

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 29 Army Cadets from Yellowknife, Northwest Territories. These cadets are under the direction of Mr. Osted. They are our guests for this afternoon. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George) introduced **Bill (No. 42) An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona) introduced **Bill (No. 34) An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced **Bill (No. 44) An Act to amend The Marriage Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY introduced **Bill (No. 45) An Act to amend The Vacations with Pay Act;** and **Bill (No. 47) An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN introduced **Bill (No. 48) An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK introduced **Bill (No. 46) An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Community of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary".**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the unemployment figures for the City of Winnipeg now stand at 17,000, representing some 7.4 per cent of the work force, could the First Minister advise what special programs, if any, his Ministries are considering with respect to youth employment programs for the summer, having regard to the fact that the universities and the other post-secondary schools will be emptying out fairly shortly, what special programs, if any, there are to assist these young people seeking employment in the workplace against this background of high unemployment figures at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, in addition to a program relating specifically to the inner city and in addition to the Public Works construction program on which design work has been done, which can be advanced by the amount of several millions of dollars. In addition to that there is the Student Employment Program which can be sized to the order of 2,000-3,000 specially created jobs. Those are about the three mainstays of special employment creation. In addition to that there may be a measure — and I can only put it in a tentative way, in addition to what I've said — in addition to that in the budget address forthcoming on or about the beginning of the third week of April.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise if any of his ministers have taken special steps or have had special studies initiated with the private sector to determine what input the private sector as opposed to the government, could have in this employment program?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is precisely the prospect of a measure, that would be in the budget itself and, accordingly, it has to await the budget address.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the budget is not slated until the 18th of April, could the First Minister not give us some indication as to what steps, if any, could be taken for the young people who will be emptying onto that market prior to the 18th of April?

MR. SCHREYER: Well what is certainly ready to be proceeded with, notwithstanding the budget, is the Summer Employment Program for students which, just off hand, I would estimate as being in the order of 3,000 to 4,000 job creation positions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you' Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I note with some satisfaction the Bill No. 23 being introduced by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, the changes to the Marriage Act as being one of those designated . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . as an important piece of legislation we will be dealing with. I ask the Minister once again, can we expect this week introduction of the bill having to do with land ownership?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, hopefully , some time towards the end of the week or early next week.

MR. ENNS: I thank the Honourable Minister for that response. I direct another question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Renewable Resources and ask him whether or not he has any information or announcements to make with respect to the meetings held in Saskatchewan having to do with the problems around the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I will have a report available after the meeting is held. We have not had the meeting yet.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Honourable Minister. My information was the meeting was to be held on the 24th. Could the Minister indicate on what date that particular meeting is to be held in Saskatchewan?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I expect the Minister from Saskatchewan to be contacting my office today to finalize arrangements.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Corrections. In view of the fact that a spokesman for the Winnipeg Police Department and a judge in the City of Winnipeg has disputed the figures given by the Minister during his Estimates, is the Minister ready to make a clarifying statement in view of the fact that his statement has gone nationwide and if it is wrong it's put quite a cloud on the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HONOURABLE J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the figure I used was put out by Stats Canada and I provided a sheet to the committee that is looking at my Estimates, and if I said once, and I think Hansard will show about five times, I said it was put out by Stats Canada. I said it to every reporter that phoned me over the weekend, except the one from the Free Press that I hung up on at ten o'clock last night. There is no disagreement between the City of Winnipeg figures and our figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister in charge of Transportation, I guess it's the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister or the government can advise the House if they intend to make submission to the Canadian Transport Commission regarding proposed railway freight increases of 10 or 12 percent which is projected for June 1st?

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

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, we seem to be forever facing increased costs and I can assure the honourable member that we are forever pursuing the matter in various ways, but we will be doing whatever we can to make our views known to the proper authorities.

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder would the Minister or the government provide members of the Legislature with copies of their proposed submission.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, depending on the nature of the rate adjustment in question, depending on the form that's provided for us, in some cases rate adjustments are made before any formal hearings; there may be agreement to allow certain changes to take place under certain statutes, for example. Passenger air fares, for instance, may sometimes go up without any formal hearing before the ATC. But if there is a formal presentation to be made I will be pleased to make a copy available to honourable members.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to another Minister, the Minister of Highways. I wonder could the Minister of Highways advise the House if he or the government has proposed a date for weight restrictions on the highways in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin): According to the latest report, Mr. Speaker, that will be coming very shortly. To the best of my knowledge there has been no definite date set as yet. As soon as that is known it will be announced in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Yes, a question to the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister confirm

or explain that it was really his opinion only that the \$50.00 an hour fee paid to Mr. Murdoch MacKay was a great deduction because I checked with the Law Society . . .

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

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Urban Affairs and ask the Minister if he could report to the House as to the outcome of his meeting over the weekend with the City of Winnipeg officials regarding the Transit System deficit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Well, Mr. Speaker, yes we did meet with the City of Winnipeg on Friday. I indicated to them I would advise them today and what we have done is confirm that in fact in 1976 the formula did call for the 50 percent of the lesser of revenue or deficit but we recognize that 1976 was an extraordinary year, not a usual year, in that the Transit System didn't operate for about ten weeks and therefore their revenues fell considerably. As a result of that we are not asking for an adjusted refund or adjustment on the amounts of money that was paid out by the province. The amounts that they received they will be able to keep for 1976 and, as has been indicated before in 1977 we are moving to 50 percent of deficit and we will review that policy to see how it works, at the end of this year.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for another Minister, the Minister of Public Works. I'd like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he could tell the members of the House as to why approximately 95 percent of the fifth floor space in the Norquay Building has been empty ever since the Department of Industry and Commerce moved out more than a year ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works. Order, please.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister now be able to confirm that his government has paid his friend and NDP candidate, Mr. MacKay, over \$100,000 since he took office. It was a question I'd asked earlier. —(Interjection)— \$100,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the appropriate Minister who might be in charge of this particular matter. It is reported that the Government of Manitoba has guaranteed a further loan to Minago Construction in Northern Manitoba of \$406,000.00. Could the appropriate Minister advise if in addition to that loan any other grants have been made to that particular construction company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HONOURABLE RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, since the honourable member failed to give notice of the question, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, have any grants been made recently to this construction company in addition to the loans?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: While my honourable friend refreshes his memory about his department would he find out in addition, Mr. Speaker'

what the present state of that company is with respect to unpaid grants from the past and also with respect to further guaranteed loans up to the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. **MR.**

SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the question has been taken as notice in its substance, however, in case my honourable friend is still in some doubt about the matter, it has been policy of this Government to put funds to work to bring some opportunity for both work and training opportunity to people in those parts of the province which have been so sadly neglected for so long. **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley. **MR. WILSON:** I have a question for the Minister of Health.

Would the Minister confirm that he agreed to a special grant of

\$5,300 to the Knox Day Care Centre in recent weeks? **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health. **MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't remember the exact amount but, there was a grant for no deficit, which was before the present day care program was initiated, and this is what the grant was made for, for that difference.

MR. WILSON: If I heard right, this is for an old request and it doesn't mean that the Minister is reversing his stated policy of equal treatment for . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, he did not hear right.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for the operation of the Provincial Environmental Commission. Before I ask him the question, I'd like to compliment

him on his colour, it is a great improvement, and I apologize for not giving. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: I apologize for not giving notice, I know the Minister has been away. But it's been reported that there has been companies operating after the expiration of an environmental order which allowed them to dump controlled waste either into the atmosphere or into rivers or onto the ground. How many companies are operating with expired orders?

MR. SPEAKER: Order for return.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Statistical question.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, allow me to ask the question. How many companies are operating with expired orders, in other words' with no control now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just so there's no misunderstanding, it wouldn't be no control. What the honourable member is referring to is is that there would be an order granting a company authority to operate within certain and he is suggesting that the limits for a certain period of time' order expires and they are continuing to operate within those limits.

I am not aware of any cases, but I'm not suggesting that that doesn't occur. The honourable member should be aware that when the Commission went into existence everybody was operating without orders and many still do; there are no clean environment orders unless there is a new company going into existence, an application has been made by somebody wishing limits to be made or a complaint is received, or something is done by the environmental protection branch which brings that particular company before the Commission and that is done on a priority basis. If the honourable member had a case in mind, I'd find out or I will have some information to him in a general way as a result of him having put the question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you proceed with the adjourned debates on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you Adjourned debate Bill No. 3. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand' Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate Bill No. 4. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5 as well.

Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. G. JOSTON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN: Stand' Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 23) — INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on this occasion afforded to me by Bill No. 23, the Act which grants to the Government the proportion of funds, roughly a quarter of the dollars that they need to carry on programs of government, including, of course, therein the proportion of funds the Minister of Renewable Resources requires, the Minister of Northern Affairs, and as well, the portion of the \$250,000 that this government is providing to the fishermen as a transportation subsidy to help ailing fishing industries in Northern Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that I take this occasion to bring to the government's attention, to the Minister of Northern Affairs and hopefully the Minister of Renewable Resources who is not currently in his seat but who can avail himself through the reading of Hansard on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I have been drawing to the attention of the government since the start of this Session, the serious difficulties that have been encountered by northern fishermen with respect to their relations and their continuing operation within the framework of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it very clear to members opposite that it is a particular position that I take with some caution. I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that in a sense partisan politics has little room in this issue, in the sense that the record will very clearly indicate that past administrations, past Conservative administrations, in concert with the present NDP administration, both worked co-operatively in bringing about some order into the marketing of freshwater fish in this province. I make that statement on the basis that I don't want any implied suggestion to be left that we

are now merely playing politics with the issue at the expense of northerners and particularly our native people in Northern Manitoba who, in many instances, find the fishing industry one of the few viable economic opportunities open to them.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to what was a hope shared by the then Conservative administration and carried out by the present NDP administration? The fishing industry has gone downhill in the last eight years and that's not simply because I say so, it is because the statistics support it. The fishing industry that at one time harvested some 75 million pounds of fish is now down to some 30 to 35 million pounds of fish, if my general reading of the facts is reasonably correct. Mr. Speaker, we have agitation within the fishing community ranging from southern Manitoba to the northern areas as both the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Renewable Resources can, of recent date, attest to, agitation of great concern among the fishermen as to their continued relationship with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like on this occasion to take the opportunity to table and present to the Minister a petition that I received just recently, dated March 18th, from the Gimli area, a petition listing some 28, 29 fishermen with the specific request that they be given the privilege of opting out of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record some of their major complaints.

1) The fishermen indicate that they have never had an opportunity to vote.

2) The Marketing Board was established to be a buying and selling desk only. The end result was that they entered into a processing situation which is far too costly.

At the time of the initial concept of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, it was estimated that the cost of operating that selling desk, referred to in item No. 2, that of creating a buying and selling desk, would be of the order of \$100,000.00. The result is that we have a \$6 million processing plant at Transcona that the fishermen of this province have to carry on their backs, so to say, Mr. Speaker, as a heavy addition to the overhead costs to their product.

The fishermen were told, Mr. Speaker, by a Mr. Corney that the handling charges would be from one to one-and-a-half cents a pound. The end result, Sir, some seven or eight years later, is that even at the outset of the Corporation's activities the handling charges rose to 18 to 25 cents a pound and are currently running at between 40 and 50 cents a pound. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps that handling charge, that overhead, which is placing the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in its most difficult position. It is simply incapable of having the flexibility to compete in the foreign markets and international markets, mainly those of our neighbours to the south, where we export 85 to 90 percent of our products to.

The fishermen at Gimli are concerned that the mere calling of a referendum will not solve the problem. They claim, Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, that a certain amount of discrimination exists within the operations of both Ministers involved, discrimination as between natives and white fishermen, that in too many instances the native fishermen are, in fact, supported and aided with different kinds of programs, support programs, subsidy programs, training programs, grant programs, that are not available to those relatively lesser numbers, the white fishermen fishing on the southern lakes such as Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg.

They go on, Mr. Speaker, to say that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation's financial statements are not clearly tabled. And, Sir, this is supported by none other than the Auditor-General in Ottawa who makes that rather serious charge that the Corporation's books are a mess and that after repeated attempts by Federal MPs in the House, attempts to getting the current report before them for consideration, have been unable to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the Estimates of the Minister of Renewable Resources and we still do not have last year's financial statement, last year's report on the operations of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely that is unforgivable. We already deal, in far too many instances, with things of the past. We are continually dealing with statistics as those provided by us a year ago. But in the case of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, Sir, we, not only we in opposition, not only the opposition in the House of Commons, but the Minister directly responsible for the welfare of the fishermen of this province, to this date still does not have last year's, and I underline, Mr. Speaker, last year's Annual Report of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, which the Auditor-General had some pretty severe comments about just recently.

