

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Tenth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Tenth Report:

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 41 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Development Fund Act.

No. 43 - An Act to incorporate St. Anthony's General Hospital.

No. 45 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 44 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).

No. 46 - The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, there is a statement that I would like to make. In recent weeks, the question period preceding Orders of the Day has become a matter of concern to me, and although I well appreciate the importance of the question period, and I am mindful of the fact that of all institutions of our democratic society, certainly the Legislative Assembly ought to give the greatest opportunity for the exercise of freedom of speech, but I also feel, and I am certain that honourable members will concur, that the question period ought to be used only for the purpose for which it is intended.

A quick perusal of Chapter 5 of the 4th Edition of Beauchesne did not provide me with a concrete statement of the purpose of the question period. I then went to an authority from time to time cited by Beauchesne, namely, Cushing. In his Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies, 1907, Citation 1571, he states as follows: "Questions ought regularly to be such the answers to which will afford information to the House, relating to some pending measure or to some public event connected with the administration or to enable the House to form an opinion of the policy of the government."

It was also interesting to note that in a subsequent text written in 1929, Campion in his An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons, which is also cited by Beauchesne from time to time, he comments on the matter of questions before Orders of the Day as follows: "Most of the authorities agree that the privilege of asking questions is liable to abuse and that the number of questions has increased inordinately." May I remind the honourable members that this is a statement made in 1929 and not 1969.

Campion goes on to say that the first recorded question was in 1721 by Lord Cowper in the House of Lords as follows: "Whether there was any ground for a certain rumour." Now today of course such a question would be ruled out of order. In 1923, over 100 questions per day was the average in the British House of Commons, which has more than 10 times the number of members in our House.

On Page 127 of the same text, Campion defines the question as follows: "To be in order, a question should be genuinely directed to seeking information or pressing for action, addressed to a Minister who is officially responsible for the matter with which it deals and framed in accordance with the rules of constitutional usage and Parliamentary etiquette."

I would hope that the honourable members will be mindful of the comments I have made in presenting their questions. I also hope that the aforementioned comments would assist them

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) in interpreting Beauchesne, which deals more with the breach of the rule rather than the observance. And, in conclusion, I hope that the honourable members will utilize this portion of the sitting for the purpose and in the manner for which it is intended, and no other; and thus contribute to making this an efficiently operating Legislative Assembly.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank you for your thoughts this evening. I know you've gone to a good deal of trouble to develop your remarks, all of which are very much to the point. The meaning of the question period is obviously something we all know. I realize too, Sir, and I'm sure many of my colleagues in the House realize that we have abused this over recent days, but I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the abuse has been on both sides of the House, and I realize your problems as we have gone along, something along the lines, if I may use the term, that what is good for Peter has been good for Paul, and I would agree with you, Sir, that the sooner this sort of thing comes to an end, the better it will be for the House and the decorum of this House. And should you live long enough and you're there for 36 years, reading of Speakers in the past in Westminster, if you live that long, God bless you, and I can assure you, Sir, that on this side of the House we will try, in the days that lie ahead, to do our best; and at the same time, if we are provoked we have no other alternative but to reply in kind, and I hope you will give us the same consideration as you will to others. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. First Minister.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Honourable Member for River Heights asked me, during the question period, for some delineation of the transport functions of the Government of Manitoba. I undertook to give him an answer before the end of this session. I should like to indicate, inform the honourable member in reply to his question, that all matters pertaining to railway policy as it affects Manitoba, all questions in that general area of railway policy will be dealt with in this House by a man who has had many many years of experience as an employee of one of our two major railways, a man who it might be said is well steeped in the whole folklore and legend of the Canadian National Railway System - I refer to the Honourable the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): I'd like to thank the Honourable First Minister for his statement. I wonder if he could indicate, then, in view of what he has just said, whether the Department of Transportation will now be changed to the Department of Highways.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the way it will be proceeded with is as follows: that those Orders-in-Council that were passed by the previous administration last October, I believe, or November, which transferred certain functions from the Department of Industry and Commerce and perhaps one other department, into the newly designated Department of Transport, that those Orders-in-Council will be rescinded so that we will go back to the status quo ante.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again, I wonder if the First Minister would answer -- in view of what he said, I am assuming that the government will not have now a Department of Transportation but will have a Department of Highways and other departments which will look after related matters affecting transportation.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it could be said that we will have a Department of Highway Transport.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder if he could inform the House whether he's obtained information as to what Hydro borrowings will be or anticipated to be during this fiscal year.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Not yet, Mr. Speaker. When I get the information I'll certainly be prepared to give it to the House if the House is in session. If not, I could invite the Honourable Member for River Heights, possibly, to come with me to San Francisco, Chicago and New York at which time we will be exploring it and then he'll get all sorts of information that I will have at that time. Of course it will be at his expense but his help will be useful.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Finance has referred to various junkets that he'll be taking in connection with the activity - yes, junkets in connection with the activities of his department. May I ask -- I understand from what he's saying that he is going on an exploratory mission to determine what capital

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) borrowing can in fact be undertaken, or is he going out specifically for capital borrowing that he now knows he requires?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the honourable member, when he was a member of the Cabinet, was not fully aware of the nature of the type of problems that were considered at the time of borrowing. His reference to "junkets" of course has been noted by me and no doubt by others. It's his privilege, as it has been all along, to use the kind of language he wants to use, to make the kind of assumptions he delights in making, and I reserve to him that privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this government, in carrying out the program of the previous government which involved capital borrowing of a very substantial amount, to go to the United States markets and there to introduce again, as has been done in the past, information about our government and the government's desire to set up a bond issue in the United States. Now, as I have said before, the purpose is firstly to introduce to the United States market an up-to-date report on the government, its plans and its activities, to invite interest in the investment field as was done in eastern Canada early in August when I went at that time to the Canadian market, and, for the honourable member's information, this type of trip ends with a consultation with the fiscal agents and representatives of the syndicate in United States to explore with it the extent to which and the rate at which borrowing can be attempted on the United States market. That is the purpose of the trip which I am making at the expense of the people of Manitoba, or in this case I think at the expense of Hydro, which the Honourable Member for River Heights chooses to call a "junket".

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that the word offended the Honourable Minister but the use of the term "junket" was first used by the honourable members on the other side when they were in opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Can he indicate what or which, if any other government members would be accompanying him on this business trip?

MR. CHERNIACK: No members of the Manitoba Legislature are expecting to travel with me on my trip to the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, a follow-up question to the Minister of Finance. Has the government made connections with the World Monetary Fund in trying to secure funds?

MR. CHERNIACK: That's an interesting question, Mr. Speaker. I can inform my honourable friend from Rhineland that I'm not aware that this was done, but if it was done I would expect I would be able to advise the member. I'm really not aware that provincial governments have access to that Fund but I will explore any means that would be available to the Province of Manitoba to borrow money on the best and most favourable terms. So that, to that extent, I welcome his question as a suggestion.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question, because under the United Nations organization certainly there are subsidiaries of the World Monetary Fund which makes money available, interest free and for long periods of time, so I think it would be worthwhile -- (Interjection) -- Yes, whether this will be checked because I think it's worthwhile to do that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Interest-free money is most interesting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the other day I directed a question to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the First Minister in his capacity of Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the First Minister can reply to that question at this time. The question was whether or not there was any further news or announcements to be made about the prospect of Tartan Breweries locating in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in communication with the president and owner of the company involved. My latest information, when I was last in communication with him, was that there was no question but that construction would proceed. Now there may have been a development in very recent days. I'm sorry I can't give my honourable friend a report that would take us up to today, but certainly as of 10 days ago there didn't seem to be any question about it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may. The question is prompted

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) by me and by some of those in my constituency, or my former constituency, I should say, by recent announcement that this same firm is planning expansion in Newfoundland, and has the First Minister any information as to whether or not that is in any way related to the planned expansion here into Manitoba? In other words, is it here or there or can the Minister throw any light on that aspect?

MR. SCHREYER: No I can't, Mr. Speaker, because as I said, my information as of only a few days ago was that the company's plans were to have construction commenced very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister—without-portfolio in charge of the Centennial Corporation. Is there a financial statement available from the Centennial Corporation and if so, can this be made available to members?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I was deeply involved in a letter here that I was reading and I wasn't paying attention to what the honourable member said.

MR. FROESE: Yes. I will repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. The question was whether the Manitoba Centennial Corporation issued a financial statement and whether the same is available to members.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, possibly the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs is not aware of the fact that there was tabled, if I recall correctly, a financial statement of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation last year. If my honourable friend desires further information insofar as the financial aspects of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation, we will be pleased to forward the same to my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would like to, first of all, congratulate the new Minister of Railroads and ask him if he intends to travel to Churchill and Lynn Lake to check out the deficiencies and also the high cost of freight in that area. And also how many railroads are there in Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. BEARD: And also how many railroads are there in Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend that I am prepared to take due notice of his remarks, and I have travelled from Winnipeg to The Pas, Thompson, Sherridon, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake. I have travelled from Thompson to Wabowden and Churchill and all of the railroads in northern Manitoba, and I am prepared, now that I have retired from the railroad, to thoroughly investigate into all aspects of railroad transportation in Manitoba. The second part of his question is dealing with the railroads which will now be under my general jurisdiction as the one answerable to the House insofar as freight rates and that is concerned, it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, not only to deal with the broad aspect of freight rates, rail line abandonments and other aspects of the railroads, to have the confidence and co-operation of my honourable friend in Churchill and other members of the House in an assessment of the application of all these matters as far as they affect the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, now that the news is out, I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the House would take under advisement the fact that in Swan River we've been getting the train three times a week for the last 48 years. I wonder if you could have it changed with a view to a rail liner serving northern Manitoba daily.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend that this will be one of the matters that I'll have under consideration in order that the destinies of the great town of Swan River are so expanded under this government that it is necessary to have daily service rather than the three days a week that has been in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, while on the topic of the near north as well as the far north, I wonder if the Minister of Youth and Education could indicate the progress, if any, on the million dollar a year Newstart program that was initiated by the former government to assist northern Manitoba.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the Newstart program initiated by the Federal Government has not yet taken off. It's still in the formative stage and the Federal Government has withheld any announcement.

