

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 14, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 28 students of Grades 6 to 9 standing of the Ilford School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ed. Vizniak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

We also have 30 students of Grade 5 standing of the Carpathia School. These students are under the direction of Miss Block. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Reights, the Leader of the Opposition.

And we have 32 students of Grade 6 standing of the Ralph Maybank School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Moffatt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

And a further 62 students of Grade 11 standing of West Kildonan School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Klassen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions - The Honourable Member for Radisson.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Transcona Country Club, praying for the passing of an act to amend an act to incorporate Transcona Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Attorney-General.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a report on progress of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission, and there are some other copies here.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table the annual report of the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited. I have 24 copies, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like the Clerk to see to it that they get to the members of the Committee on Public Utilities which would be meeting to consider the report, and in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see whether I can get the concurrence of the House, that the Committee on Public Utilities meet for the purpose of this report on Wednesday at 8:00 o'clock, and the reason I'm saying that is if by that time we are in a procedure where the House would normally be meeting at 8:00 o'clock, that the Citizenship Court had scheduled something here which of course we could pre-empt very easily, but if it's possible to hold the committee meeting at 8:00 o'clock to 9:00, then the Chamber would be definitely available at 9:00. Wednesday at 8:00 for the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreeable) Thank you. Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills - The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 53, an Act to amend An Act to amend The School Tax Reduction Act (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor); also Bill No. 52, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways. The Honourable Minister of Health.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield) on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Highways introduced Bill No. 56, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister--Oh, the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns) on behalf of the Honourable First Minister introduced Bill No. 11, The Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund Act (Recommended by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to place on the record my protest to the House Leader on the calling of the Public Utilities Committee for 8:00 o'clock on Wednesday morning. I couldn't catch his --I couldn't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: 8:00 o'clock Wednesday night, not morning.

MR. ASPER: Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, the point of order or the objection is the same.

MR. GREEN: . . . we have unanimous concurrence I have no intention to call it, so rather than have a protest . . .

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my objection, and I tried to catch the House Leader's eye when he was seeking the concurrence of the House, my objection is that the notice for the meeting is short inasmuch as Wednesday evening is normally free I, as being a member of that committee, have already scheduled another engagement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister has concurrence. I asked whether this was agreeable; I had no voice objecting to it at that moment. Now if the honourable member wishes to raise an objection now, he's entitled to that and consequently the Honourable Minister will make further arrangements in the light of that - that's the procedure. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that by Wednesday evening we are expecting that the House will be in session in any event and that Wednesday evening would be an occupied evening, and that is why I said we would meet in committee from 8:00 to 9:00 and come back into the House at 9:00 o'clock, and therefore previous appointments for Wednesday evening would, I anticipate, really preclude the honourable member from coming here at all.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. GREEN: So we, Mr. Speaker, I intend, because I believe that I did receive concurrence, to proceed on Wednesday evening at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: The whole discussion is out of order in any case.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I assume we're on the question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question really, I think, should be directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs and possibly the First Minister. It deals with the airstrips in the north. I wonder if he can indicate whether there are, in the contracts for the airstrips in the north there are deadlines for completion, or are they open ended contracts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON. McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, there are a large number of airstrips, and there are a different numbers and types of contracts, and therefore without any specific question about a specific airport, I don't think I could answer that question.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs can indicate whether there's any contract in which there would be a provision for hourly payments until completion?

MR. McBRYDE: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question will be to the First Minister in the absence of

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could indicate whether the government has monitored the increase in the interest rate of the Bank of Canada and are in a position to determine what that will mean in increased costs to the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing offhand whether this has been done as a matter of routine by the department, so therefore I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

CORRECTION

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of privilege, and the point of privilege relates to a statement that I made in this House on March 30, 1973 appearing in Hansard, Page 1244, the second last paragraph on that page. Mr. Speaker, I'll read the statement and I'll make the correction. I informed the House as follows: " Unless the Finance Minister also feels there's no need for a debate on Manitoba's economic position, let me tell him that according to Statistics Canada between the years 1969 and 1972, the net out-flow of people from this province, the brain drain, was 16,000 net." Mr. Speaker, I've been informed that as a result of additions being taken where subtractions should have been taken in our own research, that the figure used of brain drain was incorrect; it is not 16,000, Sir, it is 26,000, and I would like the record to so show.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that you should perhaps take under advisement the attempt to get on the record by way of a spurious effort to correct what was improperly stated in the first place really constitutes a point of privilege or a point of order, because of the very basis upon which my honourable friend speaks, ignores the whole previous history of this province for the past 25 years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should also like to rise on the question of privilege raised by the Leader of the Liberal Party. If I understood him correctly the excerpt that he read from was some time in March, and according to our rules, any question of privilege that is raised in this House must be raised at the earliest opportunity; and surely, surely the honourable member has had in his possession a record of that transcript for some time now. I raise this point, Sir, because if it is going to be possible for people to go back as much as two months, what's to prevent them from going back as much as four years, and ask for a correction in Hansard; and if that procedure is going to be adopted, Sir, why then we're going to have a flood of corrections because I know my honourable friends opposite will want to correct a lot of things that they've said in the past four years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege that has been raised by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to all honourable members that it is not a point of privilege, in fact it was not a matter of privilege, but I had to hear what everyone was saying.

MR. GREEN: Well, then I assume that I'm in that category too, Sir, and I would just ask that if the honourable member is correcting previous statements that he made which were incorrect, would he fulfill his undertaking to correct what he said about what he saw with his eyes and ears on television with regard to the Manitoba Development Corporation advertising people to take out loans and go into debt.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the records on the point of order raised in effect by the Honourable House Leader of the Conservative Party is quite correct and I would inform him and through you, Sir, that the point he makes is absolutely valid, but on the other hand the information that made the point of privilege, i.e., that the figure used was incorrect only came to me a matter of an hour ago --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I indicated that it was not a matter of privilege and even if it had been brought up the following day it was just a correction not a matter of privilege. Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD - Cont'd)

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could give to the House the position papers that he took as Attorney-General to the recent conference that he attended at Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the position papers that I took to Ottawa were the papers that had been prepared by the Federal Department of Justice and furnished to all Attorneys-General and therefore there were no particular provincial documents; there were additional departmental information available to me, but no formal brief was presented to Ottawa.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a further question, I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate whether he has taken any position on behalf of the Provincial Government regarding the present Abortion Act which was discussed at that conference?--and I believe the Justice Minister made some comments on it.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the honourable member that the same observations that have been articulated by the Premier of this province and others of us in this Cabinet, and others in this caucus, to the effect that the present Abortion Law certainly ought not to be changed at this time to reflect any concern of some who want to make provision for much more flexible and wider abortion, and that the law should be lived with, it should be reasonable enough in its present form, and there was--I clearly indicated that I was opposed to any extension of abortion at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson. Last supplementary.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney-General telling us then that he's indicated at Ottawa that he's satisfied with the present law?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone can at any time ever be satisfied that the laws are perfect and that everyone is following them. There was concerns evidenced by the Minister of Justice that there were difference in standards as being applied by therapeutic abortion committees throughout the country, and there was some discussion about that, but it was rather inconclusive that there was any way in which this matter could be directly channelled; each one of us indicated a concern to examine perhaps the criteria in which different committees base their decisions.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General what position he put forward from the people of Manitoba to the federal authorities regarding increased fines for cattle rustling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. As I indicated during the course of the presentation of my estimates before this House, I believe that I indicated that if the opportunity arose at the forthcoming meeting of the Attorneys-General I would address the concerns of the people of Manitoba and of members of this House, of this government, with the problem of escalation in offences dealing with the theft and slaughter of cattle. I did so at the Attorneys-Generals' Conference and was pleased to note the ready acceptance and agreement of other western Attorneys-General with a concern in respect to this problem; even the Attorney-General from the Province of Quebec indicated some concern. The Minister of Justice after hearing the arguments which I made, and supported by other Attorneys-General, agreed that they would look at the provisions of the Criminal Code and give some consideration to whether or not any provisions there might be changed to provide for a more effective deterrent in respect to this criminal activity.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question to the Attorney-General. In the event that there is no immediate action from the Federal Government, what plans has the Attorney-General to carry forward our continued concern about rustling in this province?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not so sure that the question is appropriate at this time because it's conjectural, but I think I've indicated that during--again during the course of my estimates, that it's quite likely that there may be some further discussion of this during the course of this session because it may be that I will be introducing some legislative changes to again give some concrete evidence of our concern.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Attorney-General assure the House that that legislation is coming forward this session?

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General tell us whether the Minister of Justice in Ottawa expressed dissatisfaction at the administration of the abortion law in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. After some consideration I believe the question is asking for an opinion. The honourable member rephrase it?

MR. ALLARD: I did not ask for an opinion I asked whether the Minister expressed dissatisfaction, I'm not asking for opinion but only a statement of fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as I took the honourable member's question, he indicated whether there was some dissatisfaction about the abortion laws of Manitoba. The provisions in the Criminal Code dealing with therapeutic abortion are laws of Canada and there was a discussion about the administration of those laws throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and he did indicate concern that there appeared to be varying strictness in interpretation of criteria in respect to therapeutic abortion, and I think that was fairly obvious from the statistics that were provided. And there was discussion about the type of criteria that he felt ought not to be considered, and there was a fairly vigorous discussion about it but it was inconclusive.

MR. ALLARD: Did he specifically express concern about Manitoba's circumstances, numbers and statistics?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that he indicated a concern about any particular province, as surely that would not be the case in respect to Manitoba because our statistics per 100 live births are among the lowest in respect to this area of the law. He did express a general concern and I think the statistics indicate that the highest percentage of abortions occur in other provinces, certainly not in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. In view of the strike by the plumbers which will affect one of the buildings in Manitoba, the Convention Centre, is the Minister or his office giving any assistance to bring this plumbers' strike to an end?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the services of the Department of Labour are ready to be made applicable to either management or labour on their request. After all the strike only started a few hours ago.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary. Can the Minister tell us how many workers are on strike?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . question to the Minister of Health and Social Development and ask him if he can advise the House how many guests of his department have escaped from the Manitoba Youth Centre since it was brought into operation some weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, three to my knowledge, but I'll check and give maybe a more accurate number to the honourable member.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister while he is doing that would undertake to determine how these escapes took place?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. I think I related how the three that I mentioned got away, and that was by breaking a window which was supposedly a nonbreakable window.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg has approved a report regarding the function of the Seven Oaks Hospital can the Minister tell us what status that hospital stands in with the Provincial Government at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, some of the finite details of the proposal for Seven Oaks Hospital will be discussed with the Committee of Seven Oaks Hospital tomorrow evening, I

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . believe, with some of my colleagues, with a subcommittee of Cabinet, and possibly more details could be made available to Members of the House later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs responsible for Housing. It relates to the questions he took as notice, I believe it was Thursday or Friday, from me; is he now in a position to confirm that the value of building permits in the City of Winnipeg for the year 1973 is down 20 percent from last year so far?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've requested that information. I should have it tomorrow morning for the member.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is he in a position to give us any indication as to whether or not the cost of new housing in Winnipeg has risen 15 percent approximately so far this year?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to the member that I'm obtaining the information pursuant to his question of last Thursday or Friday.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the government is prepared to, or proposing, or will be during this Session proposing any action to halt the somewhat alarming, as I indicated before, rise in the cost of housing in Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I should repeat that the use of the word alarming as an intent to set--it is alarming the use of that term by the honourable member. It's certainly an attempt to isolate Manitoba from the increase in the cost of housing throughout the entire length and breadth of Canada and certainly the extent of any increase here is not abnormal when so compared, and I would expect that the honourable member would trust and hope that his friends in Ottawa, who have the effective means of controlling the cost of housing across Canada, would take firm action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Can the honourable Minister indicate whether or not he is aware of the submission before the Manitoba Milk Control Boards on behalf of the milk producers of Manitoba for an increase in their price of milk? I'm aware that some increases have been granted in the past year but there is still an outstanding increase being requested . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member is . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . from 88 cents per 100 I believe. Does the Milk Control Board intend to act on this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. --(Interjection)-- I agree that the honourable gentleman doesn't hear when he's asked to come to order. I wish he would co-operate. He knows the rules in respect to oral questions and he always tries to get a little extra in. Now I would request the co-operation of all the honourable members with respect to the oral question period that we keep them brief and to the point and direct, that no opinions are expressed which may provoke a debate or a reply which may also provoke. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Did the Government of Manitoba receive prior notice of the criteria changes under the LIP Program that were . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if my honourable friend is referring to the criteria that are applicable relative to the proposed extension of certain of the LIP programs. If that is what he means then I believe that we did not receive any prior notice apart from the same source that he received the notice, which was through the media. But I will check with our Winter Works office to see if there was any communication.

