

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 26, 1973

MR. CHAIRMAN: 25 (a) -- passed; The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns): . . . sorry the Honourable Member for Riel is not here yet, I wanted to compliment him on the manner in which he spoke in the last three minutes of this afternoon, he used what I thought was unusual restraints for him and presented his arguments in such a manner that I would like to maintain the same manner.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think he was absolutely wrong in the attitude he expressed. He spoke in a vague way about what one would assume would be morale in the civil service -- something which I believe is absolutely incorrect. I think that all governments are involved in the appointment of staff for governments, for departments. There is a Civil Service procedure in this province which has been of longstanding and which does provide for bulletining of jobs and reviewing of applicants and recommendations for jobs. In my own experience which was limited to some three and a half years, I know that the Civil Service Commission has done a thorough job of presenting the qualifications of applicants and ministers in the main have accepted it.

May I say that there was a practice, which I became aware of early in time, where the decision on a - after a job had been bulletined and reviewed, that the decision was passed on to the Minister for the Minister to approve or reject, and in Department of Finance I started a practice of calling for the top four or five number of people that were being reviewed so that I could myself do more than just rubber stamp the recommendation. I thought that that was the right thing to do, otherwise what was the point of having to approve at all. I don't recall any case at any time when I disagreed with the decision of those who made the recommendation, and I believe in every case I approved of the person who was the first recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and its procedure. I think that was right to do.

However, when one starts talking in terms of those who are involved in making policy, involved in planning for a program, and involved in the delivery of a program at that level, one is entitled to be assured that the people who are charged with the responsibility do indeed understand the program and are prepared to carry it out. There'd be no sense at all for any government to adopt a policy and leave it to be carried out, executed by those who indicate in some way that they are not working towards it. And I had the very pleasurable experience early in the formation of this government of being told by a civil servant of a fairly high level, that he considered himself a Tory, that he did not have, that he did not agree fully with the programs that we were carrying out but that he felt that the job of a good civil servant was to make sure that he was carrying out the policies of the government for the time being. And that person showed me that he not only intended to do what he thought himself was a job he had to do, but started to review and study platforms of this party, programs that were suggested by this party when in Opposition, to the extent where it wasn't long before he could point out to me that on some occasion when we were in Opposition, I or another member of our caucus had made a certain statement about certain policy, and he knew what it was that we were saying then, he understood it and he said, I feel it is my duty to carry on to do that which this government, the government of the day, wants to have done. That to me was a very satisfying relationship that I had with that person who was able to say, I know my job; I'm going to do it well.

But there are others. I remember near end of the debate on Autopac when a senior civil servant told a Deputy Minister that he was not going to carry out government policy or program in a certain area because he felt that the government would be defeated almost anytime and probably the Deputy Minister would go with it, and why should he carry out a policy that he didn't want. That's the other side of the coin.

But in the main one has to judge the people one works with by the confidence one can have in them. And I believe that the record of this government shows that we have had justified confidence in the vast majority of the civil servants who are in the employ of the government today. And I say the vast majority because the record shows that there have been very few changes, very few changes, that have come about because of a difference in orientation and policy and direction. And one of those of course is the one that is immortalized by the words of the Member for Riel, in a comparison with a hockey player, I forget which one it was -- (Interjection) -- Gordie Howe. Gordie Howe has been lost to Manitoba. But there are times when there has to be that separation between the policy decision-making and those who are instructed or required to carry out policy. So that I think the record shows that there's been

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) very little change, and maybe too little change, and maybe when there was change it was a little late, later than it should have been.

But in the main, I think that one must recognize, as the whole structure of the Civil Service recognizes, that there are certain levels where people are required to understand and to carry out the policies of the government of the day. And that is why Deputy Ministers have no protection whatsoever in their position. Those under the rank of Deputy Ministers do have protection. I'm not aware of appeals to the Civil Service Commission of any great number or any serious nature saying that we are being unfairly treated, because of what the Member for Riel chose to talk about as political choice.

But there should be no doubt that the people involved in planning, the people involved in policy making, the people involved in directing the execution of policy, have to be people who have shown, and can show, that they are prepared to carry out the policy of the government of the day. And as I say, in most cases, the vast majority of cases, this has been proven to be correct. And the standard of the civil servants we have I think is very good. (Hear. Hear.) Very good and they are -- when I say standards, I mean their standards of service and their recognition of what their task is. And I think they're to be commended by -- I don't think it's helped one bit by creating an aura or a smoke of dissatisfaction. The records themselves should show the extent to which that kind of dissatisfaction is properly carried through the Civil Service Commission with the proper tenure rights and the proper appeal rights.

I do want to say however, that the people that this government has brought in have either come through the regular channels of bulletining, advertising, applying for jobs, and then being awarded jobs, or else they've come in through Order-in-Council, and the record is open. No question about people who've come in through Order-in-Council. And that is something that has been recognized for many many years as being the acceptable way of making sure that policies are carried out as government would want them to be done.

I can only say that when there are leaks and when there is talk from civil servants -- I don't know the extent to which this can exist -- it's usually the Opposition that knows a lot more than government does about leaks because they're the ones to whom leaks are made. It's government who knows -- who are the people that may not be trustworthy in the jobs that they hold? Opposition knows that. Government doesn't. Opposition must know who it is that comes to them with complaints and therefore Opposition must know those people who have not accepted the proper responsibility for carrying out the jobs assigned to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes I would like to participate briefly in this portion of the Minister of Labour's responsibilities dealing with the Civil Service Commission.

I would like to initially apologize for the absence of my colleague the Honourable the Member from Riel who obviously was not quite complete with his remarks. He unfortunately is involved in a speaking engagement and I expect him here shortly. -- (Interjection) -- Well the Honourable Minister says hit and run, Mr. Chairman, I you know, want to make it very clear and continue my reasonably good track record of trying to improve my image, Mr. Chairman, in this House by -- (Interjection) -- I recognize, I recognize when there is room for improvement there is room for somewhere to go. And I quite frankly was quite as -- just as well it happened that I wasn't here the other night, Mr. Chairman.

But before I deal with the specific question at hand that was raised by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, I am sure, Mr. Chairman that you will grant me the same license that you granted your colleague the Honourable the Minister of Labour before we adjourned at the supper hour, when he laid at the feet of the Conservative Party, particularly, the entire responsibility of the Dirty Thirties and the Depression. And the fact that he, -- (Interjection) -- and the fact that he had to work at the salary of \$5.00 a month on some farm.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes I would like to raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to also indicate that when a member rises on any side of the House to raise a point of order, it is not becoming to another honourable member to shout, "sit down". For the honourable member's information it is -- she is entitled to rise to make a point of order when somebody else is speaking. The honourable member is referring to the latitude that was taken in this afternoon's debate and I'm just throwing out a caveat that certainly latitude is permitted but the Depression debate was on the Minister of Labour's Estimates and we are now on the estimates

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) of the Civil Service Commission, so I hope we will not go back to that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I'll go back if you want to. I don't have to be defended.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, if my recollection serves me correctly that particular aspect of the depression debate was in fact on the Civil Service you know debate.

MR. PAULLEY: I will defend myself in any case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe my honourable friend to be incorrect. I believe that that debate finished at about a quarter after five, that the Minister of Labour's Estimates were then passed and we then came to the Civil Service. The Honourable Minister introduced his Estimates with a short statement about the wonderful Civil Service that we have in Manitoba; he was followed by the Honourable Member for Riel, and I would therefore implore my honourable friend unless the Chairman indicates that I am . . .