MR. CRAIK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Newstart group not established a staff of some sort and had several meetings?

MR. MILLER: Yes, they've established a staff. They held one meeting in Winnipeg, but the Federal Government has requested that until they are ready to make the announcement no information be given out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Railways. I wonder if he would tell this House whether it's his intention to call the Manitoba Transportation Commission into session within the next two weeks.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend that this matter is under consideration, and may I also say to my honourable friend that now that the First Minister has made this announcement it will be my obligation, it will be my duty to consider all aspects insofar as -- it will be my obligation to undertake a review of all aspects dealing with railroad transportation in the Province of Manitoba despite my honourable friend from Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Honourable Member for Rhineland, in reference to the Monetary Fund, that I am advised that there is no access to the Fund by non-sovereign bodies. The United Nations is acting as an association of such bodies when it deals with the Monetary Fund and unfortunately -- no, I shouldn't say unfortunately; I'm not sorry that we are not a sovereign nation because we are part of the country of Canada, and as long as we are part of Canada, then we ourselves as a province have no access to the Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question was really a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Railways. Would he consider the advisability of the Manitoba Transportation Commission determining whether they would want to make representation about the discontinuation of the Great Northern passenger service from Winnipeg to St. Paul and Minneapolis.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend that I would take this as notice. The Honourable the First Minister indicated to the House that this is going to be one of my responsibilities. I will not renege on my responsibilities; I would take this question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should rise in reply to that question, not to interfere with my colleague who has already answered, but to say to my honourable friend the Member for River Heights that it's just not correct to say that there's been an application by Great Northern before the Interstate Commerce Commission for discontinuance. It's an application for curtailment, a reduction in the frequency of service. My honourable friend is perhaps playing a little mischief.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I'm not playing any mischief because the over-all effect, if the Honourable First Minister's words are correct, it is really not a discontinuation, it's a change, but the effect of the change really ultimately means a discontinuation of the service because it will be very inconvenient for people to travel on that line, and in this respect I think the terminology may have been wrong but the intent was there. Basically it will mean that passenger service will be usurped as a result of the inconvenience that will be caused by the change.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend I would be glad to consult with him insofar as this matter is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate whether or not the Manitoba Government is currently negotiating a new ARDA contract with the Federal Government?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, at some point in this session I had answered that question for my honourable friend. The answer at that time was that the ARDA Program is under review and, as he well knows, a new agreement must be entered into with the Federal Government by March, and it will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. -- Do you have a supplementary? I defer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As usual, the Minister of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) Agriculture really hasn't attempted to answer the question. The question is simply: are negotiations taking place? I didn't ask whether the review -- a review could be within the department here or in Ottawa, but are current negotiations taking place to renegotiate an enlarged or curtailed ARDA agreement for Manitoba at this time?

MR. USKIW: There have been negotiations, Mr. Speaker, and there will be negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister and ask the honourable gentleman whether his swift return from the north central United States reflects a preoccupation with the business of this Chamber or indicates that there's no business for us in North and South Dakota?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should, in reply to my honourable friend, say that the prospects are very good for increased flow of trade and business arrangements between businessmen of Manitoba and North and South Dakota. The reason I'm back in such a hurry is because of, as he put it himself, my concern for the affairs of the Province of Manitoba and the work of this Assembly.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister -- the First Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House whether it's the intention to transfer from the Department of Industry and Commerce those civil servants who are the experts in connection with rail matters, to the Department of Labour.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have already indicated that we will try, in the interests of better government - and I don't mean that in any offensive way - some innovation. We shall have this arrangement whereby the Honourable the House Leader is answerable in this House and also responsible for assisting in the process of policy formation in matters affecting railway policy, but we propose to leave the personnel in the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question again is related to the statement of the First Minister, not this one but the first statement that he made, in connection with the change. I wonder if he can now indicate who would be responsible for the Mauro Report and its implementation - which Minister?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that will be by way of Cabinet committee work, by way of Cabinet decision-making itself, by way of efforts on the part of the Minister of Highways in all those aspects of the Mauro Report that have to do with highway improvements, by way of the Department of Industry and Commerce, myself in matters relating to air service to the north and my colleague the Minister of Labour in matters relating to railway transport for the north. It will be all a joint effort on the part of my colleagues.

MR. PAULLEY: And we all talk to each other.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, then, if the First Minister can inform the House whether (a) the Mauro Report has been sent to the federal officials and what departments the Mauro Report has been sent to the federal officials; and (b) and (c) and (d) what departments are now discussing aspects and recommendations of the Mauro Report; that is, what provincial and federal departments and what Ministers are now involved in discussions with the Federal Government?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, copies of the Mauro Report have been sent to governments of the sister provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I do believe that we have offered to send a copy to one or another of the appropriate federal departments, and to my knowledge all departments of the Government of Manitoba that have an interest in implementation of the Mauro Report have copies and are studying them.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Is my honourable friend going to ask . . .

MR. SPIVAK: This is a second supplementary . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I believe that, Mr. Speaker, by the rules of the House, my friend has exhausted his supplementary questions.

MR. SPIVAK: No, this is the second.

MR. PAULLEY: We're getting into the order of argument. Now maybe one of his colleagues could pick this up.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on a point of privilege this is the second supplementary.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, point of privilege, not a supplementary question; that's all right.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether any discussions have taken place with the National Harbours Board in connection with the Mauro Report.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no definitive kind of discussion between the National Harbours Board yet but I hope that there will be soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the Honourable House Leader's abilities in the House, wouldn't it be more appropriate if we could refer to him as the Minister of sidetracks?

MR. PAULLEY: There's been no more sidetracking from this side than there has from that side, and if my honourable friend wants to talk about sidetracking I'm the guy that he should refer his questions to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Today, according to the news tonight, the Federal Cabinet are meeting in Ottawa in an emergency meeting on the grain situation on the west coast which is affecting the farmers in the Province of Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- That's right and I'd go yet if you'd just say the word. But I -- To the First Minister I . . . Direct representation, Mr. Speaker, has been made to the federal Cabinet by farm organizations all over the prairie provinces, by the Conservative caucus in Manitoba, by the federal Conservative caucus, and since the Minister of Agriculture has indicated this morning that he's sick and tired of hearing about the problems of agriculture, I make an appeal now to the First Minister, and I do sincerely appeal to the First Minister to make a direct appeal to the Federal Government to do something about the Vancouver crisis.

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I made no such statement this morning. I said I was sick and tired of the kind of repetition we were getting in the same questions every day.

MR. WATT: At that time, Mr. Speaker, and on the same point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I said to the Minister that I was sick and tired of getting no answers from him, but I would expect one from the gentleman over here, who I believe is a gentleman.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I confess that I didn't hear every word of the honourable member's question but . . .

MR. WATT: I'll give it to you again.

MR. SCHREYER: No, that's not necessary. I got the essence of your question, Sir, and I would answer as follows: that inasmuch as the tie-up at the west coast is a matter of grave national concern in my opinion, that is the reason why I joined with the Premiers of Alberta and Saskatchewan in a joint letter, or telegram which was sent several days ago to the federal Minister of Labour and to the Prime Minister asking that if there were any delay in the loading of ships in the slipways at the terminal elevators at Vancouver, that Parliament should be convened or called immediately. Such a telegram was sent. Inasmuch as the Honourable Bryce Mackasey, Minister of Labour, has repeated and repeated his determination to get the grain moving, I didn't feel that it was necessary to send a second telegram from myself personally, but I'd be quite prepared to do so if the Minister of Agriculture advises me that he feels it would be necessary. It's important and we've already taken action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, if what the Honourable Member for Arthur has had to say this evening, and it is true that serious consideration is being given to it at this moment in Ottawa, I would on behalf of this side of the House anyway, Mr. Premier, appeal to you tonight to send a telegram and apply your good offices in order to do something for the Manitoba farmers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on third reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a very brief statement -- this is for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface's benefit -- in connection with this bill as it goes into its final stages. I do so because of the statements of the Honourable Minister of Finance in winding up the debate when we were in Committee, and because in his statement he indicated a criticism or suggested criticism of those of us on the other side who he referred as "crying doom and gloom" for Manitoba. And I'm quite surprised that the Honourable Minister of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) Finance would (a) use that terminology, and (b) criticize those on this side who have sat in government for such a long period of time as purveyors of doom and gloom, because for the three years that I sat on the other side the purveyors of doom and gloom were all in the New Democratic Party, and in the speeches that came forth on more than one occasion, whether it be the budget debate, or debate on the Department of Industry and Commerce, or the debate on the Speech from the Throne, we were told over and over again (a) how bad Manitoba was doing, (b) how bad Manitoba would continue to do, and (c) how difficult it was to carry on and make ends meet under the tax burden that the people of Manitoba had to bear. -- (Interjection) -- And what a lousy government. For the record, I should say that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface did say that.

