeal Board said that you don't have to work, I don't believe that. And this is important enough, this is serious enough if that is the case I would like to have this proven. But not come here and make a statement that somebody - I'm not going to tell his name, I'm not going to give his name, but this is what this person said. The cases, the appeals have been going down every year. That is also to show that there is less people that are on welfare. Of course he's going to find a case, and I would like to investigate that case, I would like to know. He's going to find a case here and there of abuse. You know, it's not because you have changed governments or changed Ministers or so on that you're going to regulate or legislate that everybody will be perfect, some people are out to beat the system. But that has been exaggerated. I came in on a white charger when I became the Minister, I was going to fix it up because I felt exactly the same as my honourable friend, and boy, those unemployed employables have to be very careful. And I can't find that many. There are some, there are not that many. Fine. The Appeal Board is there - first of all there is a section in the Act that if people do not want to work that they don't have to have welfare, they can cut them off welfare. So you know that is there, all they have to do is use it.

Now my honourable friend - I'll repeat what I said. For instance, the recipients in 1974 were 10,028 and now it's 8,980, that is also going down. That's municipal - well that's what he's talking about. Now I stated that this - let's talk about the Appeal Board because it is quite a . . . - and if you want to talk about the welfare in general, the social workers and so on, we can cover that later on, but just the Appeal Board now. The Appeal Board - and you know the department, we're quite proud because things are going down. There is less and less requests and so on. I gave that yesterday. It came down every year. Now I happen to have just the last two years.

There were 413 cases heard in 1974 and 383 heard in 1975. Listen to this. Not allowed to apply - that's the reason, the category. There were six in each year. The decisions delayed, 3 in 1975, 2 in 1974; applications denied, 81 in 1974 and 83 in 1975; assistance cancelled, 121 in 1974 and 85 in 1975; not enough assistance, 203 in 1974, 194 this year; and outside jurisdiction, 12. In fact I guess that means they shouldn't count, they weren't in that jurisdiction, it wasn't actually heard. So that would make it 371.

All right. Well out of those, those that were allowed - of these 383 cases, those that were allowed were 95. You know that's not that bad. There were 95. And then those that were dismissed were 144, withdrawn 94, did not appear 31, and others 19. So you know things are not really that bad.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

Now granted if you search - and I'd like you to bring those cases to me because I'd like to investigate them myself if there is cases like this, especially if there is a statement by the Chairman of our Board who would make the statement that you don't have to work. But I don't believe that, and I think it's a very serious accusation to make on somebody if you can't prove that.

Now I think that there is always two sides to a story though. There is two sides. There are some municipalities, fine, that do their best. Maybe they are --(Interjection)--I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)--Well let's hope that you're on the true side once in a while and so am I. So let's hope that there is a duplication there somewhere.

But the thing is, no doubt that there are some people that want to work - I get some, I have had threats and so on, people coming in with chains and so on to beat the hell out of me - or the girls and so on, because they're not getting their money. We have some of those and we're fairly tough. And when we're tough I usually get a letter from one of you saying my constituent is not treated too well. Let's remember that also. I can dig up that file, I can dig up that file.--(Interjection)--No, I'll say that. I've never seen one from George Henderson.

But there's another side also. You know some people, through no fault of theirs, are getting some help. They are not employable and so on, they can't find a job and so on. Now they're not always treated perfectly. You know, some of those municipal men should look at what they're doing also. For instance some municipalities pride themselves in saying we have no relief, no welfare. Because they make it so tough - first of all the rates make no sense at all, you would starve. So therefore they bring them in and they say if it's a weekend they have to wait until Monday or Tuesday, the next meeting, and then they have to appear in front of a lot of people. I don't think - even George I don't think would want to go that far, and so on. Some of them, as I say, because the rates have never changed, there is no minimum rate - there's something that we have to look at - and they're forced, they're forced out of there. You know the people are very happy, we've got a very prosperous community, we have nobody on welfare and so on, we got rid of those people. Where are they, where did they come? To the City of Winnipeg, and the City of Winnipeg is struck with these people in the core of Winnipeg because they have no place to go and then they get welfare from the City of Winnipeg. So there's always two sides, I'd be careful before I do that. I believe exactly what my friend does, there is no ideological differences and so on that you want people to receive it they don't work. Not at all.

As I said, I came here all enthused about all the changes I would do, and I can't find that much to do, I can't find that much to do. There are some abuses. I would like to see - we've discussed and we're still discussing a way where the people that come and get their cheques - I'm talking about the unemployed employable - they could come and get their cheques in another area in the classroom or something like that. Then we've also discussed it with the Federal Government, my First Minister has discussed this with the Federal Government, he would love the Federal Government to try to work with us where we could have a system to make these people work. But the Federal Government doesn't want to, and I'm not knocking the Federal Government, it is a complicated thing; if you have that, how many people, how many municipalities would have cheap labour, and so on, if this was the case. So it is not an easy matter, it's not perfect, but to say that it's getting worse is not factual at all and that's what I resent; it is not getting worse, it's getting better. It's getting much better, it's not perfect but it's getting better. And there's not, I don't think, there's certainly not any ideological difference between my honourable friend and myself, because there is no way I want to see people just being parasites without working.

But I think that we have to be human also. You know, there is some, right away you say, well this guy is a no-good bum, he's a drunkard - what do you do for his wife and his kids? Just think for a minute, close your eyes in fact, if you don't want to look at me, and think. It's not going to be that simple. And even that person, what do you do, if you don't give him welfare - you know, it's far-reaching - this guy is going

