

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 22, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
 Reading and Receiving Petitions  
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
 Notices of Motion  
 Introduction of Bills

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris) introduced Bill No. 72, an Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Morris, the Town of Morris and the Rural Municipality of Montcalm.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill) introduced Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Flin Flon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may take a moment and direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery. On my right we have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from the Warren Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Johannson. This school is located in the constituency of Rockwood-Iberville. We also have on my left 66 students of Grade 6 standing from the Oakenwald School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Fitzpatrick and Mrs. MacIntosh. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General, Fort Garry. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name and the name of the Minister of Education.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House. May I ask you please to call the educational resolutions first and then the one standing in my name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): The resolution will have to be read for the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Schools Act by providing among other matters for the increase of certain grants payable under the Act. The Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the two resolutions on the Order Paper here are really dealing with the two companion bills which provide for the Foundation Program, and set up the levying, the taxing and budgeting procedures in single districts or unitary divisions. The first resolution was placed on the Order Paper, I believe, on the understanding that there was the requirement of a money resolution in connection with this particular Bill that will be before us but I don't believe it really needs a money resolution. However included in this section of the Bill is a measure authorizing the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations respecting the amounts to be paid under the new Foundation Program. I'm not sure it needed a money resolution but having appeared on the Votes and Proceedings I thought I should draw this to your attention. That particular Bill actually makes minor amendments to The Public Schools Act and provides for the administration of unitary single district divisions and makes, as I say, the regulations in respect of the payment of grants to the unitary divisions by the Finance Board. That is really what resolution 1 is all about and the Bill will be before us. I think after members have had an opportunity to read the Bill and see it we can have further debate.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, is there anything proposed here for assistance to those divisions that did not vote 'yes' on the 10th of March?

MR. JOHNSON: Not in these resolutions, Mr. Chairman. That is a complex matter as you know which is currently being examined very carefully by the Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Resolution No. 2 standing in the name of the

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd) . . . . Honourable Minister of Education. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Schools Act to provide among other matters for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund for certain amounts to be payable to a public schools finance board to be established for the purpose of providing for the payment of certain grants by the finance board. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this second resolution, as I say The Public Schools Act is being brought in in these two companion Bills and in this particular Bill the authorization for the payment to the Finance Board from the Consolidated Fund of 65 percent of its annual estimated expenditures is provided for. It also provides for all the financial matters relating to budgeting and levying of both the foundation levy and special levy. I think when this Bill is before the honourable members and they have had a chance to peruse it, several sections, we can debate these at length at that time. But this is the requirement for this resolution as a money resolution is because in fact these financial provisions are in this particular Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? The resolution in the name of the Honourable the First Minister. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Legislative Assembly Act to provide among other matters,

(a) for the payment of indemnities, expenses and allowances to members of the assembly; and

(b) for the payment of pensions to certain persons who have been members of the assembly.

The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think the wording of the resolution is indicative of what the Bill contains and as a rule it would not be considered desirable to go much beyond the material that is before the Committee. But I think that as this is a matter of wide public concern and as it does affect members of the Committee personally that it might be appropriate if I did give some information about two of the main aspects of this piece of legislation; while of course we can reserve for the second reading the discussion in principle that takes place at that particular time.

It is clear from the resolution that one of the proposals here is to provide higher allowances than are now available to members of the Legislative Assembly and I ought to give some brief explanation as to why this is thought to be desirable at this time. Some might say that the length of our Sessions is increasing, and that is true, but I do not really consider that perhaps to be the main point at issue here. I think we have to consider what has been happening with respect to the duties of members of the Legislative Assembly in recent times. Because to an unprecedented extent, some think fortunately and some think unfortunately, the area and extent of government activity, in particular as it relates to the citizen, has been increasing at a very considerable pace and more and more we see changes in the role and function of government in the area in which government operates with respect to their relationship to the citizens of the province. The complexity of public business is indeed quite remarkable these days and we have seen very considerable changes in that respect in recent times. And I submit that these changes are to quite an extent reflected in the role and function of a member of the Assembly because I submit that more and more a member of the Assembly is on duty a good deal of the time rather than merely the time that he is in this House. I think that is largely attributable to these changes in the role of government to which I've made some reference. I think that in rural areas in particular the member is called upon to serve his constituents in a more intensive and marked degree than has been the case in the past and it certainly is one of the reasons why I think we should look at this question that is before us now.