Now here we have the bill, or Income Tax Act, which I think now can be referred as the Epistle of Saul, and I think may be remembered in history for the business community as the Epistle of Saul. But one of the things that really disturbs me in this sort of blanket condemnation of those on the other side including those members of the Liberal Party who took the same position as we did on this, that we're purveyors of doom and gloom, is that there really has been no evidence shown, no real concrete evidence shown, that any of the criticisms we offered are not justified.

We find no supporting evidence from the business community that the statements that the Honourable Minister of Finance has made are really considered to be correct. We have no evidence brought forth by the New Democratic Party that there were any serious or meaningful discussions with the business leaders of our community, with those who are involved in industrial development, with those who have attempted to try and make things happen in Manitoba; that Manitoba, by being placed in an uncompetitive position in connection with corporation taxes, would not in effect really have a serious impact on the continued and future development of our economy.

Now, all of us on this side must say to those on this side; do you really know what you are doing? Do you really know what you're doing? You say we must disregard the TED Report in this respect because the TED Report was written by businessmen who would be seriously concerned and interested in their own businesses. -- (Interjection) -- Now let me explain. This is what the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare said as the position of the New Democratic Party, and if this is so, and if the TED Report in your terms was written by businessmen who are interested in their own businesses and they have said: "Do not place Manitoba in an uncompetitive position because it means that business will not develop," then surely you should have paid some heed to those businessmen because those are the businessmen that you're going to be depending on to continue to expand the economy of this province. And yet, even though you say that we have to look at this very judiciously and scrupulously and we must pay heed to what was the intention of those who wrote the report, you're obviously not interested in listening to them, because they have told you on this matter on the estate tax that it is important that Manitoba be placed in a competitive position, and those of you who believe - as the Honourable Minister of Finance does - that taxation is just a pittance and taxation is really not something that is seriously considered by corporations, I suggest to you that you know nothing about industrial development. And you know nothing about industrial development in this province, because the difficulty in Manitoba, and the continuing difficulty, has been to try and make things happen. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not suggesting I know it all, but I'm suggesting, and that's very important -- I'm not suggesting I know it all but I'm suggesting it would have been very wise for the Standing Committee on Economic Development to have had an opportunity of hearing those who are concerned in making things happen testify, so that we would get their opinion and we would find out whether in fact we can be in an uncompetitive position, and we can have higher real estate taxes than in other areas, and we can have a situation where there is going to be a question of the stability of the economic climate in here, and whether that will or will not inhibit industrial development.

And so I simply say to the Honourable Minister that the concerns that are expressed on this side are justified because there is no supporting evidence to the position you've taken, and you really don't know what is going to happen, and we are going to have to wait and see. In the meantime, we are at a point in our economic development where the continuation of the momentum that we now have must be maintained if we are going to be able to do all the things that we want to do and be able to meet the needs of the rise in incomes of our people, and to be able to continue to have the tax dollars necessary to carry on the existing programs, let

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) alone other new programs that are required by the events of the day. And so we are going to have to wait and see what those results will be, but I suggest that the Honourable Minister of Finance has no right to claim on our side doom and gloom, but simply has a right to say that "I don't know what's going to happen but I hope that it will work out."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. FROESE: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Has the honourable member support?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: Five. I only noticed four. Has the honourable member more? Fine.

O.K.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The motion before the House is that the debate on the third reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance be adjourned.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Mrs. Trueman. Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Jorgenson, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Watt.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johansson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate that I did not vote because I was paired with the Honourable the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, if he desires he can now speak.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had planned on making certain remarks and I was going to use an article that I saw in the Financial Post just the other day, and I thought it was very fitting. I didn't have it with me so I won't enlarge on it, but I will have to forego it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm closing debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Is the Minister of Finance about to speak? I would question, Mr. Speaker, whether he has the right to speak. I regret to prevent him from doing so, but I think the rules of the House do not permit the closing of debate on third reading of a bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It is the same question that comes to my mind, too.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is correct, that at this particular stage my honourable friend has not the right to close the debate on third reading. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we may call the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their comments. The Chair is in agreement.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd mind calling now Committee of the Whole House to consider third reading on the bill standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister, dealing with amendments to The Election Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 38, standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have before us the amendment from the Honourable Member for Rhineland which reads as follows: "That Section 37 of the Act is amended (a) by adding thereto at the end of clause (b) of Section 2 thereof the word 'and'; (b) by striking out the word 'and' in the third line of clause (c) of subsection 2 thereof; (c) by striking out clause (d) of subsection 2 thereof; and (d) by striking out the word 'one' in the second line of subsection 3 thereof and substituting therefor the figure '2'."

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: The committee may recall, Mr. Chairman, that last evening the Honourable Member for Rhineland introduced this amendment, and that at that precise moment, because of the terminology of the amendment proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, I made a request that we should have an opportunity of considering the amendment proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland. He intimated to me at that time that this dealt with the question of the deposits for running for office. He also indicated to the committee that I had proposed this resolution in the past dealing with the abolition of the \$200.00 deposit for running for office, and at that particular time I agreed with my honourable friend that I had in fact made this proposition. At that time, I appealed to my honourable friend that possibly the subject matter of his amendment might be considered by the Committee on Elections and Privileges which has been established by this House, and that we may consider this during the recess of the House in between sessions. And, Mr. Chairman, I did then appeal to my honourable friend and to the members of the committee and they agreed with me - and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to have some attentive audience during my discourse . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. PAULLEY: And I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you may call the honourable members to order, in order that they may hear me out, because I think what I am going to say is of the most importance to this committee. I, at that time, Mr. Chairman, suggested to my honourable friend that there were one or two alternatives, and I appealed to my honourable friend not to endeavour to proceed with his amendment, with which I have no conflict basically. I wonder if my honourable friends opposite would just listen to what I have to say because I think this is most important. I suggested to my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, to possibly consider the withdrawal of this amendment in order that we might proceed, in accordance with the rules of the House, to consider the subject matter of his amendment and to refer the same to consideration of the committee established on Elections and Privileges, and also to give us an opportunity of considering the amendment of my honourable friend, which I admit and I reiterate and repeat that I had introduced into this House on a number of occasions previously, namely the elimination of the requirement of the \$200.00 deposit. And at that stage yesterday evening, Mr. Chairman, in committee, there was no consensus. The committee rose to give us an opportunity of considering the amendment of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland. And I want to say, Mr. . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable House Leader appealed to me last night whether I would not allow this matter to remain in committee, and this is exactly what I did. He asked me and I agreed to it.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate very much, Mr. Chairman, the co-operation of my honourable friend, and as a result of his co-operation and the procedures that took place last night, the matter is still before this committee, so I want to thank my honourable friend.

But, Mr. Chairman, as the result of the co-operation of my honourable friend, we have now had an opportunity of considering precisely the recommendation or the motion of my honourable friend. First of all, Mr. Chairman - and I'm not really going to press the point at this time - what my honourable friend is suggesting is the elimination of the \$200.00 deposit for candidates seeking office. -- (Interjection) - Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Very good. Right. Now then, my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney -- Pardon?

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): The speech you made was made each year.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. I've made this speech on a number of occasions.

MR. WATT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Leader of the House if he's speaking on the proposed amendment or an amendment that has been accepted by the Chair.

MR. PAULLEY: It was not accepted. I say to my honourable friend the Member for Arthur, and I sincerely suggest to him that he listens to the words of wisdom that are coming out of Transcona now.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order, I'm quite prepared to listen to words of wisdom at any time, but what I'm trying to ascertain right now is what point my honourable friend is speaking on. Is he speaking on an amendment that was rejected by the Chair.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm speaking on the proposition as suggested by my honourable friend from Rhineland and I suggest to my honourable friend from Arthur that he allow me to continue, because . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that we're now discussing the point of order as to whether this amendment is in order, and before the Chair rules I think we should hear discussion on that point.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, the amendment was accepted last night.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): No, it was not.

MR. FROESE: Sure it was. I'm sure the record will show that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I happened to be in the Chair last night and my first remarks to the Honourable Member for Rhineland were that the motion was not in order. I didn't make a ruling on it as to why it wasn't in order, but I did say that I felt it was not in order, and then the debate started as to whether it was or wasn't and we didn't complete it. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have to take issue with that, because I'm sure that the -- I rose to speak and so did the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the amendment was accepted by the Chair. We discussed it as a result.