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)to go and help himself, many of those people, you'll have more crimes. You know it's not that easy and that simple. You try to walk a very narrow line, you try to be compassionate on people and it is true. What probably - I never heard that statement that the Chairman has said that in a country such as ours nobody should through no fault of theirs should have to starve or anything like this and I agree with him. We have some people who can't work, we have all kinds of people here, but we are trying; we have an experience going on now, we have tried to get an area where we will have some incentive; we have bent over backwards to find a way that exactly the people will not say, I'm better off on welfare, I don't want to work at all. We've been working now with a new Act with the Federal Government, all the provinces have been doing that to try to build some incentive in the program. We've done that with the Day Care Program and so on where the people will say well, all right, I will not . . . You need some incentive or they're not going to work. Any people, if they can get more money not working at all, they're not going to go to work. So the only way you're going to do that is to try to bring some incentive and so on and help the working poor. Nobody's talking about the working poor. The fellow that definitely does not want to go on welfare, he's going to do every damn thing possible, in fact he might do with less than he should get because he's got pride and so on. I think we should help these people. But we are trying to do that and there is no ideology changes between . . . If you feel that being compassionate is wrong, well then yes, we're on the opposite side of the fence. I think we have to have compassion, but we have to be fair and we have to be fair to the taxpayers of this province and there's no damn way that I want to see any parasites living off the back of other people in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments and I appreciate his sentiments in those comments. And as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I wasn't here last night to get the beginning of his comments so I was sort of at a loss here. But, Mr. Chairman, I have five municipalities in my constituency which I represent. I know all the municipal councillors in all the municipalities, and I think they are all dedicated people; that if there's anyone who is unable for various reasons to work or to look after themselves, he will apply to the municipality first and foremost for assistance. But there are some cases, I just wanted to use one, and the Minister says I make a serious charge in this House and that I should prove my charge. The question I would like to ask the Minister, and this becomes very very important, that when the Appeal Board comes together and meets, whether it be in Treherne, Holland, Notre Dame or wherever the case may be, out of the comments recorded by the person in question who was appealing for welfare and the councillor in question and the member for the Appeal Board, is all that recorded? Because, Mr. Chairman, if it's not, then I'm only repeating here this afternoon the information I received from the councillor in question who was responsible for that person who has applied for welfare to the municipality; and that person having done that, and having received welfare from the municipality for a certain period of time, suddenly the councillor in question finds a job for that person. But you know he can get more money, as I'm given to understand, under welfare than he could get for the job that he was offered working in the municipality at that time.

MR. DESJARDINS: They could cut off his welfare.

MR. EINARSON: That's right, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says they can cut it off, and that's exactly what happened. But are you aware of what takes place from there on? That person then has the right to appeal to the Appeal Board and the councillor is powerless. That's my point. The councillor is powerless, so that person goes to the Appeal Board, then you have your hearings such as a court hearing, and that's where I was told by this particular councillor of the kind of reaction that came from the Appeal Board and particularly the Chairman of that Board. The councillor was most unhappy, Mr. Chairman, and he registered a complaint through me. Is this the kind of responsible government we have in the Province of Manitoba? I just want to register this with the Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is always two sides of every . . . Last night I was told that we were too lenient and now today it's a complete change

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)about. Maybe I should have the meeting in the other room. I don't know. We've changed the personnel now. We're too soft. I am not chastising the member for bringing this to our attention, in fact, he should have done it before, and that is not the point that I was trying to make about this particular case. The point was only this, the member stood on his feet and said that this chairman said that the people did not have to work and they should get funds. Well that is the only part, and if that is not out of context I want to know about it because I want to replace the chairman if that is the case. You know, this is something that the press will get and all of a sudden it's an accusation that is not factual. And that's dangerous. I don't think that we should play around with civil servants or people who are donating their time, and so on, if we're not ready to approve. Now on the other side you say that the councillor wasn't happy and well first of all you say that this person has a right to appeal. Of course he has a right to appeal because that's one side. But that doesn't mean that automatically he'll be successful, but he has a right. You know you made a statement and everyone of us listening, we said fine well if that's it, that's bad, he tried to work. But do we know the circumstances? I don't know. That's what the Appeal Board is there for.

Now I won't even challenge the sincerity of that councillor that talked to you. Let's say that he was most sincere but if the fellow that he turned down appealed and then if he won the appeal, of course he wouldn't be very happy because he thought he was doing the right thing. So I'm trying to say that's why you have an Appeal Board, and they'll be criticized, no matter what they'll be criticized. But I am trying to point out to you, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the cases are going down, they don't automatically win the cases. We are getting progressive reports. Those people that are there, as far as I'm concerned, are not supporters are not some of them, but they have not been chosen because they are supporters of this party. One of the fellows that's there worked against me in my own election, and he's on the board and he's doing a damn good job, he's doing a damn good job. So, you know, the thing is there is some progress, it's a difficult job.

Now if my honourable friend would like to be on that board, maybe we could arrange that. I think then he would be exposed to the two sides. And I think he would have the same awakening as I did when I came over as the Minister responsible for this department. As I said, I came on this white charger and I was a crusader, I was going to change the world. And it is not that easy. I've tried, I've tried. I've had difficulty because of the federal, and I've explained why. I don't blame the Federal Government. I think we're improving.

Now, I'm sure there's going to be abuse. I'm sure that at times . . .it's just like courts. I can tell you some dandy decisions that the courts have made, and so can you. You know, we're human beings. If there's something like this, if there's something that looks . . .I would like to know about it. But does my honourable friend know, as I said, that some municipalities will do everything to push these people. I could also bring you, and I wish that I had brought this and give you some instances of the kind of money that they were offering and what they subjected these people to wait after the week and to starve for a few days, because there was no council meeting, and then to come and then to be present there with everybody. Would you like that? If you were in trouble would you like your wife to be subject to that? I wouldn't. If that's not the same ideology well, yes, you're right, we're on the opposite side of the fence. But I don't think we're that far apart. We're not that far apart. I believe you're a fair man and I believe that you want to see the people that cannot help themselves, that this rich country, that we can do something for them. But you're very much against the people who can work, that are too lazy to work, living as parasites off the back of us, and I agree with you 100 percent.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, excuse me. With all this can I give you some good news, with your permission, Mr. Chairman. I'm told that the nurses have just settled for eight percent - that's not too bad - plus the increment. Eight percent and the increment. There'll be a settlement in the negotiations with the nurses.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the debate but I think that the debate that has gone on between myself and the Minister has been fruitful, and to say to him that I've had a good deal of experience in dealing with people in the way of trying to get assistance because of the unfortunate situations that many have found themselves. So I've had lots of experience that way and I'm fully aware of the responsibilities of councillors and I want to say to him that I'm pleased to hear him say that any young able-bodied person who has a responsibility is trying to slough off his responsibility by staying on welfare, I'm glad to hear that he does not agree - that if that person is offered work that he should be cut off welfare and made to go to work. I appreciate and thank the Minister for the comments he has made in this debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . this that the decision of the Appeal Board can also be appealed to the court. That's another safeguard that these municipalities have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in the discussion that's been going on. I would like to come back to this Appeal Board and how it works with local municipalities, and I have never been very happy with the Appeal Board because they more or less think that the municipalities are all tightwads and that they aren't generous enough to them. I'm sure that if the people on the Appeal Board actually knew the circumstances in many cases they'd know that they weren't, because some of these people that are applying for welfare really could get work and the municipal people know it. So they're not just ready to be Santa Claus right off the bat. They're going to more or less hold back and maybe give them a limited allowance for awhile and chances are they'll likely go to work. Because this has happened in some cases, and I have municipal men that have told me that, that when somebody showed up and wanted to go on welfare, they were offered a job. Now whether they took the job or not, they didn't come back for welfare. So the municipal men aren't as tough as you think. They've got more brains than you think, that's the way I see it. And I hate to refer to the Chairman of the Appeal Board, but when you take public positions you're naturally going to be criticized from time to time. I remember in particular the time she attended the municipal meeting at Fort Garry and some of the statements she made were really ridiculous and they didn't meet with approval at all. I think if the Minister of Health was sensible about it he'd change her because there must be other people that are a little bit more broadminded than her, she's been so dedicated to the cause that she can't see any more. And this is what I'm concerned about, and I wonder who it is in your social workers or where they get it from, all this free literature you send around from time to time. But when some people are on welfare they're told well you don't take a job for awhile then you can get a course as a hairdresser or something and you can get paid for it, and in-between they go on welfare. And signs up in town saying that there's people wanted to work in the restaurants and in the hotels, and people on welfare that could be taking those jobs. Nobody likes to squeal in local areas because they don't like to be squealers. But this is going on and people know it more than you think, and more than the Appeal Board realize. And that's why your local people, as I was saying before, won't give out assistance because they know these things and they think that the person that's applying for welfare should go through some hardship and then by gosh they maybe would get a job, and if they got a job they'd maybe set up with something and hold on to the job rather than just let go of a job and go back on welfare. But when it's that easy and that generous, it's no darn wonder they go on it. And I'm one of those who would like to see it tightened up and I'm one of those that would like to see it put back into the municipal hands more than it is and not taken away from them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does my honourable friend know that if we're going to get cost-sharing we must have an Appeal Board; we can't go back without an Appeal Board. This is something that the Federal Government insists on and if we're going to get cost-sharing . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Change the chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I'm not going to change the chairman unless I know that