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Minister was followed by the Member for Fort Garry, not the Member for Riel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the Civil Service.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will make that decision on my feet and contain myself from making a speech that I was prepared to make because quite frankly the speech that the Honourable Minister of Labour made was ultimately unfair and ultimately uncalled for, particularly when it was his colleagues in Great Britain that formed the Labour Government that sat through the same depression years and provided essentially the same working conditions that he described in such graphic form to us -- (Interjection) -- Well, no, Mr. Chairman, we will try to abide by the rules. I apologize to you, Mr. Chairman, for having perhaps understandably, you know, not paid quite sufficient attention to the fact that a change of departments, of responsibilities took place at that particular period of time from the hour of 15 minutes after five to the hour of 15-20. It exercised me, Mr. Chairman, but there will, I'm sure, be another occasion, there will I'm sure be another occasion to make that debate.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, let me make some specific remarks to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. I've had occasion to try to speak on one other occasion, it had to do at the time that the Attorney-General's Department Estimates were up where I referred -- where I attempted to make some remarks with respect to the affairs of the Ombudsman. I was advised at that time by the Chair that that was not the particular time to raise the matter, or by the Attorney-General, possibly under Legislative Counsel under whose actual authority the Ombudsman comes under, that I could raise that question. I would like to raise the question with the Minister now responsible for the affairs of the Civil Service generally. And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, you may wish to rule me out of order but I rather suspect you will not. It has to do with the conduct of the Civil Service. I think from the first instance of the introduction of the Ombudsman we recognized, and certainly the government responsible for introducing the Ombudsman recognized, that his principal authority, his principal sphere of activity would be in examining the role and conduct of the civil servants because . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I might rise on just a point. If we're dealing with the Estimates of the Civil Service I want to point out to my honourable friend that the Ombudsman is not responsible to answer to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. He is a person, and his position is answerable to the Legislature as a whole and not to the Minister. -- (Interjection) -- In his report is the answer to my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, and I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to raise questions about the Ombudsman it is not under the jurisdiction of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service but under the general aegis of the President of the Executive Council, or some other position under legislation or some other, but not to me because I cannot answer for the Ombudsman, he's quite capable of answering for himself. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think I've already drawn that to the honourable member's attention the other day. He is under Resolution 3 on Page 2. He'll find that we're dealing with legislation . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if honourable members opposite would not be in such haste to muzzle my attempt to make a few comments at this particular time then perhaps they would

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) understand me. I am not particularly concerned about the role of the Ombudsman. I am not particularly concerned about any decisions that he may or may not have made, but I am particularly concerned about the Minister that is responsible for answering to this House as to the conduct of the civil servants that he is responsible for. I think, Sir, that in that context that I can raise this matter legitimately because, and I would now like to go back to my preamble which says that one of the principal roles that I am sure most members at the time that we passed the bill that set up the Ombudsman recognized that the activities of that Ombudsman by nature of the very act that we passed would be essentially directed at and involving people, persons, civil servants, whom we employed to carry out the acts and laws of the land that we pass in this Chamber. And the very nature and the very purpose of setting up the Ombudsman was to make sure that in the carrying out of these responsibilities that there was not an undue use of authority, that there was not transgression of responsibility, and so forth. And it's in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that I would like the Minister - I would like to ask the Minister whether or not it has been brought to his attention through the Civil Service Commission, or otherwise, that a rather serious charge was laid -- I suspect, Mr. Chairman, one of the most serious charges that the Ombudsman had to deal with recently -- where a private citizen charged senior civil servants in the employ of this government with willfully attempting to destroy his business and run him out of the province. Now I think this is - I want the honourable members to listen; I want to ask that question. I understand - now this was not - I will name the names involved - a certain Dr. Keith Robson has charged the director of the Animal Industry's Branch, Mr. Al Church, that he and senior members of the Department of Agriculture werewillfully and determinedly carrying out a policy, and using their office and their authority unfairly to drive Dr. Robson out of business in the Province of Manitoba. That complaint was brought, Mr. Chairman, to the Ombudsman. I understand unofficially -- I was going to ask the Attorney-General to respond to this question earlier but I was told that was not the right time -- but I understand that that -- and that will not be found in the Ombudsman's Report for the benefit of the Attorney-General who is now leafing through that report, because it happened during the course of this year -- and my understanding is that the Ombudsman did in fact look into the situation, and did in fact reject any such claim. Now my concern you know to the Minister involved, to the Minister responsible for the Ombudsman, not for the Ombudsman, to the Minister involved for the responsibility of the Civil Service in this province, this is a reasonably serious kind of complaint that I would suspect the Minister would, you know, it would have been brought to his attention, and he has the help of staff in front of him, that I suspect that it is now before him. Now having raised that particular point and, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those few members of press that are there, my understanding is that that complaint was completely set aside, that there was no foundation, and particularly for the benefit of the Member for St. Johns, that that complaint was set aside; there was no foundation for the complaint but however that the Director of the Animal Industry's Branch was therefore laterally transferred and that the complainant is about to be announced as the new Animal Director of the Department of Agriculture. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggests to me, is there not any rule or is there no undue political influence being exercised in the Civil Service. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I make no further comments, I simply say -- (Interjection) -- Okay, it's there. This, you know, this is the kind of actions that this government accepts. Here we have a person that has served, not just our administration but the other administration before us, in that capacity, he is transferred out of his job, a new man with very vested interests, I might add, the kind of vested interests that this government should suspect at the first instance -- (Interjection) -- is propelled into the very job, into the very job that he asked the Ombudsman to inquire into and the Ombudsman found no fault in Pilate's words, "I find no fault in this man" -- however within two weeks he finds himself transferred and the complainant put in his job.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is acceptable to the morality of the Civil Service standards that the Member for St. Johns like to talk about, that's fine. I won't raise my voice in this particular debate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise then one further question with the honourable members, particularly with the senior members opposite. There is no question, there is no question that governments past, present, and in the future will naturally exercise their will in the appointment of those people whom they think are qualified for specific jobs to carry out

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) those jobs. It is also natural to expect that where qualifications hopefully being equal, that there may well be a natural preference expressed as to those of like political views.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge the Honourable Minister of St. Johns who has been in this House for a considerable length of time to name the number of previous Executive Assistants to Ministers, who we all acknowledge are political appointments, that hence found their way into senior and high levels of the civil service -- (Interjection) -- of the previous administration, of the previous administration. Executive Assistants appointed by -- (Interjection) -- yes, you may have one, you may have one, you may have one, but the incidents, the number that have used this way in bypassing the normal appointments, the normal procedure of examination, the normal process of acceptance within higher positions in the Civil Service through proper civil service procedures has to be commented on, and that is what the comment that my Honourable Member for Riel was commenting on. -- (Interjections) -- Well let's, no, no. Mr. Chairman, you know the other day, the other day, members opposite, members opposite you know unfortunately - it's largely due to their own immaturity challenged members with the taunts of "name them". Well really that is not the business that was put forward, as the Member for St. John acknowledged in a restrained position that the Member for Riel put forward, and the member that I would like to put forward. I am simply saying, I am simply saying, and I ask the members opposite, and I'm asking the members opposite, particularly those - the Minister of Labour now responsible for the Civil Service, the Member of St. Johns -- I see none other here presently -- that can say, did they receive the number of complaints that we are now receiving in this specific regard, and I suggest they are not and I suggest they are not. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting . . .

MR. GREEN: member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member who says that we may have one, is he aware of the fact that David Sanders, Executive Assistant, Allan Bourgeois, Executive Assistant, and Mr. MacInnes, Executive Assistant, all executive assistants prior to July the 15th, 1969, were appointed administrative assistants and stayed with the Civil Service after the appointment of this government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not allow myself, I will not allow myself, I will not allow myself to be drawn into this kind of a numbers game because there is no fact, there is no question that if you want to name one, two or three names, that they can always be named, and they will be named. But what you cannot, and what this government, cannot deny is what the Honourable Member for Riel indicated in his brief three or four minute speech this afternoon, that there is a general concern, indeed a fear, of the kind of emphasis that is being placed on the political association that members of the Civil Service ought to or ought not to have, and the kind of pressure that is now being placed that has never been, never been the case in the past history of this province. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, not with a great number of years of experience underneath my belt but at least as many years as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has, and as many years as the House Leader has. I say that this administration or the previous administration -- the previous administration was not in that much of a rush, and never was, to appoint members of our particular political persuasion to sensitive jobs. In fact I can recall specifically that it used to be a cause celebre in this House when a senior civil servant was appointed that somehow had bypassed the usual or the regular channels of Civil Service appointment, I can recall a particular Mr. Bergman from Brandon that was appointed that way that my Leader, at that time the Minister of Industry and Commerce, was chastised at some length for that particular appointment, a single appointment, a single appointment. Certainly - and that's not the point at all - but what I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that that was cause for debate in this House four or five years ago, that a civil servant was appointed that did not go through the Civil Service Commission's regular channels.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have long since forgotten, we have long since given up the attempt to make those kind of points of orders or points of debate that the Member of St. Johns then made from these seats when "a" individual, or when "a" Bob Smellie got appointed to the chairmanship of the Boundaries Commission Report, or when a few others got appointed to temporary boards or something like that. We don't raise, we don't raise, and we don't - even

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) bother getting up in our seats to make speeches about that, Mr. Chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, when we see the ranks of the Planning and Priorities Committee swelling, when we see a number of candidates within the Civil Service that will be running against us in the next election swelling, when we see the kind of outright concern, outright concern that is being expressed, and when we see the outright concern being expressed by civil servants who, as I said before, were even during our period of time we considered them "a" political, who now are coming out of the woodwork to express concern. Well I suppose the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources sums it up in a passing comment, which I don't consider private if it is made in the House. I'll consider anybody's comments or conversations private if they're made otherwise, but not in the House, when he summed up his estimation of the Civil Service as being the Liberal Conservative Civil Service.