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of order, may I just say that I think that we on this side assumed from the statements that were made, first by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and others, that the honourable member's amendment was in order, it was a question of determination as to whether there would be government policy in which there would be approval for it or not, but if the Honourable House Leader is now suggesting that he's now talking on the question of the admissibility of the honourable member's amendment, then this is something radically different from what we considered had been settled yesterday evening, and I think this is true from everyone on this side. There was no question from our point of view that it was acceptable because there was no question of his right to bring forth an amendment. Whether it should or should not be considered to be forwarded on to the committee that's now been set up, is a matter of judgment which the committee can arrive at, but in terms of his right to deal with this, there's no question. He has a right to bring this amendment forward, and he has.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my honourable friend, despite his knowledge, I would suggest that his knowledge is so far from being factual or knowledgeable that he doesn't know what the dickens he's talking about, because I'll quote the rule to my honourable friend that "no member other than a member of Cabinet can introduce a resolution which affects the treasury of the Province of Manitoba," That's right. That's right. Because the amendment proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland affects the treasury of the Province of Manitoba, because with the elimination of the \$200.00 deposit the Treasury is affected. Now I'm not going to pursue this point. All I want to say -- (Interjection) -- excuse me, my dear friend. All I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. FROESE: If objections were to be raised on this point they should have been raised last night because you accepted the amendment at that time, and likewise I read from Hansard, I took the portion from Hansard; there was no other clause mentioned in Hansard as to him putting that -- it was put in the same precise way as I put it, this time in Committee of the Whole.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland that the reason the matter was not proceeded with last night was because I raised the matter as to the propriety of the resolution of my honourable friend, and it was on that basis that we did not proceed with it last night. However, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . interrupt the honourable member for a moment, the recollection

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) of the Chairman of last night is that he did not rule it in order. The recollection of the Clerk is that the motion was not accepted, so I assume that therefore we are dealing with a proposed motion which in fact was not accepted. We are now questioning whether or not it is proper for this motion to be accepted as a proposed amendment, and therefore should hear arguments to that effect. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to pursue this. I want to give to everybody in this House the opportunity of proceeding with it. I make an appeal to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, and I give him the assurance of the government of the Province of Manitoba that the subject matter of the question of the deposit that he raises, and properly so, will be considered by this government. It's not on the basis of principle and there's no difference of opinion between my honourable friend and myself previously, or the government today, the only matter being as to the propriety of a member other than that of the Treasury bench being able to introduce a resolution which affects the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba. This is the only point. I say to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland and to all members of the House, we are perfectly prepared to consider the advisability or otherwise as to whether or not candidates seeking office should be required to put up a bond or a fee of \$200. 00. There's the only difference between my honourable friend and myself, and I'm prepared to accept the contention, and the government I'm sure is prepared to accept the contention of my honourable friend from Rhineland, that this should be the subject matter of consideration of the Committee on Elections and Privileges. This is the only point. And so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, will he not, having this assurance from the government and I give it in all sincerity, will he not accept my undertaking as the House Leader of the Government of Manitoba that this will be done, because my honourable friend under the rules of the House, not present but past, can do otherwise, so I ask my honourable friend will he not accept my undertaking that this will be done. I'm asking my honourable friend.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, and I presume that the Honourable the House Leader has been dealing with the point of order, at least in his initial remarks I got that impression. However, as he meandered through the discussion I became lost in what he was attempting to say, and I was sincerely trying to follow him because I'm curious about the point that was raised. Last night, my understanding was that the amendment was raised, and after some confusion on that side and after it was brought to the Honourable House Leader's attention that he'd proposed similar motions in the past, I raise the question of whether or not it was possible to raise an amendment to any section of an Act that was not dealt with in a bill to amend, and I was wanting to hear the House Leader on that point because I'm curious about whether, for example, if a bill was introduced in this House amending a small section of the Municipal Act, is it possible for all members to open up the entire Act and submit it to amendments. I heard nothing from the House Leader on that point and I've been checking through Beauchesnes and through the rules of this House to find out if that was possible. I am told by those who have been in this House for some time that it is possible, and this seems to me kind of a dangerous kind of a rule to have in the House, but what I was wanting to hear from the Minister was a sufficient reason that the amendment proposed by my honourable friend from Rhineland was not acceptable.

Now he mentioned something about affecting the balance of supply, and perhaps these are flimsy grounds that I tread on here, but is there going to be an affecting of the balance of supply this year, next year or the following year if there's an election? There won't be obviously. And so is there validity of my honourable friend's argument holding water in this case? I question that, and I'd like to hear the House Leader debate on that point. He has debated the merits of the proposal set forth by my honourable friend from Rhineland, but I think what we're dealing with here is the admissibility of the amendment and the proposal submitted by my honourable friend, and it's to the point of order that I'd like to hear my honourable friend address himself.

MR. PAULLEY: I would be glad, Mr. Speaker, to have consultations with my honourable friend who with such dignity, such knowledge, served the Province of Manitoba down in that other House. I would welcome consultation with my honourable friend insofar as Beauchesne and the rules of the House are concerned. I merely raise the point now as to the effect of the amendment my honourable friend . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: On the point of order, I don't accept the House Leader's cynicism on

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) this, because I am serious.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not cynical at all. I'm offering my services to my honourable friend who is so unknowledgeable of the rules of procedure. I do suggest that in this, affecting the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba, apart from the other considerations of my honourable friend, that I am on firm ground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm taking my cue from you, Sir, and you're indicating that you're anxious to hear several opinions in order to determine as to whether or not the amendment is in order. As far as I'm concerned, that must come at the earliest possible moment. I believe there is a rationale as to why this limitation or this amount of money is placed in the Act that shall be collected from candidates prior to an election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the point of order on the question of the value of having deposits.

MR. BILTON: I'll come to that if you'll give me a moment, Mr. Speaker. Our Party's stand on this matter is well-known, and so far as I'm concerned, the Honourable Member for Rhineland has every right to put forward the amendment that he has put, and I understand the opinion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour in his endeavour to accommodate the honourable member by suggesting that he withdraw this with a view to it being considered by the proper committee at a later date, and he has assured the honourable member of the government's sympathy in that regard - not sympathy necessarily, but understanding for consideration. I, Sir, go on record that the matter should be dealt with now and the matter should be once and for all dealt with, and if at the time that committee sits, and the honourable member is of the same opinion, that he might put forward his suggestion at that time to be dealt with.

. continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I read the Honourable Minister's amendment as of May 24, 1968, as found on Page 2401 of the 1968 Hansard into the record last night. There was no mention of "consider the advisability of" at the time that he made this motion, and he made it in Committee of the Whole just like I'm doing it right now, or did it last night. There was no need for it at that time; I can see no need for it this time; and I can't see why the amendment should not be in order. I figured, I thought this matter had been closed last night and that the motion was accepted by the Chair. This was definitely the impression that I was left with, and I'm sure honourable members on this side too, because we had considerable discussion on the motion after that.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health & Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Chairman, may I say that I believe that there should be a ruling now on the question as to whether this is a motion which could affect the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba, and I submit that that may be a moot point because, if it's ruled out of order on that ground, I presume that the honourable member could put it in with the relevant wording. The Member for Ste. Rose is shaking his head. If it's out of order on that ground, Mr. Speaker, then I submit that it's out of order. If he can't re-put it in, then that's a problem that he'll have to deal with, but I submit that the motion is out of order and should be ruled out on that basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that I've heard sufficient debate. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as you and other members of this House know, it's not very often that I rise to speak to a point of order, and the only reason I rise now is to attempt to remove the necessity for you making a ruling, because I would like to appeal very genuinely to my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, if he would not please withdraw this proposed amendment for the simple reason that we, as a government, give the undertaking that the subject matter of his amendment will be something that will be considered by the appropriate committee, standing committee of this House, the Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that between now and some time during the course of the next regular session of this House next winter, we will get a determination of the majority opinion of this Chamber on the very question which my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland seeks to have dealt with now.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me we are moving with unnecessary haste here. We thought it would be in the public interest to have an amendment to The Elections Act to allow to lower the voting age from 21 to 18; then some saw fit to move beyond that and allow people to hold office at age 18. Whatever I think of that I won't say at the moment, but now we have my honourable friend from Rhineland, who may have a good idea, that the \$200.00 deposit requirement under the election law be removed so that candidates in the future need not put up the \$200.00 deposit. Without expressing an opinion on that, Sir, I would hope and ask my honourable friend from Rhineland once again if he would not just contain his anxiety and his impatience for just a few months and we can deal with it in a more effective way at the regular session oncoming next February or March. . . . that it's likely out of order and nothing would be gained, but I would hope for the cooperation of my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Member for Rhineland to withdraw the motion or to ask for a ruling from the Chair as to its admissibility?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if I withdraw it, it's certainly not on the basis that it is not acceptable and that it's not legal, and I'm sure that the same motion was accepted on a previous occasion without any difficulty, without any objections, and if I withdraw it it's certainly not on that supposition or on that proposition. If the Honourable First Minister says that favourable consideration will be given, then I'm quite happy to withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceeding with the Bill. (The balance of Bill 38 was read section by section and passed.)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 38, recommended it to the House, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now kindly call the adjourned debate on second reading on the Bill standing in my name, respecting The Legislative Assembly Act (2), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading on proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, rising to speak on this Bill, Bill No. 47, I find it very unusual that after having just been privileged to listen in on the points of order that we just witnessed, now we're dealing with a bill which, in my opinion, should be dealt with maybe not with the same committee, but I think the committee suggested by the Member for Ste. Rose would be the right committee. The Committee on Rules, Standing Orders, Practices and Procedures could easily deal with this very same bill. And I'd like to bring the members up to date on just what has taken place over the past 11 or 12 years. Twelve years ago, I think, members for Rupertsland and Churchill received the sum of \$600.00 over and above their \$3,000 salary to look after their extra expenses while they were in their constituencies, and about three years later the salaries were increased to \$4,000 and about two years later, the year of '65, they were increased to \$4,800, and in 1967 they were increased to \$7,200, with a living allowance of \$1,200 for all members outside of Winnipeg and a northern allowance of \$1,500 for the two members of Churchill and Rupertsland to look after the constituencies which they presently serve. But at that time, the Members of The Pas and Flin Flon were in the Cabinet and they naturally couldn't be provided with extra allowance anyway and I guess that's the one reason why their names weren't on the list.

But I would like to remind the House Leader, I would like to remind him -- (Interjection)-- Flin Flon and The Pas were not . . .

MR. PAULLEY: They were eligible for the \$1,500.00.

MR. McKELLAR: Ineligible? That's what I said.

MR. PAULLEY: They were eligible for it.

MR. McKELLAR: It wasn't in the Bill.

MR. PAULLEY: It was under the rules of The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. McKELLAR: No. No. Otherwise you wouldn't be bringing these amendments in right now if it was. The very reason he's bringing amendments in now proves to me that they were never in the former Bill. No.

