

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 9, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 69 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we are dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Highways, I'm sure that the Minister has probably felt somewhat frustrated because the interruptions in the presentation of his Estimates is no less than the interruption that has occurred in the Department in the past three years by the actions of the Minister in charge, or the former Minister in charge, and I am sure that the people of Manitoba and the people within the department, Mr. Chairman, must have surely heaved a sigh of relief when the Premier in his wisdom appointed a new minister to this department. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that under the new Minister of Highways, we have seen the program that he has outlined for the coming year, and we have also seen the task force report which was commissioned by this government, and which was tabled in the House last week, and I would sincerely hope that the Minister will follow some of the recommendations put forward in that report, a report which, Sir, in the opinion of the press was rather critical of the former Minister, and a report which also, Sir, contained some very valid recommendations for the future and the operation of this department in the province over the ensuing years.

Programming and planning are necessary and integral parts of any highway program for any jurisdiction and I would sincerely hope that the Minister follows the recommendations of the Task Force report and also follows the recommendations of his department, because, Sir, he has some very good men, very good men who have dedicated their lives to serving the Province of Manitoba and providing a service which, although it is constantly under the surveillance of the public, because I know of no other department which is more open to public scrutiny than this particular department. People see them working every day all over the province but this is a department, Sir, that has the civil service that is necessary to make a department function and they have the programs and the planning that are necessary to develop this country. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, within this department we find there are some areas, some areas of concern, some areas that are vitally affected because of political decisions, and political decisions which of necessity disrupt the operations of a department and, Sir, I am referring here to the problem that has existed since the inception of Autopac and the attempts at the integration of the Autopac Program and the Vehicle Registration and the Driver Registration program which come under this department. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that in this respect we find we have a split jurisdiction. We find the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is justifiably proud in his opinion of the operations of Autopac, and the attempts that have been made to weld that program into a driver and vehicle registration program operated under another department -- and, Sir, this causes problems. Problems that are possibly the result of political decisions where the politician attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable, to attempt to alleviate problems that are not easily alleviated, and in the process the population of the province has been suffering. They have been under a program of confusion, duplication, delays, and so forth, that have left a cloud of suspicion over the validity of the argument of the government in their attempts to bring forward an auto insurance program and weld it into a program

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would respectfully request the honourable member to stick to the Highways Department. We are not dealing with Autopac. Autopac comes up underneath the Department of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will not mention Autopac again in this respect. Very well -- (Interjection) -- with that one exception. I do regret that part of it. The driver registration program and the program of driver training is one that is meeting with a limited success in the province, much as the previous Minister would like to claim that his programs had led to the decline in auto mishaps and highway fatalities, we find, Sir, that such is really not the case. We need an educational program. The driver training is a program that is positive and aimed at a long-term solution. But together with that planning we also have to have the integrated planning that ties the whole thing into a coherent program -- and here we get into the field of political interference in the long-term planning on highway construction.

It is something that is not new in this province, Mr. Chairman. The politician, quite justifiably in his opinion probably has the right to make decisions that the thrust of construction shall be in a certain area in the province. That is a political decision. But in doing so I wonder if the politician recognizes the problems that it creates with the planning that exists within his own department, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that planning and that

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . dialogue has to be a coherent and constantly continuing process so that the people of Manitoba can be assured of a long-range highway planning program which is in the interests of all the motorists in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there is another area that causes some concern to me and that is in the field of the provincial role as it applies to the Transcontinental movement of vehicles and the Transcontinental movement of goods and services to serve the people of this country of Canada. We find that there are fairly large discrepancies from one jurisdiction to another and I would urge the Minister to act in co-operation with the other jurisdictions and with the Federal Government in bringing forward a comprehensive long-range program which is consistent from one jurisdiction to another. We find that truckers for instance coming out of Ontario where they have a weight limit, I believe it goes up in excess of 100,000 pounds, suddenly hit the Manitoba border and they are reduced by the weight restrictions imposed by the Province of Manitoba -- whether it is justified or not is a matter of debate. But we have a program that does cause problems in the Transcontinental movement of goods and services in this country. I would urge the Minister to work very closely with his fellow ministers in neighbouring jurisdictions so that we might be assured and Canadians throughout the whole of Canada will be assured that we have a program that is fully integrated and consistent throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, we found last winter that the Minister of Agriculture intervened and through regulations brought forward a position that Saskatchewan farmers coming into the Province of Manitoba with their livestock would no longer be fined because they did not have the proper registration in this province.

This is another example of the lack of co-ordination of a policy that should, and I hope will be, consistent throughout this Dominion. Unfortunately the Minister of Agriculture only acted on behalf of the livestock producers. He did not include all other forms of agricultural produce or agricultural products, so that there still is much to be done in this field. I would urge the Minister to use his good offices to arrive at a program which creates the least possible disruptions in the free movement of goods and services throughout this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we come further on through the Department and we start dealing with item to item, we will have further comments to make but I just wanted to make a few general comments at the beginning to indicate to the Minister some of the concerns that are expressed by this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 69 was read and passed).

Resolution 70 (a) (1) -- The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. ENARSON: Mr. Chairman, I think this resolution deals with management services, engineering, planning and design. The one I am concerned about is those who are in the Engineering Department. I wanted to make a few comments on this particular aspect of the department. While my colleague, the Member from Birtle-Russell made some mention of the difficulties found in that department, I want to say that some of the problems that I have had in my own area as a result of the past minister -- I don't want to condone the present Minister, but nevertheless he is part of that government and I would assume that he has to share that responsibility. I know, Mr. Chairman, those who are heads of a department have responsibility to see to it that the people whose employ they are under provide the best services and get the best value for the dollar spent when it's the taxpayers' money they are dealing with.