It is also of concern, Mr. Speaker, that the present Chairman, Mr. Moss, has already indicated to the Inland Fishermen's Association that there will be a decrease in the price of fish for the forthcoming spring and summer season. All the more reason, these fishermen, Sir, from Gimli state: All the more reason for these fishermen wanting to sell to the free markets.

They also make the point, Mr. Speaker, that if the Marketing Board hinges on 29 fishermen leaving it, it would appear to be in a very unstable position. Fishermen, they indicate, Mr. Speaker, would be content to stay with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation if their prices would be in accordance with the free market prices.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this petition that was sent to me from Gimli with the attached

signatures of what I gather to be most of the fishermen in the Gimli area, and make that available to the Minister of Renewable Resources, and ask the Honourable Minister precisely what is his intention, what are his plans to resolve the situation.

Mr. Speaker, conceptually there is no difference in the desire that both the opposition and the government has in promoting the best of all possible deals for our fishermen in this province. They deserve it, Mr. Speaker, and they require it. I could remind the honourable members opposite, and there are those who share my opinion, that perhaps we made a tragic error or a serious error when we allowed the Federal Government to move as forcibly as it did in so quickly disbanding and throwing out what was left of the private sector in the fishing industry, throwing them literally, and I might add, with very little consideration and certainly no compensation, out of business and creating the large modern processing plant that we now have in the constituency of the Honourable Minister who is just now leaving the Chamber, the Member from Transcona, the Minister of Labour.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, that there might have been that situation that sometimes develops where members vie for certain economic activity within their constituency. We understand that at that time between the two Messrs. (Paulley, Pawley), and I shouldn't mention their names in this Chamber, but the two members, the Member from Selkirk and the Member from Transcona, that there in fact was some heated debate as to where that plant should be located. After all, because of the senior position of the Minister of Labour, his view prevailed and the plant was moved to Transcona, at the expense of the Honourable, the Attorney-General, who lost a processing plant in Selkirk and, I might say, much more important, some 30 or 40 people lost their permanent employment opportunities at Selkirk with the closing down of the processing plant that was in existence in Selkirk.

So much, Mr. Speaker, for a little bit of the party politics that might have been there at the decision as to where the plant should be located.

Our position, Mr. Speaker, at that time, and Hansards of the day will support it, is that we opposed that kind of centralization from Day One. We saw, we foresaw the kind of difficulties that it would lead to. We could anticipate the kind of massive front-end loading onto overhead charges that the fishermen would have to bear and we could predict the fact that it could only add to the difficulties we would have in marketing our fish in a competitive market abroad, a market that is to a large extent, an export of nature.

Mr. Speaker, I must also say that in doing away with the private sector so completely at that time, we also lost some of the entrepreneurial skills that was necessary to market, particularly some of the more difficult fish that our fishermen catch. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take any great deal of genius to market our prime commodity, namely pickerel fish or our good whitefish or some of our other highly desirable species. Anybody that put them on a shelf had buyers coming to them and by and large buyers at a good price.

What we looked forward to in putting together the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was that they would be assisting us, principally in selling some of our less desirable fish, some of the fish that is described as rough fish, the mullets, the catfish, the marias, carp, that we would develop through new technology, imported perhaps from Europe where many of these species are used as a very desirable food commodity. That we could, instead of having these fish waste and, in fact, become a pollution problem on our lakes as the fishermen haul tons of these fish out of their lakes and simply let them rot on the ice, that with the aid of a government sponsored, indeed government subsidized, government supported operation, that we would find markets for some of these species of fish to the benefit of our fishermen in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that really hasn't come to pass, that really hasn't come to pass and we now have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where, because of the heavy front-end loading that is required to carry the cost of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and, Mr. Speaker, we're still speaking in the dark, I haven't seen a report of this year's operation, we know that the report can't be all that promising, if anything, it can only be more discouraging. After all, the North Ontario fishermen have opted out of the operation. Now they didn't represent all that much volume, but nonetheless any decrease in volume in that plant means higher costs to those that are remaining. We have very serious concerns being expressed by Saskatchewan fishermen and my understanding is that they are seriously debating the question as to whether or not they wish to remain in the board and, Sir, if they do opt out of the board, that means about 25 percent of the product now flowing through the plant will no longer come to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in the plant at Transcona, adding again a very sizeable increase to the overhead that Manitoba fishermen will have to bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we do about it? And really, what is this government prepared to do about it? I ask the Honourable Ministers involved, the Minister of Renewable Resources particularly, that this has to be one of the principal concerns that's on his desk at this particular time and I would hope that we could engender some kind of a debate in this Chamber we offer him pretty clear support in whatever moves he intends to take in this direction, if they can in fact improve the situation.

There is little solace coming from me in seeing the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board destroyed. I particularly don't look forward to seeing a facility that was put up largely at public expense, some six million dollars, standing empty. On the other hand, you know, I cannot turn a deaf ear to the kind of requests that are coming, not just to me but they are coming with regularity to the government side, to the ministers involved. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we look about for some pretty serious solutions. I might suggest to the government, Mr. Speaker, that the eat Board would not function for one day, one week, if it operated on the same premise as the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have enough reason to understand that many of our other marketing boards, such as the vegetable marketing boards and the difficulties we had with that would not operate and did not, in fact, operate without building into it some relief valves and some safety factors.

Now Mr. Speaker, it may well be that we don't require the services of a government controlled board to sell our prime fish. Perhaps we can look for ways and means of marketing those products with which we have no difficulty moving, for which we have sales people continually knocking on our doors, in fact, fact, offering very attractive contracts to our fishermen for that product. Mr. Speaker the real rub comes in, is that pickerel fish for instance, are selling today in Winnipeg for \$1.00 to \$1.15 a pound and the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is paying their fishermen 63 cents or 64 cents a pound. Now they just simply cannot accept that as being just and, Mr. Speaker, nor can I and I would hope to think that most honourable members opposite can't see that as being just. And if you allow that situation to continue to any extent, in fact it has continued too long know we may be throwing out the baby with the wash basin and everything when we should be worrying about how we can correct the situation before it gets out of hand.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that we look upon the special problems that we have with respect to transportation, with respect that we have to species of fish, with respect to how we can move these fish in the north, that we look to the northern fisheries as distinct from the southern fisheries, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I'm not privy to all the facts and all the information that the Minister of Renewable Resources has. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that as a governmental decision, just as they had decided that the northern fisheries is worthwhile supporting to the tune of \$250,000 annually in help of offsetting some of the expensive freight charges, that we look at the northern fisheries as distinct and as separate from those of the south.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation could incorporate into its structure some loopholes or some ability, some flexibility, I shouldn't use the word loopholes, I say flexibility, that would encourage and would attract back some of the entrepreneurial skills of the free enterprises into the business, then in many instances some of the species that are now totally ignored, totally unmarketable, could in fact be marketed. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that much like within the operation of the Wheat Board, in fact, it should be a lesson to those who sometimes suggest that all products, all cereals whether it's flax, wheat, etc., should be marketed solely and in monopoly through the Wheat Board should think twice about because, in the Wheat Board structure, although it is a very large and one of the major marketing corporations that we have, marketing board that we have on the Prairie provinces, there is sufficient area there for the private trader to exercise his particular skills in moving tons of rapeseed to specialized markets in Japan, in finding and locating those specialized seed markets for some of the specialty crops that we grow. I would suggest even those that the Minister of Agriculture tried to peddle to Cuba at a loss like black beans.

But, Sir, over the years the private grain traders, the private seed house have been able to perform a very useful function to the farmer, the prairie farmer on the Prairies, by finding these markets, finding cash markets for the farmer and allowing these markets, these products to be sold off board or alongside the operations of the Wheat Board. We don't have that, Mr. Speaker, with respect to fish. And I'm suggesting that we could learn a lesson from what is happening, or how the grain farmer has learned to co-exist both in the free and the open market with some of his production and as well as live with the totally controlled market, orderly marketing system, in other areas such as the major grains, wheat, barley and the cereals that we grow.

Mr. Speaker, I'm throwing these suggestions out to the Honourable Minister as hopefully constructive bits of advice. I would like to think that we could come somehow to grips with the situation without seeing the destruction of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation as such.

Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear about that. There is no way that we should allow the situation to resort back to pre-board days. We cannot allow the individual fishermen to be prey to the economic clout that the purchaser had in pre-board days. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there have been some significant changes take place within the primary producers that we should also be aware of. The producer, that is the fisherman, is no longer quite as helpless as he once was. In most instances he has successfully evolved into a co-op marketing structure. On most lakes, with varying degrees of success, the fishermen have banded together in fishing co-ops, and I speak particularly of the co-ops that I am familiar with such as the Lake Manitoba Fishing Co-op which is a highly successful fishing co-operative and it has had a good record in terms of the handling of its affairs in terms of the paying

Monday, March 28, 1977

out of dividends to its fishermen, and in terms of receiving the very best possible price for their product for not "a" fisherman but for the group collectively. And so, Mr. Speaker, the situation isn't quite the same back home at the lakes as it was, say, in 1965 or in 1968 or '69, in the pre-board days.

There is a better organization on the lakes within the fishing community and surely with that better organization, if we take and we are bold enough to exercise some pretty serious surgery on the board as it now stands, and Mr. Speaker, I do not accept for a moment the fact that it is a federal board, that it is a federal creature by nature, by legislative nature, that we can afford to just take our hands off it and not concern ourselves with it.

Sir, we represent, right here in Manitoba, the biggest part of the board. We represent fully 50, 55 percent of what goes on with respect to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. To have the Minister suggest that because the agreements were signed with the federal authorities that leaves us with only one board member on that board puts us in a very poor driver's seat, well then, Mr. Speaker, then again let's call for a surgeon. Let's call for serious surgery because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen in northern Manitoba, the fishermen in southern Manitoba are very disturbed to the extent that they are petitioning the Minister to opt out. And, Mr. Speaker, I quite frankly suggest that we owe the fishermen in Manitoba something better than merely acquiescing to that request. Opting out and having no better alternative, quite frankly, is not good enough for the fishermen in this province.

I would suggest that the Honourable Ministers consider very seriously calling for the very highest level of conferences with the other authorities. If Saskatchewan is meeting with the Minister in the next few days, fine. I would suggest that we better bring in somebody from Alberta. I would suggest that we better bring in the federal authorities and I suggest that we better sit down and see what we can do with respect to a situation that is not getting better.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why it is not getting better is because the pressure to sell outside the board, in my judgement, is increasing not decreasing. It's just in the last few months, for instance, that you know the markets, traditional markets in the southern United States that were fed by Mexico have been closed to them. The border has been literally closed partly because of the devaluation problems of the peso, partly because of internal problems that the Mexican government has seen fit to exercise for reasons

of their own. But I am told that within the last few months major markets that were supplied by fish in the Houston, Arizona, New Mexico area have been closed. And there are buyers, right now, buyers that have been dealing with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for the last month and a half that are wandering around this province with contracts of a million, two million, three million pounds of fish at very attractive prices. At very attractive prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to let these buyers loose on our fishermen and to kind of revert back to the days where one buyer of whom we may not have full facts and full information, or indeed have full trust in, should be allowed to make the kinds of arrangements that could in the long term, be detrimental to our fishermen but I'm suggesting, Sir, that we could use our central selling desk concept in this area. I suggest that the Board has demonstrated a woeful lack of flexibility in dealing with these people and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that markets are going for the wanting while our fish, in many instance, are not being fished or are in fact rotting on the ice of our lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I use this occasion to bring this matter to attention of the Honourable Minister with the hope, with the sincere hope, that he will in the next few days, particularly in his meetings with these people from Saskatchewan consider the seriousness of this nature and recognize that something very worthwhile, you know, may be going down the drain unless some corrective steps are taken at this particular time. And I would ask the Minister to use every imagination possible in recognizing the need for restructuring, for reorganizing and for rethinking our co-operation and our participation in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I think we should thank the honourable member for expanding on the speech he gave during the Estimates of the Minister of Renewable Resources for the benefit of the House and not only repeating his comments there but repeating some of mine and some of the Minister of Resources comments at that particular time.

Basically, though, Mr. Speaker, what the member has recommended to the House this afternoon is basically what the Minister of Renewable Resources has been pursuing. The member was quite correct when he indicated that the legislation setting up the Fish Marketing Corporation and the involvement of the province in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was drafted when he was the Minister of Resources, brought forward by ourselves when we became the government and I remember the honourable member getting very upset when we attempted to claim credit for that legislation. And he got very upset and said, "That's my legislation. It was drafted when I was in office and you people are just bringing it forward." And I don't think the member disagrees with that or would have any argument with that particular statement.