I would like to remind the House Leader, during the last redistribution --(Interjection)-- If the House Leader would keep quiet here I might be able to get on with my speech.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. You go ahead; I'll talk after you.

MR. McKELLAR: I'd like to remind the House Leader that during the last redistribution there are nine less rural seats in Manitoba - nine less rural seats, seven more seats in the Greater Winnipeg area, and the seat at Thompson and another one at Brandon. This makes the work of all members in the rural parts of Manitoba increased, I would say, by 50 percent, and I think it's only right that you not only look at it from the two seats that you have in your Bill, consider the two seats, Flin Flon and The Pas, but I think you should take the advice of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and review all the different sizes of constituencies, the problems of communication, geographical redistribution of the population within the constituencies, and having in regard for the isolated communities and such as that. And I would consider myself, in my own area, which takes in at least twice the size, that the expenses which will be involved in representing the people which I presently serve will be increased at least 50 percent, which will be an enormous amount of money if you're going to do the job right. There is a saving of money, I will admit, of nine seats at the rate of \$1,200 a year, and that is only a sum around 10,000 or 11,000 dollars a year to the Treasury of Manitoba by having nine less rural seats in the Province of Manitoba, and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to support this amendment, proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to this Bill, because I think it's fair and reasonable and I think one which all members of our party can accept, and we hope that if the government accepts, that they will permit this amendment to be handled through the Rules, Standing Orders, Practices and Procedures Committee which will be dealt with during this coming winter.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping the government will have a second thought and remember the words that they were just suggesting to us a few minutes ago, to the member, where they deal with this during the winter months. The suggestions were made to reduce the deposit of all candidates down to \$1.00 - or down to nothing, I should say. They wouldn't go along with this. Well, I would suggest that they have second thoughts on their bill

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) and accept the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is incumbent on me to make some remarks in connection with the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I appreciate the amendment of my honourable friend and I want to assure him that I know that his amendment is proposed in all sincerity and in all desire on his part to consider the problem that members of this Assembly have in respect of representation here in this House.

Having said that in respect of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I find it hard to accept the proposition of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, the Honourable Member for Swan River, and the Honourable Member for Roblin in respect of this proposition. And one might properly ask me why I raise the question as to the acceptance. Mr. Speaker, by resolution of this House some time ago - two or three years ago - we had a redistribution of all of the constituencies in Manitoba, and as a result of that redistribution of the seats, there was an expansion of the boundaries of the constituencies in many areas, including Swan River, including Roblin, including Souris-Killarney and others as well, including Flin Flon, including The Pas, including Churchill, including Rupertsland. They were changed -- and Arthur. That's right. There were many changes -- and Virden.

MR. BILTON: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman. Churchill was made smaller, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. That's right; Churchill was made smaller, but it's still a large constituency taking . . .

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, when these two gentlemen get over arguing whether Churchill was smaller or not, I'd like to see them prove it.

MR. PAULLEY: It doesn't matter whether it's proven or not insofar as the geographical area is concerned. But, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House at this session have been chastised by my honourable friends opposite, and we have been accused of porkbarreling because we have -- and my honourable friend for Riel who just scraped through says right, and he's one of the characters that should raise the point because he only now represents a mere portion of the constituency of Radisson that I represented so ably for so long, and he now represents less than a quarter of the people that I represented in this House so admirably and so well for so long.

MR. CRAIK: They're getting action now, Buss.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. They're getting action and you nearly got the action on June 25th by about 45 or 50 votes, and you know it. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that my honourable friends opposite are now accusing this government of porkbarreling because we want . . .

MR. CRAIK: Shame!

MR. PAULLEY: It is a shame, and I can't understand why it is that presumably intelligent individuals on that side of the House suggest -- (Interjection) -- I didn't say it. My friends opposite said it. And I'm surprised at my honourable friend using such phraseology as porkbarrelling. As I say, I'm amazed because, Mr. Speaker, the redistribution of the seats in the House was done by a motion of this House, a resolution of this House, and the Commission that was charged with the responsibility of setting up the new constituencies was an independent board or commission - comprised of whom? Politicians? It was comprised of the Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba, the President of the University of Manitoba, and the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province of Manitoba - and they were charged with that responsibility. They made a report to this House as to the boundaries of the respective constituencies and they were accepted, with minor changes. My honourable friend from Souris-Killarney is so right. They were accepted. And in their recommendations the new boundaries were established, and we fought an election on those newly-established boundaries.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we received the report from the Boundaries Commission - the Electoral Boundaries Commission - we knew then that there would be some problem areas insofar as representation was concerned, because under the former Act, as you're well aware, Mr. Speaker, only two constituencies - namely, the constituency of Churchill and the constituency of Rupertsland - were entitled to receive the extra emolument of \$1,500 to compensate the members because of the fact that they had widespread constituencies to take care of.

MR. BILTON: For transportation.

MR. PAULLEY: For transportation, my honourable friend the former Speaker has interjected, and I accept that.

But under redistribution, and as my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, the former Speaker of this House will recall, that one of the reasons or one of the directives, should I say, given to the Electoral Boundaries Commission was to take under consideration representation in remote areas, and the problems of transportation . . .

MR. BILTON: Representation by population.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, representation - that's right. That's right. There's no disagreement.

MR. BILTON: You didn't say that, though.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I say it now.

MR. BILTON: Good.

MR. PAULLEY: And this is one of the areas which was to be under the consideration of the Boundaries Electoral Commission, having arrived at a quotient, 25 percent up to 25 percent down, based on the problems of transportation and other considerations as well. And as a result of the deliberations of the Electoral Divisions Commission, the quotient in northern Manitoba in the constituencies concerned with this bill that we now have before us, were lower than that arrived at by other constituencies, because of the problems of these constituencies.

What we are now suggesting as a government is that as a result of the deliberations of the Electoral Divisions Committee, that we should change from the former representation only of Churchill and Rupertsland insofar as the extra \$1,500 for transportation and meeting the constituents in these respective areas is concerned. It's not porkbarreling, Mr. Speaker. It's a recognition of the fact that we have had a redistribution in Manitoba of representation.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River and his desk mate the Member for Roblin, and I want to say to the Member for Souris-Killarney or any others, that there is a committee that will be giving consideration to all aspects in respect of these matters, and that we are prepared, as a government, to give serious consideration to the representation of my honourable friend. But the purpose of this bill that we now have before us is to take under consideration the new boundaries of the constituencies of the north, the accessibility by road or otherwise.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman would allow me just a word or two?

MR. PAULLEY: No, if you want to ask me a question, my dear friend, you can, but not a word.

MR. BILTON: I'll ask you a question then, if I may. Does the Honourable Minister realize that the constituency that I represent populationwise now almost equals every other constituency in the province, and in doing so my area had to be increased by thousands of miles, and did he - now my question - when considering The Pas and Flin Flon, did they consider the situation that I've just outlined, insofar as -- they obviously took care, but not care of that one.

MR. PAULLEY: I've said to my honourable friend, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my honourable friend, the other day when he was speaking he said: "Don't consider me, the individual." I appreciate the fact that under redistribution my honourable friend represents more people than he did before. I said to my honourable friend that we are prepared - and the First Minister said this the other day as well - that we are prepared to consider representation from my honourable friend in respect of changes of this. Now, how more fair can we be? But to be accused of porkbarreling because of the change in redistribution, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept. I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, I've been long enough in this House that I have never ever attempted to porkbarrel on any issue.

MR. BILTON: Talking about porkbarreling, Mr. Minister, I asked you a question a few moments ago and I know you will attempt to answer. Shall I wait a little while or are you going to answer it now?

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend cannot conceive the answer to the question that I gave him, then I regret his incomprehensibility of diagnosing my answer.

MR. BILTON: My intelligence is not in question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may my honourable friend allow me to continue?

MR. BILTON: My intelligence is not in question. You allowed me to ask the question, and I'm asking you whether or not you will answer it?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I answered my honourable friend. If he cannot assess and diagnose my answer, can I be faulted? -- (Interjection) -- That's right. My methodology may be incomprehensible but my reasoning is sound.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say -- (Interjection) -- It's a matter of opinion, that's right. That's right, and my honourable friend the member who just interjected is one who shouldn't talk about apprehensibility or the likes of that insofar as comprehensibility is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to say to my honourable friend, that what we are endeavouring to do by this resolution and this bill is to give to . . .

MR. ENNS: Don't let us down. We're with you all the way, Buss. All the way.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. I'm glad you are with me. What we are endeavouring to do, Mr. Speaker, by this bill is to restore to the representatives of the north the privileges that they had before and to give to them the privileges of proper representation in their respective constituencies. And if I wanted to be mean - and I'm not, Mr. Speaker - I could say to my honourable friends opposite that if they were really concerned with the problems of representation in the north, that on receipt of the report on the committee on redistribution, they should have made provisions as we are now attempting to make. And the only thing I would suggest to my honourable friends . . .

MR. ENNS: Oh, Russ!

MR. PAULLEY: The only thing I would - oh, Russ, yes.

MR. ENNS: I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. PAULLEY: The only thing I suggest to my honourable friends opposite is that what we are doing now is what should have been done on receipt of the recommendations by the Electoral Divisions Commission, to continue to provide for the representatives of the north the same allowances that previously prevailed. And that, Mr. Speaker, sincerely and honestly is the purport of this bill.

Now, I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. BILTON: On a point of order, would the Honourable Minister accept a question?