Now the past Minister he dealt with engineers in the northern part of the province and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that from the information I have, a certain engineer who was stationed at Carman, the Honourable Member from Pembina, a man whom I came to know a little bit and got along very well with, and worked very well with, and information I received from him was that the ex minister did not fulfil the obligations of his office. As a result of it, Mr. Chairman, the engineer in question decided that he was going to leave the Province of Manitoba and go to another area where he saw where he was being dealt with in a much, I would suppose fairer way, dealt with in such a way as he was given to understand the law, that the law would be abided by so far as he was concerned, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the ex minister had paid more attention to his department than worrying about the abortions of women in this province we wouldn't have that problem.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, and I would like the Minister to answer one question as I rise on this particular situation -- (Interjection) -- yes the ex minister says, I can keep poking away. I have challenged others on that side and I'm prepared to challenge him any time he wants to.

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)

But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that as I'm given to understand if an engineer is transferred from one part of the country to another he has invested in a home, and if he was not able to dispose of that home then the department would take over some responsibility in that regard. And this is the question I was wondering about, and it created quite a problem in my area, Mr. Chairman. This was a man whom I got along very well with, we were able to work very well together, and we had problems and, as I think that the Minister of Highways well knows that when you're dealing with so many people everything doesn't go perfect at all times. And I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, for the record that I hope that the present Minister will have a better relationship with the people that he has his employ with and as I say when -- to qualify that statement -- I'm aware that sure things can go wrong at certain times, but I also want to say it has caused some strained relations, Mr. Chairman, insofar as these people are concerned with the municipalities. I think here is an area where we can do ourselves a disservice if we're not allowed to work with the municipal people. You know sometimes, Sir, that if there are say a culvert, a secondhand culvert, one that the province doesn't need, and the municipality can use, because I think that there's always times when negotiations can be worked out here. Because after all, Mr. Chairman, we're all taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba and I only want to convey this to the Minister and hope that that kind of relationship will improve in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 (a) (1) . . . the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would really be remiss if I didn't make one or two comments at this particular stage of the Minister of Highways' Estimates. I do so, not on the Minister's salary which we have passed; I am the first one, Sir, to offer the Minister of Highways, that is the present Minister of Highways, my congratulations for assuming the responsibilities of this department. You know, Sir, the Department of Highways or Transportation is not considered to be in the ranks of the most important of departments in terms of money spent, when I liken that to the department of his colleague beside him, the Minister of Health and Social Development who spends, you know, three or four times the Minister of Highways' budget, or when I liken it to the Departments of Education, both departments of educations which spend multi-millions of dollars, and in that sense the Department of Transportation is not always accorded, in my judgment, its due position that it in my judgment earns. The Department of Transportation of Highways nonetheless is a very vital and important department insofar as that it does provide that physical means of communication, and this is that -- we're in that modern world where the word "communication" means all that much and we liken communication to the written word or to the idea that one can transmit between people; but we forget sometimes that it's also very important to provide that physical facility, namely a good road, for communities to be able to communicate, for communities to be able to draw together to use and utilize the services of government, whether they be hospitals, whether they be schools or what have you, municipal services, that's the performance, that's the function that the Minister of Highways performs in this province.

Mr. Chairman, it's not my wish to spend undue time on the past, but it is precisely in this area, the area of Management Services that a Minister of Highways of this government charged the former Premier of this province, former Ministers of Highways of this province, the Honourable Stewart McLean and myself, with gross negligence, indeed theft, thievery and corruption. He said, Mr. Speaker, a Minister of Highways in this Assembly said that neither the former Minister of Highways, Stewart McLean, neither the former Premier of this province and neither myself should be given the privilege of even sitting in this House never mind voting in this House, because we were a bunch of "crooks". We were a bunch of thieving crooks. Those are the words of a former Minister of Highways of this Department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the interim, in the interim he had with some great deal of difficulty -- he stormed out of this Chamber. Why did he storm out of this Chamber, Mr. Chairman? Because he accused and he cast shame on this whole Chamber. He said it was not possible to speak truth in this Chamber. That's how he walked out of this Chamber at that time. He said that it was not possible to speak truth in this Chamber. That's how the former Minister of Highways . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if my honourable friend is adhering to the rules of the House? We did have certain discussions some time ago on the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . matters that are being referred to by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, but I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, whether it is appropriate or in order for the Honourable Member for Lakeside to raise the matter that he is now raising. For, Mr. Chairman, what we are dealing with are the estimates of expenditure for this fiscal year that we are now in. And I would say in all due respect to the Member for Lakeside that if he wanted to raise the points that he is raising as to the conduct of a Minister or the Minister of the Department of Highways, the proper place to do that would have been in the consideration of the estimates pertaining to the salary of the Minister of Highways.

So as interesting as it may be, Mr. Chairman, the points raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I do in all seriousness suggest to you, Sir, that he is not following the proper procedure of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. On the same point of order?

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. There would be one caveat that I think would be legitimate to place on the contribution by the government House Leader, and that is that we are at this point dealing with Management Services, Mr. Chairman, and the Member for Lakeside, my colleague from Lakeside is speaking about management, management of the department, management of the functions carried out by the employees of the government in that department and the management record of the former Minister as well as the present Minister since their administrations and jurisdictions overlapped with respect to the opportunity to study Estimates of the department.