MR. FROESE: Supplementary. Could the government give any indication as to how much they will affect the program, the present program, in effect dollarwise?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that too I would have to take as notice. My honourable friend is asking for a quantification in dollars and cents and I don't believe that that is readily available. We'll have to make some research on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister aware of whether or not the Milk Control Board will grant the most recent price increase asked for by the Manitoba Milk Producers in the very near future or if any action is being contemplated by the Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would presume that the Milk Control Board will hand down its decision as it normally does, and I am not aware of any decisions having been made to date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Does the Minister have the intention of introducing any law to outlaw the sale of firearms in the Province of Manitoba, or what did he mean by his speech over the weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the major legislation dealing with the possession and use of firearms is dealt with by the laws of the Parliament of Canada and the province cannot legislate in the major part of this field. There was a discussion at the Attorney-Generals' meeting in Ottawa last week about the concern for the various weapons still being available for sale, although restricted sale, in Canada, and I indicated our concern that it was still possible for guns that are primarily used, or were used, during wartime purposes to be purchased in Canada. And I talked there about automatic weapons and semi-automatic weapons that have been utilized in some of the most serious incidents of criminal activity and I think there was a general concern evidenced that this type of gun should not be available at all even on a restricted basis.

MR. ALLARD: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would that mean to include the ordinary 303 rifle that is very widespread in the north, its use is very widespread, and which is an army surplus?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there was no indication, that I recall, that the general type of firearm that is used for hunting purposes, was to be considered. There was no argument advanced along that line that I can recall. Concern was in respect to the kind of weapons that I described earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, it relates to the announcement today that gold has risen to \$100.00 and the U.S. dollar has dropped by 2 or 3 dollars. The question is, having regard to the bond investment of Manitoba, or sales of Manitoba bonds in Europe, can the Finance Minister indicate whether this change in international market conditions will create losses or profits for Manitoba in its foreign debt?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I suppose one can draw statements everyday based on the fluctuation in the market everyday, since indeed we have foreign borrowing as against which we also have some foreign reserves, it becomes an exercise which would take up, I think, a fair amount of work of my staff to do something which is really not helpful in the long run. Because indeed in the long run there's a great deal of balancing out on these exchange rates. If we were required to pay back U.S. dollars today then it would be cheaper for us wouldn't it? On the other hand if we were required to borrow U.S. dollars tomorrow we may have to eventually pay more or less depending on fluctuations. I will inquire from the department whether there's any quick response to my honourable friend's question but I certainly would not ask the department to go through the exercise of gathering the information he inquires unless I am satisfied that it has a useful purpose.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. While the Finance Minister is in effect taking the request for information as notice I wonder if he can also take as notice. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ASPER: . . . in the same question if the information. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wish the honourable member would rephrase his question. It is hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the preposition 'if' related to the information he was going to get for me in the answer to my question. The question being what will the cost of servicing

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd). . . . our European debt be in the next twelve months? Up or down as a result of this, and has it been budgeted for or is there a stabilization fund to take care of it?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the answers to the budget questions are in the Estimates which have already been passed. Again it is speculative to deal with questions dealing with speculation on the dollar when indeed there are variations time and again. I again would answer the question only if the answers are readily available, I see no purpose in setting people to work to get the information which I think will prove academic in that we already have borrowing. The time when questions of that are considered are the times that we are trying to decide when to borrow and where to borrow. Those are the crucial times that we have to make decisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he expressed opposition or dissatisfaction with the present early parole easy early parole, and day pass system as used at the Federal Penitentiary at Stoney Mountain, and also the high number of escapes that have taken place there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: There was, Mr. Speaker, a fairly extensive discussion about the provisions of the newly enacted Bail Reform sections of the Criminal Code of Canada, and at that time there was considerable discussion about the high level of criminal activity that has taken place, certainly in various jurisdictions, by persons who are at liberty on bail. And there was certainly a concern for improved intelligence system, improved dialogue and understanding, on the part of both police and Crown Attorneys and Justices handling bail applications because of the apparent need for further dialogue in respect to it. There was general approval to the reform that took place, but I indicated our concern for the high number of people who while on bail charged with a serious offence have been, while at liberty, involved in further criminal activity.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask about bail, I was talking about early parole and weekend and day passes which release the dangerous criminals onto the society here in Manitoba.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, although discussion of that matter may have been very interesting, it was discussion dealing with matters of attorneys-general and that whole area is under the aegis of the Solicitor General of Canada. There were a number of matters that did come up for discussion, and again they were kind of diverted to a fall meeting hopefully of the Solicitor-General and various attorney-generals whose portfolio covers both corrections and other matters, and I for one urged a meeting as early as possible to deal with all of those matters.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General would mind telling us, has he expressed opposition or dissatisfaction with the present parole system and day pass system?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, that matter was not under discussion. Earlier on there had been a matter raised in connection with something dealing with the Solicitor-General's department and the Chairman of the meeting, the Minister of Justice, indicated that those matters which members might wish to discuss ought better to be discussed with the Solicitor-General, and before the end of the conference there was a request by myself that the Solicitor-General have a conference early in the fall when matters such as the type that the honourable member raises could be discussed with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Universities and Colleges. Can he tell us what number of university students have registered with the government summer employment office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable member for giving me notice that he'd ask this question. The Student Placement Office has received approximately 7,500 applications and to date, I think this is as of Friday or last Monday rather, they've placed about 2200 of those. Placements are still going on through that office, and also through the various other student programs such as the rural STEP program, STEP and community programs, but these are



## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MILLER con't). . . . still going on, and we don't have any final figures on that.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the information. Can he tell us if these were all university students or were there some high school students as well?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about students who have been placed and those would be those that are ready to be placed. In other words, they would not be high school students, they would still be in school.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Resources. Would he table or provide a copy to all members desirous of getting one of the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited as was distributed here this afternoon, and to which about a million dollars has been allocated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the figure is more than a million dollars and the honourable member will get a copy of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can he indicate when he will table, as he said he would, in the House the offer he says the Province of Manitoba has received to sell its interest in Tantalum Mining Corporation at a profit of 18 percent, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll make an effort to table that tomorrow.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. I'd like to ask him if all the jobs that are placed through the Student placement Office meet the requirements of the Minimum Wage Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge they do. The jobs that are being placed through the Student Placement Office are jobs in various government departments and they would I am sure meet the requirements of the Minimum Wage Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Education. I wonder has the Minister of Education or the Department of Education assumed the financial responsibility that will be incurred by the provision of two additional teachers and textbooks at the school in Camperville?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): I'm not sure I heard the honourable member's question correctly. Has the department assumed responsibility. . . ? Mr. Speaker, it was several weeks ago that I had indicated to the Duck Mountain School Division that we would assist the - financially - we would assist the school division in providing education services for the people of Camperville community. That is to say whatever difference there may be between what may be received under the normal grant structure and any additional expenses incurred.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this in any way affect the budget of Duck Mountain School Division?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. If we pick up the cost of the difference, then. . . affect.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I wonder if he is aware of the details of the Florida bill that was just passed in the House of Representatives dealing with dignity with death and would he mind . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that I have indicated to members, the Minister's awareness of something which is not necessary to our procedures is not a fair question or even a proper question. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is familiar with the so-called Death with Dignity Bill just passed in the Florida Legislature. Is he prepared to ask the State Government to send copies and details of that bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a copy of that bill and I'll attempt to get copies for the members that are interested.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SPEED-UP

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an Order for Return --(Interjection) -- Oh, those are both written questions that are on the Order Paper. Then, Mr. Speaker, would you call the Resolution appearing on Page 4 of the Order Paper now standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on Friday I was dealing with some recommendations to the motion to speed-up the session and essentially what I was attempting to do is to point out the difficulty of keeping a balance between the desirability of an expeditious examination of the government's program on the one hand and the necessity of maintaining for the members of this Chamber the right to give free expression to their views on any bill or any measure placed before this House. In attempting to seek this balance certain restrictions have been imposed on the debates that take place in this Chamber, and one of them being the 90 hour limit placed on the consideration of Estimates. And it doesn't matter what effort that we have brought forward to change that and improve it, we still find that we are unable to give the kind of consideration that we would like to give to Estimates and at the same time enable members on both sides of the House to give expression to their views. And I suggested then, Sir, that in my view the answer to the dilemma is the removal of the limitation altogether, not only the limitation on the number of hours which Estimates can be considered, but the limitation on the 10:00 o'clock adjournment hour on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays. Now in saying that, Sir, I recognize that there are going to be problems that also will be associated with that kind of a change, and perhaps one of the most difficult problems that will have to be faced up to is the proper staffing of those people who are expected to keep the records, the clerks and those who operate the equipment and machinery in this place. It seems to me that the imposition of that extra amount of time on those people is something that has to be overcome by perhaps the acquisition of temporary staff during the period of the session. And I think that that can be done very easily, Sir, because for every day that this House is in session, even for those 30 members who live outside the City of Winnipeg at the rate of \$15.00 per day, that amounts to \$450.00 a day that the taxpayers are picking up just to pay for the living-out allowance that is given to members who live outside the City of Winnipeg. And it seems to me that the shortening of the session by the measures that I have proposed could more than be offset in terms of dollars what it would cost in extra help to work in this building. And, Sir, what has suffered more than anything, as far as I'm concerned, is the kind of an examination that I believe should take place during the consideration of Estimates. Everyone feels some self-imposed restriction not to speak at any great length on any of the measures that are placed before the House for fear he is taking up the time of someone else. I know that honourable gentlemen opposite, especially those in the backbench who may want to make contributions to the debates on Estimates, may feel that they may be under some pressure from the Ministers to not participate for fear of being accused of, as indeed I have on occasion, of taking up the time of the Estimates which rightfully belongs to the Opposition. I think the removal of those restrictions is the best way of dealing with that particular problem. It seems to me, Sir, that --(Interjection)-- Yes, surely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm just wondering whether the Honourable Member for Morris would consider for us, at no great length, the advisability of taking Estimates out of the House as I believe is done in Ottawa and possibly have concurrent meetings of different departments?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The difficulty with that--that suggestion was given consideration in the Rules Committee but the problem that we faced in following that suggestion is the bodies that are in this Chamber. There just aren't enough to deal with that adequately in committees. We felt that even if it were possible to send some Estimates to the committees, there would

## SPEED-UP

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . be a compulsion on the part of many members to want to participate when they came back into the House for concurrence in any case. So it would be better to deal with them in the House so that they can be completely dealt with by all members who wish to participate.