One problem, though, with the member's comments, he said that certainly it's not correct to use

the fact that it's a federal agency and a federal board which we have one representation on, as an excuse, but I would submit that neither is it quite fair to make comments that appear to put the blame on the Province of Manitoba fully for the functioning of that board and the fact that their reports have not been made available at this time, and their management and their reporting is not what it should be.

When the legislation was brought forward in terms of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation there was certain serious problems within the fishing industry. The province agreed that action should be taken and I don't think there was any disagreement between either side of the House on the establishment of the corporation but I guess on hindsight the honourable member is saying — and I'm a little bit concerned here because I agree with him on quite a few of the points he made and that doesn't always make me feel comfortable, to agree with the Member for Lakeside — but the authority we gave over to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has not been used in the manner that we feel has been most beneficial to the fishermen of Manitoba.

And I suppose that one of the problems has been the setting up of a very large plant to process fish with a high capital input into that plant and with the unwillingness of the federal authorities to write off some of the capital of that plant so that in fact the cost of the capital and the high cost of processing comes out of the pockets of the fishermen in Manitoba. And this is a fairly serious mistake but again we're looking back on it, at a mistake that somebody else has made. In hindsight, I think that governments and industry are learning that sometimes it's not the best to go with a big plant, with a big processing, with centralized facilities, but to go with smaller facilities and decentralized facilities. And that is the direction, certainly, that we have been attempting to move in in economic development in the north through a number of departments, to get away from huge processing to small processing in areas where in fact there is highest unemployment, so people can take advantage of those opportunities.

So, Mr. Chairman, I can't disagree with the member because in those days, not being a Cabinet Minister, I was able to go out in a protest march and protest against the moving of the Selkirk plant from Selkirk to Transcona, from a smaller plant to a very large and very elaborate plant. But I don't think that there is a disagreement that there has to be some co-ordination and some central marketing. There doesn't necessarily have to be central processing but there has to be some form of central marketing to protect the best interests of the fishermen.

When the corporation came about those fishermen had organized themselves into co-operatives. They had organized themselves into co-operatives with advice and assistance from the previous government and their co-operative development branch. Some of those were successful and some of those failed although a big issue wasn't made of the failures because it was understood that some of those, in fact, would fail. But those fishermen that had organized themselves into co-operatives, and into successful co-operatives, had some protection in the marketplace. They were getting fairly reasonable returns on their fish. Those fishermen that had not organized themselves into co-operatives, that were still completely dependent upon private fish companies and private fish buyers, were in an extremely difficult situation and the fishery was in very serious trouble.

So the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation didn't benefit the co-ops, people organized into co-ops, as much as it benefited the fishermen who were unorganized at that time.

The member made reference to the utilization of experts in the fish business and I think that there is some merit in that suggestion. But I can recall when the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was set up and the independent fish buyer at The Pas was appointed as an agent for the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, I got calls from all the fishermen in my constituency saying, "Why is that such-and-such-and-such being appointed in this new corporation when he's the one that's been using us all these years, and taking advantage of us all these years?" And there was a very strong reaction to the use of those people. Now I'm not critical of the fish buyers or the fish companies at that time because they are in a very very tough and competitive industry and the only way they can make a buck was off the back of the fishermen and that's how they made a buck. So in order to survive they had to operate in a certain manner and that's the manner that they operated in. As a matter of fact, the corporation has hired the individual I got all the calls from, again, and he's now a regular employee of theirs so they have that expertise.

There's a little bit of difference now that the expertise or the fish buyers or those that used to operate in the past, are now a little bit more controlled and a little bit more affected by the fishermen. That is the fishermen are a little bit more on top and the old-timers are a little bit more in a professional role but not in a controlling role, in an advisory role, in a technical role, but not in a controlling role over the fishermen. So that is, I think, a fairly positive thing, that these people can be used as long as they're on tap for the fishermen but not on top of the fishermen. Not in control of what the fishermen do.

The member made mention also of the transportation and that transportation costs have increased very greatly. And this is one of the serious problems. The fish prices haven't increased very greatly; the transportation costs have increased very greatly. I think that in the last five years, for

example, air fare has gone up something like eighty percent, if I can recall the figures, in the transportation of fish. And another federal Crown corporation is also part of the problem. The Canadian National Railway and the way they function in hauling fish, the manner in which they deal with the fish-haul, has been a detriment to the fishing industry in northern Manitoba. And that other Crown company should also be brought to task and pressure put on them to deal in a more appropriate way with the fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we appreciate the repeat of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his comments. I know that he would have to be the one to comment because I don't think the Leader of the Opposition knows very much about the fisheries industry or about northern Manitoba in general

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McBRYDE: . . . but the Honourable Member for Lakeside, in his previous capacity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McBRYDE: . . . has some understanding of that situation and I'm sure that the Minister of Resources appreciates the advice and suggestions from the experienced Member from Lakeside who has recommended a number of things that the Minister of Resources is already in the process of doing, and I'm sure that the Minister of Resources welcomes the opportunity to explain what he is doing to fight on behalf of the fishermen of Manitoba so that they have the opportunity to earn a decent living, to be productive, and to feed and look after their families. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief for two reasons: one, I'm just recovering from the flu; the second, the honourable member has heard my opinions on this matter more than once, I believe, as well as other members of the House.

We had a rather lengthy debate within my Estimates on this particular topic, at which time I expressed some of the things that we are doing, indicating that we have been holding meetings regularly over the last couple of years. In fact, within two months of being appointed Minister responsible for fisheries in Manitoba, I had contacted the Ministers of the Federal Government that would have anything to do with fisheries, including the Minister of Indian Affairs, the Minister of Fisheries, the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc. And in my meetings with them, within that first two months, I outlined all the things I saw at that time as being the problems associated with the operation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

I must say to date that we've had a number of meetings since, a number of presentations both by myself, individually, and jointly with the Minister from Saskatchewan who is also concerned about the operation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. And to date, Mr. Speaker, we have not had a great deal of success in getting reaction, decision by the Federal Ministers to assist the fishermen of Manitoba to improve their lot. We argued and negotiated for months to try to get them to agree on a transportation subsidy for northern Manitoba fish and finally we had to go on our own in this area even though it is clearly understood, and I believe clearly accepted by all members of this House, that the Federal Government definitely has a responsibility in this area, and should be indeed assisting the fishermen of Manitoba. However, Mr. Speaker, we saw a gap there that had to be filled and we had to step in to fill that gap to help the fishermen of northern Manitoba be able to continue to make a living from that industry.

We have made a number of other representations, some of which were to satisfy problems that Saskatchewan had and those that were joint problems that Saskatchewan and Manitoba felt should be rectified. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe either province is satisfied with the way the organization is structured. The board of directors is not that representative in the way it is appointed of the fishermen and the producing provinces. Manitoba for example only has one director on the board and, Mr. Speaker, we have made representation that there should be more directors on the board representing Manitoba. We hope that having more directors on the board, that this would assist in getting a better voice in the operation of that company.

Mr. Speaker specifically on this the Minister from Saskatchewan and myself came together on a proposal last year to the federal Minister in which we recommended that the board composition be as follows:

That five fishermen-directors be elected on the basis of production representation. This would give Manitoba two to three directors on the board alone.

There would be according to our recommendation only five federal appointees, whereas now, Mr. Speaker, they are all appointed federally — even our appointee to the board is only nominated by the Government of Manitoba and is then named or appointed by the federal Cabinet.

The third recommendation we made is that there be five provincial appointees on the basis of financial accountability. And, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba according to the agreement with the Federal Government in 1969 — which was signed, I believe, by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and certainly promoted by his party before their defeat — our present agreement only allows us one

director on the board, as I said. This would give us, with five provincial appointees on the basis of financial accountability, two to three directors in addition to the two or three that would be elected by the fishermen themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, this would greatly improve Manitoba's representation on this board which I believe at the present time is lacking because we only have the one member and his opportunity on the board to push the policies and the programs that the Provincial Government wants him to pursue is very limited.

In the area of assisting the fishermen directly, Mr. Chairman, we made a number of proposals to the Federal Government, almost all of which were not even considered to date. For example as I already mentioned, we made a proposal on behalf of the fishermen for transportation assistance. This was rejected so we went on our own on that one. We also asked for a cost-shared program. This was also supported by the Government of Saskatchewan. We asked for a cost sharing, federal-provincial, with the provinces all participating on a program of price stabilization which would be a temporary thing until we got the corporation back on track and to give that credibility back to the fish prices and the fish markets so that the fishermen could get out and fish and feel comfortable about being a fisherman again.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the need for improvements to capital facilities in all of the lakeside stations and in all of the lakes of northern Manitoba and remote areas, we also proposed that we have a program of capital improvement, of fish-handling facilities that would be cost-shared, federal-provincial, with the provinces participating with the Federal Government. This also to date has not been accepted by the Federal Government.

We asked for a program, Mr. Speaker, just as the honourable member said he had hoped, the corporation when it first was started, one of the hopes was that it would really market the rough species of fish. Naturally as the honourable member indicates, it is not that difficult to market those varieties of fish that are high quality, high in demand by the public, high in demand by the export sales, but it is very difficult to market our less desirable species. Mr. Speaker, we had said that the promotion and marketing of these species must not necessarily come, in fact should not come, from the pockets of the fishermen who are primarily fishing the high quality species. They need not necessarily pay the cost of marketing the lower-priced and lower-quality species. We propose, Mr. Speaker, that this should be the responsibility of the Provincial and the Federal Governments.

We proposed, and I had concurrence on this from our government, to cost-share on a program of product development and promotion, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister from Saskatchewan was in agreement with me on this and we made this proposal to the Federal Government. And this is another one which has not been accepted to date.

We also proposed to the Federal Government that they write off the outstanding depreciation and interest charges on the Transcona plant. The Transcona plant at the present time is a total debt to the fishermen within the area of the corporation. They must pay that back under their existing arrangement. And Mr. Speaker, we make the case that this debt should be written off, the fishermen should no longer be burdened with the debt of the Transcona plant, that it is too onerous a debt, given the fish prices as they presently stand. The net incomes of the fishermen have been declining steadily since the corporation has been established. The fishermen of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, their net incomes after taking off their expenses have been declining. They have not been increasing. And Mr. Speaker, part of this is the fact that they are paying off a debt which is the huge plant in Transcona which comes off every pound of fish that is harvested within the corporation area.

We are presently negotiating on all these points that I just mentioned with the Federal Government. I am meeting with the Minister from Saskatchewan next Monday. The Honourable Member for Lakeside had asked me earlier today when I would be meeting with the Minister from Saskatchewan, and I just checked with my office after the Question Period and a meeting has been arranged for Monday next. Mr. Speaker, we will be coming together with a common position on these points and others to present as soon as possible to the federal authorities responsible.

And Mr. Speaker, I concur with the honourable member that there is a danger here of the corporation losing its credibility with the fishermen and we must act quickly and we are going to be pressing this point home to the Federal Government that they act with haste as well and try to come to a reasonable solution to the problems facing the fishermen. And it will take some funds, Mr. Speaker, it will take spending on the part of both Federal and Provincial Governments to assist solving many of the problems that are facing the fishermen today. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly expect and appreciate the support of all members of the House in my fight to help the fishermen of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments in response to what the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Renewable Resources have been saying. It seemed to me the tenor of their remarks, the impression they created, at least in my mind, is that at all costs we must save the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and to heck with the fishermen. It is the corporation and the concept of so-called orderly marketing that is important,

rather than the fishermen themselves.

I suppose that that is to a large extent the reason why the corporation is in difficulty because they have refused to recognize some of the changes that have taken place and they refused to recognize one very point at the outset. And I recall during the course of the debate on the setting up of the corporation, when I suggested that rather than confiscating or expropriating or whatever they did to all the fish processing plants along the lakes, located in strategic areas which would have obviated the necessity of high transportation costs, that they follow the example of the Wheat Board and simply license those plants to act on behalf of the corporation.

I think that if that policy had been pursued at that time — and I don't say that just because I made the suggestion — but if that policy had been pursued at that time, they would not have had that tremendous white elephant sitting over there in Transcona, that plant that the Minister suggests is eating up all of the profits of the fishermen, there is no question about that.

I recall last year asking the Minister during the course of the consideration of his Estimates why it was that fishermen were getting 60 cents a pound, I believe it was, for pickerel fillets at that time, and they were retailing over the counters for something like \$2.50 at that time. I believe that today that they are much more than that. And his answer was a classic. His answer gave us some insight into what the Minister of Agriculture had been contemplating for the dairy farmers. He said that it was because of the high capital costs at the plant of Transcona that had to be paid by the fishermen that the corporation were not able to pay them more for their products and sell at a lower cost.