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) there is something wrong. I think the chairman has been . . . I don't agree with everything the chairman or chairperson does or says but as her job, she's doing her job very well. I think she's compassionate and she's not alone, there are other people there. And I certainly will not change the chairman because some of the municipalities . . . And I'm not . . . the blanket coverage on all the municipalities, I think that some have been very good and I think that others have not been fair. So no. If there's some reasons to change the chairman I certainly will do it without delay, but not because some municipal man is not very happy because the chairman has agreed, as one of the member's on the Board, on an appeal. We must have this Appeal Board. I'm not going to read it again, I told you it's not a foregone conclusion. They've been tough; they have regulations. Sure, sometimes they tell us that we're not generous enough. They're an advisory committee also. Some of the things we've changed, some of the things we've refused to change. You know, the responsibility is still ours as the elected members. These people on Appeal Boards are certainly not making money for the time they spend on that and the dedication. I've met with them and I was surprised with the dedication of these people there. They're not all perfect. They're not right on every instance, but they're not alone, there's more of them, and as I say there is always an appeal to the court also. But I think that the record that we have in front of us speaks for itself. I think things are improving and improving very fast.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think they're improving in my area and one of the reasons is because they know that it's not going to be so easy to get some of the help. But I know of other cases where . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Are they improving or are they going to another area?

MR. HENDERSON: I think in some cases they may be shifting.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's great for you.

MR. HENDERSON: And that's because they can go some place else, and I don't suppose that these social workers can keep tab on everybody. And when they see somebody come in and they've got two or three children and they say that somebody's left them, or they've left somebody else and they have no place to stay, I guess the social worker has no other choice. But if she knew the truth maybe she'd be telling them to get back to where they were and maybe take another job or else going back even to their own husband, because there's many sides to this. And many of these people they claim they're deserted and they can easily live in common-law and everything else, and the local people know some of these things; the social workers who come around don't. So I'm just wondering if the Minister himself doesn't believe that these programs would be administered far better if they were turned back more to the municipal level.

MR. DESJARDINS: They are administered by the municipalities now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this item 57, 3.6 million and under that section, the Welfare Advisory Committee, it would seem to me that a number of the statements have to be explained from an urban point of view. I couldn't agree more with the Member for Pembina who says that the local people won't be fooled and they have, apparently from my experience, they do have a get-tough policy and I remember before the Unicity Bill that many of the districts, St. James-Assiniboia was one that used to be very proud of the fact that they had very few people on the welfare rolls, that they chased them into Winnipeg where they had a soft touch. So now that we're all one big city, we've got an overlapping or a duplication of services and the result is that you get into sort of a contest, and it seems to me that the workers themselves have become demoralized and downhearted because for them to be able to question a particular purchase or to be able to hold up a purchase of whether it happens to be a new bedroom suite or something, or an article that was purposely damaged by the person with an alcoholic problem, and in some cases that I've been privy to people as a result of drunken brawls have smashed up all the furniture and then have gone to the welfare to have this furniture replaced. And it would seem to me that the welfare worker is then in an arbitrary position knowing that if she does become very firm with the person on welfare they will simply go down to the Welfare Advisory Committee and receive more than a sympathetic hearing. I'm sorry that

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. WILSON cont'd) I was out - I didn't get the Minister's breakdown - but it would seem to me that this particular committee, if they have any faith in the social worker, should have a larger percentage of these appeals being turned down. And how many of these appeals are from repeaters? In other words . . .

A MEMBER: What is the percentage turned down?

MR. WILSON: Well, I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to explain it to me. What is the percentage . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: What kind of a stupid statement is that? They get up and say they should have a larger percentage turned down and he just finished saying he doesn't know what the percentage is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well, with all due respect to the Minister, apparently he suggested out of 383 cases that 144 were dismissed for not showing up, or were they dismissed by the Committee? And I'm simply saying if the social worker is capable and combined with the pressures of which they are under . . . In other words, if they make a too firm decision they then are chastised by their superiors because they are wasting time, they could be in the field in front of a Welfare Advisory Committee. It seems to me that if the social worker is doing his or her job that their decision should carry a little bit of weight.

I really do feel that a lot of these particular cases that the Welfare Advisory Committee deals with should be turned back to the municipality and there should be some consideration, and I see you do deal with it in one of the sections, that we in the City of Winnipeg are really absorbing a very very large pool of people on public assistance because of the fact that they are moving in from areas where they have a very firm municipal council who, as one of the members pointed out, will be found out, or for that matter there is jobs available and they seem to have some doubt as to whether they would accept them or not.