And, Sir, the problem is one that we have been struggling with for a number of years, and one that I don't see any easy end to unless the restrictions are removed, and I'm confident that that is the only way that it can possibly be done. I say again, Sir, I don't believe that any government - I would hope no government would abuse their right to delay the closing of a session every evening simply to ram through and force through Estimates. I think that the reasonableness used in the number of hours that members are expected to work, but at the same time we could get from three to four hours a day more in the consideration of Estimates which would certainly reduce the lengths of the session by a considerable amount, at the same time making sure that everybody in this Chamber is going to have an opportunity to participate.

Now one of the things that will happen, I'm quite sure, is that during the evening session members who have other responsibilities than sitting in this Chamber will be absent, will be absent attending various functions that they're asked to attend from time to time, and it seems to me that there has been - the press has been unduly critical of members who do not remain seated, glued to their seats, all the time. It seems to be one of the things that the press in particular seem to want to elaborate on from time to time. I know that it happens in Ottawa a great deal, to a lesser extent in this Chamber. I would remind them that in my opinion a member who sits glued to his seat in this Chamber all the time is performing perhaps about as useful a function as the newspaperman who sits glued to his typewriter all day long. The good newspaperman is out digging stories and spending very little time writing them; and the same thing with members. Our responsibility here is not to sit in this Chamber and listen to the Minister's educate us. Our responsibility is examining the government, and getting our information from the people that we represent and conveying that information to this Chamber, and you don't do that by sitting in this Chamber all day long.

A MEMBER: I'm about to do that, Warner, right now.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, if we're to have the - if we're to have I think the kind of of an examination that is necessary then it is important that there be an understanding of, first of all, what the role of this Legislature is, and I get the impression that there's a good many people that don't understand it. The news that was printed in the papers the other day as a result of a poll absolutely appalled me, a poll that indicated that most of the people in this country were happy with the minority situation in Ottawa. To me that is an absolutely wrong impression of what the whole concept of democratic government, and responsible government, is all about. And if that's the sort of thing that the people of this country are wanting in the way of government then they're asking for chaos, they're asking for anarchy in a very short order, because no government can function under those circumstances for very long; and no government can carry on the responsibilities unless they have the support which they can count on, support in the form of their own members. And I must confess that the result of that poll led me to believe that there's a great deal of educating to do in this country about the role of this Legislature and the role of parliament, and indeed the role of government. And I think the sooner we can separate the functions of government from the functions of Legislature, or the functions of Parliament, the better the understanding will be.

Now, Sir, even today up till this point I've been very constructive Sir, in my suggestions. I can't remain that for long because there are a few other comments that I would like to make because I'm not one that believes that the role of an Opposition is to offer constructive criticism as is often suggested by honourable gentlemen opposite. That seems to be one of the cap phrases of the day, and it seems to me that people that are asking for constructive criticism are asking for nothing more than unqualified praise, and I'm not one that feels that my role is to simply say, Aye, ready, Aye, or Amen, to everything that the government says and does. Now if it means that sometimes we go overboard in our criticism that will be found out, and I'm the one that will suffer for that, and I'm prepared to take that risk. But government now, and we've seen in the introduction of four bills now on the Order Paper after the Estimates are completed. We've considered very few bills, one or two I think all told, during the entire course of the consideration of Estimates, and I feel that this is the wrong way of dealing with the business of the House. It compels people to sometimes overlook the importance and the

## SPEED-UP

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . . ramifications of legislation that is placed before them, and unless there is an opportunity to bring out weaknesses in various pieces of legislation through the process of debate, then the democratic process suffers and it can only be by debate; it can only be by a bringing out an opposing point of view and the conflict that exists between those who oppose and those propose in this Chamber, that one can get some idea of the merits and the worth of any piece of legislation. And I have never taken the position in this House that, regardless of the merits of any piece of legislation, that it is my responsibility and my duty to stand up here simply because it may be politically advantageous for me to do so, to approve of it. Quite frequently I have found over the years that some of the best looking legislation, some of the legislation that appeared to be very desirable, has broken down in the face of criticism, has broken down in the face of an opposing point of view, and in many cases it has modified, changed and corrected it so that some of the objectionable features of a piece of legislation can be brought in. The Minister of Agriculture is pretty well aware of that. The bill that he brought in here, The Farm Machinery Act, which contained 36 sections, before the examination was completed of that particular piece of legislation there were 55 amendments, which indicate that the drafting of legislation is not a perfect art, and it's only when it's subject to the crucible of debate and examination in this place that those weaknesses can be exposed and changed and corrected, so that you have an opportunity of bringing in the best kind of legislation for the people of this province.

Sir, when we endeavour to cram that all into a short space of time there is a tendency on the part of a lot of members to resist the temptation to make a contribution because of the time element. There is a tendency on the part of members not to have that kind of an opportunity to examine as closely as they would like to, and there is a tendency on the part of the Ministers to try and slough it off as quickly as possible in order just for the sake of getting it passed. Sir, this is not a sausage machine where you put the ingredients in one end and legislation comes out the other; and there has been the conditioning on the part of the people of this province that the speed with which a Legislature or a Parliament operates is a measure of its success, and that, Sir, has been - there isn't a greater fallacy that is foisted on the people of this province than that belief, and I would strongly condemn any effort to convince people of this country that we have better government, that we have better legislation, simply because they operate a lot faster. That, Sir, has never been true, it has never proven out to be true under any circumstances.

So, Sir, with those few words of criticism, I say that we're not going to oppose this Speed-up Motion--it's a traditional thing--in spite of the fact that I believe that the government are abusing it, I think they're abusing it to a fare-thee-well, and I believe they've done so ever since 1970. It was only during the first session that there was a moderate use, and perhaps a proper use, of the Speed-up Motion. By bringing in the bulk of their legislative program after the Estimates are completed, and after Speed-up has been brought in, is certainly an abuse of the Legislature, and has created, has brought in I might say, Sir, perhaps some very bad legislation that needed to be amended at the next session several times, and it's been a tradition of this Chamber now that legislation that is brought in by this government in one year, you can expect a dozen or more amendments the following year simply because it was rushed through in a hurry, there was not an opportunity for proper examination, and there was not an opportunity for proper drafting of that legislation. Sir, we can avoid much of that by giving members of this Chamber plenty of opportunity to examine legislation properly, and I suggest for that reason, Sir, that the examination of estimates is one that we could well have extended hours on, but the examination of legislation is one that should be done much more carefully because once legislation is passed it becomes a law of this land, and it's awfully difficult to live with when you find out that it's wrong; and I would suggest that we reverse the procedure that we've been following in the past number of years by ensuring that there's plenty of opportunity for debate on the estimates when it seems that it's the occasion when most members want to take part, and that there's more time given for thoughtful consideration of the bills that are placed before this Chamber.

With those few remarks, Sir, I hope that the government are not going to abuse the speed-up legislation, at least until we get to the latter stages. And in closing I would like to ask the Minister just one question, that if this resolution does pass today, I was wondering if it is his intention to impose speed-up on this very same day or whether it would wait till tomorrow? Thank you very much.

## SPEED-UP

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few points to make on this motion. I've had to put up with it for the last some ten years, and I have no argument and agree that we have to have a speed-up motion to finish this session, for the session. But I am concerned how long we will be sitting here and to what hours. I know that we've been told that we will not sit late, and we don't have to go too far back, even last year, Mr. Speaker, that we did have to sit not only on one occasion that we sat till five in the morning but we sat till after midnight on several occasions. And this is the argument that I have as far as the speed-up motion is concerned. Much what the Member for Morris had said I couldn't argue and I agree with him. Perhaps there's nothing wrong with having more time, and I would like to see more time as far as the Estimates are concerned, because, Mr. Speaker, I know that you will agree, and that everybody in this House knows that the greater part of the Estimates have not received any scrutiny, have not been debated, and maybe the 90-hour limit that we have set on the Estimates is not sufficient. A few years ago there was, almost unheard of in this House, it was very seldom with the exception of one member, of the government then that any of the backbenchers would debate or raise any matters as far as the Estimates are concerned, and I don't argue with that, I think that they should, they have problems in their constituencies, and it's their right to raise matters to take an active part as far as the Estimates are concerned. So my point is, by looking at 80 hours what took place a few years ago, and 90 hours this year, and with perhaps more active members who are wanting to get involved in debates from every side, from the government side of the House as well as this side, and I feel that 90 hours was not sufficient. And just by looking at the department we've covered, it's an indication itself that it was not sufficient. Some of the Ministers take perhaps much more time than the others to answer all the questions, so I feel that we go to the Speed-up Motion, and I do not argue with the Speed-up Motion, I think there should be some indication from the House leader how late we intend to sit. I have no argument with having three sessions, with having three sittings a day; there's no argument and I think--believe that in three sittings a day we can pass an awful lot of legislation and a lot of business can pass through this House in three sittings. We will have morning, afternoon and evening sittings, but all the Minister, the House Leader from his seat, keeps saying, we will be sitting late, late, and that's all you can hear from him. I think it's unfortunate with the attitude that he's taking because surely if we would have passed say at least 50 percent of the bills in this House, or many of the bills would have had at least second reading, it would have been different, but I believe it's much easier to deal with Estimates to sit later hours than to deal with bills, because if one adjourns the bill in the morning sitting, you have to speak on it quite likely in the afternoon and it does not give you sufficient time to peruse and give the bill proper attention, and perhaps to make the calls that you have to to various people, or organizations, who that legislation will affect, so you have some knowledge of that particular bill.

So, as far as the speed-up itself, there's no argument, but I do not accept the Minister's remarks from his seat that we will be sitting once 12 o'clock, late, late, late.

Now, a few years back we used to sit for--as the Member for Souris-Killarney has mentioned--we sat for perhaps three or four days or a week at the longest to finish the session and that was when the Speed-up Motion came in. I know the last few years we have sat at least three weeks or longer after the Speed-up Motion, and I believe we have sat as long, as somebody has mentioned, as five weeks, and in my opinion, in my estimation, this is too much. Surely the Minister can give us some indication how late he intends to sit. He said by agreement; we sat last session till five or after five in the morning. But there were other occasions, Mr. Speaker, that we sat after one, I believe we sat till two, and there was no agreement from the other side of the House; and I am sure he can go back as far as most of the members in this House with the exception of a couple, and I don't believe or, I don't recollect, with the exception of one occasion that we sat that late, so I do appeal to the House Leader that he should be reasonable as far as the late sittings are concerned.

I would be prepared to support the resolution on condition that we do not sit after 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock because after three sittings a day I believe this House can dispense with a lot of legislation, do a considerable amount of work, and can do it properly, instead of sitting till wee late hours and we will not have the opportunity to give the bills the kind of perusal that they should be given. I know even in 1971 there was a bill, or a few bills, passed in this

SPEED-UP

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . . House that the members who had been here for quite some time never had an opportunity to look at the bills or study them, and in fact weren't even aware of what was in the legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, I would support the Speed-up Motion only if the House Leader would give us some conditions to how late we'll sit; if what we have to do what he is saying from his seat that we will sit till the wee late hours, then I am not prepared to support the Speed-up Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I wonder if I may direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 82 students of Grade 8 standing of the Ignatius School of Thunder Bay, Ontario. They are under the direction of Mr. Zulianni, Turcotte, Clark and Schach and Mrs. Ottway, Bergamo and Miss. Wenzel. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

SPEED-UP Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, again like as usual at every session every year we find ourselves with the Speed-up Motion on our agenda, and while I agree to certain parts of it, and I think most members do, that as far as having three sessions a day and then being able to speed up the process by which legislation can be brought in and dealt with at a much speedier rate, I don't think there is so much objection to that, but just by bringing in this type of motion doesn't automatically mean that, or necessarily mean that we're speeding up, because this rests with the members in the House. If they decide that they want to speed up they can do so in a very short order, and it's up to the members, and I think from past years - I recall the night that we were sitting here, when the NDP members sat on this side and the now Labour Minister was still leading their Party, that one night he came in with a special nightcap -- (Interjection)-- you still have it, eh? When it was referred to a nightcap the other day certainly we didn't mean liquor, it was an actual cap --(Interjection)-- So that they were complaining very bitterly at that time about having to sit these late hours --(Interjections)-- and surely enough all of us know that these late hours don't certainly add to, or contribute to good debate, or having good legislation passed. I think the reverse is true; I think we should have proper hours and then debate the legislation during that period of time and bring in the proper amendments where necessary and have legislation passed. I think proper consideration of legislation should be made at all times and that Speed-up should not be brought in to curtail debate or consideration of legislation.