Well I suppose under those circumstances we have to stand responsible, yes, it was a succession of Liberal and Conservative Governments in this province that essentially built up the Civil Service, and to that extent I suppose that we have to stand accused, if we want to be accused by this government of having appointed 98 percent of them, unless the acceleration has exceeded even more rapidly than I thought in the last four years. But surely this government's pet phrase of what we did in 99 years, I have to accept some responsibility as a Conservative as having said, yes, that it was a Conservative Government and it was a Liberal Government that saw to the appointment and to the staffing of a responsible and a decent Civil Service over the last 99 years, and so maybe I, you know, if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wants to dismiss the present Civil Service as being essentially a Liberal-Conservative Civil Service that's fine, I have to accept that. Then I have to also accept the fact that you are doing your damndest to see that that is changed and, Mr. Chairman, we're seeing that attempt being made; we are seeing it being made, and very often in its most crudest form and, Mr. Chairman, very often in a form that really begs a question as to where the future will lie for us. I recall the First Minister making a statement, the First Minister once threatening us, and I don't think the use of the word "threatening" is ill-advised, that he in other words said that if the Opposition mounts this kind of attack on the Civil Service, or suggests that we are going to sweep with a big broom those appointments that this government has made, then they are only begging the same retaliation when they come back to power. And what really saddens me, Mr. Chairman, is that you know if we want to adopt that role then of course we're accepting what in my judgment is one of the more negative aspects of American politics, and it is that, you know, when a change of administration takes place in the White House you know 70,000 civil servants come down and 70,000 new walk up, and even any objective person must acknowledge that that kind of waste of manpower, that kind of waste of skill or efficiency in the particular jobs, is not one that we want to, not one that we want to copy or one that we want to even get close to.

Well then, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister says "hear, hear". Then, Mr. Chairman, then it really is a case of utter importance that we in the Opposition when we have that responsibility and we recognize the responsibility that at one time we will be government, that if we do not want this kind of practice developed in our province, in our system of government, that places an equal onus, an equal responsibility on those who happen to be in a position to hire those persons and make the necessary additions to the Civil Service, that they do so in a most responsible manner, and that they deny themselves the privilege of using the appointments to the Civil Service as a way of paying off what could be considered as political debts or political patronage.

Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that there have been, that there has been a very serious loss of morale in the Civil Service. I accept the fact that if a senior civil servant, particularly in the deputy minister rank, or ADM rank, cannot wholeheartedly support or carry out the responsibilities that the policies of the government of the day are - he is impelled to do, then he is obviously of no use to that government and should in fact be relieved of his office. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that from my own experience within -- you know let's call a spade a spade, Mr. Chairman, after all I was a Minister of several departments of this office, so obviously I do still have some channels within the Civil Service. Now what this government is doing, and this is even worse, that in most instances they're not firing people, they're not letting people go. They're using the convenient lateral transfer situation. And that is unforgivable. When you move a person in senior high levels of Civil Service that

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) is being paid 20 or 23 or 24 thousand dollars, and you move him into a little office to do nothing but shuffle paper because you haven't got the guts to fire him because he happens - maybe he's not prepared to carry out the policies of the government, I want to assure you that despite what you may fear that your position in releasing those civil servants that will refuse to carry out your policies, that that is the correct position for a government to take. I'm suggesting that in too many instances they're out of -- don't rock the boat, don't cause ripples, don't create waves, is being chosen by this government and we have senior staff people within our Civil Services that all of a sudden find themselves conveniently transferred to special projects, or to researching God knows what; but they're drawing their \$20,000.00. There are a few people like my brother, Sig Enns, who got transferred in that way that really in all honesty and all integrity couldn't accept the fact that he should be holding down a 22 or 23 thousand dollars Civil Service a year job and not doing his job anymore, not doing his job anymore. And so of course those kind of people do have the integrity and they quit. And there are a number of people that do quit that way. I imagine that Al Church the former director of Animal Industries will be quitting the same way very shortly because we've made room for him, we've transferred him out, and we're moving another person in, and you really can't expect a man with that capacity to carry on in that. He will of course if in his own particular circumstances, if he's within a few years of pension naturally he will carry on. But this is what this government is doing and the Minister of Agriculture can sit down -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order, please. A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the member alleges that for political reasons the man that he just named was moved out of this position, and I would ask him to withdraw that?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of withdrawing that remark at all, because the man, the man that they have put in his position happens to be one of the biggest con artist this province has ever seen. He conned Duff Roblin from the day he was in office. He got about 80 thousand or 90 . . . out of conning Duff Roblin. He owes about 50 automobile dealers money left-right across this province. He has the -- (Interjection) -- Dr. Keith Robson one of the biggest con artists this province has ever seen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. -- (Interjections) --

MR. ENNS: Then I have no intention of withdrawing that at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I imagine my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has finished his contribution if one may call it that.

MR. USKIW: If the honourable member would then submit to a question. Is it not true that when he was minister a number of departments that where you received a recommendation from his deputy that a certain man, at whatever level, should be moved out of that position, that he would have taken under advisement and acted either accordingly or otherwise? And I ask him to answer that question.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no particular knowledge that what the Minister is referring to. Certainly, obviously, he is referring to the discretion of a ministerial decision. I want to make it very clear that if faced with a decision that this Minister is facing, I would have no doubts as to the integrity and as to the character of the two persons involved.

MR. USKIW: Well just to set the records straight then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment or two to indicate to my honourable friend opposite that there was no political motivation in moving out the director of Animal Industry, that the move that was made was on the advice of the department, an advice which we have been pondering for some period of time. But just to let the records set straight, that particular course of action was set at the time that this Minister passed the Artificial Semen Act a year ago.

MR. ENNS: No, don't kid us, don't tell us any stories about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, now that there has been some discussion on the Civil Service and we have listened to the oration of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whether or not we should get down to the question as to whether or not we have faith in the Civil Service of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has made accusations against

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) individuals within the Civil Service, and it's unfortunate that those particular individuals cannot answer in this House to the accusations made by the Member for Lakeside and . . .