Well, I drew a picture for the Minister at that time in which I reminded him that had the Minister of Agriculture had his way with the crocus plants, it would not have been inconceivable that in four or five years' time the same question could be asked in the Minister of Agriculture's Estimates as to why it was that the farmers were getting perhaps \$5.00 a hundred for their milk and it was retailing over the counter for over \$1.00 a quart. He gave the answer to the reasons why the dairy farmers and the opposition in the House were so opposed to the construction of that plant. But that is the kind of folly that we get into from time to time when you are wedded to a dogma and the theory here being that orderly marketing is the marketing of a product through one desk. That to me is the most disorderly kind of marketing that you could possibly imagine and because the present government are wedded to that kind of philosophy of marketing, there is no hope that the situation in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is going to improve to any great extent.

The Minister apparently takes a great deal of satisfaction from simply saying, "Well, we are making representations to Ottawa on this and that and the other thing" and that the fact that they are making representations on behalf of the fishermen of this province, that that is sufficient.

We have had enough experience in this province to know that anything that is dominated by the Federal Government is not likely to be acting in the best interests of western Canada. We have had too many experiences to believe that a corporation run by the Feds is going to have any great interest in making any improvements that will be done to the benefit of the fishermen in this province.

Oddly enough the people of Ontario have opted out of the plan for very good reasons, for the very reasons that a good many fishermen in this province are talking about doing the same thing.

I suppose that we can talk about the mess that the fishermen are in as a result of this concept of the marketing of fish — not a great deal is going to be done about it because the plant is there. I agree that if there is a possible chance of getting the cost of that thing written off, it might be a tremendous help to the fishermen. That may be one avenue but I don't hold up much hope that the Federal Government is going to agree to do that sort of thing, unless of course the Minister strategically applies the pressure to the government about the time that there is an election booming on the horizon, a federal election that is. That may be one way of making sure that at least they will listen to you and at least they will make promises which they probably will not keep.

But it does seem to me that increased representation on that board is not going to solve that problem. Mere bodies on the board in numbers is not going to change the fact that the big difficulty that lies in our inability to market fish for the fishermen at a profit to the fishermen is the fact that they are burdened with the capitalization cost of the plant itself and until that problem can successfully be resolved there isn't, I don't think, much hope that a great deal can be done.

The Minister also mentioned that there was a problem in the marketing of the rough species of fish that were taken out of the lakes and I find that a little bit difficult to understand. In these days where we know that there is a considerable amount of research being done, that the researchers have been unable to come up with the processing or the development of a product that is and can be readily saleable and indeed eagerly sought after by customers. I find that very difficult to understand. I wonder what they are doing over there in the way of research if they are not working on that particular problem. It seems to me, and I don't know whether the present government or the Minister has brought to the attention of our researchers the necessity of attempting to come out with some produce that is saleable. I say that if the Minister hasn't, then I suggest he should. And if he has, then I suggest that he should keep after them because apparently the kind of research that is being done is

not materially assisting in the marketing of the rough species of fish because if that had been done, the problem would not exist at the present time.

I sympathize with the Minister and the problem that he has inherited but I do invite him to take advantage of the suggestion that was proffered by the Member for Lakeside. The entrepreneurship of the private individual who — I hate to even mention this — who might want to get a bit of profit out of marketing that product or doing something with it may be the best way of solving the problem, that the government is not too high-bound in their determination to prevent people from making profit, then I think that there is an avenue that could be found to help the fishermen of this province.

I hope the Minister will take the suggestions that have been made, not only by myself but the Member for Lakeside, to heart because this is a problem and the answers to which must be sought. We believe that a departure from the rigid concept of marketing by the government only could be tried out to see if it would work, to see if success can be achieved. I am convinced that, given an opportunity for some material gain — which again is something that I hate to mention to this government — might be the answer to the problems of the fishermen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance will be closing debate.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank meers for expediting the moving of this bill and just for the record, when it was first introduced there was a question about the arithmetic and the figures that were shown on the bill, were they right or wrong. I believe that the Member for Riel will now agree with me that the figures were indeed right, it was simply a question of 25 percent of what, and I think he concurs that in fact it is 25 percent of the total of the Main Estimates less the Statutory Appropriation which is not voted upon, and therefore the amount of \$275,737 is correct and does indeed represent 25 percent.

That's the only comments, Mr. Speaker, and with that I hope the bill can now, with leave, perhaps get Third and final reading.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Health, by leave, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider and report on the following bill for Third Reading: Bill No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1978.

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

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the Committee to proceed with the bill? (Agreed) (Bill 23 was read and passed.) Bill be reported.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker, and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 23 was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 26, the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 29) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE SNOWMOBILE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 29, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed this piece of legislation that is before us of certain amendments to The Snowmobile Act and certainly have no basic problems with the new legislation and the amendments to the Act.

The snowmobiles are certainly filling a very useful role in our society today, especially amongst the people in the far north. I think it is our duty as legislators to make sure that all possible ways and means are supplied to them to solve some of their transportation needs at this time.

Monday, March 28, 1977

The only one concern that I would have with the legislation, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to the problems of snowmobiles running down wildlife in certain areas of the province, when we start to relax the legislation that we have had on our records and has achieved such a high rating across Canada where Manitoba is considered to be, if not the best, one of the leading provinces in the legislation regarding snowmobiles. And the reason that I bring this to the Minister's attention is the fact that British Columbia has seen fit already to ban certain areas from snowmobiles completely in that province due to the fact that those that are using them basically for recreational purposes are running down wildlife and destroying it in its natural habitat. A lot of people, especially young people with snowmobiles, think maybe the fun thing to do is to chase a fox or rabbit with a skidoo until it lies exhausted but it certainly is not fun for those who are conservationists and those who believe in the wildlife, that it has a place in our society.

So, with those few remarks, I congratulate the Minister on the legislation and we look forward to seeing it in Committee and maybe some amendments there would be worth considering regarding the controls on certain areas, hunting areas, for skidoos with our wildlife.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for Corrections and Rehabilitation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
ESTIMATES - CORRECTIONS

CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital): We have a quorum gentlemen, the committee will come to order. I refer honourable members to Page 33 in their Estimates Book, the Department of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, Resolution 64(c) Probation and Parole Services, (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the first order of business is that possibly the Minister might give us some clarification as to the news reports on Friday's meeting. They were conflicting to say the least, and I think if he could give us a complete understanding so that it can be properly reported to the press, this horrible mess that we find ourselves in, it would be well worthwhile at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if that discussion might not better take place under the next section, Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders, section (d). Resolution 64(1). The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister would care to give us an explanation, there is a lot of money involved here, a larger staff and what they are all doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: One of the reasons why we, perhaps, are in this position was that we didn't want to pass too much until the Member for Swan River was here. I gave out two pieces of information, one was kind of a synopsis of the programs that are offered within the whole ministry and another one had some figures that I received from Stats Canada on March 14th as they reflect what they see as the crime rate in the City of Winnipeg relative to juveniles. Now that particular piece of information was picked up as if I had released it, they were my figures, which they are not. But the item itself is the next item. If the member has some specific questions relative to probation and parole and the rest, we can perhaps address ourselves to those, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his kind remarks but what I'm concerned about at the moment is what are we going to be spending \$2,398,000 on in the way of Salaries? Where is that?

MR. BOYCE: In this book, not this book but this whatever you would call it, a report, from Page 10 on it shows you where the different staff are deployed. You will see that last year the complement was 164 staff man years and it's the same for the next fiscal year, there is no increase in staff. The increase in dollars is largely because of the negotiated agreement with the MGEA. But as I mentioned on Friday, one of the reasons why the Director of Probations has been successful in containing his staff at this level, at the same time improving the service, is by initiating programs and I enunciated those programs including voluntary probation officers in the community and with community correction committees. There are 50 voluntary probation officers and 100 volunteers operating in probations in the province of Manitoba. The people who have been located in the communities who can be of assistance rather than, for example, fly-in people in remote communities.

MR. BILTON: Are they paid out of this item?

MR. BOYCE: Some of them are paid an honorarium of \$20.00, yes.

MR. BILTON: Well the thing that concerns me, Mr. Minister, is that I'm just wondering if that figure isn't just out of line? Here we're spending over \$2,000,000 in salaries and Other Expenditures is only \$466,000.00. Are you satisfied that this sort of expenditure is doing the job that should be done and if you are satisfied, why are we in the mess we're in today, as reported by this statistical set-up we've got here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well, once again I wouldn't place too much credence on that statistical set-up that you have there. We'll go into the details and there's virtual agreement between the figures that the City of Winnipeg police have and our staff have. But you will notice that every expenditure that's relative to the operation of the staff, the programs that I just referred to have increased from \$926,000 to \$1,300,000 so there actually has been an increase in the amount of money available to deal with voluntary probation services in the community and, hopefully, the Director will be able to implement more community probations in the next fiscal year.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would remind the honourable member that he should direct his remarks to the Chair and not directly to the Minister. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I just said Mr. Chairman, prior to your remarks. I think I know my place in this committee without being prompted by yourself. But at the same time, I have read this, Mr. Minister, over the weekend. Mr. Chairman. I beg your pardon. And this is academically set up and written as

though someone was somebody was writing a book. It tells us nothing at all as to exactly what you're doing. You're planning, you're planning, you're planning and all the time you're — you told us this last year — and all the time you're planning, look what we've got here. When is your planning going to end and when are we going to get some action for the money that's being spent?

MR. BOYCE: Well we're not only planning. Yes, last year I told you we were planning and during the year we did it. We did an awful lot of things. For example, in the City of Winnipeg just two weeks ago we finalized a lease at 303 Kennedy Street which will be able to provide 24 hour services as I suggested we would be doing. The Director has given me a list and advises that some of the things that we are doing, not just talking about, is family therapy and, of course, in trying to . . . I would much rather deal in lay terms too. I agree with the Member for Swan River.

When you talk about family therapy, that's, you know, kind of out of a textbook perhaps, but it's dealing with families who have youngsters in difficulty. Under the Probation Act, probation officers can deal with the total family. They are trying to help people who, for some reason or other, haven't developed the skill or the employable, you know, usable tools for employment, they call it lay skills. It seems strange in this day and age that with education being so accessible, there's still a goodly number of people haven't got even a completed junior high school and they have no academic training and they have no trade training. So this has been initiated. They deal with the individual in trying to get them to participate in society, if you will.

One of the things that has been worked out pretty well as far as the details are concerned, is a community restitution program. There was some attention given that recently in the press as far as what they are doing in Winnipeg in the schools. There's community work activities that are done also through probation and then, of course, the other services that are performed by this particular group are bail supervision and parole supervision. So, you know, these things are now being done, they're not just talked about. There are some things that we contemplate hopefully being able to do next year. Some of it though is in the area that will not be resolved until we know with more definiteness as to what direction the Federal Government intends to take with young people in conflict with the law. The Associate Deputy Minister just returned from a meeting of Deputy Ministers in Regina and he advises that it is the intention of the Federal Government to introduce this legislation in the fall. In the meantime they want to once again go back to the community to talk to the provincial jurisdictions and other interested groups in the community as to what direction it should take.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I believe the Minister mentioned a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, that the number of staff . . . I didn't catch it but there is an increase of \$300,000, that's added staff is it to what you had last year?

MR. BOYCE: No, no, 164 staff last year, 164 staff this year. The increase in dollars is relative to the negotiated agreement with the Manitoba Government Employees Association.

MR. BILTON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I too examined last year's Estimates and the talks on it and there was a lot of emphasis on planning and I'm still not clear as, when he talked about planning and accomplishments in the coming year, he mentioned something about 303 Kennedy as a step forward. I wondered if he had done any consideration to an educational process indicating to some of the young offenders . . . that we look at the justice system and try to explain to them what justice is because I can't help but feel that a lot of them, when they shoplift from someplace like Eaton's or The Bay, think that they are getting even with the "haves" of society, whereas if it was explained to them that really what happens is large businesses that they shoplift from really don't lose any money. They are really taking advantage and ripping off everyone because what happens is they simply take the million dollars they lose for shoplifting and add it on to the cost of the products and so, therefore, we all are paying for distrust. I think so many of the younger people that I've talked to seem to have this chip on their shoulder that they're getting even with somebody by shoplifting from these major department stores, when really they're costing all of us money and I think the word justice because so many times you see the parents come into court, "Oh where did I go wrong?" and we all know it's more complex than that. But when you start to talk to these young guys and girls, of course, they have a wrong educational thrust as to what is justice. It would seem to me that if it was explained to them that they're ripping off all of us and not the big department store by their antics then we would be a lot better off.