MR. PAULLEY: When I'm finished. On this point, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, may I suggest that if the political representation had been different than it is at the present time, I am sure that there -- (Interjection) -- Ah but just a minute; you're accusing us of porkbarreling, and I reject this. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if on the basis of representation politically the same situation prevailed, and were I still sitting where my friend the Member for Souris-Killarney is sitting . . .

MR. McKELLAR: You'll be back.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . as I was -- yes I'll be back, but I doubt whether my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney will be back.

MR. McKELLAR: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, now that's going too far, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think so.

MR. McKELLAR: I assure you, I'll be here long after you're here.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I appreciate the statement of my honourable friend. He is a couple of years younger than I am, and who knows?

MR. McKELLAR: You've only won one more election than I have. I'm five and you're six.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, and I'm sixteen and you're six.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would accept a question?

MR. PAULLEY: When I'm finished.

MR. BILTON: That's what you told me the last time.

MR. PAULLEY: When I am finished. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, and I've tried to be a fair and reasonable individual over the years, but I think that in all fairness that as a result of redistribution by an independent commission - which we fought for years to obtain - there was the change irrespective of political affiliation. Instead of, from that side to this side accusing the members on this side - no matter what their political makeup may be - an accusation of porkbarreling, in fairness to the representatives of these areas, I on that side of the House would be saying yes, I think this is fair. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the proposition contained in this bill. And I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that in my present position, if it included an honourable member of an opposition party for this amount, then I would support the same.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).

Now, we're dealing with an amendment by my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose. I think we are fair, -- (Interjection) -- I never forget anything. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I am being fair, that I am being reasonable, that I do not accept -- oh, stop nodding that empty head of yours -- I do not accept the proposition of my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose. And I want to conclude on the same basis, Mr. Speaker, that I started. I appreciate the sincerity of the proposition of my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose. I want to also, Mr. Speaker, say that we are prepared to reconsider this matter, either in the Rules Committee or the Committee on Elections and Privileges, in order that there is equality in representation of members of this Assembly and that they are treated fairly. I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose, allow this proposition of the government to go forward, the extra emoulment for expense allowance for the constituencies of Flin Flon or The Pas, and we're not, we're not rejecting the proposition of my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question but I must prefix it with a remark, that when the honourable gentleman holds forth he reminds me of a good old Anglican Bishop, and as such I'm sure he wouldn't want to misinform the House with any intent whatsoever, and I did out of his remarks hear him say something about what we might have done insofar as redistribution was concerned. I would remind him that the commission did sit and was non-political and did a good job, an excellent job, no one questions that whatsoever, but that didn't come into force until around May 25th of this year. The party in office at the time had no opportunity whatsoever to do what he is suggesting they should have done. The responsibility fell to the government in office today and I compliment them for what they have done. But my question is, and I repeat it again, that if they were so concerned about some parts of Manitoba, or constituencies in Manitoba, why didn't they look a little further afield where other constituencies are affected. And it bothers me to be pleading this case, because I think it's only fair and right and proper, it bothers me that I'm the affected one. But I think it's only right and it's the principle of the thing, Mr. Minister, that I'm arguing. I hope you will agree with me that this government that was in office had no opportunity to give the consideration that you're suggesting they should have given before they went out of office to this particular situation.

MR. PAULLEY: If that is a question directed to me, I must reject completely the contention of my honourable friend, because the government of the day prior to May 22nd had received, enacted and passed the -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes it had. We could not have had -- (Interjection) -- oh, my honourable friend, gee whiz. I must say to my honourable friend that the election that was held on June 25th was on the basis of legislation that was passed prior to May 22nd. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you'll agree with that? Then I would say if my honourable friend agrees with that, then he must agree with me that the government of that day had the opportunity of changing the basis of expense allowances on the basis of the new redistributed constituencies. -- (Interjection) -- There's no alternative, it must have been.

MR. CRAIK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would think likely on this point that if the previous government had given consideration to extra indemnity for those in remote locations it's very likely that the only one that would have been included, other than those that were included before, was -- (Interjection) -- Well yes, the very one -- (Interjection) -- no, he's made the statement of what the previous government would have done, and I'm suggesting that the only constituency that likely we would have given consideration to would be Thompson, and that's the only one that they have excluded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate on this question other than to remark that it's of course the little things that this government does that add up to the bigger things, and in this case a little bit of grease soon adds up to pork, because you can't quite look at the bill before us without of course looking at another measure right behind it, which proposes to set up a northern touring commission that again seems to affect very much the same members to enable them to study the north, have expenses paid . . .

A MEMBER: Would you permit a question?

MR. ENNS: . . . and I of course would like to have \$20.00 expenses to tour my enlarged constituency just as well.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order, I wonder if my honourable friend would deal with the subject matter under debate in the committee -- (Interjection) -- it doesn't hurt and I'll

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) debate the other one when we come to it. All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that my honourable friend restrict his arguments to the bill that is now before us and not the resolution that is following.

MR. WATT: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Labour that he should have set an example when he was making his speech, because if anybody deviated from the subject he did for the last half hour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm glad my honourable friend has returned to the Chamber to know what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside may continue with his debate on the motion before us.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate my complete support for the motion, for the amendment to the bill as proposed by the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose, because, Mr. Speaker, I think that of course this government has the will and the power to carry out the measure that we have here, but it is an amazing record that's being compiled by this government, and quite frankly, I think we would be doing a service to the remaining five or six members of the backbench of your government if we prolonged the session for another week or two because I'm confident that in those two weeks every one of you on that side would be somehow adequately looked after for an additional two or three thousand dollars of compensation, because you have pretty well looked after them all, and that's stacked up against the record of the previous government . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, my question is that when my predecessor by two, the Honourable Duff Roblin, brought in legislation back in 1958 - which I well recall, I was there - he brought in legislation to provide for extra indemnity for those MLAs serving constituencies north of the 53rd parallel, the northern Manitoba. What are we doing here that's different, because every constituency involved is north of the 53rd in whole or in large part.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the First Minister's question, the only thing that you are doing different - there's nothing wrong with the principle of it - is that in addition to that is the other things that you are doing that happen to befall on the same members, and in addition to this, the fact that when taking this reconsideration for the enlarged constituencies you have not taken into regard the case put by the honourable member for Swan River with respect to the considerably increased and large question that he faces there.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm sorry to interrupt my honourable friend. It's not that I find it -- well, I do find it objectionable but that's not the reason I rise, Sir, but to ask whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside would wish to carry on now, and do we have consent of all honourable members to carry on to 11:00 o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ENNS: Yes, we certainly have consent, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had rather considered that I would not give consent, but having heard from honourable members that they would like to proceed, I might do so. However, I think that I should mention that we've passed a speed-up motion, we generally did not sit on Wednesday nights, now we've already sat two hours for this evening, the session will already be shortened by one speech that I was going to make, and I rather felt that we would not have to extend it, but I will give consent.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to assure the Honourable Member for Rhineland that I am about to sit down to enable him to make the speech that he was about to make a little while ago. I think, Mr. Speaker, the point is made; and I think the decision in front of you, in lieu of the other things that you're doing, the government would be well-advised to accept the amended motion as attached to this bill by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Since we've got into this debate -- (Interjection) -- and pork barrel, and since I have been appointed to one other commission and they now tell us that this is a campaign commission for northern members, I think we'll get right down to the nuts and bolts of some of these things that have been said.

First of all, I would agree - and I didn't sit in the last session - but if there was going to be a different philosophy on expenses for rural members, certainly I feel that it should have

(MR. BEARD cont'd) been brought in when the bill was brought in itself; or it could have been introduced at the same time that asked that commission to consider redistribution, and it could have been added in as one of their principles that would help look after the additional costs of rural members if they felt that this was necessary.

But I think that there are two or three things that I would like to - reflections I would like to pass on to the House. First of all, the Member for Swan River said that Churchill was smaller. I'll advise him now that Manitoba's area is around 251,000 square miles, for his information, and the Churchill constituency takes about 119 to 120 thousand square miles of that area -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. BILTON: Does that include Hudson Bay?

MR. BEARD: No.

MR. BILTON: Thank you.

MR. BEARD: There's also an additional 400 miles of coastline in the Churchill constituency, if the honourable member would like some more information in respect to Churchill's constituency. Churchill constituency at this time, I also must remind him, goes down to take in a great deal of Rupertsland, old Rupertsland, because it includes down to God's Lake and Island Lake area, and I am sure if he looks on his map he will see where that is. And our population is increasing also just the same as his, in fact they tell me that our population has the largest reproduction - is the largest reproduction area in Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Not lately.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Not lately what, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BEARD: The honourable members are quite interested in additional expense money, and I would quickly point out to him that the Minister of Finance is right there before you get that expense money to snatch it back. That's not deductible, and I would wonder whether this is the proper approach, because I will gladly give the Minister of Finance the money that I receive for additional travelling expenses in northern Manitoba, he can have it lock, stock and barrel. He doesn't in fact, doesn't even need to give it to me at the end of this session, if in return he will provide either transportation for me round the area or if he will allow me to submit receipts for my expenses, legitimate expenses, on the travels around the Churchill constituency -- (Interjection) -- I would also - and one contingent would be to cut the St. Boniface member off completely in all expenses.

MR. BILTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BEARD: Yes.

MR. BILTON: Would he not agree with me that I was not arguing the money but rather the principle?

MR. BEARD: Well, perhaps so.

MR. DESJARDINS: In your tax bracket you'd lose money. -- (Interjection) -- In your tax bracket you'd lose all kinds of dough.