Certainly, as already mentioned by having each session a separate session and then having a morning session as well, this certainly brings about the Speed-up already and I feel that the matter of sitting till late hours at night and to the wee morning, is something that I object to very strongly --(Interjection)-- because we're not dealing with the estimates any longer except for the concurrence motions, so that we'll be mainly dealing with the legislation itself after this Speed-up Motion has been passed. And therefore I feel that it is untimely and that limit the evening sessions to our normal hour of adjournment.

Certainly we have a number of committees that haven't met as yet. The Agricultural Committee hasn't met. I asked the question the other day whether it would be called and the Minister wasn't in at the time and the message was to be referred to him. I don't know whether he has any intention of calling it. I certainly feel that here is an area where the committee definitely should have sat and considered some of the present ongoings in Canada and in Manitoba, especially in connection with agriculture. This is very important.

The matter of the grasshopper infestation certainly is one thing that should receive consideration, and members of the committee should have the right to find out whether proper preparations are being made in case there should be a very serious outbreak.

The Member for Morris brought in a number of things as to what possible changes should be made in the House Rules and I certainly would take very strong exception to some of the things he proposed. Presently we have a 90 hour limitation. I think, too, that in some way we should have room to have extended hours so that all Estimates of all the departments receive some consideration. We tried it last year by dividing up the time between the various departments. This wasn't very satisfactory I agree. Just what the answer is at the

## SPEED-UP

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . present time it is hard to say. The matter of staffing was mentioned. Here again I too feel that with the present hour in the evening, the present hour of adjournment, certainly the staff can accommodate us much more readily, and we're not that far behind in Hansards, and so on, so it is certainly beneficial to have a proper time limit for adjournment each night.

On the matter of having committees function outside the House for Estimates I certainly would oppose that very strongly because this would mean that only certain people could take part in consideration of certain departmental estimates, such as is the case in the Federal House. I certainly wouldn't go for that because you can't be in two or three places at the same time, and this would often be the case that you were called to be, and which is impossible, and therefore you could not debate the estimates of all the departments. I certainly feel very strongly about that we have sufficient time to debate the bills and the legislation that come in. Over the last four years, especially the last three past years, we've had very long debates on certain pieces of legislation coming before this House to which opposition parties took a very strong stand, and as a result so much of the legislation that was being presented was more or less permeated with the socialist trend or centralistic measures and as a result this is what caused a lot of the debate.

I think we should try and work out some way so that probably after a certain number of hours were spent on Estimates that we then have a division of time and also that the opposition would have some say as to which departmental estimates would be brought forward and would have priority. I think this is one of the criticisms that I would have that we have no say in which departments are going to be dealt with first, and certainly the Department of Education is one of the largest departments and we haven't been able to debate it at all, so I certainly would have felt that that department should have been considered if any should take precedence.

The Member for Morris also mentioned the matter of being in attendance in the House. There I differ very strongly with him because I remember a former Premier, D. L. Campbell, he used to be in the House I think just about all the time and he felt very strongly on this point that we as Members should be in the House, and I agree because so often we have people in the gallery visiting us and if there's just a handful of members in the House, this looks very sad indeed. And I've been over to Ottawa on several occasions and visited that House and when I saw only about 38 or 40 members present out of 265 this looked very poor too, and sometimes when the House opened there were more but later on there were more but later on there were also less, and I saw where they were discussing Estimates when there were only about 10 to 12 members present out of 265 discussing Estimates in the Federal House. And I thought that was . . .

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend would not want to put a statement on the record that he couldn't substantiate. If there were only 10 or 12 members in the House of Commons the House would have adjourned, because the quorum is 20 at least.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: That's a shaking announcement. --(Interjection)-- I recall counting them at the time and I know that on one occasion there were 35 and another occasion there was 38, and another time there was 40, and also I recall when they were dealing with Estimates there were just a wee sprinkle, there were two or three of the Cabinet Ministers in there, and they had some of their departmental people in front of them providing information, and there were just a few people around considering the Estimates. So that all in all that certainly looked very poor indeed for people coming from other parts of the country visiting our Federal Parliament and then have so much absenteeism. And we know that they often refer to in the Federal House the TNT members, those were the Tuesday to Thursday members. They didn't stay, they didn't come early, and they didn't stay for the weekend, so this is common knowledge out there.

And I feel that members should spend as much of their time in the House as possible, that we shouldn't have absenteeism unless there is good reason, and I feel this also makes for better debate. If the chairs are empty in the House the debate is very poor, and how can you get enthused about something, and therefore I take great exception to members not attending, if they haven't got a good reason for being away.

Mr. Speaker, I do have an amendment to propose which will provide that, still provide for the various sessions each day, to have the three sessions, and also that business can be speeded up in that way. I don't take exception to that. In fact I think we need some means

## SPEED-UP

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . whereby this can be done toward the tail end of the session. But what I take exception to is the removal of the 10:00 o'clock limit, or 10:00 o'clock adjournment.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the motion be amended by adding the word "to 10 P. M." after the words "8 P. M." in the third line thereof and that the words "and the rules with respect to 10:00 o'clock p. m. adjournment be suspended." In line 5 and 6 be deleted.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, . . . Do honourable gentlemen wish to have the motion read? (Dispense)

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment and to the main motion insofar as I haven't had an opportunity to address myself to the motion, let me simply say that it's of course interesting to note the authorship of these resolutions, the amendment, and indeed the comments that have been made by my colleagues, the Liberal Party. Those who of course who have so little opportunity or little hope of ever aspiring to government, one could expect these kind of resolutions from them. From us on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, who have had the responsibility of government in recent years, and who indeed will have that responsibility very soon again, I have one of those happy occasions to get up on my feet and support my honourable friends, my honourable friends the members of the government, because really, Mr. Speaker, the question before us is as age-old as this Chamber itself. It's a well accepted mechanism of this Legislature that we employ to bring to conclusion our debates with some despatch in this Chamber, and essentially we in the Progressive Conservative Party will concur with and agree with the motion put forward by the Honourable the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

We do so mostly because, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that of course it will be standing, the same motion will be standing in the name of the Member for Morris the next time it appears in this Chamber. And or somebody, and it may even be myself, but one thing is very sure it will be authored by a Progressive Conservative Member the next time this motion appears in this Chamber. And I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that it will appear in much the same form. It will appear in much the same form. So, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of foreknowledge, and with that kind of responsibility to our actions, that certainly would forego any possibility of the Conservative members from not essentially concurring with the motion before us.

The thing that has to be examined, Mr. Speaker, is how this motion has been used by different groups from time to time in this House. Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to have been a member all that many years with the previous administration. I did have the privilege of serving that administration for some three years, 3 1/2 years, and I can recall that at the time that this motion was introduced, at that time by a Progressive Conservative administration, there was probably the most important point that the opposition of the day wanted to be assured of, and wanted to have some guarantee of from the government, was that all major pieces of legislation had been introduced into the House prior to the introduction of the Speed-up Motion. Now this wasn't a hard and fast rule. I'm sure, and I know, that there were some exceptions to that but I can recall the House Leader of the Administration that I was part of very conscientiously attempting to list by actual number, and indeed by actual content of the kind of bills that perhaps might still have to be introduced while the House was in Speed-up. And usually these kind of bills were a very minor nature, numbering four or five bills that just for one reason or other, pressure on the printer, and so forth could not have been distributed earlier. That, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment was a responsible way of entering into the Speed-up Motion in this House, and that, Mr. Speaker, prevented the Speed-up Motion from being used in any way as a club by a willful government to drive something through this Chamber without the necessary time for debate being allowed to it, and surely members opposite if they do conscientiously challenge themselves, and ask themselves, about which matters, which legislative matters they debated most vigorously with the then government, would have to concur that that in fact was practised by and large.

I can't be that charitable to this government. For this reason this government has to be chastised pretty severely about how they have used Speed-up. Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, in the manner in the way in which they have neglected to take that particular



## SPEED-UP

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . approach to the introduction of bills that I've just mentioned seriously. Mr. Speaker, they have on all too many occasions introduced major bills while the House was in Speed-up. Not only while the House was in Speed-up but while the House was in its last two or three days. Mr. Speaker, I refer specifically to a major bill that having to do with the field of agriculture, the major revisions, rewriting of the Farm Implement Act, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, there are at least reasons for us on this side to believe that we were double-crossed on that particular bill. That bill was brought into the House and given a second reading with some assurances, although not perhaps all that official I now would have to say, by members opposite, I believe by the House Leader or the First Minister himself, that it was the intention to have that bill then left standing, to leave that bill standing in this manner so that it could go to the Agricultural Committee during the summer recess so that people throughout the Province of Manitoba, farm groups, farm organizations could find out about the details of the bill, make suggestions to the improvement of the bill, and that it would then be indeed returned to the House at a future session for final ratification.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened to that bill? That bill was forceably rammed through by a spiteful Minister of Agriculture in the last days of a session which required people coming from Toronto, from Hamilton, from distributors from across this country, to make rushed and hurried plans to attempt to give the committee, Law Amendments or the Agriculture Committee, where the bill was in that stage at that particular time, the benefits of their thoughts on the bill. Mr. Speaker, subsequent events, subsequent events have indicated the price Manitoba farmers are having to pay for the ill-advised action of pushing through that bill in that manner. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba farmers, indeed Manitoba consumers, as a result are going to pay more for their food because of that particular legislation. The fact of the matter is that only in Manitoba, Manitoba farmers are being penalized or surcharged to four to five percent higher costs for their farm implements as a result of that piece of legislation, hastily enacted, by this government.

My colleague the Member for Arthur points out another aspect, which is partly true. For those fortunate Manitobans of course that live closer to the western boundaries they are taking the business away from the Manitoba businessman and so that the Manitoba tax revenues suffer consequently, and they're going to buy, they are buying their farm implements in Saskatchewan where its cheaper, where the provisions of this act that we rushed through in that hurried fashion don't apply, where the surcharge doesn't apply. So you have the ridiculous situation, you have the ridiculous situation of where the, you know, Manitoba farmer, the Manitoba farmer has to go to Saskatchewan to get his farm implements cheaper than in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I use that only by way of example, by way of example to illustrate how not to use, and how not to abuse this Speed-up Motion that's before us.