This has been the first opportunity for my colleague from Lakeside, or for anybody on this side to examine the management role of the former Minister as well as the current Minister because their administrations overlap, Sir. Therefore, I suggest that with all respect to the point raised by the government House Leader, my colleague from Lakeside is well within the rules of debate on this point. He's discussing management services of the department and that's an area for which the Member for Thompson just a few months ago was responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may on this point of order raise a point in disagreement with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. There was an opportunity, and there is an opportunity to any member who wishes to raise the questions being proposed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside on the tabling of a report, which I believe was tabled; a report of a committee or a commission or call it what you will, that was requested to investigate into the managerial affairs of the Department of Highways. That report has been tabled, and it would have been quite proper, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest, for a substantive motion or a comment on the tabling of that particular report.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest in all due respect that what we are doing here in this estimate is dealing with expenditures for the fiscal year that we are now in. I appreciate the point, I appreciate the point raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry of the change -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? I appreciate the -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Yah well some of you fellows are tied up too. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the point raised, that there has been a change in ministerial jurisdictions or a change in Ministers, but may I suggest for the consideration of the Committee that we are now dealing with the Estimates of the present Minister of Highways and not the previous one. I raise this point in order that the conduct of the House or the Committee would be on a proper level at this stage, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to that same point of order. I certainly agree with what the House Leader has said and one of the reasons I insisted that report dealing with Dauphin and dealing with the province be tabled before the Estimates were completed is so the opposition, particularly the Member for Lakeside, would have an opportunity to discuss it on the salary. In fact I had to fight like heck to get that report tabled. I was very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, when the Member for Lakeside did not bother showing up when the Minister's Estimates were up -- and they have been up on two separate occasions -- I'm sorry, three occasions -- three separate occasions which he could have spoken on, and it was my earnest desire that he should bring it up because I would like to say something about that report, I would like to say something about the charges that I made regarding himself,

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . the previous Minister, similar to the charges I had made against Rex Grose and Gurney Evans which have been proven because we set up a commission, but we did not set up a commission here. I regret very much that the member did not choose that opportunity and I say to him now that he has blown his opportunity to do so.

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

MR. CRAIK: Same point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just ask you, if there is going to be different rules for either side of the House then I ask you how this information that the Member for Lakeside is trying to reply to, got on the record in this House in the first place if there wasn't latitude allowed by either the Speaker or the Chairman of the day to allow the Minister of Highways of the day to say the things that the member who was accused is trying to reply to at this time. The member has an opportunity to reply in the report that has been tabled under the Highways Department and if the government is now trying to hide itself behind the technicality of where it is now located on the Order Paper, it shows the true shallowness of the charges as they were originally made and their every effort to try and stifle any honest reply to the charges that were laid at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader, on the same point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, on the same point of order, and I cannot allow today the remarks of the Honourable Member for Riel to go unchallenged. I did consider at one time that the Honourable Member for Riel was a reasonably intelligent person who knew, who knew -- (Interjection) -- yes, I'm supposed to be the House Leader and I am the House Leader and not the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: on the same point of order, as to whether it is proper to discuss what has transpired previously, today when we are considering the estimates for the present fiscal year.

The Member for Riel raised a question on the point of order under consideration, Mr. Chairman, as to the appropriateness of discussing what had transpired previously and he accused this government of trying to hide behind procedural manipulation or whatever he wants to call it, and I say, that at one time I thought that the Honourable Member for Riel had a little knowledge of government and parliamentary procedure. The report of the investigatory authority into the activities of the Department of Highways was tabled -- (Interjection) -- any report is debatable on a substantive motion and this is -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Theory, no; Beauchesne, Mays, and any authority that my Honourable Member for Riel wants to investigate, but no, Mr. Chairman, the intellect of my honourable friend does not go into the realm of investigation, but suspicion.

He used the same tactics last night and I suggest in all due respect, I suggest in all due respect that there is opportunity for anyone in this House, be they opposition or be they government, to consider any report that is tabled in this House. It may be, Mr. Chairman, beyond the realm of mental capacity of the Honourable Member for Riel, and it may be questionable as to whether he has that mental capacity or not, but it is historic, Mr. Chairman, in the annals of parliamentary procedure that he has that right and we do not deprive him of it. But it's also true, Mr. Chairman, in parliamentary procedure outside as well as within this House, that while we are dealing with the estimates of any department, be they Highways, Labour, or what have you, the item under consideration is reflected only in the expenditure of monies for the fiscal year.