This development with respect to the duties of the member I think can be traced in the allowances that are made in other jurisdictions in Canada. I think that is a germane point to consider when we think of this whole question. And I have before me here a table of the basic allowances, by which I mean the indemnity and the expense allowances, the expense allowance usually being one-third tax free, the basic allowances which now prevail in the different jurisdictions of members in Canada. Starting with the nation itself, it is \$18,000. In the Province of Quebec it is \$18,000. In the Province of Ontario it is \$11,000 and \$12,000 depending on the location of the constituency. In the Province of British Columbia it is \$7,500. In the Province of New Brunswick it is \$7,500. In the Province of Newfoundland, \$6,500. In the Province of Saskatchewan, \$6,000. In the Province of Nova Scotia, \$6,000. In the Province of Alberta, \$5,400; and now next to the bottom of the list we come to the Province

(MR. ROBLIN, cont'd) . . . . of Manitoba where it is \$4,800 and the final province to be enumerated is Prince Edward Island at \$300,000 -- I'm sorry \$3,000. I would not like that slip of the tongue to go uncorrected.

So as things stand at the present time the indemnity and allowance in the Province of Manitoba is very much below most provinces; indeed it is number 10 in the list with only Prince Edward Island being below this province. Now what is proposed is that the indemnity should be increased from \$3,200 by \$1,600 to make \$4,800. \$4,800 the new indemnity proposed. The expense allowance which now stands at \$1,600 would be increased by \$800 giving a total expense allowance of \$2,400, giving a total remuneration which could be compared to the figures that I have just quoted you for the other provinces of \$7,200. This means that if this proposal commends itself to the Chamber that our position with respect to this matter of indemnity and allowances will be in the middle of the range. We are now No. 10; this would move us up to the middle of the range just between New Brunswick and Newfoundland.

Now there's something with respect to this that I should like to make perfectly clear and that is this, that should this arrangement be agreed to I want it to be understood that the salary and the representation allowance of the members of the Cabinet would be reduced accordingly. I do not believe that it would be appropriate to increase the salaries of members of the Cabinet by this means; in fact I do not think that they should get more but that their salary and allowance should be reduced by the amount of these increases. They would get the same amount as any other member does but their salary would be reduced to take account of this fact. Thus the pay of a Cabinet Minister which is now \$15,000 would be reduced by \$1,600, being the amount of the increase in the indemnity. This would give him a pay of \$13,400. The representation allowance which stands at \$3,000 would be reduced by the increase in the expense allowance, namely, \$800.00, which would give the Cabinet Minister a new representation allowance of \$2,200.00. If you add those figures together his total remuneration of pay and representation allowance in this respect is reduced from \$18,000 by the sum of \$2,400, giving a new total of \$15,600. So it should be clear that this adjustment will be made effective at the same time that these recommendations are effective if they are agreed to with respect to the pay of Cabinet Ministers.

Now the second main proposal that I should like to mention has to do with pensions, because pensions are proposed here for members of the Assembly only, there is no proposal for pensions for members of the Cabinet except what they're entitled to for being a member of the Assembly. So the pension proposals apply only to a person's remuneration here in respect of his holding the office of member of the Legislative Assembly.

Now here again we're rather late in coming forward with such a proposal, because in the Federal House there have been pensions for 15 years. In the Province of Nova Scotia there have been pensions for 13 years; in the Province of Saskatchewan there have been pensions for 13 years; in the Province of British Columbia they've had pensions for 12 years; in the Province of New Brunswick they've had pensions for 9 years; in the Province of Ontario there have been pensions for 7 years; in the Province of Newfoundland they've been pensioned for 5 years; in Alberta they've had a pension system for 3 years; and in the Province of Quebec they've had a pension system in for 3 years. Neither Manitoba or Prince Edward Island have pension systems as yet.