Mr. Speaker, I have no - I'm caught in a quandary because for reasons I outlined right at the outset of my few remarks we are supporting the Speed-up Motion, because we have demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that we have used that motion responsibly. They have used that motion as a politbureau would, you know, in a totalitarian socialist state. They have used it to ram something through, to push something through, if it takes to 5:30 or 6:00 o'clock in the morning, Mr. Speaker. Now simply because they have abused the resolution that they, you know, and we're prepared to on good faith go along with that resolution, it gives us no indication, no guarantee that they will not continue to abuse it. But, Mr. Speaker, our difficulty is that in attempting to be consistent we cannot change our attitude about the necessity and the desirability of having this kind of a motion passed.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland who introduced this resolution is one of those members who is preoccupied about the conduct of the House and I suppose we all are from time to time. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular hangups in this regard. I recognize the government is the government and the government can behave arrogantly, they can behave ruthlessly, and they have, and Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are finding out about it. It doesn't matter what kind of rules, regulations, we want to establish for themselves the fact of the matter is the government can behave in precisely the manner and the way in which they will. If they choose, as they have in the past, to abuse this resolution they do so, they do so at their own, you know, with the knowledge that the cost, the penalty, of behaving in such a manner will surely catch up with them. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the imposition that our open society and our openness in this Legislature itself places on any government is

## SPEED-UP

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . really the only restraint that we can expect to be placed upon any government. I for one, Mr. Speaker, you know, have no difficulty in judging or accepting the fact that governments are known for what they do or for what they don't do; the legislation they pass or the kind of legislation they don't pass. Whether or not, Mr. Speaker, we always win the plaudits of the visiting Grade 4 school classes, or indeed the acknowledgements of our members, our friends the Fourth Estate, that really is beside the point. History doesn't record those factors as being all that important when judging the performance of an administration versus another administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that in that context some of the remarks made by my colleague the Member for Morris have some particular merit in reviewing the whole approach to how we attempt to restrict ourselves in examining the actions of this government by rules, by regulations, you know, which at any time, and most times prove to be of a restrictive nature rather than one of - I suppose when they're introduced one of an equating or bringing about a greater equality in the time allotted for members to debate subject matters, departmental estimates and so forth in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment that you have received by the Honourable Member for Rhineland be not considered by this House. That we rely on the responsibility that is the government's and the House Leaders to so conduct the affairs of the House even under speed-up that are reasonable. But to put any kind of automatic deadlines on the resolution that for some reason or other we have over the years found so necessary to pass at this stage of the Legislative sittings would in our judgment not help in dispatching the business of this House and in completing the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear. We of course hope to see the business of this House completed as soon as possible. We hope to facilitate this government to get their unofficial election campaign into official high gear status as soon as possible, because, Mr. Speaker, we welcome, we look forward, as I suspect most Manitobans do, that the campaign should be under way you know in a more official way. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there's a big question could be raised that the longer they're in office, you know, the longer that they are not bound by their own piece of legislation the Elections Act which they passed, the more letters are going to be coming out at public expense from the Premier's office at the cost of \$60,000 or \$70,000 tax dollars to the Manitoba taxpayers.

I can expect a letter coming from the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Agriculture telling us about some water sewage programs that he has in mind for the rural parts of Manitoba. I can expect a few more brochures to be coming from the Queen's Printer to be sent out at public expense by the Treasury Benches office. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think there is perhaps a great moral responsibility, if we want to, you know on behalf of those people who have had, you know, their requests for maybe a \$15,000 grant here or a \$10,000 there denied and I'll see the expenditure of \$60,000 or \$70,000 on what really has to be considered nothing but utter propaganda. It serves no purpose other than to tell the people of Manitoba, what they already knew. Or is the claim being made, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget Speech did not receive proper press attention? Is the claim being made, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that we supported this budget did not sufficiently impress the people of Manitoba to the point that certain things were in the budget? No, Mr. Speaker, another \$60,000 or \$70,000 had to be pumped into the unofficial election campaign to further enhance this government's image. Mr. Speaker, I think, you know, that kind of electioneering, Mr. Speaker, is unfair, is undemocratic and is highly questionable, highly questionable by a government who themselves as one of their first pieces of legislation in this Legislature brought in an Elections Act which was going to control the more rigidly supervise and define the proper spending of moneys in elections. Well, Mr. Speaker, we find out now what they mean by that. They're worried when it comes to the private sector spending money in elections but when it is the government in power dipping into the taxpayers purse to spend money to get themselves re-elected, then, Mr. Speaker, it's of no great consequence and of no great concern.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we in the Conservative Party will support the speed-up motion in the hope that we can facilitate the reasonable dispatch of this House. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we have no intention, no intention of foregoing our responsibility of diligently pursuing those bills that undoubtedly will be put forward, particularly those bills that have yet to be introduced, they will receive our very in-depth scrutiny, as well as of

SPEED-UP

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . course we will take full advantage of the fact that we have only had an opportunity to discuss perhaps half of the departmental estimates and there are no doubt a considerable number of points that we would want to raise on concurrence of estimates when that motion or when those motions are in order. But, Mr. Speaker, other than that, the Progressive Conservative Party is prepared, happy and willing to get this campaign into an official status if for no other reason than to try and keep those fellows honest with the use of the public taxpayers . . .

. . . . continued on next page

## SPEED-UP

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's always kind of enjoyable to participate in this particular debate because I always have the feeling that this is one where everybody is with you but everybody has to maintain the posture that they are against you, that this motion should not go through as a matter of some type of ritual that takes place every year. And the ritual was only departed from I think in the context of the speech that was made by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party who started his speech by complaining about people not being in the House when he was speaking, which if honourable members know what the word chutzpa means then they will know that the honourable member has chutzpa to the nth degree, that he should complain that there are honourable members not here when he is making his speech. And then, Mr. Speaker, I think he referred to numerous things that he couldn't debate of what we were doing. Now I know of nothing with respect to the resolution that we are considering at the present time which precludes debate.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we are considering at the present time puts parliament into its normal condition rather than a condition which is abnormal. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is nodding his head and I know the Honourable Member for Morris will agree with me, that in fact the Honourable Member from Morris' suggestion that we have unlimited hours for the Estimates, and a majority of the people controlling the hours of the House, is the normal parliamentary situation. And for someone - I think somebody said about totalitarian socialism is what is being used with this resolution. I know that the House in British Columbia on any night can sit through the clock, and that was under a Social Credit administration; and I think it maintains that way in Alberta and British Columbia. And I believe that Saskatchewan is much the same. The normal parliamentary practice is for parliament to be in session at the will of the members and parliament has sat for a day - they have sat around the clock more than one day running in many many cases, at the will of the members. And that did not destroy the parliamentary process. As a matter of fact that was one of the features of the parliamentary process. And there is no intention in this resolution to take the responsibility off any ones shoulders to give consideration to what he is supposed to give consideration to.

But the Honourable Member for Wolseley said that we won't get a chance to debate this and we won't get a chance to debate that or the other thing. It's interesting that on the items that he has talked about wanting to debate for the most part, and I hope I'm not exaggerating this, but I say that for the most part he wasn't here when those items were being discussed, and didn't even debate them when the opportunity arose. Mr. Speaker, on Capital Supply I understand that the honourable member wasn't here.

A MEMBER: I was here.

MR. GREEN: Well if he was here, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- he spoke - what was his speech? My understanding, to be fair to him, is that he was saying that there wasn't enough hours left to debate Capital Supply, and therefore he didn't speak, Mr. Speaker, about the Supply to Hydro which he would be happier to have forgotten making an issue of apparently. He didn't say anything about Leaf Rapids which he I assume has been suggesting that he wanted to debate very strongly. He didn't I understand say anything about the Manitoba Development Corporation which --(Interjection)-- Well okay he then he did say something about this, Mr. Speaker, but he didn't avail himself of the time that there was for debating these items, and now he says that debate - he says he had a half hour. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he had one and a half hours it is only because he let it go because he had an opportunity of getting up as many times in committee of the supply to discuss each of these items as he wished to, and apparently, Mr. Speaker--he is shaking his head that this is not correct. I tell the honourable member that he is not correct, that he could have debated that capital supply that afternoon, that evening, the next morning, the next afternoon, as long as he wanted to debate those capital supply items. But he didn't. Until the closing of 90 hours, and then there is still, Mr. Speaker - and I'm not going to tell the honourable member, he will have to learn for himself, but that there is still time for debate, and perhaps he should take a leaf from the book of the Honourable Member for Morris, because the Honourable Member for Morris knows something about parliament. He knows that if there is one way of closing off an avenue ther usually is another way of opening an avenue.

## SPEED-UP

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

That's why I don't take very seriously the criticism that I heard from the Member for Souris-Killarney, the Member for Lakeside or the Member for--No, the Member for Morris to his credit didn't really attack us very strongly. Because when the 90 hours was put into effect there is always a tendency for somebody - and I will admit that we were not as skillful in this practice as is the Honourable Member for Morris at the present time - but during regular House business there is a tendency to find out how you can debate on government time rather than on Estimates time. And two years ago it was on Motions to receive a report that the Member for Morris spotted an opportunity to take debate out of the Estimates and put it into House time, and he did it very effectively until that was closed off. And I don't blame him for it. I say that that is good House practice, that is what an Opposition member should do. But we know where he's done it this year, we know every occasion where he's done it. It's not hard to spot it. And the honourable member is smiling and I'll tell you where he's done it. He's done it first of all by using up almost all of the grievances which - when we were in Opposition we used to use up one or two a year, we used to regard them as very precious, I don't know why. Eventually they wear out anyway so you might as well use them and the Member for Morris correctly told his caucus, use grievance time, don't use Estimates time. Estimates time comes off our time, grievance time comes off government time. And he used grievance time. And therefore one of the complaints that he has that we have not properly managed the affairs of the House I really don't take very seriously because I know that the honourable member has had a role in how the House has participated and I think that that's a good rule.

Another thing that he has done is he said - and I can see him saying it to his member, look don't use estimates time, use bills time. When the government brings in a bill and you had something that you wanted to say on estimates, don't use it on our time use it on their time. So we had a bill, we started to bring in bills in the way--and he's smiling and I know that I am properly echoing what he told his caucus members--we had a bill that was brought in, it was probably one of the most innocuous bills that was brought in, except the Minister of Labour if he was here he'd probably scold me for this, but we have a bill here, an Act to amend The Employment Safety Act. --(Interjection)-- That's a dandy! We had about five adjournments on this bill and five speakers on this bill and it's now standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Charleswood on the basis that we were going to keep on debating this bill. We will debate toilets on Memorial Gardens on this bill; we will debate governments proceeding without a permit on this bill; we will debate all of the things that we would like to talk about and hit the government with and not use up Estimates time. Again I don't criticize that. I think that's a Parliamentary technique which deserves the credit of the Honourable Member from Morris. And that is what he has done. Essentially it's been to use bills time which normally goes through quite quickly; one member speaks on the bill from the party, puts the party position, it either goes to second reading or it doesn't. Use grievance time because that is also government time and do it in that way. And therefore when he says --(Interjection)-- well the question period has lasted approximately an hour every day, that is also government time and particularly in this respect I have to move away from the Member for Morris for my congratulations and turn to the Member for Wolseley for my congratulations, because the Member for Wolseley knows that he's not going to be here during debating time, so he says, I will debate during question period, and the question period has therefore been a part of the debating time that has been used by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, I very grudgingly, Mr. Speaker, convey the same congratulations to the Member for Wolseley as I do to the Member for Morris, although maybe the difference is that the Member for Morris knows what he is doing and the Member for Wolseley doesn't know what he is doing. But otherwise they have both used up government House time, and I'm not complaining, I don't think that I have ever said, you people have filibustered, you have stopped us, or you're interfering with the progress of the House. But you then don't expect that we will fall into your pattern. If I fell into the pattern of the Member for Morris and kept calling every bill on the basis that the bills would take up all the time while we are trying to complete the estimates, the Member for Morris would think little of me for doing that, because the intention of the government is to try to keep control of the House and the intention of the Opposition is to try to use whatever available opportunities they have to discredit the government. I don't fault that, I accept that; but I don't expect that we

## SPEED- UP

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . should take it and hold up a white flag and surrender and say, okay please take over. So we have to do certain things too. And when we noticed that there was going to be a great number of debates, I did what the Honourable Member for Morris said that I'm supposed to do, I had a good mixture of bills, a good mixture of bills and estimates and I'm calling bills, and when I saw that the bills were going to be used as a subject for debate or for getting in time on government business, I stopped them--(Interjection)-- Well, what did you expect me to do? When the Member for Morris decided that he was going to make a motion to receive a committee report, a major opposition tact, well I admit quite frankly and I said at the time, from now on we will not bring in the reports until the session is virtually over, then if they want to debate those receipt of government reports, they will do it. And as a result we really got an improvement in the House. We said, well, we both concede we know what's going on and we said that there is no more debate under receipts of government reports, which I think was a good change in the rules. But the fact is that now to get sort of the pained expression, admittedly not so much from the Conservative Opposition as from the Member for Rhineland, the Member for Wolseley, the Member for Assiniboia who tends to pay a great deal of attention to them, that somehow this is a terrible thing that has occurred here. It is merely operating Parliament as it is normally operated, and I say advisedly that I do not expect any member of this House to in any way abdicate his responsibility. A bill comes forward and you don't wish to speak on that bill, there has never been an immediate refusal to grant an adjournment to research a bill. There's never been that. If there were three or four adjournments requested and a bill had to go through, then we have decided that that would not occur. But for immediately looking at a bill, for examining one in greater detail that has occurred all the time and nobody has suffered by it.