I did look at this pamphlet that was given to me, and I'm a little bit concerned of the make-up of a board that is involved strictly in the profession of dealing with social assistance. If these people are really dedicated and they are receiving large salaries, I see some of them are directors; one is a Director of the Jewish Welfare, the other is a Program Director of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, and it goes on. It would seem to me that if these people are really dedicated and accepting a salary already, that some small honorarium should be sufficient, or possibly they should volunteer, like a lot of us do on committees, for gratis and then we wouldn't be faced with a \$111,300 expenditure.

I would also like to comment the Minister talked about cheap labour, and he also said that he was riding a white charger and that he was against parasites living off the system. May I offer some suggestions and one of which has been basically very slightly accepted by the Minister, and that is the Sheltered Employment Program. Practically every community club in this province . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There we are going a little too far because we'll cover some of these things. We're talking about the Appeal Board, and I think you've had a lot of latitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30 Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 9

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 9. The Honourable Member for Morris has five minutes left.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, when the resolution was last before this House I was responding to some of the comments that were made by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in which he was endeavouring to make the point that throughout the course of the hearings of the Land Use Committee that the members on this side of the House had very cleverly and ingeniously organized a group of farmers to present briefs before the Committee. He went so far as to suggest that perhaps we had been responsible for initiating, if not indeed even writing a number of those briefs. I was endeavouring to point out to the honourable member that in most cases the people that were presenting briefs before this Committee were unknown to me. In any case, even if there could be - and I don't for a moment suggest that there was - any thought that we had organized resistance against the Land Lease Program, then surely the events that took place in the, I believe it was the winter of 1974 or was it the spring of 1975, Convention of the NDP Party, when members of their own party attacked the Minister for his Land Lease Program. Now it's kind of far-fetched to suggest that we on this side of the House were doing that kind of organization, but I think it's a little too much to expect that we had organized that kind of revolt in the NDP convention, because, even in the most critical of members on the other side of the House wouldn't want to suggest that I would have any influence on their thinking. I see that the House Leader has something to say, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines has a question?

MR. GREEN: I know that the honourable member usually yields to a question unless it's trying to interrupt his debate. The Member for Lakeside has indicated that the New Democratic Party Convention called for the public ownership of all land in the Province of Manitoba. The Member for Morris is now indicating that they were against the Minister of Agriculture. Which position are you people alleging that the convention took?

MR. JORGENSEN: The latest convention that was held, and I believe it was in the Spring of 1975, but following the hearings in any case, just before the end of the hearings, and that could have been February or March of 1975, I'm not sure. I believe that the criticism that was levelled at the Minister of Agriculture at that time was as a result of the storm of protest that had arisen in the country, and the Minister was being castigated for having introduced a program that did not meet with the approval of the farmers. I don't suggest that the NDP Convention were opposed to the government acquisition of land - I believe that is a fundamental and basic concept upon which this party operates - but they were I think more critical of the fact that he had created such a storm of protest in the country that their chances of gaining further support and votes in the country were being rapidly diminished as a result of his high-handed attitude with respect to this program. So there is no comparison between the resolution that was passed initially about the government ownership of land and the events that took place at the latest convention, or at least the convention in the Spring of 1975.

Now my honourable friend asks me if I'm supporting the resolution, and all I can say is that having carefully studied the repurchasing portion of the lease agreement, and understanding something about agriculture, I suggest to my friend from Radisson that the inclusion of, even if this resolution is adopted, it isn't going to do one single bit of good, not one iota, it's going to do nothing to improve that particular position of the farmers; but on the other hand it's not going to do any harm, so I can see no point in opposing the resolution if it's not going to do anything one way or the other. If it makes my honourable friends happy opposite that the resolution is before us and if they are planning to introduce it, well then I'm not going to oppose it, because notwithstanding the fact that allowing farmers to purchase the land under this arrangement one year after they have taken out a lease agreement will not in any way help them.

I just can't see where it can do any harm either. Because if a farmer is not able to buy land this year, then is he going to be in any better position saving the winning of a sweepstake, or something like that, and then even these days from the reports that we get from the sweepstakes, I wonder even if he won one whether there would be any

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) money to pay him, so unless some relative died and left an awful lot of money, I doubt very much if there's going to be an opportunity for any farmers to take advantage of the provisions of this resolution even if it were included in the lease agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've always been opposed to the government taking the ownership of the land, of good farm land. I was on the committee that heard the hearings and if the Minister at that time when he went out to the country was wanting to hear from the people and had any notion of doing what the people said, it would have been a different thing altogether. What the Minister actually was out doing was trying to fool the people, pretending that he was listening to them and that he was going to do what they said. He had no intentions of doing that at all, he just wanted to advance his own program. I have a feeling that it actually backfired on him. Sure, when the program, when they brought out their policy and there was people that used it, but that don't say that the bulk of the people, or most all of the people, don't believe that it's a bad thing.

Now the Member from Ste. Rose was accusing the people on this side that were on that committee of organizing those meetings and just getting people to speak against the program, and particularly he referred to the meeting in Morden where so many of the briefs were agin the government's land lease program, and he accused me of possibly even having written some of those briefs. Well I think it would have been an honour to have written some of those briefs because they had such a good reasoning behind what they were saying, and they were definitely against the government purchasing the land and leasing it back to the people.

Now to get back to the resolution. It states in here, that they should be able to exercise the option at any time after one year. Now what the government have said all the way through this argument is that they were trying to help the farmer get established, that they were going to allow him the right to buy it only they wanted it for five years. Now if there was circumstances, and I believe there would be some, where a person wanted to take advantage of it sooner, why wouldn't the government let them do it? If they really believe that private ownership is the best and if after one year a person was wanting to exercise that option, why wouldn't they give him the privilege? Why wouldn't they give him the privilege? Now the honourable Member from Morris has said that this isn't very likely to happen. Truly it is not very likely to happen very many times, that that option could be in there, just a small thing to put in, and in many cases it would help people a great deal. People that are wanting to become owners and get the opportunity, and even supposing they took on a five year lease, if things went real well for them, and they wanted to go ahead within three years even . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member would permit a question? Would the honourable member agree that the Province of Manitoba should pass a law making every tenancy in the Province of Manitoba of land have a mandatory requirement for a one year option to purchase after the commencement of the lease? In every lease of land to a farmer in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is using his cunningness again to try to get a person to say something that he really doesn't mean at all. What we really are saying is that they would like the government to stay out of the purchasing of land altogether. Of course if a man takes on a five year lease and it's a business proposition - but lots of five year leases with the landlord and the tenant is changed within five years and the fellow may become a buyer. --(Interjection)-- I do believe the farmer should own his land. Many a farmer who started off renting the land in his earlier days turned out to owning land and he was renting it from people, and they weren't all bad like you say. In fact, many of the landlords that had land leased out, and it was in the first report that went out before we held the hearings, he never even made four percent on his investment at that time, that was the best he could make. Things

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) have changed since and it's been better in farming. But even today people that own land and rent it out, if they take a fair market value aren't making a big return on their money; they're speculating on the land, I'm not going to try to hide behind that, but they aren't making a big investment on their money.