I just want to generalize on one more thought along this vein. It also occurred to me that when, and I guess we're not supposed to talk about those figures in this section, but the Minister did give us this report and when we get to that section I would like to ask him whose paper this was on and who was it prepared by? I realize they're government figures, but somebody had to put this together. Was it somebody in his department?

Also the Minister had mentioned that the figure, up to the end of 1976, was far worse than the 7,900 it was approximately 13,000 or 14,000 I believe. I'll have to check Hansard and see if that was correct.

Monday, March 28, 1977

But when I started checking into my area that I represent, which is probably one of the areas that has a very large juvenile crime rate, it was found there isn't one program that government has to support drop-in centres or something for the kids to do and everyone of them you talk to says, Winnipeg has nothing to do. Winnipeg is dead for juveniles. And when you start to examine it, at one time we used to have — and we're talking about a concept — at one time we used to have drop-in centres in our schools, they ran out of funds, they're closed. Why doesn't this Minister approach the Minister in charge of lotteries and say, drop-in centres, recreation for the youth is recreation, we should have some of these programs supported by the lottery fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with Rule 19(2) I'm interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour and will return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

ESTIMATES - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins(Logan): I refer members to Page 34 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 65, line four, Medical Program, \$86,540,000.00. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I wonder if the Minister can tell us what the Harry Medovy Residence near the Children's Hospital will be used as. I understand the resident interns who reside in this residence so that they can be on call around the clock at the Children's Hospital have been given 30 days notice to vacate these premises.

I have another question dealing with the optometric services. It seems to me that this government has not negotiated with optometrists for quite some time. It is getting to be exceedingly difficult to attract optometrists into the rural area. For instance, in British Columbia, optometrists are receiving \$18.00 per service, this was established on January 1st, 1976; Saskatchewan optometrists are receiving \$16.75 established January 1st, 1977 and \$17.75 as of January 1st, 1978; Alberta they are receiving \$26.50 January 1st, 1976; Ontario \$17.00 May 1st, 1976; and Manitoba is only at \$10.00 and this was established April 1st, 1971. I am wondering if the Minister has given any thought to negotiating with the optometrists. As I say, it is getting exceedingly difficult to attract optometrists into the rural areas because they want to remain in areas where there is a very large demand for their services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 65, line four, the Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Harry Medovy building, for the people on call, they will still have the fifth floor, the last floor of that building, while they are on call, to live there. So there are no problems at all. It will be going on for awhile, there are some people living there and arrangements were made with the Health Sciences Centre and that is their responsibility but there doesn't seem to be a problem at all.

The optometrists, what my honourable friend says is true, there has been a problem with the optometrists and I think most of the provinces have the same problem. It would appear that they changed their fees and they are actually, in fact, extra billing. It comes to the same amount of extra billing because things are not covered. This is being discussed and I was directed by Cabinet to bring in a proposal and it might be that we will have to make some changes to protect the public in this and also to pay a fair amount of fees to the optometrists.

MR. BROWN: I don't know if I understood the Minister correctly. Did he say that there was only going to be one floor that was going to be occupied at the Harry Medovy? Could he tell us what this floor was going to be used for?

MR. DESJARDINS: It is for the people while they are on duty. It is a living quarter, it will not be their permanent residence but pretty well the way it is used now. It is for the people while they are on duty, that they could stay there and there will be beds I imagine and so on and this is what is going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 65, line four—pass; 65, line five, Pharmacare \$5 million—pass; line six, Ambulance Program \$1,319,000—pass? The Honourable Member for inland.

MR. BROWN: I wonder if the Minister can explain this expenditure. There seems to be no increase and I wonder if this means that there is going to be a cutback in services because certainly the cost of service is increasing.

Another question that I would like to ask the Minister: Are patients covered under Medicare when they have to be transferred from one hospital to another or from a hospital to a personal care home, or *vice versa*?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend should remember that this has nothing to do with the PAT, with the northern ambulance, we've covered that. This is a per capita grant to the municipality; it is not picking up any deficit or any budget. It is an arrangement that we made, it was fairly liberal, fairly generous at first, to allow these people to get going. They were allowed to purchase a vehicle, to use it for a communications system and they pretty well use it the way they wish. Some municipalities can take the funds to cover — it is not under Medicare — but to cover transportation from one hospital to the other, but that is up to the municipality or the district. It is strictly a per capita grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 65, line six—pass; 65, line 7, Other Health Services Programs \$150,000.00. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I wonder if the Minister could explain the \$150,000 for other services.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, there was a certain amount of money last year for the proposed pilot project at the Youville Foundation, that is with the Grey Nuns involving hospitals in that area, especially the personal care beds. No program has been approved yet, there has been a delay because the program wasn't advanced enough. There has been some delay on the part of the nuns

and also government and this will be re-opened, nothing is being done for the time being, and in a few months this will be re-opened again and this will be to develop the program, there will be \$150,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Line six—pass; Resolution 65: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$224,840,000 for Health and Social Development—pass.

I would now refer honourable members to Page 27, Resolution 58(a) Ministerial, the Minister's Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we have spent almost two weeks examining the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development and the time has come to move to other departments if we are to examine all of them. The Minister of Health has answered many questions and on many occasions we have been in agreement with his answers. In the past eight years we have seen many universal and comprehensive health care programs which has created a demand and which this government, or any government for that matter, would find impossible to fulfill.

The present Minister has inherited a nightmare from his predecessors and their advisors. I doubt very much whether he will get the support from the present government to bring some control into a program, the cost of which is absorbing a greater portion of the entire Budget every year. In 1969 the total Budget of this department was \$82,226,946.73; in 1970, the first year of an NDP government, this rose to \$109,021,999.42; 1971 saw further increase to \$146,907,000; in 1972 there was a further increase to \$172,812,770.00. By this time the department had more than doubled, and the rate of inflation was low those years. Since then the costs have skyrocketed to where we now have a budget of \$430,026,800, and this does not include this year's supplementary Estimates.

In 1969, we did not have a long waiting list of elective surgery. Health care was excellent and all the provinces of Canada were envious of the health care delivery system in Manitoba, a delivery system in which the providers of health care played an extremely important role.

Prior to this government taking over we had sufficient acute care beds and an orderly flow of patients to alternate care facilities. Seventy percent of personal care patients were covered by government assistance. In the eight years of the NDP Government they have spent a total of \$2,286,838,396, and what do we have for this two and a quarter billion dollars, Mr. Chairman? We have Personal Care Home Program almost completely subsidized by the government, but no beds. We have a similar subsidized Nursing Home Program, but no beds. We have free Medicare Program — the pride of the NDP Government — but no beds. Hospitals are jammed with elderly patients awaiting appropriate care. Patients in their acute bed hospitals are occupying enough beds to create two or three acute hospitals. And what is your answer, Mr. Minister? The answer seems to be to build another extensive acute care bed hospital. Everything is free, Mr. Chairman, free, but nothing is available.

This government seems to be following closely what other socialistic countries have done in health care, and special favourites seem to be Sweden and Great Britain. Where are these countries now? Socialized medicine and socialized policies have brought these countries into serious fiscal difficulties. Proof positive that governments cannot be everything to everybody. Sweden, Great Britain and Manitoba have all experienced grave battles with the chief providers of health care, the medical doctors, because of interference in the health care delivery system by bureaucrats. Bureaucrats have disrupted the orderly flow between various health facilities creating huge backlogs of elective surgery and long waiting lists for nursing homes and other facilities.

We are more than pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister finally has decided to provide a place for children in need of psychiatric treatment. This is long overdue, and a former Minister of Health under the Conservative Government told me that they had set aside \$4 million for a hospital for mentally disturbed children and we are pleased indeed that this is about to materialize.

There seems to be no provision, however, for adolescents who have come into conflict with the law and who need psychiatric care. This poses a grave problem for our judges who find there is no place where they can recommend treatment for these adolescents. The whole field of psychiatric care seems to have had a very low priority with this government. If this were not so, then why would the Selkirk Mental Hospital lose its accreditation; a mental hospital that once was acclaimed as one of the best in the country, a hospital in which many a psychiatrist received his training. There seems to be a serious deficiency in this field.

It was a great disappointment, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister could not answer the questions that I asked on community clinics. We have eleven community clinics in Manitoba, and it is obvious that the Minister has never evaluated them. I know the Minister inherited these from his predecessors, but he stated that he would give consideration to more clinics of this type if he was asked to do so. This, Mr. Chairman, without any evaluation. Other provinces who tried this concept have phased out community clinics because the cost does not justify their existence.

Saskatchewan had twenty-six and then phased out all of these except for two. Why do we insist on continuing programs that obviously are not practical and do not justify the expenditure? because this government, rather than acknowledging mistakes, continues impractical programs?

The Minister stated that there was a 19 percent increase in senior citizens over the age of 65 in the

last ten years. He also stated by the year 2000 one in five persons would be over the age of 65 in Manitoba. This poses some very serious problems and requires long range planning immediately.

We know that many of the problems we have today are because of a lack of housing for senior citizens. The Minister talked of enriched senior citizens' homes and I agree there is a great necessity for this. I hope that immediate attention will be given to this problem and a long range program developed. If we do not proceed with creating more housing and alternate facilities, then our problems will rapidly worsen. That is, free comprehensive universal medicine and person care programs with absolutely no space available.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was bracing myself for quite a rebuttal of criticism of my Estimates. I'm disappointed in a way because I don't think my honourable friend paid attention while we were going through the Estimates, either that or somebody gave him some notes that he had prepared before the Estimates and even though we've covered that in the Estimates he decided that he would make his final speech anyway.

Now, my honourable friend seemed to be criticizing the amount of money that we spend but I don't know, all through my Estimates the members of his party and himself have never criticized one program — that has been a change — but not one program that we should abandon, not one. It was more this, more this, even in day care. It was more of everything. There is not one that my honourable friend stood up — or anybody across — and said, "Don't have that program." Well, Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be serious criticism of a department of the money spent, I think that the least that the party could do, the critic of the Estimates should point out and say, "This you shouldn't do," and this wasn't done.

Now I will not accept again these general statements as my honourable friend so often wishes to make. I've challenged him on another occasion before and I'll challenge him again. He has said there was personal care, no beds. That is a ridiculous statement. There is over 7,000 beds. I explained to my honourable friend, I gave him the figure that there were more personal care beds here than in Alberta and Ontario. I have told him that. I have also announced last year a five-year program for the beds — that will put another 700 beds or so. I've told him that. I've told him that we are negotiating and we might have more facilities at Deer Lodge. He knows that, he supported me in that, and he's saying that there's no beds.

I also stated that, yes, there were some people in the hospitals that were in acute beds that could be in personal care beds. I admitted that last year, and I could not build a bed from one day to the next. I'm saying that this is not new. I'm saying that . . . I have clippings that I can bring and show my honourable friend that the same thing, the same speech, you could make it every year, and it's a good thing you can make that speech, because the minute that you stop making the speech it means you have no control, it means that you are spending all kinds of money, there is no breaks, nothing, and it means that some people will generate more revenue by probably putting more people through there.

I am not saying that we could not use more beds, and I'm doing everything possible to do that, and my honourable friend knows. I told him last year what should be done. But just two years ago my same friends were saying there were not enough acute beds. And my honourable friend, if he's going to be honest, has got to remember that the way this was practically imposed on us because of the costsharing formula with Ottawa. The cost-sharing was only on acute beds. My honourable friend must remember that in a province where the Conservatives form the government, in Ontario, the Minister had to go around and close beds — and they haven't got more beds than us — close beds. So I'm saying if my honourable friend agrees with me, let him say it. I know that there are many areas that I was fairly weak, that we haven't been doing enough, and we tried to rectify it. We've announced what we're going to do and try to do and so on, but that should be recognized. I'll be the first one to admit that, and I would like to receive some constructive criticism. But this is not constructive criticism and not as strongly — I guess he's afraid that I'm going to challenge again — but this question seemed to insinuate there has been interference in the health field, and that I say is poppycock. That is not true again. I repeat, again, this is not the case at all. There is more — I repeat more — discussion and dialoguing with people in paramedical and in the medical profession and the nursing profession than ever before, in many times more, many times more. Well, you might not believe it but you don't take the trouble of finding out, because I could substantiate that. I can give you all the facts.

It is true that at certain times . . . there is a strike going on in Transcona, the people are not very happy with that. There has been other areas, and when the fee schedule came up last year there was some difficulty and there was difficulty with the bus drivers, and there was difficulty with a lot of people, and that's the only place when we were talking about fees. And it's bound to be. There has always been that fear of what will happen, because that is what the government wants. I've repeated many times certain statement of what I felt, the relationship of the medical profession and other professions, and I tried to make it quite clear that there was no idea of trying to control them at all.