My honourable friend had an opportunity, as the Member for Thompson said, when discussing the salary of the Minister, to raise his point and he did not. I don't know if he was absent from the House or not but he had the opportunity -- (Interjection) -- I want you just simply to pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: The honourable member had the opportunity. If he was not in the House let him not fault the government because of his absenteeism. He has the opportunity to bring in a substantive motion at the appropriate time dealing with any area -- (Interjection) -- Oh it is unbelievable, I'm sure. My honourable friend -- I'm still on the point of order, yes. My honourable friend, the Member for Riel, if he has a grievance, has that opportunity, Mr. Chairman every single time that the motion, or at least once during the session, when the motion to go into Committee of Supply is called, and he has not done so, and yet, Sir, on this point of order he smugly sits by and accuses this government of subterfuge, accuses this

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . government of violating the privileges of the House and the privileges of the member of this House, and I say the point of order that I raise is a valid one. -- (Interjection) -- Yes you need a little ordering. Is a valid one because it is inappropriate, it is inappropriate, Mr. Chairman, for the Honourable Member for Riel to attempt to raise the questions he did, and it is not in accordance with the rules of the House for the Honourable Member for Lakeside to do so either. That is the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that we have for the consideration of this Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On that same point of order in connection with the discussion of the report, certainly the only way he can bring the whole report before the House is by motion of concurrence, and how would anyone on the opposition side be as stupid as bring in a motion of concurrence in a report that they don't leave in?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. On the same point of order?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. When speaking on the General Administration I pointed out specifically that we would be dealing with the items in the estimates that were relevant to the points that we wanted to bring forward, and we are attempting directly to do that. We are dealing with Management Services. There is a report on management. We did not deal with it under General Administration, we only made passing reference to it and said we would deal with the specific items as they came up in the estimates and we are trying to abide by the rules of the House, and the House Leader has no business standing up on phony points of order. Surely he should know something about the rules of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. On the same point of order?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, I was just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to rule

MR. ENNS: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I'm going to rule. I have taken all the points of order under consideration. I will read to the members Beauchesne Fourth Edition, Citation 238, Sub-section (2) . "Each grant is a separate motion which must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question and when it has been formally carried no reference can be made again thereon. Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the Chair. Sometimes there may be a number of items in a resolution, each item may then if the committee think proper be taken up as a distinct question and so discussed and amended. The debate in such case must be strictly relevant to the item and when it has been disposed of no reference can be made to it when the subsequent items are under consideration."

Therefore, I rule that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is out of order. He has had an opportunity when the report was tabled in this House. I would request him to stick to the item Management Services, Operations and Contracts, Salaries and Wages, Resolution 70 Subsection (a). The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let me make it very clear that one of the reasons why I chose not to speak on the Ministers Salaries and why by and large both of my colleagues chose not to particularly bear down on the present Minister of Highways' salary is because we acknowledge that the present Minister is doing a reasonable job. After all he has repealed most of the stupid mistakes made by the former Minister. You know, that, for instance, of allowing overweightes, you know for pulp trucks 74,000 pounds, you know, on frozen roads which made no sense at all, but because the former Minister wanted to prove a point, wanted to prove the fact that he was the Minister and said no truck will carry more than 74,000 pounds, the present Minister saw the stupidity of that and repealed that. So I am the last one as a Minister that also saw that kind of wisdom that I am going to criticize him.

Also Mr. Speaker, the present Minister tabled a reasonable, what I consider a reasonable highways program which had some consideration of the fact that 90 percent of the people in this province do live in southern Manitoba. That there was a reasonable consideration for roads to be built in southern Manitoba -- as well as the road that had to be built in northern Manitoba -- and for that reason I don't criticize the present Minister of this Highway. But Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that under Management Services, Planning and Design, that surely the monies expended in the current budget, Mr. Chairman, for the Highways --

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . that exhaustive highway study in-depth report that the former Minister instigated came under this resolution and was paid under this resolution. And I'll beg to be corrected and make my remarks on other occasions. I therefore say that it is, Mr. Chairman, respectfully quite in order to speak about management. We are on the resolution dealing with the Management Services and insofar as that under Management Services and the \$5 million expense under that item, surely was the authorization to carry out an exhaustive study and report dealing with the Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman, I look to you for guidance. I do not wish to be out of order. I'll wait for my proper time to make the point if I choose to, but, Mr. Chairman, lest the Member for Thompson, who in his usual arrogant manner suggests that he was the one that demanded for that report. I stood up on this seat three, four, five weeks ago and asked for the report and the present Minister knows well that he waffled around for a little while, played a little game of semantics as to which report was to be reported, and finally when they got their I's and Q's dotted properly he did in fact submit a report. But let the record state, you know be very clear that it was the Opposition, that it was this side that asked for that report. Because after all, Mr. Chairman, we had a little more -- and I say this very seriously, Mr. Chairman, we have a little more than a passing interest in that report. Because, Mr. Chairman -- and I have to come back to this again -- Mr. Chairman, three members . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, again on the point of order that I raised -- on the point of order that I raised I thought it had been made amply clear by the ruling of the Chairman that we are now dealing with an appropriation in the Department of Highways, Appropriation No. 70 dealing with Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design, and the first item for consideration in the Appropriation No. 70, Mr. Chairman, deals with Operations and Contracts, Salaries and Wages No. (a)(1) of \$300,000 -- (Interjection) -- I'd suggest you go back to the hockey game, you may know more about hockey than you know about parliamentary procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: And secondly, we then deal with Other Expenditures.

I say in all due respect, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that if he wants to raise questions on the over-all conduct of the -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to suggest to my honourable friend that in this we are dealing with a breakdown of Management Services, such as operations and contracts, laboratory materials, surveys and titles, bridges, stores and storage yards, district offices. It might, if my honourable friend wishes to pinpoint some particular criticism as to the operation of one of the district offices, Arborg or Dauphin, or wherever you will, that it would be under that particular appropriation. The five -- (Interjection) -- Amen is right and I only wish to heaven some of you would go somewhere on Sundays where you listen to what Amen really means -- so moted, so moted be. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and that includes the Honourable Lady Member of this House as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Minister to a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest, I suggest the point of order that I raise, the point of order I raise, Mr. Chairman, is one that you have attempted on numerous occasions to have the members of this Committee adhere to, a discussion on the item under consideration. In this particular case it deals with Operations and Contracts amounting to \$393,000. If my honourable friend wants to raise a point on District Offices and the conduct there, I suggest in all due respect he has the opportunity later, but the general administrative function of the ministry of the Department of Highways has now been passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Resolution 70 (a) (1) -- Salaries and Wages . . .