But to get back to the resolution, it's saying that if they want to exercise this option sooner, they should be given that right; and I don't know why that little clause couldn't be written in there. If you really believe that you'd like them to become owners of the land and you believe that private ownership is the best all you would have to do is put that in. There might only be a few people that it would apply to each year, but it would at least show that you were sincere and it would at least help out these people that did want to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We might as well all get a word or two in on this resolution, it may be the last chance we have to talk to the MACC Land Lease Policy before the session ends.

I think just about everything that I was going to say has already been gone over pretty thoroughly by my colleagues. But originally I think the discussion that prompted the establishment of the committee was on the foreign ownership and I think we found in the hearings that really maybe hasn't been as much of a concern as the concern of state ownership of land. But I think there definitely has to be a concern of foreign ownership when you become concerned with that. What level it should reach I'm just not prepared to say, but I don't think there's that much of a concern yet on foreign ownership and I don't think we established in the hearings just what you do about foreign ownership, that wasn't too clear in many many of the briefs. I think the Minister of Mines questioned many of the witnesses very thoroughly on that and the answers weren't all that conclusive.

But the resolution that's before us, Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues that I don't think it's going to be that much help, but I can see no reason to object to it. I feel that the option to purchase should be there; in fact I feel that there could be other means to provide financing and provide assistance to young farmers to become established outside of large intervention by the state in the ownership of variable farm land in the province. I think the Minister could have done some consultation work with financial institutions throughout the province or throughout the country, that he appears loath to do in any government financing program that has been undertaken by his department, whether it be a feeder stabilization or a diversification assistance, or whatever. I think there's been a great change in the thinking of farm financing over the years and I think there are many of the institutions that are historically in the financing or providing mortgage funds that are prepared to provide long-term mortgage money to allow young farmers to become established in agriculture. How they arrive at a satisfactory interest rate with what's gone on in our monetary system in the past few years, is something again. Whether it's in the form of a subsidy or whether there is some other assistance provided, I don't know; I think that's being provided in any event whether it be by the present lease that is being used or not. I don't feel that the lease in its present form is attractive. I agree with my colleagues, and I doubt that a young farmer taking a lease and becoming established is ever going to buy that land. I think in many cases they're going to husband it properly for as long as they want it and when they're getting ready to leave it, they're going to bring that last little bit out of it. It concerns me of how you lease that again to someone else when he may know, or may have knowledge of what's happened to that farm in the previous two years of the lease. It's going to take him a great deal of input, a great deal of work to get that land back into a productive level that he would like to see it in, or what would be an acceptable level for a brand new lease.

The Minister in charge of Public Insurance smiles and I'm sure he knows that's the case that land can be high graded the same as a mine can be high graded, and we all know that that's gone on before, and I don't think there's any protection in the lease. Certainly you can have inspectors go there and check that farm, but you can't really say that he's not doing a good job, he has put fertilizer on there and he's just taking that extra crop off, but he's not really husbanding that land in the way that he would do if he

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) owned that property. I think that's an important, a very important feature of the lease if the option --(Interjection)-- No I don't, certainly the requirements have got to be good husbandry and any lease is going to have that in it, but I say, the option to purchase that land in the first place should be there rather than having to lease from the government in order to get started in farming.

I also want to mention the remarks of the Member from Ste. Rose when he spoke last on this bill. I can't help but take exception to the remarks where he said the conduct of members of the opposition on that committee was disgraceful. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Ste. Rose, while he gets up and speaks quite often, we all know that he doesn't say too much, or nobody pays too much attention to it, but to say that our conduct was disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, is going a bit far. I think there are other members on that committee and I think we conducted ourselves admirably. The unfortunate part of it was, Mr. Speaker, I think about 52 out of the first 55 briefs we heard, or maybe it was 53 briefs, came down pretty heavily on state ownership of land and tended to promote the free enterprise system of the farming community, and this didn't seem to sit too well with the members and they had to stall the meetings often and wait till the next year till they could get their troops lined up and show up at some hearings in southern Manitoba where it got so bad that they all came out on government stationery and they were stapled with the same machine, and they even had three members of one family who have run for just about every office of their party, to present three different briefs, from the church to the farm union. And, it even got down to where the use of farm land became so important we were going to remove the tombstones and farm right over . . . My colleague the Member from Lakeside suggested to the Minister of Mines that they start on South Indian Lake burial site first, but I feel that those hearings you were getting in most cases were getting a real honest input from the people and they were expressing their genuine concerns. I think the questioning was thoughtful and sometimes maybe a little provocative by one or two members of the committee, that we heard occasions where other members might have been frightened off a little bit from coming and presenting their views, but that was beside the point. But to say that our conduct on those hearings, or the members on the opposition side was disgraceful, I don't think I can accept that, Mr. Speaker. I think the Member for Ste. Rose knows better, and he can tell when things aren't going his way, but --(Interjection)-- Yes, he can speak for himself.

But, Mr. Speaker, the farm lease policy I think has met with severe criticism throughout the country and I can admire the Minister for trying to do something to get young farmers established in agriculture; we all agree that that's probably necessary. We hear so much today of maintaining the rural areas and keeping people in the rural areas, and I have always maintained, Mr. Speaker, that young people didn't leave the farm because they didn't like that way of life, they left because they couldn't make enough money. You show a young man that he can make himself \$20,000-\$30,000 farming and he's going to be back on that farm, and if he wants to get back there bad enough, he'll get there regardless of prices of land or whatever. Some of them it may be a little more difficult than others, but those that want to farm will make it. We heard so much of when the committee was set up about the great tracts of land, well sure in the early 1900s there were great tracts of land owned by landlords. My father came here in the early 1900s and settled in the Rapid City district and worked for a man named John E. Smith that had farm land from north of Brandon, south of Brandon, all the way down to Souris. He had thousands and thousands of acres and had all kinds of men working for him. He and his brother were in partnerships but eventually something happened to the brother, he fell ill, or wasn't able to handle his share of it, the operation, the management of it became so large that it was just impossible for him to run it, and so the farm was divided up and sold and my father became an owner of a farm at that time through many years of hard work and labour and fighting mortgages at a smaller interest rate than they are today, but nevertheless the difficulty of meeting those payments was just as bad. I think the pride that was always there, and the ownership of that particular land commended good husbandry, there is no question about it because you had to have that land producing as well as it would produce.