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Before the Minister persists on this course of action did I not in initiating this discussion ask the Minister whether or not this particular individual had not brought a very serious charge against the civil servant involved and did I not also indicate that the Ombudsman revealed that there was no basis to that charge, and under those circumstances will the Minister not reconsider the validity of my charges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I was attempting to point out, and I believe that the latest words of the Member for Lakeside validates the position that I am now taking, that he has made certain allegations against the person and that that person hasn't the same opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of answering in this Assembly, and that due to the general law the Honourable Member for Lakeside has certain immunities from his accusations. Now he mentions the matter of the report of the Ombudsman, and I have read that in respect of the individual that the Member for Lakeside has castigated, in my opinion most unfairly; and it may be true that the Ombudsman in his report did not agree with the general propositions or charges, if you want to use that phraseology, that were made in respect -- (Interjection) -- will you please listen to me -- Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I at least gave my honourable friend from Lakeside the courtesy of sitting by and listening to him and in this I may have been out of context; I may have not been my normal self, but I did at least grant to my honourable friend the courtesy -- yes, the Member for Rupertsland said it is unusual, and it is unusual, but it's not unusual for him to constantly interject on something he doesn't know anything about. That is not unusual. But I did afford, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside the courtesy -- which I'm not receiving from Rupertsland -- to listen to him in his tirade against the Civil Service of Manitoba in general, and one person in particular. I want to say to the Member for Lakeside that the doctor that he refers to has just been appointed to the position of Director of Animal Industry, and the reference that he makes insofar as the Ombudsman is concerned happened, Mr. Chairman, in 1972 another year from that under review at this particular time, or under discussion at this time. And I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of my honourable friend . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

A MEMBER: . . . it takes a little time.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . of course it takes a little time. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PAULLEY: And it won't take too damn long before you're not here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. There can not be two or three members all speaking on the floor at one time. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Ombudsman found no irregularities as to the conduct, or the appointment, of Mr. Keith Robson . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. There's a deliberate distortion being portrayed right now by the Minister of Labour. -- (Interjection) -- The charge was against the Director of the Animal Industries Branch of the Department of Agriculture. That was the only charge. And let him not muddy the waters here. What the Ombudsman said that there was no miscarriage of the responsibilities of that director, that the Director of the Animal Industries Branch, Sir, was carrying out his responsibilities with full and proper, in a full and proper means.

A MEMBER: Ah, it's not that simple.

MR. ENNS: Well, okay that's fine. Then let's bring in the politics.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I attempted to say, and I'm sorry, I'm sorry I couldn't penetrate the mind of my honourable friend from Lakeside. I say that there have

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) been no irregularities insofar as the appointment of Dr. Robson as Director of Animal Industry and notwithstanding . . .

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order. That was not, that was not the responsibility of the Ombudsman to assess or look into. The responsibility that the Ombudsman had was to look into whether or not the former director of the Animal Industry Branch, Mr. Al Church, carried out his responsibilities irresponsibly or in effect, as alleged by the now Animal Industry Director, in an irresponsible manner. And the Ombudsman found that that was not the case.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right and that's what I'm trying to say to my honourable friend, and there were no irregularities, there were no irregularities in the appointment.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. Mr. Chairman, I insist on this same point of order. The Ombudsman, surely the Ombudsman has no . . .
Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I'm going to read out for the honourable members so that they'll get this point of order, point of privilege business straight once and for all. I would refer the honourable member to Page 60 of our House Rules. "When a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege or order." The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I say, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, there's been no irregularities insofar as the appointment is concerned. The Ombudsman found no irregularities after the allegations. -- (Interjection) --

A MEMBER: You're distorting the facts.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not distorting the facts at all, I'm being . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

MR. ENNS: . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege. On a point of personal privilege. I have made certain statements in this House and I would ask you to pursue the rules that pertain thereto, and I am being called a liar right now by the Minister of Labour, and I resent that, and I think that that is against the particular orders or rules. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never said - it was not my position at all that the Ombudsman had anything whatever to say, or it was not his position to pass any judgment as to who this government appoints. The Minister of Labour keeps repeating and keeps saying, that the Ombudsman found nothing wrong with how this government appointed a certain Director of the Animal Industries Branch. That was not my contention, not my point in the first place. My point is, Mr. Chairman, that the Ombudsman did find no irregularities, no lacking of carrying out responsibly the functions of office of the former Animal Industries Branch, Director of the Animal Industries Branch. And I will persist, Mr. Chairman, somehow to continue to disrupt the carrying on of this House if the Minister of Labour now attempts to somehow have the Ombudsman take on the responsibility of appointing the new Director of Animal Industry's Branch for the Minister of Agriculture. That is utter nonsense. Since when does the Ombudsman appoint senior civil servants in this province? Or even pass judgment on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is one statement my honourable friend made that I - he suggests that I was calling him a liar and I didn't use that terminology at all, but all I say, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend, if the cap fits wear it insofar as you are concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. That applies also to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. . . . rules as were.

MR. PAULLEY: And it could conceivably be, Mr. Chairman, that the cap should fit because I am not trying to depreciate the position of the Ombudsman, but neither am I attempting, as indeed the Member for Lakeside has attempted, to judge an individual in this Assembly who cannot answer for himself in this Assembly. Mr. Chairman, certain allegations have been made by both the Member for Riel and the Member for Lakeside insofar as the treatment of our Civil Service is concerned. And endeavour has been made by each of my honourable -- yes I suppose -- honourable friends to try and cast aspersions and clouds on the Civil Service of this province, and also on this administration. I want to reject this . . .

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CRAIK: Point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Point of privilege. There was no attempt on this side of the House to cast aspersions on the Civil Service, quite to the contrary, the aspersions were cast at this government.

A MEMBER: Very funny.

MR. PAULLEY: I can accept that from my honourable friend because he is not intelligible enough to know the difference. I recall quite well, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- yes, and I'm going to recall something to your attention. -- (Interjection) -- I recall quite well, Mr. Chairman, when I first became a member of this Assembly -- yes, in 1953, before anybody else in this Assembly -- we had a Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce who had served Manitoba well under the Liberal regime and it wasn't with a twinkling of an eye that when that outfit, the Conservative club of Manitoba took over that he was discharged because he was a Liberal. -- (Interjection) -- I recall quite well . . .

A MEMBER: You got Gordie Howe.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that the former premier of this province, Mr. D. L. Campbell raised, -- (Interjection) -- a great man yes, a very great man, and one of the best that has served Manitoba in its whole history -- raised charges against the Conservative Party for political patronage, not, Mr. Chairman, with deputy ministers who are charged with the responsibility of carrying through governmental policy, but poor little flagmen who wave flags to ask or to designate whether a truck or a car should go through construction on the highways. I recall, I recall -- I agree with what -- I don't agree with it. I never have, and we haven't practiced it. I recall, Mr. Chairman, I recall, Mr. Chairman, that when as Leader of the CCF Party, and the New Democratic Party as its Leader for ten years, that the then Chairman and negotiator for the Manitoba Government Employees Association if I met him at the corridor coming into the House he would say to me, "For God's sake, Mr. Paulley, don't talk to me unless those so and so's find out that I'm talking to you because of the fact that they'll think that I'm giving you some secrets." This was the attitude of the government, the Conservative Government of Manitoba, and this was what they did to the Civil Service of Manitoba. They put the fear of the Lord in the negotiators. And now, now today -- (Interjection) -- Yes, they talk to me today and I'll give them credit, Mr. Chairman, they'll even talk to the likes of the Member for Sturgeon Creek because they have the freedom today to talk and they didn't have that damned freedom when they were the government, they had the fear of it. You talk, you talk, the Member for Riel talks, the Member for Lakeside talks about the rights and privileges of the Civil Service in this Province. Well damn it all they were behind the . . . , they had to hide themselves . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER. ORDER. Order. Is the honourable -- Order. Order. Is the honourable member going to behave himself in this Chamber or does he wish to be named?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When one is caught up with the fiery oratory of the Minister, any Minister of this government, one can't always you know contain himself to bursting out with spontaneous applause.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the feelings of my honourable friend. I can appreciate with him that the hour of truth has come home to him. Mr. Chairman, I recall my own daughter was deprived employment by the Government of Manitoba because it was found out that she was my daughter under a Conservative regime. -- (Interjection) -- Of course, Mr. Chairman, of course, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for any government, it is necessary for any government to have its senior officers individuals that . . . carry through their political policies. I ask, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friends opposite how many changes have taken place in the Department of Labour since I became its Minister? I can tell them that there hasn't been any because -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's time you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: It's time you served time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am the custodian of the time.

MR. PAULLEY: I say, Mr. Chairman, I say, Mr. Chairman, that where there are senior citizens or senior civil servants that are not prepared to accept . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the policies and the principles of a political institution as government is, they must be replaced. Even the Honourable Member for Lakeside has suggested that, and yet, Mr. Chairman, both he and the Member for Riel have condemned us because there have been occasions when there have been changes in personnel and they attempt to put it down to political patronage, but oh, they consider themselves more holy than we. -- (Interjection) -- Yes and you don't know what it even means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. The time being 9:00 o'clock the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: First item on Thursday night under Private Members' Hour is Public Bills for Private Members. Bill No. 21, the City of Winnipeg Act -- sorry.