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order?

MR. ENNS: And perhaps I could suggest a way out of the impass. I appeal to the Minister of Highways, who after all is the Minister responsible, and he has the suitable mandarins seated beside him that can give him the advise that he now needs. If, Mr. Chairman -- and I want to make this very clear -- if, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways and his senior staff can tell me that senior management, management in the Department of Highways, had nothing whatsoever to do with the report that I have attempted to refer to. Nothing whatsoever to do with the carrying out of the research and the involvement of

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . that report; nothing whatsoever to do with possible payment of persons involved in the report -- although I understand it was carried out by civil servants. But that the management of the Department of Highways was in no way involved -- and that really is incredible. Here is a serious, you know, report dealing with the Department of Highways. Now if the Minister of Highways can tell me that the Department of Highways and the senior management staff was in no way involved in the report that has been submitted and tabled in this House, then Sir, I'm prepared to accept the House Leader's ruling that it is out of order.

But, Sir, if the Management Services of the Department of Highways was in any way involved, either in terms of supplying information for that report, in terms of supplying help in compiling the report, in terms of reporting to the Minister of that report, and indeed it was the Minister that tabled that report, then Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that under Management Services a major report dealing with the management of the Department of Highways is certainly in order to be discussed under this particular Bill at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works, On the same point of order?

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I sympathize with my honourable friend in his frustration but I think that according to parliamentary procedure, as I understand it, you have ruled that questions of administration have already been passed. If we accept my honourable friend's argument then it is true *reductio ad absurdum* that in every aspect, in every item in the estimates he can relate these to the Minister and to the administration. I mean it can easily be done and my honourable friend is attempting to demonstrate that. But in fact we have passed 69; we are now on Resolution 70 which deals with questions of Surveys and Titles, Bridges, Stores, etc. I think you have made your ruling and I think it is incumbent on all the members to obey your ruling and to deal with the more detailed and microscopic points now that the broad general questions of policy have been passed.

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

MR. ENNS: The same point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with Management Services and we are dealing at the time that a specific report was current within the estimates of these estimates that we are now considering. Mr. Chairman, I ask you seriously to consider that under Management Services -- and I want to remind you that the Honourable Walter Weir was responsible for management services at one time of this Department. The Honourable Stewart McLean was at one time responsible for services of this department, and I also had the privilege of being at one time responsible for the management services of this department. All of us have been called thieves, crooks, and that's putting it mildly. That's putting it mildly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! Order! Order! Order! Order, please. Order! The Honourable Member for Lakeside, I have already ruled. You have had an opportunity, there has been a report tabled in this House. Order! Order! I don't want to have to read Citation 238, subsection (2) again. I have already ruled, the member has had an opportunity. I would also refer the member to Citation 149 of Beausheune -- "and to refer to any debate of the same session on a question that is not then under discussion." We are not under discussion of that report. We are under discussion of the Highway Department Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design. Resolution 70 (a) (1) -- Salaries and Wages. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. To that point, please.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, under the Management Services of the Department of Highways let me then proceed. If indeed the charges that were made under the present administration, that the management services were in the hands of crooks, thieves and blackmailers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: When we consider the Estimates of the operation of government for the purpose of clarification of the areas of jurisdiction there is a heading to a group of expenditures. In this particular case, Resolution No. 70, the term Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design, that phrase is used to indicate the component parts of the total appropriation in Resolution No. 70. -- (Interjection) -- What was that mumble about? And the breakdown and the points to be considered for the expenditure of money are broken down. In this particular case the \$5,345,600 in Appropriation No. 70 is broken down into sections (a), (b), (c), (d), etc.; and the first breakdown under the over-all heading or umbrella of Management Services deals with the question of Operations and Contracts -- or an appropriation of



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . \$393,800, and that I say, Mr. Chairman, is the item that's under consideration at the present time. The general management of the department is under the Appropriation No. 69 and that I have said -- (Interjection) -- on a number -- ah, talk your clock off. That is the time that my honourable friend should be raising this, but the question, the motion really before the House at the present time is shall there be an appropriation awarded of \$393,000 for item 70 (a) (1) (2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On that same point of order, when Votes and Proceedings will come out, it will say Management Services, Engineering, Planning and Design - \$5,345,600 passed. That's all that will show up in the Votes and Proceedings, and that's what we're discussing. We're discussing Resolution 70 on that item, and therefore we can discuss any of the items below under that particular resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, last night in this Assembly, those of us in the Opposition were accused of being in the hip-pocket of another vested interest and having our election payments paid --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. Order. Call in the Speaker.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, while in the Committee of Supply discussing Resolution 70 (a) (1), I ruled that debate in such a case must be strictly relevant to the items and when it had been disposed of no reference can be made again to it when subsequent items are under consideration. The Honourable Member for Lakeside insisted on discussing the report tabled in the House with respect to the Department of Highways. I ruled him out of order and the member challenged my decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I have had a ruling of the Chair read to me. The question before the House: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. ENNS: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. Order, please. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee be sustained?