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BLAKE cont'd)

Getting back to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I say those of us on this side feel that it hasn't gone far enough, that that option to purchase should be there right from the outset of the lease and not after one year but someone has mentioned on the other side that it would just turn the corporation into a real estate office - it might have been my honourable friend from Ste. Rose - I can't really see that being the case any more than the fact that it's a real estate office right now. But I think if they're concerned about just tying up the details of that particular transaction and getting that tenant together and leasing him the land and then finding out that he is going to buy it within 12 months, if that's wrong there's no problem to putting a stipulation in there that he absorb some of the costs involved in drawing up the lease or whatever. There is no problem in putting that one year option in place; although I don't think that that probably would go far enough, I think the option should be there right from the outset.

From my own point of view on the land hearings, Mr. Speaker, I certainly enjoyed getting the views of the various witnesses that appeared before the committee from the different communities and some of them were at cross purposes, some contradicted each other, we had some that expressed concern of foreigners coming in and buying large tracts of land - I don't know whether those purchases were really large enough for them to become really concerned with or whether they weren't. As I heard mentioned earlier, I don't know just where the level is when you become concerned with foreign ownership. I think right at the present time foreign ownership of farm land in the province isn't that much greater than the land the government has purchased, and if we're going to be concerned with one, you have to be concerned with the other. I would find it very difficult to really ban foreign ownership unless we're prepared to accept some retaliatory measures on their part. If you're going to ban foreign ownership of farm land you should probably do it on housing or very many other things, and it would be very difficult legislation I think to draft and to bring in. But I didn't detect throughout the hearings where foreign ownership has become alarming. I think there is an area where we have to be pretty vigilant and watch for it creating problems and assure ourselves that those foreigners that are buying up the farm land aren't prepared to come out and husband it and become good citizens of the province, as so many many people have done over the last 50 years or so, people that have immigrated here and have either leased or bought land and have become excellent farmers and excellent citizens.

There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if the present purchase of farm land keeps on at the pace that it had accelerated to last year that the MACC is going to be the largest landlord in the country, the largest farm landlord in any event; therefore I think they have to really take a serious look at the leases and possibly consider the purchase option at the earlier point of five years. If they're not prepared to do this, there's not too much that those of us on this side of the House can do about it, other than to urge the government to give consideration to all the options that might be of benefit to the young farmer in becoming established, because that is the main thrust of the whole program, is to assist young farmers to become established in agriculture. If that young farmer happens to be highly successful one way or the other, whether he maybe finds that Howard Hughes was a far distant uncle, and if that should be the case and he's just leased a section of land from MACC, I'm sure that within a year within litigation that will be settled, I'm sure the young fellow would have enough money to buy land, and - as a matter of fact, I guess if that were to happen, that he wouldn't be too interested in farming really, he'd find something else to do while he spent his money. I think every consideration has to be given to that young person if he becomes, as I said, eminently successful and wished to buy that land and do some vast improvements in the way of buildings, or extra scrubbing or filling potholes, or whatever. He's going to be reluctant to do that on leased land, although I know, there's going to be the argument that the provisions are there for it. But there are many many arguments today, with the price of land, that every available acre should be used to its fullest extent, and that includes scrubbing out potholes or/and levelling to the point that they don't hold water and they become useful farm land. Those expenses are certainly worthwhile if land is limited

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) and a farmer can reclaim 30 acres on a half section of land. At the price of farm land today it's probably a pretty good investment. He can write the expenses off, and he can recover them over a period of three or four years on the crops when the time arises.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason in opposing the bill. We feel that it may-
 be doesn't serve that much purpose, or maybe doesn't go far enough, but we can see no
 objection to it, it's an option that's there to the young lessee, and certainly should be
 available to him. I know the Member for Ste. Rose in view of our remarks, now, is
 going to consider the remarks he made about our disgraceful conduct, and I know he will
 feel badly about saying that about his colleagues on this side of the House, and we'll look
 forward to the next contribution which he makes when he may have an opportunity to
 indicate to us that he is filled with remorse and he won't say nasty things like that about
 us anymore. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, after one has been in politics for going on seven
 years, you have a tendency of forgetting that once you were a farmer. --(Interjection)--
 For 20 years, born, raised on a farm, and having to deal not with the FFMC, but in
 often cases dealing with banks, trust companies, credit unions, and organizations that do
 have conditions in regard to loans.

I think the resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, is more psychological than any-
 thing else in the sense that if an individual can find funds to pay off a debt after one year,
 he would have bought the property directly from the farmer that was retiring, and I think
 it's being, to say the least, hypocritical to indicate that the type of leases that we have
 available is not being sincere and not wanting to actually make it possible for farmers to
 purchase land. I contend, based on experience from my grandfather that came to this
 country in 1879, and having farmed himself, my father and myself, that if I couldn't find
 a \$100,000 or \$150,000 to purchase a quarter or half a section this year, that I won't
 have that kind of money in one year or possibly not even in five years. I can't accept
 the first, therefore, Mr. Speaker; nor can I accept the second, therefore, in the reso-
 lution.

I'm not going to propose an amendment to the resolution before us, but I certainly
 will vote against it, because I feel it's not the type of resolution that is indicating sin-
 cerity in a government program that has proven, and I say mainly in the western part of
 the province, to be effective in having younger people going back to the farm. For the
 honourable members on the other side of the House to attempt to prove otherwise would
 be for them not to be sincere with themselves. All they have to do is look at the
 records, and all I have to do is talk to the constituents that have availed themselves of
 this additional option, and that's all it really is. It's an additional option. Instead of
 going to a credit union, instead of going to a bank, instead of going to a trust company,
 instead of going to any other corporation, financial institution in the province, the Farm
 Credit Corporation is there as an option, not forcing anyone to avail themselves of a
 lease with an option to buy, but making that option available to farmers. I've had a lot
 of compliments on the part, especially of the young farmers in my constituency that have
 availed themselves of this option, not being forced by anyone first of all to sell their
 land in question, not being forced by anyone on this side of the House, or employees of
 FFMC, to lease land, but availing themselves after looking at all the different options
 available, and they have praise, they have praise for the type of program that is now
 being conducted.

I think this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is irrelevant in the sense that, like I in-
 dicated in my opening remarks, if a young or older farmer cannot find funds on the first
 year he will not after the second year, unless it's his turn and he wins a lottery. It's
 not often our turn. So I think even if it was our turn that we could always invest it and
 wait another four years and then exercise the option that is within the agreement.