Now the clinics, my honourable friend is very disappointed because I could not tell him how much was spent in the clinic. I can tell him, I can give him the budget of the clinic, I've offered that, I gave

him that, but that's not what he wants. He wants to make a comparison. Well, if we want to make a comparison we would have to take the private clinic also and make a comparison; and my honourable friend has not seen — I think he's seen one clinic and he's making statements like an expert — the least he could do is go and see a few of those clinics. Does he know what it's all about? Does he want me to close the Churchill clinic? Would you like me to close that Churchill clinic? No. Would you like me to close it? — (Interjection)— All right, but you made a statement that we should close. . . . Would you want me to close the Churchill clinic? The Leaf Rapids clinic? Now how can you find out what the cost is, if they weren't there, what would you do if they have no facilities like Lac du Bonnet and so on. These people would have to be transferred here. That is where we had problems with the PAT Program because it was exaggerated, more people used it because the facilities weren't there, and I want to build the north and build the area instead of having an airlift to Winnipeg and bring the people to Winnipeg. And that is not the way to do it.

We've had a good discussion. I guess we all made a few statements that were partisan, but I think in general in my years in the House, especially before an election the debate has been less partisan and I don't want to introduce it at this time. I think that there's a lot of programs that we made, so I'll refrain from that.

Now, I said that I would try to give you some information and try to answer you questions re the lotteries, and you have in front of you a set of figures. The first one is to try to give you — and this is not audited, I tried to get this to the best of my ability to certainly give you some information and comparison, if you wish. I'm very happy. We had an extremely difficult year last year, there was no backing including the press, where there were a lot of difficulties on this, that everybody was attacking us because we were trying to get — (Interjection)— Oh, I'm sure we'll have time this evening, I'm not trying to ram this down your throat. I want you to look at it and if there's any questions.

The first chart you'll see in the middle of the page right after Total Expenditure, you'll have Net Revenue from Ticket Sales, and the Estimates for 1976-77 is quite high. As I said, it is a difficult situation now. You have so many lotteries where at one time there was only one, and the Corporation "A" or total community involvement is not involved in that. That's the Golden Sweepstakes, they're running their own affair. They keep all the money. There is no money going to government. The Manitoba Sports Federation with the Sports Toto is doing the same thing. Then the Corporation "A" or the Western Lottery - Manitoba Distributor, Inc.? There's a partnership that will get some revenue also, and this is the revenue that you should have in 1976-77. The Loto Canada, we should get a few dollars out of that. That's not in there at all.

Now the second sheet is to give you an idea of the transfer of funds over the year. Now I think that's self-explanatory. You will see that there is balance of the year' it is estimated that we should have — in a few days — it should be a little over \$2 million and that will be transferred from the Manitoba Lottery Commission to the Special Fund and then divided, and my department will get 25 percent of that.

The last page is to give you an idea of the lottery this year. I've tried to make it as comprehensive as possible, to give you the information. I feel that it was a tough fight and I know that there was a lot of ridicule last year, some of the members of the press were not too helpful. I am convinced that we did the right thing' we've got a bigger share.

First of all I've seen so much greed in this, I can tell you now that if there was a vote — if we had to review and I was a supporter of this lottery I'd vote against it, to be honest with you. Then I think it's a shame the way that we've multiplied lotteries all over the place. We have to keep up and now it's not winning \$100,000, it's millions of dollars and so on; all across you have you have a battle going with the Provincial lottery and the Federal Government and so on, so it is a very difficult thing. We've tried to get a steady income. Even with our partners in the Western Canada Lottery Foundation it's been tough because there's been less direction from the provinces and everybody. The corporation wants to make money at all costs, no matter what. Now we've resisted that. We might have been even more successful — but we haven't — and I'm talking about those under the Manitoba Lottery Commission now. We have accountability which we didn't have before. We have a larger share going to the Provincial Government and to the partners, and I can say that they've had enquiries in different provinces, for instance, Quebec had an enquiry and exactly what I prophesized here last year happened. They've had a district, a middle man made up to \$900,000; and there was a kickback in the study, then there was a kickback per district of \$5,000 to the Liberal Party, the then party in power in Quebec and this is a kickback on donations. And we can't have this here because there has been no politician in this at all. — (Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Well maybe it was money down the drain, I don't know. This is why it wasn't very popular at one time. We have got a lot of work to do, to keep on doing in this but we hope that — (Interjection)— Beg your pardon? Eh? That's right. That's right. And I can say that the government is getting away from that as much as possible, that the \$5 ticket, I have an announcement that I will make that we are working with the Western Canada Lottery distributor, that they will run that and they will get more of the funds on that and the government will be out of that too, probably retroactive to January 1st. And they will run the lottery and the government will be less

involved but we certainly will monitor it to see that the policies are continued and that we need full accountability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear that a Minister admits that they are going to get out of the lotteries. I wish to heck they had never been into them. I am glad that I kept my stand all the way through and I don't believe in running lotteries, taking money away from local organizations to be spread around wherever governments like to spread it for political advantage.

I would like to make a few remarks just before closing about the way the Minister and his department has handled the care home out at Manitou. I think it has been very very bad because they met there earlier on and they told those people that they were going to get a home — that's before the present Minister was in — and those people out there went out and worked hard, done everything that was necessary to get the home. Then later on they started to change their policy. The Minister or his officials didn't have the guts, we could say, to go out there and tell those people that they weren't going to give them the home. They sent out of a couple of girls that were just told to give certain answers which was just a way of saying that it is not going to happen and the government can't come out and face you on it. Now Manitou has moved a way back and these older people that worked hard, done so much, were even going ahead and raising money locally, are left very very disappointed and they think that the government handled it very badly because if they had to be disappointed, they would have been far better off if they had been disappointed right on the first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 65. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, to deal with the lotteries it will take a little time for us to digest this statement that the Minister presented. I wish he could have given it to us on Friday. We would have had a chance to review the thing and come up with some details. But I have a few questions, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to raise to the Minister at this time regarding first of all the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have 40 seconds with which to raise those questions.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, do you want to call it 4:30, Mr. Chairman, or do you want me to carry on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, according to Rule 19(2) of our House Rules, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Private Members' Hour. First item is Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 12. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand)

RESOLUTION NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 8 by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has fifteen minutes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the return to the House of our blackbird Socialist, as he likes to call other members from time to time, and obviously it was on my mind as I began to address the Chair, Mr. Speaker, because there was a particular comment that I wanted to pass on to my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, on this question having to do with the convenient and very appropriate change of position by his government and by his Minister of Agriculture with respect to the land-lease program which is now, Sir, being called the land purchase program. And of course my honourable friend, the Member for Portage la Prairie likes to thrash out on all sides of this question, suggests that the Honourable Members of the Official Opposition have only belatedly come to grips with this matter and any chastisement on our part of the present government for not doing what was suggested on this side of the House in its first instance and expressing some lack of enthusiasm for his resolution before us as being opposed to the government's position, or the government's new position in this election year on the question of the government purchasing of lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I recall, I started out my few comments on this resolution in the last week or the last time this resolution was before the House by pointing out to honourable members opposite how under times of stress or particularly when election day comes closer and closer at hand, then in fact the members opposite are well aware that certain Socialist principles have to be bent somewhat in order to make their position more acceptable to the electorate. I believe, Mr. Speaker, I indicated at that time or drew the attention of the members of the House at that time to a subject that was current at that time last week or a few days earlier to that, how the Labour government in England for instance, in Great Britain, was in fact very very astutely demonstrating that capacity that Socialist friends had to adopt quite frankly in a free and open society and in a democratic society because Socialism of course simply isn't compatible with freedom as most Manitobans know it and simply isn't acceptable to the majority of most Manitobans. And that statement, Sir, that I have made in this House in 1969, in 1970, and every year hence and I will continue to make it, and my honourable friends opposite only reinforce that statement, that position, by doing what their First Minister had told them they would have to do from time to time, particularly as they approach an election, that is that they would have to bend their principles.

And I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in those few remarks that the truth of the matter, and that of course is something that they cannot at this late day in the game hide to the electorate, that they do not believe in what they are currently doing. They do not believe in giving back to private ownership a valuable resource which they consider should be in the hands of the public at large through the duly-elected government. They simply do not believe it. I know that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does not believe it. Of course they display a unique kind of balance on this very question even today. For instance while it is politically unacceptable for the government to be getting more and more land into public ownership and so therefore have made this change as announced by the Minister of Agriculture, they are still not prepared to do it in the north.

In the north where I and other members of the Land Committee sat in Thompson, the request from so many about the possibility of freeing up and returning and providing title to land, to either long-term land residents, to business entrepreneurs who want to establish businesses and who find it difficult from time to time, not impossible but difficult from time to time, to arrange for the kind of financing that is necessary to establish businesses and so often that financing is incumbent upon having title to land in order to get access to the moneylenders of this province or of this country to enable that business to flourish. However I would ask the question. I can well remember and the recorded transcripts of the day will underline it, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources particularly made it very clear that there would be no relaxation at all of any Crown lands currently held by the Crown in the north reverting to private ownership.

Well, you see, Mr. Speaker, up north although that question is of concern to a number of people, it is not a major political question as it is down south. So down south the same Minister, the same government, is prepared to, on the eve of an election, change a basic policy to acknowledge what I and other members of the opposition have been telling him. Down south it is still very much a matter of concern to the majority of farmers in particular and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, as many non-farmers as well. It is simply not acceptable, other than for specified, needed government projects such as highways, drainage ditches, schools or other public projects. It is simply not acceptable to have the

government in the business of buying up land. I make that as a flat statement and I believe what the Minister of Agriculture has done is he has demonstrated his acceptance of that fact by changing and even calling the program by a different name. It is no longer called the land-lease program. It is now called the lease-purchase program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose and I think I indicated to the Honourable Minister at the time that I should be somewhat flattered by that position. I also tell the Honourable Minister and the government that it is too late because the true colours, the true colours of his government, are evident to too many, are evident to many.

And while I have the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in his seat, I will remind him of a statement that he made that I will try to recall without the benefit of Hansard, that in a previous debate dating back possibly some three sessions ago You see, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate and I can acknowledge that the position that the honourable members have and in fact hold truly when caught in a less sensitive time of electioneering, when they are prepared to state their position on such basic and fundamental things as the public vs. the private sector. For instance, I can respect and I can understand fully the major criticism that this government has always had of the forestry complex in The Pas. The differences have not been on the question of the conception of the program or in its need or in its viability, even although that might have been questioned at one time. The single biggest difference that separates us from them is simply that if upwards to a 100 percent of the money is necessary to begin the venture, then surely the public should retain the control and the ownership of the venture. That is a position that has some integrity, a position that can be understood by people. It can be understood by myself. I suggest it can be equally well understood that if a project requires necessary skill in a highly competitive industry, in an industry that the number one requirement (A) is to have the necessary expertise of producing the product; and (B) to marketing it around the world, it is necessary to have those entrepreneurial skills that today only the private sector can satisfactorily produce.

So I make no apologies for the fact that yes, a previous administration went into an operation largely funded by public money, because I will say to this day that if the private entrepreneur were running that corporation, it would not be running \$6 million in the black. It would not be running \$6 million in the black. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister says it is ridiculous. But that is not really what I wanted to say because I can recall in the ongoing debate about that question, having asked the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at one time that that theory and that understandable position from my Socialist friends opposite certainly should also apply to an operation like Simplot. For instance, if the largest amount of public money went into the setting up of the fertilizer plant in Brandon, no matter whether or not that plant paid it back, as they in fact have in advance of time, that by carrying over that same argument, the Simplot plant should today be run as a publicly-owned Crown corporation.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I also remember getting up and asking the question, "And why would they need to differentiate if the public is prepared to put up \$100,000, \$200,000 to set up a viable economic farm unit, buy the land for that farmer, set him up on that farm — and then you are going to give it back to him? That is where your credibility backs down because there isn't a single man here that has some credibility and some concern about his personal integrity, who can tell me that they in fact would be prepared to do that. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the farmers of Manitoba understand. That is what the people of Manitoba understand, that it is posturing, it is electioneering posturing on your part now to suggest that you believe in the private ownership of farm land. You do not believe in it and you are not prepared to put into the hands of an individual farmer \$100,000, \$150,000, or \$200,000 and then on very gratuitous terms, allow him to reap the rewards, the benefit of that, having set him up in business. No more so than they were prepared to do it for Simplot, no more so than they were prepared to do it for CFI.