The suggestion that the Member for Souris-Lansdowne said, well we've been kept in speed-up for three or four months. Well, so what?--(Interjection)-- It's not three--excuse me--(Interjection)-- two, the honourable member says that I should keep my record straight --(Interjection)-- five and half weeks, and that they only did it for three or four days. Well, what relevance is there, what difference does that make? All that that means is that since the New Democratic Party has come to power the average legislative session has been in the neighborhood of five and a half to six months, whereas when the Conservatives were in here doing nothing, the Legislative session was three months. --(Interjection)-- Well, you want me to be easy on you; you would like to be able to throw all the junk that you want, but when we get up here we're to say "nice Earl" and we're to pat you over the head and cheer what you have done. Now the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a change, and I--oh yes, that change I believe will continue if we're going to get back into the election campaign-- the fact is, the fact is I have no problem with the Legislative sitting, I've said before that I think it's going to last longer and longer, because I believe that the people of Manitoba want to have a government that does more and more things on behalf, or gives the people an opportunity through their governments to do more and more things, and that is going to involve more Legislative time; it's going to involve more reports, it's going to involve more accountability and it's going to involve more time. But to suggest that by moving to what is the normal way of conducting Parliament we are somehow destroying democracy or--I heard the Leader of the Liberal Party talk about. . . the House Leader whipping them, Well, Mr. Speaker, I must admit a desire to do that from time to time; if I had a whip I might probably be tempted to from time to time, particularly with respect to the Member for Wolseley, but the fact is, the fact is that the legislative time and the legislative proceedings are governed by a majority of the people in this House, and if the honourable member thinks that I have somehow the capacity or the power to require members to do things that they don't want to do, then he is incorrect. Maybe he has that capacity.

I note that the members of the Liberal Party, good solid people that I knew in the past six years, have almost now nothing to say about what happens in the Liberal Party, because the Leader of the Liberal Party says the Liberal policy is my policy and if they don't like it I will resign. That is, Mr. Speaker, a direct quote, and that has affected the Liberal back-benchers because we hear very little from them, we know that to their problem the leader is in charge and maybe he thinks that that is the way we operate over here. Well, that is not the way we operate. The fact is that we cannot require a majority of members in this House to sit longer than they wish to, and that is the normal way in which Parliament takes place.

## SPEED- UP

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . And therefore, Mr. Speaker, knowing that to be the case and knowing full well that every bill still has to have first reading, has to have second reading, has to then go to committee unless it is a money bill, and then it has to have third reading. The rules of debate apply, people can stay here as long as they want to under those rules. They still have other occasions to debate, which the Member for Wolseley does not know about but the Member for Morris does know about; all of those opportunities will be utilized and we will continue to exercise our responsibility as parliamentarians. And that's why I don't take very seriously the suggestion that has been made by certain members that the government is doing a terrible thing, because I happen to know that all of them, or if not all, the very very great majority welcome the opportunity to put more work into a week than they have under the normal rules and that they therefore, even some of them who will criticize that, will make those criticisms hoping full well that there is the indication that the government wishes to proceed.

As to saying that there will be a -- giving the Honourable Member for Assiniboia a commitment that there will be a closing hour, I make the only commitment that Parliament can make; that the hours of closing will be determined by a majority of the members in the Legislature, and I think that that is the democratic process. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to rise on this debate but I am going to make a few remarks as a result of the statements of the Honourable House Leader. My purpose is to first indicate the support for the general position taken by the Deputy House Leader of our Party and to indicate that we are going to support this to get the business of the Legislature completed. I believe as he does that it's probably in the best interests of the people that we proceed as quickly as possible to complete the pre-election campaign in this Legislature and then go to the hustings and let the people decide whether the NDP are to continue in power or not. --(Interjection)-- The rush? There probably is no rush except that the actions of the government, the manner in which they have I believe abused the office by publicizing their programs, the way in which the legislation has been conducted in the last little while, I think justify the position now that we go to the people and let the people decide.

But if I may I'd like to make a couple of comments with respect to the question of the conduct of the House and the kinds of procedures and changes that I visualize when we become government. And I believe that they are relevant because these changes are necessary in order to avoid Mr. Speaker, the problem we have today. I believe that people are expecting government to do more things, and I believe that you cannot rely on the procedures of the past and the practices of the past to be followed as the means to discharge the obligations as members of the Legislature and as the people's representatives. I believe that fundamental changes must and should occur in order to make government more open and more responsive to the needs of our people. I do not believe that the practices followed in the past are relevant today. I do not believe that there is an adequate manner in which we cover the estimates of the departments. I do not believe that the procedures themselves facilitate an understanding of the complex machinery of government, and we will propose and we will change very drastically the approach that has been followed in the past and which is being followed at this particular time by the speed-up motion.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Legislature are paid on an indemnity basis for each session; we will change that. They will be paid from the time they're elected they will be paid on a monthly basis, they will be paid until their office is terminated or their representation is terminated and someone else replaces them. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is that they should be on call and will be on call at all times for the work on behalf of the public. And the session itself, Mr. Speaker, will not be a session of three months or four months, but rather will be a continuing session in which we can deal adequately with sufficient time and throughout the whole year with the problems, the legislation and the specifics which government must deal with and bring before this Legislative Assembly.

And Mr. Speaker, if we do that, consistent with what the Honourable House Leader has indicated in his presentation, the House Leader on behalf of our Party, we will then be in a position to deal adequately with the complex machinery and be able to have sufficient time to discuss the estimates of the various departments. I was rather surprised at the Honourable

## SPEED-UP

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . Finance Minister's remarks in answer to a question I think to the Leader of the Liberal Party, when he said about the question of the interest rate on the moneys borrowed from outside Canada, he said that matter has been dealt with in the estimates, yes, Mr. Speaker, he said . . . --(Interjection)-- yes, he said, you said it's in the estimates, it's been taken care of in the estimates. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been taken care of in the estimates, but the only thing is we never reached the Department of Finance. So, Mr. Speaker, we're in this position, realistically we have no answer to the question, we have no answer to the question --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, we have no answer to the question which is a pretty relevant question on the part of the Leader of the Liberal Party, because there are no specifics that have been given because we in fact have not dealt with that, Mr. Speaker; and notwithstanding the fact that there may be a credit figure in the estimates in some form, until we have an opportunity for a full explanation, that in many cases is fairly meaningless as far as understanding the implication.

Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting to you that the reality is that in this session we have not dealt with the matter of Housing and Renewal Corporation. We have not dealt with the Manitoba Auto Insurance Corporation. We have not dealt with the Department of Industry and Commerce. We haven't even dealt with the problems of the Honourable Minister of Public Works and his department. We have not dealt with the Department of Transportation. And the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that we have not dealt with many departments that spend--and we have not dealt with the Department of Education. And we are now talking about departments that spend substantial sums of money in which the information requested by this side would be valid and be important. And Mr. Speaker, I suggest that when we form government we're going to change that, because there is no way in which you can logically suggest at this point and agree with the House Leader of the government who says that people want more and more government activity, that you can agree with the proposition that there should be more and more government activity unless there is a different way in which we can deal with the way in which government activity is funded, how it is spent and be able to make evaluation of the estimates of the government and the way in which the public purse is treated.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared at this particular time to proceed with the motion, we are prepared as well to get into concurrence, we are prepared as well to go to the people and we are prepared as well to go through this process. But we give herewith, Mr. Speaker, an indication that we will change the manner in which the sessions have operated, we will change the procedures in which the session is operated, we are going to change the committee system in which we have operated; we are in fact going to operate in such a way that the members of the Legislature will in fact discharge their fundamental obligation which is to the fact observe, that is members of the Opposition, to in fact be in a position to observe, to inquire and to criticize the way in which the public purse is handled so that the people's interests are in fact protected. And we believe that procedures can in fact be adopted which will allow us to be able to carry on with what is now a much more complex form of government, which now has far greater implications than it did ten years and which require longer sessions, a great deal more scrutiny and a differing structure in order to be able to operate properly. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared when we assume office to in fact introduce this and to make these changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question? Am I to understand that the Progressive Conservative platform now is that the job of the members of the Legislature Assembly will be full-time and will be full pay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the members of the Legislature will have the same function they have now, but the sessions will not be compacted into a three-months' session in which we're going to have three weeks of speed-up morning, noon and night to try and accomplish the objective of completing a session; rather we will deal with the session in a way in which the members will be on call and have the ability at different times to come and deal with the matters. We will change the form in which we deal with the estimates, we will not put the time limit as suggested now with respect to the estimates and we will be in a position to scrutinize fully and the government will have that obligation -- we as government will have that obligation to present fully the Estimates before the Legislature and deal with them and have it approved by the House.