And then if we go even a bit further, if there's a change of heart pertaining to
 circumstances arising over, say, the first year, there is a section within the agreement
 that can deal with that. Under certain conditions the lessee or the lessor can terminate

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) the agreement. And that's in the agreement. So that means if the lessee because of financial rewards that weren't expected before say five years, does receive an inheritance over the first year, can, with due notice, break the agreement, and then he could purchase land that he wants to purchase outright without continuing to lease for another four years.

So all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is we have a program under the Minister of Agriculture's Farm Credit Corporation that is giving an additional option to farmers which I sincerely welcome, which was started by the way by the previous administration. It wasn't --(Interjection)-- Yes, it was started by the previous administration, it wasn't the Credit Corporation . . . it wasn't that much exercised by the previous administration in regard to actually attempting to purchase land from farmers who were wanting to retire and leasing it out to others, but some of that had been done. I only believe that in the last five, six years, Mr. Speaker, that more and more farmers have wanted to avail themselves of this option. And because of that, the Farm Credit Corporation has had business. So why would we attempt to criticize that. Why would we want to avoid having people exercise their freedom of choice. And this is what we hear, Mr. Speaker, from those honourable members, the members of the other side of the House, and especially coming from the Member from Portage la Prairie, wanting to cut back on the freedom of choice of individuals in this province. I can't understand it. I would understand it if it came from a Conservative that wanted to curtail freedom of choice but from a Liberal, it's just outrageous, Mr. Speaker, outrageous. It really isn't when you stop to think of it, when you look at the conditions of the agreement, and when you look at the possibilities set forth in the agreement, and when you look at the feasibility of finding enough funds within one year to pay off the amount that is required to purchase that land. I think it's completely irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly encourage the members from all sides of the House to vote this resolution down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virден.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising in support of this resolution of the Honourable Member from Portage, I listened with concern to the Minister of Tourism and his remarks regarding the one year and I think many have spoken here, but I wonder how many have spoken here that were in that situation of trying to buy land some years back; and certainly I was one of those when it took every single dollar and much of my operation to put that down payment. The next year I probably could have done it much easier. So I think this resolution has a lot of merit. I think if this resolution was to gain support, it's four-fifths of the way that we want to go. Certainly the government supporting some of this is not the worse plan. And I say to you who are cackling on the other side, you haven't been a farmer and you haven't come out of the service with a very few bucks in your pocket and wanting to go and make a farm and staying with it and seeing that thing successful. And I would like to see my son start up some time in the future and I would like . . . that first year is the tough year. You're doing a lot of planning, you're doing a lot of things, and a lot of built-in expenses that you maybe didn't foresee unless you took advice from your father, and I was one who didn't do that to my --(Interjections)-- Well, all right, to the honourable member maybe it was a failure, and I don't mind this kind of failures, but I do think . . . and also referring to the land hearings - I wasn't on that committee, but I did attend Virден and it was a shocker to me, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, because I'm not one to go out and promote things, not even for leadership campaigns, I don't. The meeting is called and I go there like anyone else and they can make their choices, I make mine, and I don't try to weigh and sway. But at that time I knew almost every person that appeared at Virден and I couldn't get over it. They were good socialist supporters almost to a man and, you know . . .

A MEMBER: They plant them.

MR. MCGREGOR: I don't know - but surely they were not supporters of government ownership. That was the shocker. One is the articulate brief from someone who I knew was very well educated, and I couldn't believe what he was telling the committee at Virден. --(Interjection)-- I don't know, but he was against government ownership. That was the thing, a socialist against government ownership. And I had nothing to do with it.

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) But I do think that having that option in there, if they don't want it they don't have to buy that first year but it does give that young person the guts to put that thing together right now and make that land produce that first year. Because if you own something, you look at it and you work at it differently than if you rent. And I do feel that five years down the road you become under a system and you give a portion and it's much safer, there's less gamble doing it that way. --(Interjection)-- Well somebody.

MR. BLAKE: Big brother or big daddy.

MR. MCGREGOR: So I just say this resolution has considerable support in my thinking. I think it's right, and I think it's the attitude of the future young farmers, get right in it right now. It's expensive, and I know it's expensive and I say that first year if they have to lease on the first year, it isn't the most hopeless thing. Five or ten years . . . Well and as I said I started with and I can tell you, I started with four borrowed horses, and if you want to start farming that route, you can't do it today I realize, and I shouldn't have done it then. But however I did own it from the first day, the payment was there. So I just say I respect this resolution and I support it. Thank you.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I am not a farmer and I will not try to justify my arguments on the basis of my personal occupation. I must tell the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that I was one who did not find the conduct of the Conservative members in that first round of hearings, disgraceful. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that --(Interjection)-- No, I didn't think it was deplorable or disgraceful. I thought that they did a very logical thing. They packed those meetings and they made political hay. They made political hay at those meetings. And, Mr. Speaker, I will compliment them, I think they did a good job. They got political mileage out of those meetings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is how long? They got political mileage during the first round of hearings. They got political mileage last election through attacking our land lease program. I'm sure that we may have lost constituencies because of the attacks that they made on the land lease program. We probably lost constituencies that some honourable gentlemen opposite now represent because of our land lease program. And one must compliment them. They were successful in attacking the program to some extent. And it cost us politically advocating the program and bringing the program in. But I don't fault them for attacking our program at those hearings. I don't say they're . . . I differ with my colleague, I don't think they were acting disgracefully.

But, Mr. Speaker, the second round of hearings were entirely different and the reason was they didn't pack those hearings, we did. And the result was, Mr. Speaker, that I thoroughly enjoyed that second round of meetings. I heard some great briefs. I heard some really great briefs which made a lot of sense. --(Interjections)-- Yes, the ones in Virden that were produced by those good socialists were good briefs. There was a lady named Maud Lalonde speaking --(Interjection)-- Lalonde I believe is the name - who made a very fine and very precise presentation. But, Mr. Speaker, I did not write those briefs and contrary to what the Honourable Member for Lakeside says, neither did Mr. Schultz, Herb Schultz.