Now all I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is for the honourable gentleman not to insult us in terms of our conception of their approach to things. We know their approach. Also, do not accuse us of scare tactics or of electioneering when we have to underline the basic and fundamental differences that differentiate the honourable gentlemen opposite from ourselves. Sir, we believe very, very deeply that it is a fundamental fact of life that if we want to have the kind of volatile, the kind of enthusiastic, the kind of agricultural industry to produce food for North Americans on a scale that has never been seen anywhere else in this world; if we want to have the kind of agricultural community that is able to respond to the legitimate needs, cries of help from around the world, as fellow global human beings, then it is gospel, Mr. Speaker, that we maintain and do not tinker with the agricultural machine that we have built up on the North American continent. And certainly, Sir, to tinker with a fundamental resource such as land and the relationship the land has to the person working the land, would have to be considered as a major bit of tinkering on the part of anybody.

Mr. Speaker, we simply recognize that this government has recognized in a rather cynical way, this Minister has recognized in a rather cynical way, that while his objectives are clear and he may need another 20 or 25 or 30 years to carry them out in an open in a free and a democratic society, he

recognizes that the first priority that he faces is to get himself at least that extra four years on top of the eight years that they have had. To do that, he is prepared to make whatever change is necessary for the interim period of, say, the next six months, or whenever the next election is going to be called. Mr. Speaker, the farmers, the people of Manitoba, recognize this move on the part of this Minister for precisely what it is and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will be with some difficulty that honourable members opposite who wish to maintain some credibility and integrity in this House cannot really argue with the position that I have advanced. They may say that we are prepared to tolerate the private sector as has often been said. The Mines Minister has often said when talking about mines that he is prepared to tolerate the private sector involved in mining but if they don't respond to his policies, then he is prepared to jump in. Well, Mr. Speaker, tolerating and encouraging, tolerating and maintaining, tolerating and seeing to it that a vital aspect of our economic life stays alive is a great deal of difference. That, Mr. Speaker, will be decided at the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm really very happy to be back, to be back. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . in the pleasant weather of Manitoba, nice fresh cool air, we are moving into the summer, I believe. The place I left, they are moving into the fall so it was exactly the right time to come back and also a convenient time to come back to hear my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, on the land purchase — (Interjection) — well it really doesn't matter that much land lease, land purchase, program whereby the Minister of Agriculture and this Government have tried to see to it that there is a way of a person engaging in agriculture without investing all his money in the ownership of land and hoping to make his real gain out of a capital gain on the sale of the land rather than in farming. Does that sound so unusual to my honourable friend? Because I have heard farmers throughout this province, southeastern Manitoba, northeastern Manitoba, the Interlake, southern Manitoba suggests that the farming operation was not satisfactory and was not earning them the return on their investment, that farmers live poor and die rich. Am I stating something that is unusual to the agricultural members. The joke about farmers, which they love to tell on themselves is that; this fellow was on a quiz program and won \$100,000 by answering the question 'the announcer said "What are you going to do with it?" He said, "I'm going to go back to the farm and keep farming until it's all gone." The farmers love to tell that joke on themselves because it was true and it still, in many respects, is true that the operations of a medium sized farm did not pay the investment and that what the farmer hoped for was first of all, making an investment in his land and passing that on perhaps to his beneficiaries. By the way, to those who talk about the Estate Tax, I would estimate that ninety-eight percent of the farmers of this province never had to think about succession duties and don't have to think about succession duties now because the equity in their land and in their farm would have to be over \$250,000 if it was going to a wife. You can stand up in any farm community in this province, if there were a hundred people there, and you asked "How many of you are going to leave net, after all debts are paid, over \$250,000?" There wouldn't be two people in the room who would pick up their hands. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you not two out of a hundred, not two percent, would have that problem. In any event, Mr. Chairman, why . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. we

MR. GREEN: . . . why deal with that particular question' are dealing with the question of whether there should be a system of operation in agriculture in this province which is not based on working and investing profits in the land and hoping for the capital gain, and the Minister of Agriculture has provided an option to that system.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubts whatsoever, that that option has found favour and still finds favour with many agricultural people in this province, after all, nobody, there isn't an agricultural producer in this province who was ever forced to sell any land to the Government, not a single one. You will not be able to find an agricultural producer who was required to sell his land to the province under this program, you can find it under both Governments under expropriation proceedings, but under the program set up by the Minister of Agriculture, not a single farmer was required to sell any agricultural land to the province. What is more, Mr. Speaker, not a single farmer was required to lease any agricultural land from the province, not a single one. They could buy their own land or they could lease it from the Member for Pembina or from anybody else, so they have complete freedom to both sell their land, to buy land or to lease land. There was one freedom that they didn't have, and that's the freedom that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is trying to preclude' that was the freedom to lease public land on the basis that they would prefer to have the public as their landlord, rather than the Member for Pembina. Despite all of the agitation by my honourable friends, many decent, conservative-minded, liberal-minded agricultural people in this province came to the public and said, "We would prefer to lease from you, we like the terms, and we think that you would be just as good a landlord to us as would the Honourable Member for Pembina.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside suggests that there is something about that concept which has caused fear in the hearts of either the people of the Province of Manitoba, which I deny, or on the

part of this Government or members of this side, *vis-a-vis* facing the electorate, and that this change which is an additional option, it doesn't preclude the lease, not at all. Under the program now before the farmer, he can either lease it or he can purchase it in a program which operates in such a way that it would take him twenty years to earn that capital gain, and he'd have to give back any subsidy that he got in the meantime, it gives him an additional option.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has said something which bothers me, he says we did this to get votes; Mr. Speaker, I'm telling you if that's why we did it, then we made a very bad mistake because we will not get votes from this change, not at all, we will not win any additional support in the Province of Manitoba because of this change. If anything, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that this is not the case, but I know by the way my honourable friend is dealing with it — well my honourable friend is not in the habit of announcing and continuing to underline programs which get the Government votes, but he has been underlining and announcing and repeating what the Government has done on this program. Why, Mr. Speaker, why has he made such a point of what we have done? Because he thinks that it will cost us votes, not that it will get us votes. And therefore, Mr. Speaker' I suggest to you the reason that it could have the effect that honourable friend is suggesting, and I certainly would hope that that is not correct because I like to get votes and lose them, is that somebody could get the notion that we were very unhappy about what we did in the first place; we regret it, we think we are going to lose votes by it, and therefore we have to try to turn that situation around. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this, that we were not unhappy, that it is a good concept, that it is a concept which remains, which has not been changed. It is still there, it still means, Mr. Speaker, that a farmer, an agricultural producer in the Province of Manitoba, can come to the Minister of Agriculture, lease public land, never buy it, operate on that lease, live on the income rather than invest it in the land and not strive for the capital gain' which is what we decided in the first place.

The Minister has given an additional option, and the additional option is that you can purchase, stay on the land for twenty years and earn the capital gain, and I would gather that the honourable member should be able to see from that that what we are trying to do is to provide an incentive for a farmer to stay on the land for a longer period of time. That with the lease, it is possible that somebody could farm for five years and then just leave' which nothing has been lost because the land remains. We say that those that stay and continue in agricultural production for a period of twenty years will get a bonus, and Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with that concept. The Province of Manitoba has looked at the figures with regard to individual farmers, resident farmers, and have seen that they have gone down from roughly thirty thousand in 1967 and reduced by a considerable number to this date, and we say that we think that one of the most desirable forms of agricultural production, one of them, is for an individual tied to — well "tied to" I suppose is not a bad word because that is the concept of private ownership — related to a particular field of land, will stay on that land and produce agricultural commodities, that's one of the systems. But for my honourable friend to suggest that that's the only system, and that is obviously the best system and that there is no other way to feed the world, is to fall into the same trap as the President of the Chamber of Commerce, who said that there must be individual ownership incentive or there can be no good agriculture, and there is no other way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will concede that individual ownership has been the major incentive for agriculture in the Province of Manitoba, I think we said that in the Land Report and I wouldn't argue with that question. I have spoken on this land issue every year, and I've said that in the area of agriculture there has to be' there must be a way in which the farmer who is involved with a particular field of land, will know that his work and energy in that land will be in some way recognized, and some system of tenure has to be provided so that he knows that he cannot merely be dispossessed. The Torrens system is one system but, Mr. Speaker' try as they might, even the most hard-rock conservatives, will have to agree that in the last analysis, there is no such thing as private ownership of land, that it just doesn't exist. The land cannot be owned by. . . — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the land. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please

MR. GREEN: . . . cannot be owned by a private person. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that because the titles that were issued under the Conservative administration, and are still issued under the conservative administration, a Torrens title is essentially an unlimited leasehold which says that the public can take the land back any time that they want and that it is being put in the hands of an individual at the sufferance of the public, and that that man can transfer it and get the capital gain but ultimately the public has a right to that land. So when the honourable member says that land will revert to — and he used these terms — that in the north land will revert to private ownership, when was it ever owned by a private owner. In the north the land was never owned by a private person, and it is impossible for it to revert to private ownership. The only thing that can happen to land is that the public could decide that it wants to own

it. We have said with respect to farmland that a certain limited amount, limited by reason of social custom and history, will be available for a person who wishes to lease it from the public on the basis that he doesn't wish to invest his earnings in the land in the hope of getting a capital gain and he wants to continue to farm the land. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not really tried to upset the relationship of that person renting from . . . —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. The honourable member had his twenty minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have been perfectly happy to do two things with the Member for Pembina, either let him continue to lease the land out to whomsoever he wants, or if he gets tired of that he can go to the land-lease program, sell it to the public and let them lease it out. We are giving him two choices. The Honourable Member for Lakeside wants to eliminate one choice, he cannot stand that additional choice, it irritates him so much that he is just pathologically resistant to any suggestion that the public can be a land owner. And the reason that he is worried about it — and I appeared by the way, in the 1973 election on television and the man sent from the Conservative party was Graeme Haig. I don't know why Graeme Haig was sent, he wasn't a candidate but nevertheless he was sent. I'm going to try to tell you what Graeme said, hoping that I'm not misquoting him, but the honourable member can check it with Mr. Haig; he said the real reason that the Conservatives don't like the land-lease program is they are afraid that it will become so popular that everybody will be leasing land from the Government. But, Mr. Speaker,—(Interjection)— So, I'm not misquoting. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, ORDER.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not misquoting. . . —(Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to again ask the co-operation of the Member for Lakeside, if he wishes to carry on this debate will be take it outside. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Lakeside will acknowledge that I hardly uttered a sound during his speech, which is not usual by the way, and I really don't mind his agitation because I know that when the Member for Lakeside is agitated it indicates that he really hasn't been able to make his point, and he is a little worried that some of it has not hit home. In any event, all I'm suggesting is that the program rather than being something which we could lose votes for, it was indicated by Mr. Haig it is something that he thought all of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba would suddenly want to farm in this way which I, Mr. Speaker, have never suggested. As a matter of fact, I think that for many many many years to come, outlasting all of the lives of the members in this House, that because of the social historical patterns in the Province of Manitoba, the large majority of agriculture will continue to be farmed on Torrens titles granted by the public; Torrens titles granted by the public, which is not private ownership in land because it is ultimately, Mr. Speaker, repugnant even to the Member for Lakeside, that there could be private ownership in land. Is he suggesting that somebody could say in Canada; I own the land, you get off, because that's possible if we talk about private ownership in land. Or if we want to make it further that one person could say, "I own the world, hop off." It is impossible, the land is the property of all of the peoples in the world and governments are set up and they give temporary Torrens title to be operated by private individuals during temporary periods of time. Mr. Speaker, I really have no objection to that, but I deny that there is only one incentive which will move an agricultural producer. I say that the agricultural producer could be moved by the desire to live on his income rather than invest it and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that an agricultural producer could be motivated by a community farm, and he could be motivated on community-owned property. And if the honourable member doesn't believe it or said that there is only one system, I would ask him to compare the agricultural production of the people on an Israeli Kibbutz and the agricultural production of people who have been there longer on semi-feudal privately owned land right existing within miles of what is happening on community-owned property in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, if he says Israel is too far then I suggest he look right at home and see what his relatives have done on community-owned property. I don't think that one could say that the Hutterite farmer is a bad farmer, a bad producer. They produce very well, Mr. Speaker, and they produce with different incentive.

So I'd suggest to the honourable member that there are varying ways, that different people move different people and that the program that we have involved ourselves in is one which merely gives a greater span of options than previously existed and that undoubtedly would not exist under a Conservative administration because they have frankly stated that they're going to eliminate one of the freedoms that people of the province of Manitoba are now entitled to. That is the affect of their position.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside reminds me of a description that Winston Churchill once made of Stanley Baldwin. He said that Baldwin occasionally stumbles over the truth but when he does he hastily picks himself up and scurries off as if nothing had happened. And the member's presentation much reminded me of that description by Churchill of

Stanley Baldwin.