## SPEED-UP

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Would it then be under that plan no occasion for a speed-up resolution as was indicated by his deputy just a few minutes ago?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, if I'm correct, and I think the Honourable Minister of Finance was present, the House Leader of our Party indicated that in his opinion that he was prepared to waive a 90-hour limit on the basis of--on the basis of a position that we could deal with the estimates to whatever length of time we wanted and it would be up to the House Leader and the Government. I am not referring to the House Leader and I've --(Interjection)-- I have indicated that the position of the House Leader is the position that we've taken and I think that's an answer to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Does the Leader of the Opposition now reject the proposal made by his deputy that should they be elected, as he predicted they would, that next year the House Leader of the government, of the Conservative Party would be bringing in a speed-up resolution in much the same words as this present resolution?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to preclude the possibility of a speed-up resolution being brought into this House. It would be foolish to suggest that that may not happen, Mr. Speaker, because we do not sit on Saturdays, but I would suggest to the honourable members opposite that it would not be our intention to deal as they have dealt in the past and as previous governments before them, and we remember those governments, in which you are simply forced to deal morning, noon and night with a series of bills and are asked to basically pass them one, two, three without the opportunity for public opinion to develop and to be able to indicate their position and in effect be in a position to essentially present their views. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Honourable Minister of Finance, the speed-up may very well come in and if it does come in it will come in in the form that was suggested by the Honourable House Leader; but again, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest it will deal with the question of the days because the time limits by that time will have been changed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur,

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this resolution and at the outset I want to say that I really never have been against the speed-up motion. In fact the speed-up motion was always brought in in the 14 years that I have been here, but I have never seen speed-up motions come in with as many bills and with no real important bills brought before the House and a proper opportunity to examine them.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly when we sat till 3 o'clock in the morning. I can remember for the accommodation of then the Member for St. Johns, knowing that the committee was going to sit until the small hours of the morning asking for that important legislation that had been left on the Order paper and that was still to be dealt with, in order that he could get away and go on a holiday because he wouldn't be here the next day in the House. And he did leave. --(Interjection)-- I understood it was a holiday but - all right I apologize. I don't know what he did in Vancouver but I know he left. --(Interjection)-- Very well, But in any case I just point out, and I'm glad that the Minister of Labour is in his seat now, because he was one of the very congenial members in opposition at that time that sat until 3 o'clock in the morning, he and the Honourable the Minister of higher education were the only two members in opposition at that time that sat til 3 o'clock in the morning. And I recall how congenial they were, that it was quite correct --(Interjection)-- at 3 o'clock in the morning-- that it was quite correct to sit and finish up all the loose ends and get everything ready for the next morning that we could be prepared to adjourn the House the next day. And what happened the next morning? --(Interjection)-- Yes, and my honourable friend came into the House and he found the gallery full, found the press gallery full, found the gallery full of children, school children, and so he tied into the government. And what a government we were. Arrogance. What did he say at that time? --(Interjection)-- Yeh. The penny pinching, the pennypinching, spendthrift government. That was one I never could figure out. For lack of words, he couldn't find anything else to throw at us that morning after congenially leaving the meeting at 3 o'clock in the morning. However, I just say this in passing.

But I want to point out right now, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason that the business of the House has not gone on to the point where it should have is because the government has

## SPEED-UP

(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . . spent the time of the House in caucus, in caucus--within the House. I wouldn't bring this up except that twice now I've already answered the First Minister when he got up and chastised in the House us on this side the other day because of the time of an hour of questioning in the question period. Who has taken up that time? The backbench of the government. The backbench of the government have consistently for hours and hours in this session and the last session and the session before held caucus with the frontbench.

A MEMBER: . . . what's wrong with that ?

MR. WATT: We caucus in caucus. But a turmoil in caucus on that side of the House is the same as a turmoil in the Cabinet. When the Cabinet comes to caucus they don't know what to tell the caucus. The caucus can't find out from the frontbench what's gone on in Cabinet. So they come into the House. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend says that's where I'm wrong. What I say is exactly right because it's been demonstrated on that side of the House all through this Session, that constantly the backbench has got up and questioned the frontbench. What is your policy? What are you doing in my constituency? What are you doing in this constituency? What're you doing in that constituency? And we've listened to this, and we've listened to it in estimates, Mr. Speaker.

The other day the Member for Osborne got in an argument with the Chairman because the Chairman wasn't giving equal time to that side of the House to question their own frontbench on their own estimates. Wasn't giving equal time to this side of the House. And then they come along now and they say why are we debating the speed-up motion.

I'm not up to debate the speed-up motion, I want to see the House through and cleared up. The Minister of Public Works said a few minutes ago, why? Oh I can tell you why, because the majority of members on this side of the House are farmers and it's time that we were home seeding. The majority of that side of the House are either cabinet Ministers or they're backbenchers on boards and commissions and they're all in a position to go out and have a holiday for the rest of the summer. They're all in a position to go out and have a holiday for the rest of the summer. On this side of the House we've got to go home and work, get our crop in. So I'm in favour of sitting day and night, which I always have been in caucus and I'm quite prepared to do it, but I'm not prepared to sit and listen to the First Minister and to the House Leader throw it at us across this side of the House for wasting the time of the House in estimates and in the question period. The fact is that the time of the House has been wasted on the government side of the House because the government are in a turmoil in their cabinet and consequently they're in a turmoil with their backbench. They're in and out of Cabinet. They resign today and they're back in tomorrow. And it's perfectly evident that the backbench doesn't know what's going on in the frontbench because they've got to come into the House and try and find it.

So I simply say that I'm quite prepared to sit and listen to my little old friend, the little basket-thatcher from Transcona, go on all night in caucus . . . all night. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WATT: You've never heard of a basket-thatcher before, no. --(Interjection)-- Oh no, no, no. I don't use the type of language that the front Minister allows to be used in the backbench over there. I simply say that I can't support the amendment, that I intend to support the motion to go into speed-up but let it be known that there is no reason for it at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take up too much time except to indicate what has already been indicated on the Conservative side, that I think the speed-up is necessary. It's been one that's been with us a long time and I suspect it will be here after we're long gone and defeated and dead. It's a necessary tool to get business done at the end of a session. The reservation I have and I'm sure even the government backbenchers share is, will it be abused. We have sat in here some pretty late hours and some of us have difficulty doing our research under the present sittings and if we start debating bills, you know we don't have a research staff like the government, and we have difficulty keeping up with the legislation as it is. It's going to be difficult to debate bills, some of which we have a certainly I have an interest in as an northerner, and I'm sure that the opposition has an interest in some bills also. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell the glue sniffer from Flin Flon to shut-up while I'm speaking.

## SPEED-UP

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In the gallery as well.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the system we have is not perfect. We know that we've just gone through a few departments. There's two departments I would have liked to have spoken and certainly one of them is Education. It's a large department, it's an important department because it deals with our kids and there's a great deal of money involved in it. Unfortunately we were not able to get to it. I'm not blaming anybody, maybe we spent too much time debating the Mines Department. However, it's been done. I certainly have no answer how we can solve the problem where we can get at least to some of the important departments. If someone can come up with a solution I'm certainly prepared to listen. I know that for democracy in here to function we have to have free speech restricting rules and strict censorship otherwise the House simply will not work, and certainly it's required more so since we have the Jesse James bunch in there, particularly the back-benchers. We certainly need a lot of strict rules. I'm prepared to live with them, as restricting and difficult as they are for me, I'm prepared to live with them.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the resolution put forth by the Leader of the Social Credit Party because we have a working arrangement that I will second his resolutions and he will second mine, provided there is no grave principle involved. I am prepared to sit past 10 o'clock- although the motion says ten o'clock, but I would be very concerned if we start going beyond midnight. I really hope that the government will not in its enthusiasm to call an election will not bulldoze all the legislation through past midnight because I think that it will be regrettable if they do that. I agree with the comments expressed here that the sooner we can wind up the business the sooner we can have an election and I want to assure the government that I will not do anything to prevent that. I want to assist them in every way possible to wind up the business so they can call an election and give the people a chance to either confirm, confirm their next four years in office or throw the rascals out, that's a decision that the people will make. I know what I'm going to do and the Conservative know what they're going to do and the other parties know what they'll do, the people in the final analysis will decide and as far as I'm personally concerned if they want to wind up the business by the 23rd of May, I think that's the last date to call an election, I'm prepared to blow a couple of nights sleep, Mr. Chairman, to accommodate the government to get the business out there. I simply make one, one plea is let's not abuse the rights that this resolution gives them even though we all know that government must have the right to govern, and they certainly will do that. I simply ask them not to abuse that right by pushing us past the limit because we have a great deal of work to do on those bills. We do not have the research staff that the government has and all the typists and secretaries and all the other things that government normally have, so therefore we are at a slight disadvantage. I'm sure that'll be looked after the next election. In the meantime we'll have to suffer for the next six weeks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion before the House is the amendment to the Resolution.

QUESTION put and amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Resolution as originally proposed . . . order, please.  
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Not having spoken on the main motion. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the amendment. It's now my intention to deal with the main motion. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to instruct the government members opposite as to how to vote when the main motion is put. They are to respond in a clear and a firm voice when you call it, Sir. Aye in favour, and then if there are those that wish to say nay they will then respond, Mr. Speaker. We've already indicated on our side how we intend to vote. There seemed to be some doubt as to whether they knew how they were going to vote.

QUESTION put and motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you mind calling the Second Reading of Bill No. 32 standing in my name and the adjournment in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. SPEAKER: MOTION presented. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

BILL NO. 32

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief on this Bill 32, An Act to amend the Fires Prevention Act. I understand that this bill what it does is to change the legislation to have the tax apply not only to the fire insurance but as well to casualty. Under the present legislation the government already has legislation that they can assess up to two percent of the premiums.

My concern Mr. Speaker, in respect to Bill 32 is that I believe that we should get tabled in this House a statement of revenue received, there should be some statement tabled in this House in respect to revenue that is received in respect to - that's used to the Fire Prevention. I don't believe at the present time that we have anything in this area tabled and I think it should be the responsibility of the Minister to table it so we would know how much money is expended for fire prevention and how much is being asked for. Is the government asking for much more, is it asking for double the amount that was used last year or really what will happen under this legislation. I know that the government has already the right and authority to tax up to two percent under the present legislation and this is just redefining that it apply to more classes of insurance and not only to straight fire insurance that it would apply to casualty as well. This is my understanding. So I have no argument with the bill going into Law Amendments. I however do have some reservations in knowing how much the government collects and how much it does expect to collect under this amendment. I feel it should be the responsibility of the Minister to table this statement in the House so that the members of the Legislature can examine it and see the amount that we are collecting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour shall be closing debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all refer to the point raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia so far as the statement of revenue is concerned. That is tabled annually, Sir, by myself in my capacity as Minister of Labour. And if my honourable friend would take a look at three reports I believe it is that I do table that takes this matter under consideration, namely the report of the Department of Labour, the report to the Fire Commissioner and I would agree, Mr. Speaker, that due to the fiscal year endings it may be delayed by a year, but notwithstanding that they are tabled. And also as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Accounts will meet to consider the Public Accounts, again, for a year or so before this, it is recorded in there the amount of moneys received because of the assessment on fire premiums. So I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to the honourable member's questions would be that it is revealed

But I do want to, apart from that, Mr. Speaker, make reference to the contribution --(Interjection)-- Yes, Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps - I don't want to distract the Minister, he can answer. Is this a special assessment of any kind for any special thing -- will it raise more money and how much more than was raised last year by this amendment?

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend would bear with me, Mr. Speaker, I intend to raise that point and answer my honourable friend when I deal with the contributions made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney and also the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell when they made a contribution to the debate on this bill.

It's obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that neither honourable member took the time out to read the bill, because particularly the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney said that he and his party were going to vote against this bill because it was going to give to the government an opportunity to increase taxes as they called it on premiums.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney particularly, to my amazement, indicated that we already were taxing those who have fire insurance premiums to the utmost and that the basic principle of this bill was to tax them further. Now my honourable friend normally is a reasonably intelligent individual, but Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend and the honourable friend from Birtle-Russell, who is now going out, apparently didn't take the time out to read the bill. They haven't taken the time, and lord knows we've been around long enough and my honourable friend for Souris-Killarney I believe is second in the point seniority to myself, to know what has been done. Had my honourable friend listened, if he was here, at the introduction that I gave on second reading to this bill, he would be aware of the fact that under the present legislation we have the right by that legislation to make an assessment to two percent on fire insurance premiums. My honourable friend had he of listened, and

## BILL NO. 32

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . normally he's not a bad sort of a guy, is reasonably intelligent, had he of listened on my introduction he would have been made aware of the fact that notwithstanding the fact that we have the legislative authority to impose a two percent assessment on fire insurance premiums, we are only assessing a one percent or half of it. But my honourable friend in his contribution, to use the term very very loosely, suggested, suggested that the purport of this bill was to increase the amount of the levy and that we were only going to use this in an endeavour to have a greater charge made on the citizens of Manitoba for the purpose of the Consolidated Revenue, Mr. Speaker, of the province. How ill-informed can --(Interjection)-- it does not. My honourable friend says it goes into the Consolidated Revenue and he knows, in times when he uses his better judgment, and I do give my honourable friend the courtesy of saying that at times he has better judgment, he knows that this is a separate fund apart from the Consolidated Revenue of the Province of Manitoba. And if he doesn't, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my honourable friend that he has wasted his time as a representative of his constituency in this Legislature, and I believe he came in here round about '58 or '59.