The problem is that you underestimate the intelligence of some good socialists. They can write their own briefs, and they did and I think they presented some fine briefs. --(Interjection)-- No. The Honourable Mines Minister is like the Honourable Member for Morris, I don't think that he would actually take the trouble to write briefs like that for people who are making presentations. And I don't think he would believe in that kind of procedure. I think, however, that the PCP position on this resolution is hypocritical. I think they are being hypocritical when they say that they support the resolution, because they don't want a modified land lease program. I think they want to do away with it. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Rock Lake says "Sure". Or the Member for Arthur, pardon me. Your position is hypocritical. You have said in the past that you would do away with the program. Your people out in the constituencies are talking as if you would do away with the program and then you'll be selling the land. I don't

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) know to whom, but you will be selling the land that is now owned by MACC.

Now their position in the past has been that they would abolish the program. --(Interjection)-- Well, in the 1973 election, you fought that election on the basis that you totally oppose the program and would do away with it. The Member for Lakeside I believe has said that you will do away with it. Now who speaks for the Tory Party? Who does? Does the Member for Lakeside, who was fired as Deputy Leader of your party? Does he speak for the Tory Party? Is it the Member for River Heights? I guess that's pretty obvious, he doesn't speak for the Conservative Party. He speaks only . . . Now, Mr. Speaker, I really want to know what their position on this is. Do they stand for free enterprise, that is, no interference by the state, by the government in this area?

We know this, Mr. Speaker, that the previous Tory government didn't adopt a position of free enterprise. It set up MACC. It brought in a program whereby MACC provided subsidized mortgages to farmers. It also brought in another program in the latter period, I believe 1967 to '69 whereby MACC guaranteed loans that the banks made to farmers. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was real rugged individualism. It was real free enterprise. Those great free enterprisers in the banks would make loans to farmers and if the farmer made a success of it, if the farmer made a success of it, who made the money? The banks. The banks made the money if the farmer succeeded. If the farmer was a loser, if he failed --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, I'm in mid-flight. If the farmer failed, if he was unable to make a success of his operation and he defaulted on his mortgage, who took the loss? Who took the loss? The bank? No, not the bank, MACC, the Government of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the first round of hearings that we held, the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce advocated that we go back to that system. That great system of rugged individualism and free enterprise, whereby the banks would make loans to the good risks, and where the risk wasn't so good the banks would make a loan to the extent that collateral was available, but on the portion of the loan for which there was no collateral --(Interjection)-- It's still a good one - on the portion of the loan for which there was no collateral, the government would provide a guarantee. So once again, once again, the banks would get the good risks and the government would get the bad risks and the losses.

Mr. Speaker, I've listened to the honourable members today and they seem to be coming to the position - the Honourable Member for Virden, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa - where they want us to buy the land for the farmers. They want the government to buy the land for the farmers. And then the farmers will stand up and say, we're free enterprisers, we own the land. They're socialized free enterprisers. They get their money from the public, the public takes the risk, and if there are losses the public takes the losses, but if there are gains the free enterpriser takes the gains. Now that's a nice kind of free enterprise, Mr. Speaker. You know, on those terms I would become a free enterpriser any day. I can't lose, I can only make money. Mr. Speaker, if these gentlemen ever come into government, which is doubtful, I would be inclined to go into the banking business; that's because I couldn't lose money. --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members say that there has been severe criticism of our program, and there has. There was severe criticism in 1973. There's been severe criticism since and I am informed that it was amazing when meetings were held on the Land Lease Program, people like the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and the Honourable Member for Lakeside would somehow come out of the woodwork and they seemed to be present at a number of these. Of course, I'm sure that they weren't packing the meetings. I'm sure that they weren't interfering in the free flow of reaction and information from the public. I am sure they weren't playing politics. They were just there as ordinary citizens, not playing politics.

There's been criticism, and as I said the honourable members they've made political games out of it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the payoff is starting to diminish. I don't think they're getting such a payoff anymore out of the program. I think

RESOLUTION 9

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) that most people are beginning to wise up to the fact that they were misled by the Tories and that this program isn't the great boggy man, it isn't the great land-grab by the Provincial Government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that in the Land Lease Program MACC primarily reacts to requests for land to be leased; they react to requests from young farmers for land to be leased through MACC. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are always more and more young farmers who want to get into the program. If the program is so bad, if it is so terrible, why are these young farmers wanting to get into the program? You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes, sometimes one should listen to the people and I think the response of the young farmers to this program is a pretty good indication that the program has some merit, some merit. I'm not claiming this is a panacea; I'm not claiming it's any great program, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have mixed feelings about the program because I regard this program as a conservative program. I don't think it's a radical program, I think this program is a conservative program. And when you examine it what does it do? It is an attempt to try to maintain the family farm, to maintain the family farm as a way of life in the rural areas; it is an attempt to give some real meaning to the stay-option; it's an attempt to keep young farmers farming. It is essentially of a means to maintain the family farm and as such it is a conservative program, it is not a radical program. I can't get very excited about it, frankly. I don't think it's any great panacea. I think it may have some usefulness in helping to stop or to stem the depopulation of the rural areas. --(Interjection)-- Yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Yes. I thank the member for yielding to a question, Mr. Speaker. In view of his earlier remarks I cannot help but gather that he is opposed to The Federal Farm Improvement Loans Act. That's the program whereby the banks make the loans and they're guaranteed by the governments. They're made at five percent, and I understand from his previous remarks that he's opposed to that Act.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have never stood up and proclaimed myself to be a great free enterpriser or rugged individualist, and what I was trying to point out to honourable gentlemen opposite was that when they do that they are frequently in conflict with themselves because they continually proclaim their belief in free enterprise and yet they want subsidies from the government all the time. They always want subsidies from the government. And to me a man who accepts subsidies from the government is not a free enterpriser. There is a subsidy involved in the Land Lease Program and I'm not attacking that. But I would be attacking it if it were a program which first gave subsidies to a man and then allowed that man to make a capital gain at public expense through investment by the public. That I would find offensive.

I agree with the members from our side who have said that this program is just another option. And as I said, it is not a great option, but it is another option. It's an option to the Federal Farm Credit Corporation. Remember, any young farmer doesn't have to come to MACC, he can go to the Farm Credit Corporation. He can go to the Royal Bank. He can go to any member opposite who is renting out land. He can use his own money if he is a real free enterpriser he can use his own money. --(Interjection)-- Now, the Member for Logan is right. Any good free enterpriser doesn't use his own money, he uses somebody else's money to make money on. --(Interjection)-- Preferably the public's. But in most cases someone else's money; maybe the bank's, but preferably the public's.

So this is only one other option available to farmers. It hopefully will have some effect and I'd like to see the program in operation for a number of years. I would like to see the program in operation for a few years under its present regulations to see what kind of results we get out of it before I would favour any kind of reconsideration of the present arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The hour being 5:30 I am now adjourning the House. The House shall stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)