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barkman, Bilton, Blake, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Sherman, and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 25; Nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Yeas have it, I declare the Chair sustained. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Member for Point Douglas. Had I voted, I'd have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is in Committee or is the House wishing to rise from Committee? Committee rise. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, and has elected me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Logan. Order, please.

#### IN SESSION

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

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

PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: We're on Private Members' Hour now.

A MEMBER: Private bills, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Private . . . The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, last night I made remarks which you felt that I -- (Interjection) -- On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, you felt that I made remarks last night that I should withdraw. Although I do not agree with the words used, that the words used were improper and recognize that the authority of the Chair supersedes my feelings in this connection, since the remarks did not constitute a point of principle, and I accordingly withdraw without any condition.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Private Bills on Tuesday night is the first order of business. Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Riel. No. 31. Bill No. 31.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the reason I adjourned this is that I wanted to get some more information and background to it. I haven't fully achieved all this, but I think I should say the few remarks I wanted to make anyway. We support this going to the committee stage so that we can have the parties responsible and involved here come before the committee and present their cases. One of the reasons that we support it is of course that it has been done in the past, but I think on a matter of principle it's more important to see this go to the committee stage because it does provide an opportunity for accountability by people and corporations that operate in the private sector and which often are scrutinized by the public sector and are often criticized by the public sector.

In this case we've got three insurance companies involved and there have been decisions made by them which obviously the party at stake here and desiring this bill being brought into the House feels that there is a grievance which should be examined. I think this provides us with the opportunity to let those companies that have made their decisions account for their actions, and I see no reason here or any grounds upon which we should turn this request down at this time. It simply provides another opportunity -- and there aren't that many opportunities -- for individuals to have their day in the democratic process. And for that reason we support this bill being approved at this time and going to the committee stage, having the parties involved appear before the committee and their legal counsel and to make their representations so that in fact we can see if the sectors of the community which we allow to operate freely are actually doing so.

MR. SPEAKER: House prepared to adopt the resolution?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed bill of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Bill No. 33.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't completed all my research work. I therefore ask that the matter stand.

PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) Public Bills. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 19.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak long on this matter. I would merely note a few major points in the proposal of the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie, which is his proposal, an Act to amend the Development Corporation Act. In many ways it confuses me because the information which the honourable member requests in his amendment to the Development Corporation Act is information that has already been supplied. A good deal of emphasis is placed on the issuance of quarterly reports, Mr. Speaker, and as all members should know, we do issue quarterly statements on loans made and other types of financial assistance given through the Manitoba Development Corporation in the Manitoba Gazette. In the Manitoba Gazette, as soon as the information is available on that particular quarter, the information is published in a form that is similar, indeed identical, with the layout of the annual report of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

I would for example, Mr. Speaker, refer members of the House to the last published report of the Manitoba Development Corporation, which is the annual report for the year ended March 31, 1971, and at the end of the report there is a list of all firms which have received financial assistance, granted or to be granted for that particular period. The name of the company is shown, various particulars are given, that is, rates of interest, the length of the loan, the term of the loan, the amount of the loan and an indication of the kind of financial assistance, whether it be a straight loan; whether it be a revolving loan; whether it be a bank guarantee; or whether it be an equity position that the MDC might take. So Mr. Speaker, really . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could have the co-operation of the members to conduct their little meetings a little more quietly, I'm having difficulty hearing the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the Honourable Member's suggestion in this particular amendment because we indeed in many ways go beyond what the honourable member is asking. For example, in his amendment he suggests that these quarterly reports be tabled in the House if the Legislative Assembly is in session; and if it isn't in session, then it be filed, the quarterly report be filed with the Clerk of the House. And really, our proposal by publishing the material in the Gazette, we are frankly going beyond this suggestion of the Honourable Member for Portage, because we are making it available to the entire public and as quickly as we possibly can.

Now there is some suggestion in the amendment with respect to default - section 29 (1) (c) -- it has been asked that the status of all outstanding loans made by the Corporation, whether the same are in good standing or in default; and if in default, the nature of the default. Mr. Speaker, the bill fails to elaborate on what is meant by a default. The honourable member fails to distinguish or to recognize the difference between an occasional inability of a client of the MDC to meet a monthly payment or so; and also on the one hand - or the type of default on the other, which does require MDC to exercise some action to protect its investment, to exercise its security. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, in our economic system, many a new firm does run, and some old firms as a matter of fact, do run into financial difficulties from time to time. They have short term problems necessitating adjustment of loan repayment schedules and so on, and this isn't unusual. It occurs in the financial world in general - you can talk to any bank manager or investment dealer for that matter and find out that this is the case in the real world of finance; and surely the honourable member would not want to drag the names of all these companies out into the open and to indicate to the whole world that this one company or the other company may for some reason be in default. Frankly, if a firm does get into serious difficulty, and the MDC takes action, this information becomes public anyway because the courts have to be utilized, bankruptcy action may have to be exercised; or in some cases the receiver may have to be appointed and this information then is made public and the details surrounding the loan soon becomes a matter of public record. I simply say therefore, Mr. Speaker, that to very flippantly, let us say, reveal the status of all loans that may be in default as opposed to those in good standing will lead, could lead to serious difficulty on the part of the firm involved. It could give that particular firm considerable difficulty with its other creditors apart from the MDC. It could cause certain suppliers to be very reluctant to provide materials or parts for the operation of the company, and it could provide reluctance on the part of potential customers of that company to patronize the firm in question. And indeed the revealing of such information, innocent as it may look in this particular amendment,

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, could lead that firm from a rather temporary situation of insecurity or a temporary situation of difficulty, into a very serious situation where you do force it to perhaps close its doors and perhaps force it into bankruptcy.