On my introduction of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that all across Canada there has been a change made in a designation of insurances and that no longer will there be a designation called fire insurance. This agreed to by the Committee on Law Reform and the Superintendents of Insurance that rather than designate fire insurance, property insurance, property theft and the likes of that, that there will be only one designation. That designation being, Mr. Speaker, called "property insurance" which includes fire insurance.

I do understand that in private life, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney has been involved in fire insurance. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you'll write me up. I wonder if my honourable friend would want to write me up on a now extinct fire insurance premium. I wonder if my honourable friend would like to do that. He may, but I think he's more honourable than even to suggest that to him. Somebody has suggested don't take this too literally and maybe I won't. But, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what my honourable friend attempted to say, or did say during his contribution on this bill, this bill actually will reduce the percentage amount of assessment on premiums.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have the legislative authority to levy two percent on fire insurance premiums for the purpose of attempting to reduce the incident of fire in the Province of Manitoba. This fund is used for the purpose of investigating fires, to bring about some training in the area of fire protection. We had the legislative authority for two percent; we only charged one percent and because of the expansion of the coverage by a new designation called property insurance, we intend as I said at the introduction of this bill, Mr. Speaker, to reduce further the percentage application, and we feel it will only be necessary to assess premiums by three-quarters of one percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, the Member for Birtle-Russell say that this is a new tax imposition. My honourable friend says to me, Mr. Speaker, from his seat that he doesn't trust me, he doesn't trust this government. All I say to him in answer to that, if they would only take the time out to consider the legislation before them instead of standing up and griping about something they don't know a continental about, even though they are involved as agents in the insurance business, my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney and my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell would not have the audacity to stand up and make such stupid statements as they do. And, Mr. Speaker, both of them, and apparently the chortling member from Lakeside sitting on some step halfway out of the Chamber agrees with them.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Opposition that if they haven't got the intellectual ability to take a look at the input of this legislation then I suggest they vote against it. But I want to warn them, I want to warn them as to what the next effect will be; that the Fire Commissioner's Office will have to curtail, will have to curtail its involvement in investigations into fires; they will have to curtail the provision of additional training for fire departments right across Manitoba, or, the alternative would have to be an increase in tax levied directly upon all of the people of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, this is the alternative that the Opposition has, --(Interjection)-- Oh, my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell says I have no imagination. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend that when he spoke he was only using his imagination because he hadn't take the time out to read

## BILL NO. 32

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . what was contained in the proposition that I had placed before this House, But, Mr. Speaker, may I say in all deference to my honourable friend the Member for Birtle-Russell this is typical of the contributions that he makes to most debates in this House. He is using his imagination rather--and I am sure he has some possession of intellect--he is using his imagination rather than factual reasoning insofar as legislation is concerned How nonsensical can this be.

Mr. Speaker, I think in this particular bill we are going to continue making the provision in the field, important field of fire prevention that we have conducted, and which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, was conducted by the previous administration and the administration before that. But one thing about my honourable friend of Souris-Killarney, the Member for Birtle-Russell haven't - maybe it hasn't penetrated their skulls, and there may be some reason why it hasn't penetrated their skulls, that in all jurisdictions there are changes taking place in the methodology of the application of insurance. We changed it of course, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, in the field of automobile insurance with a net result that our premiums are going down, where they're going up in every other jurisdiction in Canada. But I suggest to the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and the other members of the Conservative Party, I don't know where the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party stands on this, but if they want to condemn progress, a realization of change, let them stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has indicated to me that he agrees with the proposition, the only thing he wanted to know is as to the distribution of funds. I think Mr. Speaker, at the offset I indicated where he can get that information and if it's not up-to-date, I am prepared to give to him or to any member of the Assembly the latest information available to me.

So I say to the Member for Souris-Killarney, I say to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, if they want us to curtail our activities in the most important field of fire protection and investigation, vote against the bill. I stand squarely behind it and I recommend it to the consideration of intelligent members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion. The Honourable .

MR. ASPER: I understand that the Minister indicated to my honourable friend from Assiniboia that he would make available the spread sheets on the allocation of the funds to be collected. Can he give us an indication to satisfy us that the purpose of the bill is merely to increase the revenue to cover the increased cost of administration, or is there a revenue surplus to be gained?

MR. PAULLEY: No. In answer to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party, that on the present collections of one percent of premiums, that is on fire insurance premiums, we would receive \$169, 000 give or take a little bit here or there. If we applied that same percentage rate to the new designation of property tax we would receive \$182, 000 - about \$182, 400. We only would require under the new designation an assessment of approximately three-quarters of one percent, and this is our intention.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would now kindly call Bill No. 30 standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 30

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 30, an Act to repeal the Small Debts Recovery Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members would check the provisions of Bill No. 30 he would recognize that what is called for is a repeal of this act which as honourable members will recall provided for the treatment of debts up to initially and a maximum of \$200 jurisdiction was raised to \$500 but the \$500 elevation jurisdiction was never proclaimed because we introduced a further part to the County Courts Act, Part 2, which provides for adjudication of claims generally speaking to a value of \$500 or less. It's considered to be an

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . improvement over the provisions of the Small Debts Recovery Act and therefore we at this stage would just as well have the Small Debts Recovery Act taken off the books because it's not being used in any event. The bill contains some provisions for the transitional period, in the event that there are any decisions that have been made under that act it would be necessary to make provision for them to be still operative for a period of time and it's a very simple act based on those principles.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party supports the bill and commends the government on the way in which it has consolidated the Small Debts Recovery process through the amendments the Attorney-General has just referred to in the County Court Act. The bill is simply bringing into line the consumer protection and the right of the debtor under the legislation we've had for the past two or three years and we see no reason to hold this bill at all and put it right into committee, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I just have a couple of brief comments to raise to the attention of the Attorney-General re this bill. It's the one that's been related to me by the Justice of the Peace in the province. Apparently now the interest that they had in the Small Debts Courts apparently is being transferred to some other jurisdiction. Maybe before the Honourable the Minister can close the debate, I'm sure there is quite a number around the province have had his letter of intent but they'd like some more explanation on it I'm sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, the Minister in introducing this bill was very brief on the matter but I somehow have a view here that I don't exactly share with the Minister. I know we had legislation in the name of the Small Debts Act which was amended raising the monetary jurisdiction from a hundred to \$500 in 1971. In that there's no problem there.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I understand this amendment where you have J. P.'s and magistrates throughout the rural parts of the Province of Manitoba, changing this legislation will have some effect. Let me give a few examples, Mr. Speaker, I can use in my own area, such as where we have in Somerset, we have a magistrate and if someone has money coming to him he could go to the magistrate and file his claim at a very nominal fee and it could be looked after by the local magistrate. Now, if I understand this correctly, Mr. Speaker, that person has to go to Morden and he has to file his claim, then he goes back home again and then when the hearing takes place he's got to go back for the hearing. I just use this one example, Mr. Speaker, and I can quote many examples where people, they have their local J. P. and magistrate which they're able to use now, but by repealing this act this will all be done away with and I can't help but wonder what is the motive behind this government in repealing this. Is it eventually they are going to do away with all the J. P.'s in the province, do away with all the magistrates in the province. And here, Mr. Speaker, we have a service that these two positions are performing and are giving to the people in the rural communities. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, if this is what this means, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely opposed to it. And I want to say that the fees that the magistrates and the J. P.'s are assessing on individuals is very nominal. And so, Sir, I question this, unless the Minister has an answer for me on this matter, I'm opposed to it as I understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't have much to say. I'm just a little at a loss because of the wording of the act that we first repeal it on the top part, then later on we're still allowing the actions to come forward as a result of the old legislation. Perhaps the Minister could clarify that point to us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with the observations from the Honourable Member from Rhineland, I accept the advice of the draftsman and the legal expertise who have said that the technique is to repeal the provisions of the act but to allow notwithstanding its repeal for certain rights to continue for any judgment that has been obtained pursuant to the former act. It's a legal expertise that's involved in the design of the bill and, you know, to me at first glance I was a bit concerned but I was reassured that this is quite appropriate.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Now dealing with the Honourable Member from Rock Lake's concern and the concern of the Honourable Member for Roblin, our concern is not to emasculate the limited jurisdiction Magistrate role or the Justice of the Peace role but the Small Debts Recovery Act had limited application only. It was only available to individuals who had a claim for a liquidated sum of money; that is it could not deal with a claim involving a dispute where there was not an absolute certainty of a specific sum of money being involved as you would have in the case, for example, of moneys owing under a promissory note or moneys owing under a specific contracted sale. They couldn't deal with small damage, in other words, so you really have two systems, two administrative systems operating. And it's always more costly to have two kinds of system operating. We felt it necessary to establish a small claims procedure to deal with small disputes involving in some cases automobile accidents where there's the deductible portion involved; where there is a dispute under a contract and there may be interest involved, there may be an interpretation of a question of damages for petty trespass; any number of things where it's not an explicit sum of money that's owing as a debt. It used to be, well it still is called the Small Debts Recovery Act, and unless you could establish that there was a debt owing you couldn't go into that court. Now we've made a Small Claims Court where anyone can go in respect to a claim. It doesn't have to be established as a debt. So the utility of this act has been markedly reduced.

Now there is a point to be made about inconvenience, because instead of being able to call upon a Justice of the Peace or a limited jurisdiction Magistrate really, one would now commence their proceedings under Part 2, of the County Court Act. But I don't believe that this is any problem. I don't believe that the Small Debts Recovery Act was being used. If it has been used it's been a very limited use, because the procedures under the County Court Act are very simple. Processes can be handled by mail, for example. Now that's not to say perhaps the initial process can be done by mail but the County Court does have ample provisions for the circuiting of judges if it's any inconvenience, and I know that the County Court judges in the areas of the provision with the exception of the northern judicial district have not been excessively over-burdened with court volumes and the proceedings under the Small Claims Act have the additional benefit that the judgment is a judgment of the County Court initially and can be enforced by the remedies that are available under the County Court.

A judgment under the Small Debts Recovery Act merely provided a certificate and then the person having that certificate would have to take it and register it in the County Court district in which the Small Debts Recovery Act proceeding had been taken in any event and attend upon court there to have it registered and then attend upon court for any follow-up procedure. So that I don't think there is any significant effect in respect to the individual involved who wishes to bring a claim for a specific sum of money which would ordinarily be categorized as possible under the Small Debts Recovery Act. If anything, I think that the system will be improved because there will be one administration under one act instead of there being a duplication which can be confusing to people. At the present time they can bring a proceeding under the Small Claims Act and potentially under the Small Debts Recovery Act as well. The Small Claims Act is a much superior process in the opinion of our court experts and that's why we have produced this piece of legislation which will make it consistent with the best practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister a question then. If I understood the Minister's explanation on this matter, for small debts the people can go to a magistrate today; is he still going to be able to act and collect those debts? That's my question.

MR. MACKLING: No, I thought I made that clear. The claims now, whether it be a debt or a claim would be brought under Part 2 of the County Court Act.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that a change be made with respect to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The Honourable Minister of Finance to replace the Honourable First Minister. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and shall return at 8 p. m.