Public Bills. No. 21, as amended by the Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you omitted the private bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Order Paper indicates private bill ahead, but our rules as we adopted them on Thursday night indicate public bills, then private bills, then resolutions, and I'll take them in that order unless somebody wants to make a motion to change the Orders of the Day.

As I indicated Bill No. 21, the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I won't speak at great length at this bill because there's only one issue involved here, the issue of whether the Mayor of Winnipeg should be elected at large or whether in fact he should be elected from the councillors of the 50-man council that are elected to the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, we've gone through many of the debates, not this year alone but with the passage of The City of Winnipeg Act when it did go through two years ago, and this argument has been argued at some length at that time and has been again at this time. I think that we've seen the City operate now for a year and I think that we're all in a position to pass judgment on whether or not the mayor should be elected at large or whether he should not. If there are any subtleties that the government has observed in the operation of the City of Winnipeg to persuade them that there should be some different arrangement for electing the mayor at large these subtleties haven't been brought forth in the debate with regards to this change in the Act. And I think that from the point of view of having gone through one election and seen the City operate that there is probably sufficient evidence at this point to support the main motion and not to vote for the hoist at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, in essence what I'm saying is then I'm standing to support, to vote against the hoist, and to in fact support the principle of having the mayor of Winnipeg elected at large and not have it as was originally planned in The City of Winnipeg Act and then changed to have him elected at large two years ago. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's quite logical at this point to ask the government if in principle it agrees at this point with the election of the mayor at large, why they do not deal expeditiously with the matter at this point and simply pass the original motion as it stood, unless there are subtleties, as I say, that are involved here that have not been brought forth and the argument and since this does not involve a matter of dollar expenditure, then it is quite in order for a private member to bring in a bill and have it dealt with without the government sending it to the graveyard, which is effectively what this does.

The First Minister has risen and said that -- on several occasions now -- that without doubt if the government is returned it would be his intention to see that the mayor was elected at large and that the proper changes were made to the City of Winnipeg Act so that could happen. Now if the First Minister is not prepared to do it at this time, is it because he cannot

BILL 21

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) get the support of his caucus to have this take place or what exactly are the reasons that haven't been enunciated, and I think that there's a legitimate reason for a member who presents this amendment to ask for this before the majority of the House, namely the government, simply kills the change to the Act by giving it the six-month hoist. Can it be that the government itself is not prepared at this time, in the majority of its caucus, to support the principle of the act, or are they in fact caught in the same situation they were caught with with the amendments to the Public Schools Act which would have allowed the support to the private and parochial schools, which was a fond hope of the First Minister, but did not carry the - did not carry the complete support of his caucus or his Cabinet in presenting it? It would appear, and the only conclusion we can reach on this side is that the government is in fact caught in the same bind as they were caught in when they presented the proposition of extending aid to private and parochial schools, where in fact the First Minister cannot carry with him his caucus or his Cabinet to the extent that he wants to to make it an act of the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, then I think that legitimately we do not see the subtleties that would prevent the government from supporting the move at this time. And I think that in all fairness that if the government is considering such outlandish suggestions here that one hears is their alternative, such as appointing - allowing for the person with the largest majority in his individual community committee election to automatically become the person who should be the leader of the group, of the 50-man council, and thereby assume the mayor's chair, if in fact these outlandish suggestions are being considered by the government -- and I really can't believe that they are -- (Interjection) -- I assume they aren't but nevertheless I hear on the airwaves of the radio that these are some of the suggestions that are being considered by the government - they're certainly not being aired in this Chamber -- then they should be brought to the attention of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, to cut a long story short then at this point there is no reason to -- from the point of view of the arguments that have been presented in this House other than that the Minister of Urban Affairs somehow feels that the responsibilities of his office mean that he and he alone must make this presentation to the House, other than that reason there appears to be no reason why the government can't be expected to make the basic decision on this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go back to an example that took place in this House several years ago when the now House Leader was sitting on this side of the House and he brought in a resolution to change the Public Schools Act so that people of native origin living on -- as treaty Indians, could be elected at large to the public school boards. And it was an item that had been under consideration by the government, and at that time being Minister of Education and having discussed it after the member brought in his resolution, we said, yes. We didn't take the position, we didn't take the position that we had to vote down or amend or send to the graveyard by a six-month hoist the member's resolution which would have allowed Indian people to go on to school boards and be elected there at large. Instead of that we advised the member who brought the resolution in -- who was the Member for Inkster at that time -- that we supported in principle the idea that he presented; we supported his bill and that the government intended to act on it, and the government did act on it, and the issue was over, and it was all done. And the move that we made at that time, Mr. Speaker, has some similarity to this one. And in fact it was a matter of principle that was probably more far-reaching than the election of the mayor at large or otherwise in the City of Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and I say to the government, that there are parallels here that would lead us to believe that the motion should be dealt with and not hoisted at this time. There are precedents in this House where resolutions and changes to Acts have been presented, and have been acted on, and have been acted on forthwith in order to see that the action was taken when the topic was an issue rather than killing the idea by killing the bill and attempting to bring it later on -- in later on as an Act of the government.

So I ask you again to reconsider this and those of you who are of a different mind, at least on the government side, to stand up, to stand up on the basis that this is a matter where a free vote, a free vote if ever a free vote was permitted in this House, should be allowed to take place on a vote such as this. I ask those of you who are on the government side, and there are many of you who are members of urban constituencies, to deal with this from the point of view of your own -- from the point of view of your own constituents as to whether or not they want to see the mayor elected at large and to deal on it from the point of view of whether having

BILL 21

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) watched the City of Winnipeg operate for the period of time it has, for better than a year, as to whether or not you think that the principle was a correct one to have been acted on in the first place with probably less notice than this resolution has had, with probably less notice when Bill 36 at the time was brought in to committee and had that portion of it changed at committee and dealt with in a matter of days, as to whether or not those members of urban constituencies on such a fairly straightforward proposition as this with the experience they're had can not deal with this; do they really feel compelled to give this a six-month hoist which in effect really makes meaningless the First Minister's proposals here of what he will do after. Because there's going to be an election between now and then and as confident as he may feel in standing up, anything happens in an election and he'll be able to tell a lot more about it the day after it happens - like a horse race - than he will be able to tell about it standing where he is now. So there's no reason at this point why this cannot be essentially a free vote in the Chamber and I recommend this wholeheartedly to those members of the backbenches in the government who have a commitment to their constituents, and who surely must have some semblance of individual thought in their minds and must feel that they're here to do something more than to simply back the money bills that are presented by the government at this session of the Legislature.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I again repeat that I intend to support the bill on the basis that I think that it's in the best interests of the people of the constituency of Riel, and I'm sure it's well recommended to many other constituencies in the urban area.

. continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words on this bill. I'm one of those who haven't spoken on the bill itself or on the motion, so I'd like to say a few words on the six-months hoist. I remember so well many times that when we moved a six-months hoist how we were condemned as a government. We were condemned that we were not responsible to the people when we moved a six-months hoist, because what it does, it kills the whole thing. But the First Minister had the gall this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to get up and say that he was not going to stop the mayor from being elected in the City of Winnipeg, he was going to have the mayor elected in the City of Winnipeg but it wasn't today, it was next year after the election. Well I realize there's nobody in the gallery there, a few people up in the gallery here. -- (Interjection) -- Who ever said that? -- (Interjection) -- I tell you that Member for Flin Flon can go back to Flin Flon and stay there as far as I'm concerned, because he's not responsible for the people of Flin Flon. And I don't need to tell him; the people of Manitoba have told him in the last 48 hours. There are a lot of people in Manitoba who have told him.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to come from the biggest city in the Province of Manitoba, I come from the smallest town in Manitoba, 34 people; 33 people when I'm not there and my God, I tell you, I don't want the town, I don't want any kind of a town or city where the mayor is elected, and of all the gall of the government of the day saying to the people of Manitoba, saying to the people of the City of Winnipeg that they do want their mayor elected today. We'll tell you when we want him elected.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the mayor would never have been elected if there hadn't been public pressure put upon that government, and I tell you that public pressure was put on by the Member for Sturgeon Creek and other members of the Opposition here and other people in the City of Winnipeg at that time. They had no intention of electing the mayor for the City of Winnipeg at that time. No intention at all. They were forced into it. The bill was amended at the time, I remember it so well, a great big bill that was presented to us. This is the attitude of the government of the day. This is the attitude of the government. They have no intention, I bet you a year after from now, of electing the mayor of Winnipeg.