MR. BEARD: What I would say, would honourable members consider when they're asking for these things if they would ask that some of the real costs that politicians have to attend to that people by and large do not realize are expenses, and I think they're legitimate expenses. There are long distance calls; there are travelling expenses back and forth. We have only got it once, only got it once -- one member said we've already got it but we haven't -- (Interjection) -- oh, I'm sorry. Well this is what I'm saying. We all have these expenses and I think these are the things that we should be tackling rather than asking for more money, because the impression on the public immediately is, well here's a greedy politician that wants to ask for more money, and I don't think this is really what any of us have in mind when we're considering this.

The amendment is probably a reasonable one, but I would rather see it turned around to where the election committee that is coming up, it's supposed to be looking into all these different considerations, then they could take it on as their responsibility to look into this and say: how can we relieve the expenses on an honourable basis where we can allow members to submit expenses when they are travelling back and forward throughout their constituencies. I think that this would be far better than hassling about whether the Member for Churchill should have so much or so much, because if we took the basis of equalizing these things then I would say, if I have 119,000 square miles than I should probably have ten times as much as somebody that has 10,000 square miles. But it's just the amount of area that you have to go to, the amount of costs that it may be, and I realize that the people in Winnipeg have different

(MR. BEARD cont'd) costs than I have. The rural members have different costs than the northern members have, and I think that about the only place is like the constituency of St. Boniface where they don't have any expenses. Probably in places like that they should be reduced and given to other areas.

But I think the people would say it was unconscionable for us to ask for more monies at this time, but I think that they would sympathize with us if we said the expenses are growing and if we can get those travelling expenses, the necessary expenses, and be allowed to submit them to the comptroller. And there would be rules set down on which we could do it. This happens in our committees. When we're called in we're given an expense allowance, we have to submit our receipts and such on, and I think that they could settle down and come up with some type of a formula which would help you. Because if you are asking for additional money, whatever you ask for you're not going to get that amount because the treasury benches, both federal and provincially, are going to take their cut off that. So you're not going to get that amount of money. But on the other hand, if they are looking after the expenses, then I think that we would come to some suitable arrangement and it certainly would satisfy me. I know that often people say, well it's fine and dandy for you to get \$1,500 extra, you don't have to have anything to worry about, but believe me, by the time we add it up at the end of the year there is a deficit.

But for what it's worth, what I've had to offer, maybe the same commission that created all these problems and these three wise men, maybe they could come back with an answer because they really caused the problem in the first place and maybe they can come back with the answer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to know if there are any members who would like to speak on this motion because it seems to me it's been before honourable members for quite some time and if they have any view that they would like to express, it seems to me they would be likely wanting to express it this evening. In fact I would ask the Honourable Member for Fort Garry if he feels that it's just impossible to carry on with his contribution this evening.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question from the First Minister, no, it's not impossible to carry on with our contributions this evening, but at this juncture I would defer to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I did want to go on this resolution, however I just came from the library and the material I wanted is locked in the library, so I'm in full accord with the Member for Fort Garry that I feel that it should be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, although the motion hasn't been moved that the Member from Birtle-Russell is intending to adjourn the debate -- although the motion itself wasn't moved he may move it now, but I think that is what he was intending to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member for River Heights speaking to the motion?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak on this thing but the material I wanted to get is in the library and the library is locked now. The member has moved adjournment and I'm in full agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair heard the motion to adjourn. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask if there's any objection if I speak to the motion for a few minutes. Do I have leave?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you, Sir. I would like to speak for just a few minutes to the motion before us for the simple reason that I must say that my soul is grieved to hear all of the black and ulterior motives that are being attributed to this government because it has seen fit to ask this House for authorization to pay extra indemnity to those members of the Legislature who represent northern and larger constituencies of the north. It grieves me because I can say

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) without fear of contradiction that in 1958 when my predecessor, the Honourable Duff Roblin, introduced similar legislation to provide for extra indemnity for the MLAs from the northern ridings north of the 53rd parallel, there wasn't one single dissenting voice nor was there any protracted questioning of it. And what we are doing here is precisely in the same spirit. There are, because of redistribution now, four ridings north of the 53rd parallel which we consider as being large enough, communities far-flung enough one from the other to warrant extra expense allowance, if you like, or extra indemnity. And that's all we're proposing.

Now it strikes me very strange that what should have been all right in 1958, so much so that there wasn't a single dissenting vote, certainly not from the party that I am a member of, why should there be now this determined opposition, and worse than that, the attribution of ulterior motives for pecuniary gain that opposition members are throwing at us. When you look at the map of the northern constituencies you can see it is obvious that the constituency of Churchill is still large and far-flung and that it does certainly justify extra emolument being paid to the member who has to represent that area. And the same is certainly true in the case of Rupertsland and the same is certainly true in the case of The Pas constituency, and it is our judgment that it is also true in the case of Flin Flon. We do not consider it to be quite so true in the case of Thompson; we have not made any such move with respect to the riding of Thompson.

There can be no question about the additional size and expense of moving around in order to fulfill one's duties in the constituencies of Rupertsland, The Pas, Churchill and Flin Flon. Therefore, I should like to know why honourable members are finding it necessary to carry on this determined opposition to it. If they have some argument with respect to some subsequent resolution on this Order Paper, well fine, and we can debate the principle of that later. But this particular motion before us has to do with adjustments in indemnity to members representing northern constituencies north of the 53rd parallel. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, between now and tomorrow morning I can find the reference in Hansard of 1958 or '59 where it will show clearly that when similar adjustments were proposed by the Roblin administration there was no kind of mischievous effort to obstruct from the opposition.

MR. BILTON: On a point of order. Anything I have had to say on this subject I certainly don't consider it to be mischievous and I'm sorry the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You're not the only one that spoke.

MR. BILTON: It doesn't matter, I'm with the group that did speak and if he says it — (Interjection) — order, please. But I do want to emphasize, Sir, that I did not intend to be mischievous when I brought this matter up. I brought it up sincerely, and as I said to the Honourable Member for Churchill, that so far as I was concerned it wasn't the money — and I'm not a wealthy man — it wasn't the money that concerns me, it's the principle of the thing. And, Sir, if you had intended it to be — if I may comment just a moment further — if you'd intended it to be north of the 53rd parallel, as far as I'm concerned, why wasn't that in the bill. Had that been in the bill I would have had no argument, but I would remind you, Sir, that I'm only 15 miles from it at my northern point.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad — perhaps I should apologize to my honourable friend, but I really want him to understand that I used the word "mischievous" not in any offensive way but rather in the sense that probably the opposition is feeling that they are having some fun at the expense of the government and at the same time causing them some embarrassment. No doubt the Honourable Member for Swan River did not have such motives in mind, but, Sir, I cannot feel that way unfortunately about the Honourable Member for Lakeside, because what did he say just a few minutes ago? He said, and I'll try to paraphrase very closely, "that if the session were to last a little longer, then all members of the backbench would find some extra amount of indemnity as a result of a special adjustment." Now that's what I call mischievous, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: I call it fact.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Swan River has made a good suggestion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of privilege before the First Minister continues. In view of the fact that it is my amendment and he uses the term "mischievous", I think if you will read my comments of this morning and the intent, I'm sure it is not a mischievous amendment.

MR. SCHREYER: Well it may well be, Mr. Speaker. I unfortunately wasn't here this

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) morning, not only to listen to but to hear the tone with which my honourable friend from Ste. Rose proposed this amendment. No doubt he proposed it with serious intent and no doubt the Member for Swan River also spoke in the same serious vein. But the Member for Lakeside did not and there can be no escaping that fact.

But, Sir, the Member for Swan River has made a very good suggestion, one which points out the value of a constructive opposition. He proposes that the legislation should make specific reference to the 53rd parallel and I think that's an excellent idea, because that is what is generally understood traditionally, historically in Manitoba and economically, still as being the - if you like - the line between the settled south, the south with the roads, and the northern part of the province that has still unfortunately far too few roads and communication services, the 53rd parallel. In other words, Census Division 16. All that part of northern Manitoba north of the 53rd, that also happens to be Census Division 16 under the Federal Government's census arrangements, that is northern Manitoba. The honourable member has made that proposal, I think it's an excellent one, and between now and tomorrow we will attempt to draft an amendment to that effect if the honourable member hasn't already got something ready. Well I think it's excellent and we'll work on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, what motion are we voting on?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call the resolution standing in my name and the adjournment in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may before the Member for Riel speaks, I think there is some clarification to be made on the amendment. You'll recall this morning that you brought to my attention that the wording might cause some difficulty and I have prepared another amendment. I have submitted it to the Clerk; it appears on the Order Paper but it has not been read into the record. I have copies here, I can read it if you wish or submit them to you.

MR. SPEAKER: This is simply to clarify and correct the amendment intended by the honourable member.

MR. MOLGAT: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. And the amendment as it reads now in the Order Paper is correct and it is the one I have re-submitted, but it hasn't been read into the record by myself; I don't know if you want it or not.

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

MR. MOLGAT: All right then, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the motion be amended first by adding in line 8 after the word "that" the following words: "this House consider the advisability of establishing"; second, by deleting in lines 9 and 10 the words "comprised of Messrs. Allard, Beard, and McBryde be established" and replacing them by the following words: "the composition of which is to be decided by the seven man committee established under our House Rule 68 (1) at the beginning of this Session."