The matter of providing information to the Standing Committee on Economic Development, this is provided for already in the Development Corporation Act, the amendment which we made, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago - and members of that committee do have the ability and the right and the opportunity to request information from the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I simply say that we have gone a great way in enabling the public of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba to know just precisely what the lending activities of the Manitoba Development Corporation are. We do this because we feel the taxpayers who are ultimately providing the finance to the MDC have a right to this information.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I note that in many other jurisdictions including the federal jurisdiction which operates a development bank, namely the Industrial Development Bank, there is absolutely no information provided on the clients of the Industrial Development Bank. The Federal Government does not provide information on details of firms which have obtained loans or any other kind of financial assistance of the Industrial Development Bank. I don't know of any other in Canada - at least I have no knowledge - there may be one or two but I don't believe there are any other industrial development banks such as the MDC now which provides as much information on its lending activities. I say, Mr. Speaker, every opportunity is provided as well in the Legislative Committee on Economic Development, and indeed I would say this that on occasion of a large loan to new industry we have never hesitated in telling the press, if a statement is made - a joint announcement is made, let us say, by the company and the department, or simply a statement by the company itself. We have never hesitated to tell the press, and therefore the public in Manitoba, whether or not the MDC loan money and how much money was loaned, what the interest rate was and so on.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I think we have gone a long way in providing all kinds of useful information for the guidance and benefit of the members of this Legislature and also for the public of Manitoba. To go beyond this, as proposed by the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie, to discuss the status of outstanding loans as opposed to those being in good standing as opposed to those being in default will only serve to hurt the cause of industrial development in this province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of the House to vote against Bill 19, an Act to amend the Development Corporation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Riel: Bill No. 30.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed).

MR. BOYCE: Unless someone else wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter still stands. Proposed Public Bills. Second reading - introduction. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. Bill No. 34.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, can I move it first? I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill that Bill 34, an Act to amend the Northern Manitoba Affairs Act, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconded by?

MR. ALLARD: The Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a rather simple one and I propose it to all the members of the House. The purpose of the Bill is to change the term of office of members of Northern Councils from a period of one year to a period of two years and to have the members elected, half the councils elected every year. It means that every member would come up for election once every two years.

The matter of this Bill was the object of a resolution of the Northern Association of Community Councils. I think it makes a great deal of sense. The reason, I believe, that the period term of office in the past was one year, is that when the Northern Affairs Act was

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) . . . . passed, it was felt that at the beginning the council themselves and the communities would benefit from having a period of two or three years during which they could re-examine fairly often the people they had elected to council. This period is over, they have had some experience, they would now like to lengthen the term of office so that there is more continuity in their efforts. I don't think that there is much more to say on this subject. I propose it to all members of this House: I have not heard of any disagreements. I recommed it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin that Bill 38, an Act to amend the Brandon Charter, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, I believe, that the intent of this Bill is fairly clear. I think it is of a non controversial nature and merely in a housekeeping sense to make some minor adjustments to the Brandon Charter to bring it fully up to date. The one section of the Bill deals with the per diem rate that is permitted to be paid to the members of the Brandon Police Commission, and it is proposed by this Bill to enable the City to pay up to a maximum of \$20 per day to members of the Commission, as opposed to the present clause which would limit the city to \$5 per day. Another part of the Bill deals with an agreement which now exists between the City of Brandon and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals under which the Society operates an animal Pound. This has been found by the city to be an excellent arrangement, but they are somewhat concerned that under the new Municipal Act the authority does not now exist for the continuance of that agreement. The purpose of this Bill would be to amend the charter so that it was clear that the authority did vest with the City to enter into an agreement with the Society for the operation of the animal Pound.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 41. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that Bill No. 41, and Act to amend the Wildlife Act be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupersland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I expect this Bill may be a little more controversial than the last one I just presented; but before it becomes too controversial I would like to diffuse it as much as possible by saying first, that the purpose of the Bill is to remove a prohibition against Sunday hunting. It is not to impose Sunday hunting in any area or at any time. The reasons for it is simple. We have some areas of the province which because of their proximity to population centres receive a great deal of hunting pressure. The area around Winnipeg is the one that receives the most pressure. We get other areas of the province in the north especially - not - I'm sorry - where the idea of not having any hunting on Sunday is not a very reasonable one, and last fall I sat in Ilford on a Sunday doing God knows what, with no - there is really nothing to do. There's generally two arguments against Sunday hunting. The first one is the reaction of people - right? The first one is the reaction of people, one that has to deal with the breaking of the Sabbath, disturbing people, endangering picnickers; and the second one has to do with the welfare of animals, that they should get a rest one day a week.

Now the first reaction, the one about hunting on the Sabbath, breaking the Sabbath, seems to me anyway to be not much more sensible, doesn't seem sensible to me in view of the fact that we allow fishing on Sunday which is exactly in the same field - that of killing an animal. And if it's the noise that is a problem, then I suggest that we could re-examine the laws governing the use of toboggans - power toboggans, lawn mowers and things of that nature. Anybody who's been hunting realizes that firearms cause very little noise when it's hunters who are using them. --(Interjection)-- As far as the welfare of animals is concerned, it

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) . . . . would seem to make no difference whether you give an animal a rest on a Sunday, a Monday, a Wednesday or on a Saturday.