But actually, Mr. Speaker, what does a six-months hoist do? What does a six-months hoist do? I hope when the members of the government of the day get up and vote for the six-months hoist they realize what they're doing. They're killing this bill. They're killing the bill. You've got to have a conscience, men, you've got to have a conscience. And if you don't have your conscience today what good are you as members six months from now or a year from now? And I tell you I'm going to tell the people of the Province of Manitoba that you've got no conscience, you've got no faith in the City of Winnipeg. What good is the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, without a mayor elected by the people? What good is he? What good is the city? I tell you that city is not worth anything. How are you going to compete with Toronto? How are you going to compete with the Mayor of Montreal, Mayor Drapeau, the mayor of Vancouver, Calgary? You name it. Every mayor is elected in the Dominion of Canada. Are you going to have a City of Winnipeg who is going to appoint a mayor? That's not the kind of a city I want in the Province of Manitoba. I don't care if it's Killarney, I don't care if it's Souris, I don't care if it's Wawanesa. We elect our mayors. We elect our mayors. This is the kind of responsible government that I want. I don't want a half-hearted, soft-hearted -- well there's other adjectives I could use, Mr. Speaker. That's not the kind of government I want. I want one that's responsible to the people and this is the kind of a government that I want. The government will say to the people, "You elect your mayor. You give him the power and the job to do. Let him be responsible." This is the kind of government I want.

Mr. Speaker, only with that kind of responsible government will I ever support them. I'll never support any government that gives a six months-hoist to a bill which says we elect a mayor for a responsible city, for a responsible government, responsible people. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to sit down and say, as the Member for Riel said, that I'm going to support the bill and, as the Honourable Member for Rupertsland presented to this House, in a fair and responsible manner and see those irresponsible people vote against it, because that's what they're going to be. Irresponsible to the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - BILL 21

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Portage la Prairie has expressed our views on this bill quite strongly. I took the same opinion when I spoke on the Unicity Bill and I at that time spoke at some length and this is one of the issues that I strongly supported, that we should have a mayor elected at large, and the Member for Portage la Prairie last year had a similar bill before this House which died on the Order Paper, that the mayor be elected at large.

I did not intend to get up and speak on the bill because again my colleague this year has spoken on it, but when the government decided to move a six-month hoist, I wished to get up at this time and state that I cannot support a six-month hoist and I will vote against it. I cannot see why the government cannot make it a free vote, and if the government doesn't want to stake its position on this issue, perhaps it could make it a free vote and maybe the members on all sides of the House will split on it and I think this should be the case in this instance.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I believe the government is playing games with this issue because I believe that we should have an official spokesman for the City of Winnipeg. This is the largest city in the Province of Manitoba nearing 600,000 people, and surely the kind of publicity that a city can receive I believe would not be receiving if we wouldn't have a mayor elected at large. I don't believe the mayor should be subject or committed to any group of councillors that would appoint him, if the case would be that he should be elected by a certain group of councillors. And for this reason I feel that the mayor must be elected at large. I think a good indication and perhaps a lesson that the government has learned, the last Unicity elections there was a pretty heavy vote as far as the mayor was concerned in the City of Winnipeg, and even not only the City of Winnipeg, but the other municipalities and cities which were not part of Unicity previously, had turned out quite heavily in support and voting for the mayor to be elected at large which was the case, so I feel that this should be the case from now on. I cannot understand why the Member for St. Matthews, when he first spoke on the bill, he said he could not support the bill under any circumstances, and then when he spoke on the amendment he said, well, the Premier had stated the case that the government will support it . . .

MR. JOHANNSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews state his point of order.

MR. JOHANNSON: Again the member is distorting things. I never spoke on the bill itself, I spoke only on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Well I'll take back if he says he never spoke on the main motion but I understand that he stated he wouldn't support the member's bill. That's what he said, the member's bill. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May we proceed.

MR. PATRICK: He spoke on the amendment and he said he was not prepared to accept the member's bill. That's what he said. And he agrees to that, that he said he would not be prepared to accept the member's bill, which means he was against the principle of electing the mayor at large. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't know what meaning you can put into the bill when one says he will not accept the bill and the bill states that the mayor should be elected by the public at large. You can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, and it seems in this instance not only the Member for St. Matthews but the Leader of the House, you know, would like to have it two ways. Sure he would.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is speaking on a point of order or a matter of privilege?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I made my position on the bill. I did not say that I was against the principle. I made the position that I was in support of the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to indicate that the honourable member did not have a point of order. He may have had a matter of explanation or a difference of opinion, but it doesn't constitute either.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems quite prevalent in this House that the Leader of the House seems to find a point of order not only on an odd occasion but he finds it almost daily which he hasn't a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion I think the city should have the mayor elected by the people and not appointed by councillors. And surely, even the other day . . .

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - BILL 21

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of order with respect to the honourable member's remark that I rise when I do not have a point of order. I wish to quote the honourable member, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland not interrupt me when I'm making the point of order. I would quote Bourinot Fourth Edition--well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can't read Bourinot and laughs at anybody who can, but I am now quoting from Bourinot which says, "Personal explanations, calling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: . . . calling in question a member's words, interruptions of members. There are certain places where the House will permit a member who has already spoken to a question to make some further remarks by way of explanation before the debate finally closes. For instance, when a member conceives himself to have been misunderstood in some material part of his speech, he is invariably allowed through the indulgence of the House to explain with respect to the part so misunderstood. And this privilege of explanation is permitted without leave being actually asked from the House."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Emerson have a point of order?

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, I would just like to indicate on the same point of order that the references made by the Member for Assiniboia were with regard to what the Member for St. Matthews had indicated.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is mistaken. He referred to the House Leader as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I thought you ruled on it that the Member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member proceed?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, you ruled on it and the Honourable Minister had no point of order and he still proceeded. I can't understand what was his point of order. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Would we kindly all proceed with the debate. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government really has taken an unusual attitude in accepting bills or resolutions in this House from the members from the Opposition. I would like to go back in the last four years and wonder if anything has ever been accepted, which is very unusual. And really, there were times that we were able to present bills to this House and resolutions that were accepted by the government, and it's very strange that today the Premier states that we will have the mayor elected when we wish to have him elected, when the time is right, when we want to have him elected. Now the mayor -- (Interjection) -- I'll be finished in one second and I'll -- yes I will. Today in a news report I understand the mayor from the City of Winnipeg has doubted the Premier's statement that the legislation will not be changed, and I cannot understand why the government does not take its position and, as I said, if they are not prepared to take a government position surely the bill should have a free vote in the House and let's see which way it will go. But the Premier takes everybody off the hook on his side of the House by stating, well, we will have the mayor elected by the public when we wish to have him elected by the public. It may be next year, it may be two years or five years from now -- and I don't think that's good enough. I believe that the government should take a position and I feel it's time that this government has come to the decision that some day some time they'll accept something from the Opposition instead of not accepting any bills or resolutions. And I would say that in the last four years if there was anything, there may have been something but very little, which is all most unusual and that has not been the practice in this House in prior years. So, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the government is playing politics with this bill. I would like to see the government take a position; if they can't take a government position, that it should be a free vote in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended really to speak. I really feel, though, constrained to say something because I am amazed at the distortions that have been made about factual situations in this House. I have a great deal of respect for the Member for Assiniboia but when he says in the last four years this government has shown great reluctance to consider resolutions and bills and so on, I don't know how that honourable member can say

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - BILL 21

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) that. He sits there --(Interjection)-- That is right. It is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Member for Rupertsland take his seat if he wishes to make a point of order, otherwise keep quiet. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Rupertsland is merely trying to confirm what I have indicated, and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia ought to feel some sense of shame in making the argument he did. I really think he should feel uncomfortable because that is not fact, that is not fact at all. And one singular one I will draw to his attention and there were others - is when he presented a resolution in this House dealing with the age of majority and it was accepted, and at the time it was accepted this government indicated that through the Attorney-General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: . . . that we were working on a bill to bring before the House, and he sits there, or he stood there, complacently making that sort of statement and saying, you know, that there's political posturing and all the rest of this. Really, I can't understand why all the distortion on the part of members opposite. --(Interjection)-- And here's an honourable gentleman speaking from his seat, and Mr. Speaker, I would allow him to do this because I'll just indicate for the record that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney is acting in an intemperate, objectionable and fully dishonourable way but it's not going to dissuade me, it's not going to dissuade me from continuing to put on the record his objectionable conduct in this House, and he still continues, Mr. Speaker. And I admit there's another member who is acting very objectionably by muttering. Now he's getting up and he's going to say that he has a point of order. And I don't know if he's got -- I don't know what point he's got but -- he's wiggling his finger but I can't --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Arthur state his matter of privilege.