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the motion -- this is understood that the motion presented is simply to correct and amend the one presented earlier. I'm sorry, not to amend but simply to correct and clarify. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A lot of the ground of this motion has been covered in the debate and discussion on the previous motion, but there has been a considerable amount that hasn't. What is of primary concern here that I would like to express is that, first of all, I don't think in the introduction of this bill there has been a very adequate explanation of the necessity of the committee requirements to establish a Committee on Northern Affairs. I think that the terms and scope are extremely wide open. And I say this, or I question the necessity of the committee at this time, partly because of the intensive work that has been done and the programs that are just being embarked on. We have just seen an intensive investigation with respect to one economic aspect of the north which is referred to here in terms of economic

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) and industrial well-being. That's the Mauro Report which we just received on northern transportation, which has gone into in great depth most of the aspects that will be covered by this commission in its examinations.

Secondly, we've got a "Newstart" program which is under the Minister of Youth and Education, which is just getting off the ground, and although it was slated for another part of Manitoba in the initial instance, it was shifted into northern Manitoba to look at the cultural aspects which are the other part of the responsibility of this committee the way it reads here. Now the Newstart program, which has its central office located at The Pas, covers most of the area that goes right over as far as Thompson, up through Nelson House and Lynn Lake and over to the Saskatchewan border. So it takes in by and large most of the area that would be covered by this Northern Affairs group.

Now if the wide-ranging, well-financed program that is to have far more flexibility than any other government agency that has ever operated in the north, has a budget that has been established at a million dollars a year - and this is to last for five years - total input, minimum total input, the indications are that were given to us by the Federal Government that it would be \$5 million program carte blanche to look at the cultural problems, people's problems of the north and the readjustment problems that are encountered, and to try new programs and to see whether a new and fresh and uninhibited approach can assist in the problems that are encountered in the communities of the north.

Now this program, as I say, is just getting under way, so we've had a very large economic study done in the north and we've now got a very large cultural program well financed that is just starting its operations in the north, and now we have a proposal from the Provincial Government that we should have a Task Force on Northern Affairs to go in and do something. So we have before us a proposal to set up a task force, and the government has made the decision that this is not going to necessarily be a task force that involves the public, not directed specifically at involving the public, it's directed specifically and uppermost and in priority at putting three people, members of the Legislature, onto this committee, when you read it, and we're off on another what we would read as being - we're not sure - partly legislative committee and partly public committee to go in and examine an area by people who are already there.

And the point has been made here - the point was made by the Member for Ste. Rose and a very valid one - that what our real problem now is to get an understanding of the north and the south, and how is this committee made up of three members there in the north going to solve that problem? It's much more logical to have a committee that is directed specifically in interpreting the north to the south. I think they're already doing a pretty adequate job of this. I think the Member for Churchill does an adequate job, the best he can, of getting the message of the north across to the south. I can't see that he's going to do that any better by setting up this committee of which he makes up one-third of the legislative membership.

Now it may well be that the other two people that are on this do need the exposure, but these are their constituencies primarily, provincial constituencies, and what's to inhibit them from going in and doing their work, because a lot of what we're asking them to do is to learn what's in their constituencies so they can interpret it back to the Legislature and presumably to the people of Manitoba. But why set up a legislative committee, at expense to the taxpayers of Manitoba, to have these three members of the Legislature traversing back and forth across the northern communities when the Legislature's not in session?

It appears to have no valid foundation to set up a committee made up specifically of these three people that involve their three specific constituencies. Mightn't you as well set up a committee around Winnipeg of all constituencies that happen to lie on the Perimeter Highway so we could investigate this very important problem of traffic accidents on the Perimeter Highway. I don't think it's any more logical. I'm not suggesting it, but I'm suggesting there's as much logic to doing it as there is to doing this. But I can tell you right now that the members that happen to have constituencies on the Perimeter Highway know what the problems are, and I would say that I think the members that are on this group from the north know what the problems are. So what is the intent, because it's not going to prove, any more than we have now just finished a large study and already initiated on another large one on the cultural aspect, to set up this group of three to interpret back something that is going to assist the north and assist totally Manitoba. So I don't think that it has been either adequately demonstrated the requirements for such a committee; and secondly, that the make-up should be this.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd)

Speaking directly to the amendment, if this is a legislative committee and if the government in its wisdom has decided that this is going to be of assistance to Manitoba and assistance to the north, there is no question that this amendment put forth by the Member for Ste. Rose is a very logical one. And as the Leader of the Official Opposition has stated - and I can't question the validity of the statement - he has never seen a committee set up in this manner before without consultation, if it's a legislative committee, without consultation -- (Interjection) -- This is not a Boundaries Commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know. We've never seen anything like your Boundaries Commission either.

MR. CRAIK: It's not even comparable. But in his statement in the House, he made the statement that he's never seen a committee established in exactly this manner with no consultation with the other parties in this House, essentially a one-party committee, received in this House as a fait accompli proposition from the government. Now if the government then is convinced that they have the need for this committee, can the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, the Honourable Minister of Health, not articulate to us the specific requirements that he has to have and the information that he has to have in order to perform his job? Is he trying to tell us that he can't get the answers he needs to perform his job with the structure he has?

MR. DESJARDINS: Did your government get it? What did you do for the north?

MR. CRAIK: So I say in summary, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to have this committee forced onto us with the very scanty sort of justification that has been given to us in this House, if we're going to have to have it in the dying days of this House, the least that the government can do is follow the democratic procedure that has taken place in this House previously, and that is to refer the make-up of this legislative committee to the committee of seven that has decided on the make-up of all the committees in this House and not take this undemocratic approach of coming in here and telling us that they're going to have members only on their side of the House and the Member for Churchill involved in a program that involves only their constituencies plus those that they surround, Flin Flon and Thompson - Flin Flon's not represented, Thompson's not represented, the only two that are missing on here - and that we are to accept this whether we like it or not with no say on the make-up of the committee, is entirely undemocratic.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just one or two words on the amendment to the resolution before us and make specific reference to the resolution itself in the proposal that it contains for a study of the requirements for the economic, cultural and industrial well-being, growth and development of northern Manitoba as advanced by three specific members named in the resolution.

We heard a few days ago in this Chamber, and also in Law Amendments Committee, Mr. Speaker, a great deal about the term and the application of redundancy where certain enterprises are concerned in this province, specifically in regard to the fish processing industry. Well, it seems to me that when we charge such members as are charged at the moment in this proposed resolution with the challenge and the task and the responsibility of considering and reporting upon the requirements of their region of the country, that we're indulging in a rather expansive and unjustifiable exercise in redundancy, because in the time that I've been in this Chamber, since we assembled on the 14th of August, I think I can say unequivocally that the three members specifically referred to in this resolution have done an extremely good job of reporting upon the requirements, economic, social and otherwise of their particular regions of this province. And to imply, as this resolution does, that a specific committee with a specific responsibility as cited herein is necessary for that responsibility to be fulfilled, seems to me as I said, Mr. Speaker, to be at least redundant and perhaps even somewhat unjustifiably critical of the members mentioned.

There is no logic or reason for criticism of those members. They have, as I've said, stood in this Chamber and participated in Law Amendments Committee, as well as in the deliberations here, with decision and with determination and with conscience on the problems facing their constituencies and their region. And I as a poor, culturally deprived city boy who knows, or who knew very little about the north except that it's a great part of my province and my country and a region in which I take pride despite my ignorance, I as that culturally

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) deprived city boy have learned a great deal about the north and about their part of the province from them and I commend them on the message that they've brought to me in this Chamber and to others sitting here. Thus, in my own mind, I dismiss the active part of the resolution as to a certain extent slighting their efforts and being unnecessarily redundant.

The proposed amendment by the Member for Ste. Rose seems to me to meet the requirements of the House where this subject is concerned. The rule of the House under which the seven-member committee was established is self-explanatory to any one of us addressing ourselves to the rule book, Sir, and a simple glance at that rule reveals that the standard practice of the House is that this committee established at the start of the session assumes and fully discharges its responsibility for determining the make-up of important committees, Standing Committees of this Legislature, and although it's to be conceded that this is not a Standing Committee in the classic and accepted sense, it's one that certainly will be charged with a responsibility as important as any of those carried by any of the Standing Committees and will no doubt, without question, receive the very conscientious attention of the seven-man committee when it comes to the decision of make-up and constitution should the Chamber decide in its wisdom that the amendment proposed by the Member for Ste. Rose is desirable and acceptable and should that amendment pass.

So I wish to add my support to the remarks already advanced by members on this side of the House and the remarks advanced when the Member for Ste. Rose originally proposed his amendment. I think, Sir, that it solves the problem and answers the question before us. I think there is no more just and no more logical and no more parliamentary way to meet this particular problem than by complying with the desire implicit in the Member for Ste. Rose's amendment. As one who has in the past two months had the opportunity to listen and learn to northern members about the problems of their constituencies, and as one who is a member of the seven-man committee referred to in the amendment, I can assure members of the Chamber and yourself, Sir, that I bring an awakened interest and an aroused awareness about the north and the problems of northern constituencies to the challenge that will be before my colleagues and me on that committee should we be given the task proposed in the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion it is doubtful whether the ayes or nays have it. Call in the members. For the information of those members who may have been absent from the Chamber, the question was called on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in amendment thereto.

YEAS: Messrs. Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Froese, Graham, Hardy, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Urusk.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, before the count is announced, might I enquire whether any members who have an interest in this resolution voted upon it?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, surely this shouldn't pose any problem inasmuch as committees have been constituted by a vote of this House many times in the past. If there is a pecuniary interest it's well known how much it is and to whom it would be forthcoming.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question of the motion?

MR. SCHREYER: I simply wish to declare I was paired, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's five to eleven. There was agreement that we would go to 11:00 o'clock, it's so close. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, that the House do now adjourn. Just prior to you putting the motion, I believe it's the Committee on Professional Services Association tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock; Law Amendments tomorrow afternoon at approximately 3:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Thursday morning.