He once again raised the specter of the governments taking over all of the land of the farmers in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I can recall the last election campaign. In the rural areas, in Rock Lake for example, we had two scares. The NDP was not only going to take the farmers' land away, they were going to take over the churches. We were going to take over the churches and we were going to take the farmers' land away.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party really are pikers compared to the Liberals in Saskatchewan in 1944. In 1944 the Liberals in Saskatchewan not only said that the CCF — our predecessors — would take away the farmers land, we would take away the churches, they also said that they would take away the people's insurance policies. And, Mr. Speaker, the final crushing insult, they would close the beer parlours. They would close the beer parlours. Now, Mr. Speaker, the CCF won the election in 1944. They have been the government of Saskatchewan for more than twenty years, since 1944, and in that time, Mr. Speaker, they have not closed the beer parlours. In fact they are open more widely than they used to be. So that particular freedom has been expanded rather than eliminated. They have not closed the churches. In fact there are more churches than there ever was before in Saskatchewan. They have not taken the people's insurance policies away.

A MEMBER: There are more insurance policies.

MR. JOHANNSON: There are more insurance policies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHANNSON: . . . and they have, next to Manitoba, the most efficient insurance system for automobiles in North America and one that is owned and operated by the people of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, the land has not been taken away from the farmers of Saskatchewan.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what happened was that the CCF government attempted to save the farmers land in Saskatchewan from foreclosure by mortgage companies. And you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, the banks, the insurance companies, the bastions of the free enterprise system immediately appealed to the Federal Government to rule this legislation invalid. To rule this legislation invalid. And you know, Mr. Speaker, they were effective. The Supreme Court did rule the legislation *ultra vires* of the provincial government. This meant that the government in Saskatchewan elected overwhelmingly with 47 out of 53 seats, was prevented from saving the farmers' land by the mortgage companies, by the banks, by the Liberals, by the Conservatives in Saskatchewan.

Now who was trying to save the farmers' land? Who was trying to save the farmers' land? The CCF in Saskatchewan and they got very little co-operation from the free enterprise system. They got very little co-operation from your party, from the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that socialism is not compatible with freedom. He also said that socialism is not compatible to the majority of the people of Manitoba. Well, if he's talking about the popular vote one can equally say that throughout the Roblin period Conservatism was never compatible to the people of Manitoba, because they never got fifty percent of the vote. But the thing is that what is acceptable political theory when a Conservative government is in power no longer is acceptable when an NDP government is in power. We never questioned your mandate when you were in office. I paid taxes throughout the period that the honourable members opposite ran the government and I never objected to that even though I didn't agree with their policy. The fact is that they elected a majority of members to this Legislature and by virtue of that they had the right to run the government in this province. No one on this side questioned that mandate. Suddenly when the table is turned and they are kicked out of office, suddenly then ordinary parliamentary theory no longer is in effect. Suddenly they talk about majority votes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the members opposite were in government, when the Member for Lakeside was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he was the Minister who in effect was the czar over 80 to 85 percent of the land in this province. 80 to 85 percent of the land in this province is Crown owned. The Honourable Member for Lakeside was the czar over 80 to 85 percent of the land in this province. He was the man who administered this land on behalf of the Crown in the right of the Province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHANNSON: . . . that freedom was lost in this province because of that fact. While he was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Minister of Agriculture the Government of Manitoba leased two million acres of land to farmers in this province. Not, Mr. Speaker, 160 . . . What do we have now in the land-lease program? 160 thousand acres. Not 160 thousand acres. Two million, Mr. Speaker. More than ten times as much was leased out to the farmers of this province. The Member for Lakeside is one man who leases that land. The Member for Gladstone also leased land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that by virtue of offering that program to the farmers of this province the freedom in this province was impelled. I think that what they did is they offered another option to the farmers in this province. And, as far as I know, our party never criticized them for

offering that option.

Mr. Speaker, there was a government in this province some years ago that nationalized a very large company in this province. They nationalized Bell Telephone. That government, by the way, Mr. Speaker, not only nationalized Bell Telephone but it set up a Crown-owned system of elevators, grain elevators, throughout the rural parts of Manitoba, a Crown-owned system of grain elevators throughout the province of rural Manitoba. By the way, that government also regulated the Grain Exchange, that holy of holies of the free enterprise system. It subjected the Winnipeg Grain Exchange to very stringent regulations. That was the government, Mr. Speaker, of Sir Rodmond Roblin and, you know, Mr. Speaker, if that gentleman had now been sitting on this side during the past few years, if he had enacted those measures, we would have the spectacle of the members opposite accusing the man of being a raving communist. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has hope. I can point out where the Honourable Sir Rodmond Roblin is buried in case you're interested. Sir Rodmond Roblin carried out those measures. He carried those measures out in an effort to improve the lot of the farmers in this province and I don't think he curtailed freedom in this province when he did that. He brought in government regulations, he brought in government ownership, he did not bring it in on behalf of a small privileged group in this province, he brought it in on behalf of the farmers of this province, the people of the province. —(Interjection)— I was going to get to that, Mr. Speaker. The one thing he refused to do was to give the vote to women. In that case I don't think he was a democrat. There he was certainly restricting freedom. He was a male chauvinist, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the honourable member uses an argument that members opposite are very fond of, they say that when the government uses tax dollars to buy land they are using the people's own money to compete against them in the purchase of this land. Now the argument sounds plausible on surface but it's ridiculous when you look at it in any depth. Mr. Speaker, I put my money in the bank, I put my money in credit unions. That bank then lends that money out, it doesn't ask my permission, that is my money that is being used by the Royal Bank . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. JOHANNSON: the Royal Bank to lend out to people whom they choose, not whom I choose, I don't choose to whom they lend money, they choose. And the fact is, that they can use that money to compete against me if I want to buy a particular piece of land. Mr. Speaker, at the same time as the members opposite use this argument, at the same time that they use this argument, they are the people, of course, who at one time had a program of making loans to individual farmers who wanted to purchase land through the MACC. They would lend my money to farmers who would then use that money to compete against me to buy a particular piece of land. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's free enterprise, that's free enterprise. Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Yes, in the case of CFI they took my money and they threw it away. They gave it to Alex Kasser.

Mr. Speaker, not only did they lend my money to farmers in order to compete against me when they were buying farm land, but they finally set up a system which was really beautiful. They allowed the bank to loan the money to people, but if there was any possibility of loss, they guaranteed the bank against the loss. So they used my money, Mr. Speaker, to guarantee the bank in making loans to somebody to compete against me when I wanted to buy some farm land. Mr. Speaker, the argument is a stupid one, the argument is a stupid one. —(Interjection)— No, you're argument is a stupid one.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Manitoba elect a government, they elect a government to do a number of things and the government generally has a mandate to do a number of things. And they elect them to raise the tax money to do those things and, by virtue of that mandate, they have a right to spend that tax money and, of course, they are always subject to the approval of the people. If the people disapprove of what they have done, they have the chance at the next election to kick them out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member also stated that highways, drainage and conservation were the only preferences for which government should buy land. Now did I — I'm sorry if I misinterpreted the member. Just by way of example. Now the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: For clarification of the honourable member. Certainly I would have nothing against the government buying and enlarging, buying land to enlarge say, for instance, mental institutions to perhaps accommodate honourable members opposite from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews has five and a half minutes.

MR. JOHANNSON: Okay. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba, of course, will ultimately decide where the half-wits reside, whether on that side or this side and they really don't even . . .

Now the member, in other words is stating that government should purchase land only for traditional purposes. For purposes for which it was purchased in the days when he was in the

government and that's fine, but the fact is that this is a government that does more things than they ever did and that's putting it very mildly, Mr. Speaker. That was a government that did very little. This is a government that does a great deal and, therefore, this is a government that is enlarging on the freedoms available to people in this province rather than curtailing.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I really don't have any great enthusiasm for the Land-lease Program. I don't think it's a major program, I can't get excited about it. It is, as it's been described, just another option that's available to farmers in this province. I don't think that the program ever will have that large an amount of government owned land in the program. In fact, if the farmers exercise the option to buy, obviously it cannot, I pointed this fact out before, if we purchase land at the rate we've been buying it over the last few years, it would take about eight hundred years for us to purchase all of the arable farm land in the province and, obviously, that assumes that farmers are always willing to sell to the Crown. It assumes that no one will take up the option to buy and it assumes that we will be the government for the next eight hundred years, which even I do not in my fondest hope, think will happen and I think it would be a terrible thing if we were. I believe in a regular change of government, but I don't think that change will come for some time. Every twenty years would be fine. I think that's a good healthy system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, you're not going to get a history lesson like the Member for St. Matthews tried to give you. I also think that you might get a little bit of common sense and reasoning because I saw that as the member was talking everybody over here was smiling at realizing what a stupid bunch of statements would be showing up in Hansard later on because he was stating that the farmers, when they said that they were competing against their own money, he couldn't see through it. Well, if I'm paying taxes to the Federal Government and the provincial government's getting 42 per cent of mine and they are using it to buy land, then they are certainly using my money to compete against me.

By the same token, I'll admit that if the government also loans a person money to help buy land, that is also using my money, and I'll agree with that. But in one case we're talking about ownership which is what the Conservative Party all the time has advocated, and promote. What he is talking about is government ownership and that is the difference. —(Interjection)— Pardon me? That's competition from my own money though.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. HENDERSON: But it's competition to give government ownership, because that is what the government was doing. And you've made a turnabout completely in your policy — I noticed they'd done it while you were away because I believe you would have found it pretty hard to accept, and I really believe you probably did — and particularly that part where they're giving it to them under the conditions they are without putting a fair market value on it, and I'll just bet you that you don't agree with it. You're tied in on the Cabinet and you've got to go along with it, but I'll bet you it's something you don't believe in.

I also wonder what the Member for St. Matthews was talking about when he said that the government was buying up elevators all across Canada and Manitoba. I don't know of any elevators that were ever bought up by Manitoba. They helped out at the time of the Bracken government when they were in trouble, but they didn't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HENDERSON: We've got the Manitoba Pool and we've got the United Grain Growers and this sort of thing, but we have not got a system —(Interjection)— 1910, I don't even know what he's talking about. I've never heard of the government elevators. I've heard of when they came out and helped the elevator system.

But anybody that thinks that this government now really believes in government ownership, they just need to think of the way the other policy works' because when a person went to purchase it before they had to purchase the land at whichever was the highest, the government appraised value at that time or else all of the money that was used in subsidizing that program. They knew then — and they also made it very difficult — that they had to pay it off in cash within just a very short time.

Actually they were putting the people in a position that it was very difficult to buy the land. Now they're able to do it when they made this 180 degree turn, that they're able to buy it at just whatever it was — and we know there's been an awful amount of inflation in the price of land — and they're only going to make up that interest difference, and I'm sure the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows what I'm talking about, and they've done it because an election is coming up. They've done it because there's an election coming up, because that's something that they don't believe on that side over there. They're trying to get votes — sure they're trying to get votes — that's why they brought out the policy.

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has always mentioned that there's nothing wrong with politics. You do things to get votes and to be in. Sure you do, that's the truth of it. But it backfired on you, that's all, you just made poor judgement, it didn't work out the way you thought so you

Monday, March 28, 1977

decided to change it around. I think you'll be changing around a few other things before the election comes too. And then he'll say you advocated them and you believed him. We can use one of them right there as possibly the way succession duties are going to be handled. You're going to make a big turnaround on that. You've realized possibly that there's lots of places where you can turn around, but it's very noticeable at the time of election. I don't think you're going to fool the people and especially on this land-lease policy. Because I was out at the hearings at every place you went, people believed in private ownership. But eventually you thought you'd win over and show them that that was the best, but they didn't accept it, and that's why you've made the change.

Now you say you're giving the farmer two chances. He can either own his land or he can sell it to the government. Well, if the farmer owns his land and moves off it now he's got to rent it out, at least it pretty near was. He had to be competing against the government renting land out at five percent. So in other words you were making it very difficult for him to keep his land, because if he did he had to compete with all those lands that were rented at five percent.

Not only that, but you were making it harder for him again, because after he moved off you were going to tax him on the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, under the Act. You were going to penalize him ten cents on every acre besides year after year, to keep his land if he wasn't going to live on it. So you were saying you were giving him an option. You weren't. You were trying to force him into buying it and you were out there on the market wanting to buy it up so you could lease it out. So you were giving him an option, but you were hoping that the option would work to your advantage. — (Interjection)— Well, I just know enough about it and I've been around with farm people, that the policy has never been popular with farmers. I know you can say it gives a fellow a chance to farm. I don't believe that everybody has got a God-given right to do whatever he wants to do if he hasn't done nothing about it earlier in his life or prepared himself in some way. By the same token he should be able to possibly go in and be a store manager or a hotel owner or something. He should have an option on these things. If he's got these options in farming he should have them in other things, if you believe he has a right to go into whatever he likes and the government should help him to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair. The House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.