MR. WATT: Would the honourable member just take a look around behind him?

A MEMBER: That's not a matter of privilege.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, let's -- Mr. Speaker, let Hansard record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to all honourable members that they cool off their tempers and let us proceed in a gentlemanly, courteous way, that everyone extend the courtesy -- Order, please. Would they at least extend the courtesy to the Chair so it can be heard without a lot of muttering and noise. Now let us act like gentlemen. Let us extend the courtesy to each other that we expect of each other. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think the record should show that I was interrupted and that there was no point of order and no point of privilege. I don't mind being interrupted, Mr. Speaker, and I enjoy certain contributions from their seats, it doesn't phase me at all; but when I indicate that there has been a distortion of fact by honourable members who've spoken, I know that they must feel uncomfortable about that because if, you know, if it's true and I believe it is -- I can understand their discomfort. You see, most of the honourable members were in the House and heard the Minister of Urban Affairs articulate very clearly. Now I hear someone doesn't understand that word. That means to speak precisely. Now if the honourable member doesn't understand that, well then I would refer him to the Clerk and he will get the dictionary for him. It's not a very difficult word. But the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs set out in detail the circumstances and they were specifically this, that the City of Winnipeg through their council had suggested that there were certain areas of the City of Winnipeg Act that they felt that they would want to see amendments brought forward at this Session and there have been meetings to deal with those. And obviously the City of Winnipeg councillors had the view that any structural changes in the makeup of the City of Winnipeg government should not be considered this year because it would be inappropriate to deal with structural changes in the singular. If there are going to be any structural changes they should be considered in total. That seems to be a very reasonable and proper way of looking at things, and the government, through its committee meeting with the City of Winnipeg, has adopted that point of view.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - BILL 21

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Now that point of view was not expressly made, it was a logical unwritten submission. These were the considerations that the city had through their council that had met, concerned about certain changes in the Act. And it makes sense that a government that's been newly established should have an opportunity to live with that system before they start making recommendations for structural changes. Now there have been, there have been viewpoints made about certain structural changes in respect to the election of the mayor. And there has been viewpoint expressed in this House and outside of this House about that. And the government indicated an acceptance for the precise change that's advocated on this bill. But surely it's better to deal with structural changes in total. And that's what the government has said.

What's unreasonable about that? And that's what, that's what the city councillors expect this government to do. Now surely that's not being unreasonable for the honourable members to say, well you know, that's playing games or something. I don't know, I find it totally objectionable that they can't accept that a government that says it's going to do certain things does those things. We said we said before elected to office, "you know, if elected to office we're going to do certain things." And they just don't accept that, Mr. Speaker. They don't believe that political parties operate on the basis of truth and commitment. They just don't accept that, Mr. Speaker. But let the record show that that is the way this government has operated and, you know, when they get uncomfortable in their chairs, when they get uncomfortable in their chairs, and squirm and make the distortions of statement they do when they're on their feet, it's to be understood because they can't understand how this government, how this government does respond to the commitments it makes. And they shake their heads and I can hear the marbles rattling from here, Mr. Speaker, and I can hear the interjections, the noisy interjections from the Member from Souris-Killarney. But these are facts. Yes, now he says certain people understand. Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently the people in some parts of the province do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: . . . do understand that this government fulfills its commitments and a commitment has been made, so there shouldn't be any further nonsensical argument about this government not going ahead with something that it has indicated it will do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34, Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

Private Bills. No. 36 - the Honourable Member for Radisson.

BILL 36

MR. SHAFRANSKY presented Bill No. 36, an Act to incorporate The Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, very briefly the background of the bill is that the Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba is a branch of the Certified General Accountants Association of Canada. The Canadian Association are a federal organization but recent changes, particularly emanating from the Province of Quebec, have shown that such associations are and should be governed by the laws of the province and therefore the various provincial associations have been asked throughout to obtain their own bills. Consent of the federal association has been filed with the Clerk to the use of this particular name.

This Act does not in effect ask for anything that this association could not obtain by letters patent through the procedure set out in The Companies Act, except for the right to use a designation Certified General Accountant and the initial CGA. These initials are now well-known in the accounting field. They have been used across Canada through the federal association up until now. They may be used in that manner for a short period of time yet to come. It is the right to use these letters which compels this association to turn to the Legislature for

BILL 36

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) assistance. The Act, the proposed Act, is therefore the same as all other Acts which incorporate similar organizations except in three prime particulars:

1. An election must be held to set up a new board of directors within 18 months and does not allow the original incorporators to carry on for years as has sometimes happened in organizations of this nature:

2. Twenty percent of the board of directors must be members of the public at large and not members of the association, thus giving a citizen input; and

3. The seventeen subsections of paragraph 14 insure that a person who may receive disciplinary action which may result in being suspended from the association and thus lose the right to use the initials after his name, shall be afforded ample hearing with the right to have the courts review the suspension or discharge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might mention that in the meetings that the professional association had conducted the last couple of years some of these things were brought out and it is in compliance with some of the recommendations and suggestions that this particular association has agreed as a sort of a pilot bill to encompass some of the ideas that were put forth at the hearings that were held by the professional associations over the last two years. As a whole bill therefore it has been an attempt to receive only the rights that have been given to all other accounting societies, but also an attempt has been made for a citizen involvement and an assurance in the appeal provisions that no group can wrongly exercise due control over its members.

The three basic changes which I have suggested were an attempt to present a bill which was free from the abuses which seem to have resulted from the operation of other professional bills. It should be noted that this association does not have the right to stop any of its members from practising accounting even if the name Certified General Accountant was taken away from him, but even so his right in this manner are fully protected by the extensive appeal provisions set out in this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that primarily that the way that we would want to deal with this is to let it go to Committee and to have the representation made there by the various parties of interest that may have a particular axe to grind one way or another in this particular situation. I would ask though whether or not the government or perhaps the former chairman of the Professions Committee feels that the structure of this bill fits in generally with the general provisions at one time that were considered to apply possibly to all professions, that might be used as a yardstick and made common to all professions are in fact evident in this bill. I don't for instance see here any provision for lay representation on their board of governors. I guess if it's here I missed it. But just looking at it briefly here I think that was one of the provisions that was considered by the now defunct Committee on Professions, which hasn't sat for the last year but sat every year for the five years previous to that and whatever good did come out of all those many days of sitting whether or not it's evident in this bill.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, our disposition would be to have this go to committee and hopefully those that have an interest in the accountancy field will make themselves present at that and give us their good advice. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson shall be closing debate if he speaks.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to point out that there is provision after the first 18 months the original board cannot be re-elected and there is provision for 20 percent of the board to be lay people.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion agreed to?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, the people the members of the Association will be present at the Committee to explain and give their views and ideas about the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to adopt the bill?

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question? I am not quite sure what he means when he talks of 20 percent lay people. Can he give us a definition of what he considers "lay" people?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: People who are not members of the association, other than members of the --(Interjection)-- non-accountants.