And as I said the purpose of the bill is not to impose Sunday hunting, the idea is to leave it open, is to allow departments to establish good management practices, allow them to open hunting up as much as possible to relieve the pressure on areas that are close to cities and to move people into areas that are further away. And the way things now stand, the average working man cannot afford to take any days off work to go out, say 150 or 200 miles to go take a couple of days off hunting. Generally he'll take the first day of the hunting season which generally falls on a Monday, he loses that day of work, and if he misses on the Monday, he ends up staying there for the Tuesday. That's two days. Now if the hunting opened on Saturday morning he'd have two days of hunting, no loss of pay.

I said that the idea is not to impose Sunday hunting anywhere and it would give that kind of flexibility to the department to react to local pressures. For instance the Member from Emerson, I believe, told me that there's a great deal of pressure in his area and with Sunday hunting allowed in northern areas, it would allow the hunters of Winnipeg to move say, into the Waterhen or Gypsumville area and cause less --(Interjection)-- You don't want them there, do you?

Basically then it boils down to the fact that most forms of human activity are now permitted and encouraged on Sunday; and while the killing of fish on Sunday seems to cause no concern, hunting for some reason is banned, and it doesn't seem to have validity from the point of view in my opinion of the Sabbath. The continuation of restriction on Sunday hunting is discriminatory in that it prevents people from enjoying the sport, both for its outdoor quality and for the sport of hunting itself, while skiers and golfers and skidoosers and movie-goers and everybody else can have theirs on Sunday. And if the only concern boils down to the danger to others, then certainly provision for opening and closing certain areas on Sunday can do away with this danger, and it would seem that water sports and the driving of cars is a lot more dangerous than hunting itself.

I've tried to establish that the purpose of the change in the Act is not to impose Sunday hunting in areas where there are people, but to allow the opening of hunting on Sundays for the welfare of those who can ill get along without a day's pay or two days' pay, and to relieve the pressure on areas that bear too much hunting pressure at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear at the outset that the remarks I am about to make are not necessarily those of my party. I've not taken time to caucus the particular bill with the party as such. I believe this is the kind of bill that, although it's not a bill that we draw severe strict party lines on, that probably it'll be a bill that individual members will make their comments and views known as individuals and will accordingly so cast their ballots in favour of this bill.

Now with all due respect to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, I think it's a stupid bill. I think it's not in keeping with the tenor of our times. I think it's completely out of touch with the concern that we have for the ecology of our time. I think when we're concerned with the extinction of certain species, when we're concerned -- never mind just the welfare of the animals that are being hunted and that's a questionable sport in this day and age, but certainly speaking as a rancher and as a farmer, I as a rancher and a farmer want at least one day of rest from those who trespass on my property in the pursuit of this particular game - or this particular sport.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this Chamber, this Legislature will in the not too distant future be considering bills, indeed perhaps bills or measures brought forth by the governments of that particular time - talking about severely restricted hunting practices, limited to particular species, and much more limited to specific times where it can be proven that the harvest, the scientific harvest of hunting is beneficial to the livelihood of that species, that hunting will be permitted. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that to talk about expanding the general hunting, you know, and the killing of our wildlife at this particular time is completely out of touch and out of feeling with what I honestly and sincerely believe the majority of our people in Manitoba would want to have. I think that there is a growing concern, a growing awareness of the value aesthetically and otherwise of learning to live with our wildlife neighbours that share this planet earth with us. I know that in terms of speaking of the farmers, the ranchers of this province who maybe ten years ago or twenty years ago could

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . become incensed about the idea that there were some deer or some other wildlife that were taking a certain toll in terms of their alfalfa fields or so forth, now by and large, except where it becomes a serious problem, take a much more charitable attitude towards the sustenance of wildlife in our land and in our province. --(Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Churchill raised a very pertinent point. We had a debate, I know that some members opposite would like to - you know, there's been some suggestion in the current debate about a measure dealing with the imposition of a tax that it was indeed close to a filibuster. The Honourable Member for Churchill reminds me of another debate having to do with concern for wildlife, having to do with the destruction of wildlife in the area of Southern Indian Lake in a proposal that was at that time before the House having to do with the Hydro matter. Certainly, certainly if this House had the time and saw fit to use the time to concern itself about that possible destruction of wildlife then we should have absolutely no time in this Chamber to consider this bill. And I, for one, will do exactly that and vote against it.

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

MR. PETE ADAM (Ste. Rose): I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ste. George that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I wonder if it might not be in the light of the constitution of the Order Paper at the present time, it may not be the disposition of the Acting House Leader to have the House adjourn now. The next order of business is Private Members' Resolutions, and it is a resolution standing in the name of my colleague, the Member for Brandon West. In order to ensure that members on the other side of the House will have an opportunity to speak on this measure, I wonder if it could remain on top of the Order Paper and come up at the next time that Private Members' Resolutions is debated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: On the point of order, we're agreeable, Mr. Speaker, that you might now call it 10:00 o'clock, and with the proviso that the same resolution would stand on top of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm also in agreement, but I was wondering why Bill No. 26 is not called - whether it's just purely an omission. --(Interjection)-- On top of Page 4.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, Bill No. 26 belongs . . . Oh, I'm sorry, it was an omission. We have . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Inkster asked that the matter stand. (Stand)

Accordingly the hour being the adjournment hour, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.