BILL 36

MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. We are now under Resolution No. 2 proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. And the Honourable Member for Lakeside has 15 minutes.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's with considerable relish that I re-embark upon the debate that was so summarily cut short the last time I rose on this occasion.

It's with some regret that I have to notice the empty chairs beside me, namely the mover of this resolution, but even with more regret that I note my most honourable friend in this Chamber, the Minister of Labour, is not in his chair because, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, if I remember correctly, and I could be brought to bear as to whether or not my memory is that accurate at this particular time, it seems to me that the Minister of Labour was in his own, his own peculiar style was chastising the Member from Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, for suggesting that anything good could come out of any kind of conferences or debates with the members of the Federal Liberal Party because he laid at their feet all the ills of the past 100 years of Confederation, and therefore really this bill smacks of sheer hypocrisy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I recall, just to pick up the trails of that debate, I had the privilege of gently reminding members opposite, as I now have the privilege of gently reminding the Attorney-General, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and indeed all the NDP members of government, that it is the NDP Party in this country that is supporting the Liberal Party in Ottawa and making sure that the Liberal Party that's in Ottawa continues in office. And so if the Minister of Labour, or if the NDP Party, has any bones to cast, has any sticks or stones to cast upon the Liberal Party of this country they, Mr. Speaker, surely have to accept a substantial portion of blame. --(Interjection)-- Well is that not so, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you for objective ruling. Even a slight nod of your head will indicate to me that I at least am correct in my assumption. It is a matter of fact. It is a matter of fact that it is the NDP Party of this country, the New Democratic Party nationally that every night sits down, and among whatever other prayers they have to offer say, God bless Pierre Elliott Trudeau, we want to sustain the Liberal Party in office as long as we possibly can because the Liberal Party in Ottawa is the Party that we believe can do the best things for this country, and that's why Mr. David Lewis and the NDP Party generally support whatever goes on in Ottawa these days. And so when the Minister of Labour gets up and lectures this House and says he, in his own inimitable style, says that he does not give a "continental", or he disagrees with the methodology of the Liberal Party in Ottawa, then let's keep that simple fact relative that it is the NDP that keeps the NDP you know-- the Liberal Party today is sustained by the untiring, untiring efforts, untiring efforts of my red-eyed socialist friends, the New Democratic Party of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal more seriously with the resolution. Mr. Speaker, if I can recall correctly it was under the leadership of one of those great Progressive Conservative premiers of this province that established the Prairie Economic Council, the Honourable Duff Roblin, that first recognized the importance of the western provinces acting in concert with respect to the political power, the political muscle that eastern Canada had, and we at that time - and I, Mr. Chairman, was privileged as a Minister of the Crown to attend some of the Prairie Economic Councils where the premiers of the three western provinces gathered to work out policies in concert which they could take for greater effect to Ottawa, and I welcome the addition that this resolution implies that the fourth province, the Province of British Columbia, be added to that province. But, Mr. Chairman, the thrust of my debate really will be lost because there is no pleasure in delivering that thrust if your opponent is not in his seat and my opponent, the Honourable Member -- the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is not in his seat, as he is so wont not to be in his seat. --(Interjection)-- My Leader sits right in his seat where he belongs. Now having dispensed with that let's get back to the Leader of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party Leader again is not in his seat, the Liberal Party . . . is not in his seat and consequently -- there he is -- I can speak with it. Consequently -- that's an improvement -- consequently the thrust of my debate will be somewhat thwarted.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

But, Mr. Speaker, really, seriously again -- it's been said before -- my honourable friend from Wolseley constantly and consistently displays you know a lack of understanding for the parliamentary democracy that we operate under. You see I have no difficulty in accepting the fact, even as hard as it is sometimes for me, that the Minister of Public Works happens to be my Minister of Public Works, or that the Minister, or the Attorney-General happens to be my Attorney-General, and that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, even, is my Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, Premier Schreyer, happens to be my Premier as well as the Premier for all Manitobans, and what my friend the Liberal Leader does not understand is that while we fight and do our best to represent various positions and points of view and opinions -- that's after all what the democratic process is all about -- but we should not confuse the responsibilities constitutionally delegated to the various separations and functions within our political structure. And it so happens, Mr. Speaker, much to my everlasting regret that this bunch of renegades happens to be the government at this time. And this group of people have the constitutional right to represent me at any constitutional conference, at any gathering of responsible ministers, premiers of Canada, particularly western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that I support wholly part of the aspirations of this resolution, the concept that it is important for western premiers, western governments to coalesce to some degree, to forget the fact that there may be different political persuasions representing in these governments. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll overlook that interjection as the importance of the fact is of course quality not quantity that is of importance here, and surely in the big blue sky of Alberta quality forevermore is celebrated in this country, and as long as the good people of Alberta recognize in the Conservative Party as being the true masters and the true rulers of this nation, then of course there is still hope in this country. Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a great deal of merit in the resolution to this extent, that I support and I support that and I urge my government and my premier and my administration to do all they can and I suggest, and I have a feeling that they are doing in this particular context mostly what they can do in being receptive to the suggestions of the Western Conference, in having entertained just recently the three premiers of our western provincial neighbours in this fair city of Winnipeg, and that we should do all we can to ensure that there is indeed a degree of unity and a degree of a united effort in somehow presenting to our Federal Government with all the manner and force that we can those specific and unique interests that western Canada deserves. Now this has to, Mr. Speaker, supersede individual political interests, whether or not there is NDP Government in Saskatchewan, a Conservative Government in Alberta, an NDP Government in B. C., and soon to come Conservative Government in Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that the suggestions implied by my friend who likes to make these sweeping statements, who likes to have public hearings on everything. I would suggest that he could really, really in keeping with any degree of consistency he could not really have presented this resolution because as a matter of record I doubt very much whether the Liberal Party have held a public hearing as to whether or not this resolution should be brought before this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Member for Lakeside I feel that the resolution certainly has merit and perhaps maybe we can all disagree should it be strictly from the government to put the position of western Canada or it should be of Manitoba, or it may be that much stronger to have a position of all parties concerned. And, Mr. Speaker we must appreciate that for the last many many years in this country, almost 100 years, that we did not have our fair share as far as industrial development is concerned. We don't have to go too far -- at the present time you have the misunderstanding and the confusion, and the fight between two administrations of the Conservative Party, Alberta and Ontario . . . as far as the natural resources are concerned in disagreement. But not only that we had just quite recently, about three weeks ago -- and I say this would perhaps happen in the NDP Party or the Liberal Party -- we also had a crossfire between two Conservative members in the House of Commons, the two MPs as far as the amount of money that was going to eastern Canada

RESOLUTION NO. 2

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) and not going to western Canada.

So in my opinion I feel that with all due concern that certainly this resolution has merit. We may disagree, maybe we could say that, okay it's the government's responsibility to focus the attention of Manitoba to the Federal Government, is strictly the government's responsibility. On the other hand some of us may take the opinion that if it be all parties' concern, perhaps our point can be made that much stronger to the Federal Government. Now I know that many years ago the late James Gardiner who was a great spokesman for western Canada, who was the Minister from Saskatchewan and was a federal MP in the Federal House, but today when you have more MPs represented in the House of Commons from Toronto alone than you have from the whole of western Canada, it's pretty difficult to get the kind of attention that we should be getting in this part of the country. And it doesn't matter --(Interjection)-- some member is saying from his seat that's because you haven't elected enough MPs. But even if you've taken the MPs of all parties you haven't got the same attention, and really I haven't seen Mr. Lewis, the Leader of the NDP Party, express a concern for western Canada. Because you know the power and the vote is in eastern Canada and this is where most attention is given to. Unless you make this point very strong, unless we make this point to the Federal Government and to the Federal MPs of all political parties, and if we made it as a result of non-partisan view from this House I think it would be that much stronger. We must appreciate that anything that's manufactured in this country, everything that we have to buy is made in eastern Canada, it's not made in western Canada or Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- Yes, we have buses, and I understand that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is announcing that he will be selling that company, or if he didn't announce it himself he said there was negotiation that somebody wanted to buy the company, But really, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the resolution has certain good points that we can formulate Manitoba's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . when the conference convenes on the Western issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)