If this proposal is adopted, and I wish to make this point crystal clear, it will be a contributory pension system. Members will be expected to contribute six percent of the total of their indemnity and their expense allowance into this pension fund, six percent; and I mention this because as far as I am able to tell at the present time, if this plan is accepted as it is proposed we expect it to be self-supporting. Now that's an interesting point. It will certainly be self-supporting in the initial years, and if there is any charge at all on the consolidated fund, as far as I can determine, and mind you no one can be certain of these things, but a reasonable estimate based on past experience indicates that any charge on the consolidated fund would be a small one, so I think it fair to say that to a very great extent if not entirely we hope that this pension plan may be self-supporting and not require any contribution from the consolidated fund; although I must issue the caveat that no one can be positive of this, this merely happens to be the best opinion that I can get from those who have looked into it at the present time.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are the two main features of the proposed legislation. There are other points that are important but I think they can be discussed at second reading and I do hope that the outline that I've given thus far will commend itself to members of the House and I

(MR. ROBLIN, cont'd) . . . hope, perhaps optimistically, to members of the general public as being fair under the circumstances. In any case, I am certainly prepared to recommend it to the House and believe that a measure such as this ought to be adopted.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate and welcome that the Honourable the First Minister has given a fuller review of what is proposed on this occasion than is customary when we move into Committee of the Whole House on money bills, because there is a public interest involved and naturally the public is interested in what we the members of the House decide to do for ourselves. This is a difficult position that members of the House always have to assume, I recognize, and some other jurisdictions have been looking for a long time at various methods in which they might hand over at least a portion of the responsibility of dealing with the salaries and other remunerations of the members of the Houses of Representation. Well, we've never done that yet and so whatever we're going to do we still have to do in the rather invidious way of dealing with our own affairs.

I have no intention, Mr. Chairman, of following my honourable friend the First Minister through the various details that he has given but I repeat that I think it excellent that he has given them at this time so that both the members of the House and the public can be aware of them. I think it was Plato who said, Mr. Chairman, that it is only the supremely wise and the deeply ignorant who never change. Well, I lay no claim to belonging in the first category, some of my friends would probably assign me to the latter, but I'm one who at least has not changed on this matter since the last time that we discussed similar provisions. I think that it is not expedient at this time to bring in such a measure, though I must say I have listened with great interest to my honourable friend the First Minister's review. I never consider it to be a good argument in dealing with our business here, whether it be ordinary legislation or a matter of this kind to attempt to base our program on what other provinces do. I think that we are quite capable of deciding for ourselves though I must admit that comparisons are frequently resorted to.

I must say, as I listen to the Honourable the First Minister's explanation, I am certainly struck by the difference in a pension proposal that is now advanced from the one that was placed before us a couple of years ago, and to the extent that it is a much more modest pension than was then suggested; to the extent that the Honourable the First Minister believes it to be almost if not wholly self-supporting and to the extent that it is less than before; to the extent that it is not tailored exactly toward the senior members of the Cabinet - and by senior I mean senior from the point of view of length of service, not by the positions that they occupy - to those extents I consider it to be an improvement on what we had before.

However, Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no intention of opposing it at this stage. I will await with interest the bill itself. I will likely have something to say at that time and I would not expect that it would be likely that I would find myself in support of the Bill.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a word in connection with this matter. I agree with the Honourable Member from Lakeside that this is one of those problems that we have to face up in the House from time to time. I appreciate as he does the introduction by the Honourable the First Minister, but as the Member for Lakeside has indicated that on matters like this while the public may not be fully aware of the need for the method adopted, namely that by a money resolution from His Honour in matters of this nature, it is what we have to do in accordance with rules of procedure, introduction of matters of this nature by a resolution.

I read with a great deal of interest just this morning the position taken by the Honourable Member for Lakeside on May 3rd of 1965 and that honourable gentleman is taking the same position today. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a fair and reasonable position to take, namely, one, that we will not object or vote against the proposition at this particular stage, at the resolution stage. We appreciate very much the explanation given to us by the Honourable the First Minister, and when we have the bill before us at that time we will consider all of the implications involved in the bill itself and we reserve unto ourself the decision to guide our vote or our actions after full consideration of the contents of the bill itself. One proposition, Mr. Chairman, may be contained in the bill as to the methodology of the establishment of the figures that have been suggested to us by the First Minister. The bill may or may not contain provisions for referral to other agencies - we don't know these things of course, Mr. Chairman, until such time as we have the bill before us.

So I would say on behalf of the group that I have the honour to represent, we are not going to oppose the resolution and we will wait with keen interest the details of the bill so at that

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . particular time we will be able to give full consideration to the contents thereof.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I too appreciate the full statement that was made by the First Minister in connection with this resolution and what it proposes to do. I listened with great interest as to what is happening in other provinces. I fail though to understand or I'm not sure whether the information was given - the pension plan, is it going to be voluntary as far as members of this House, that they may contribute and may not? I think this would be information that I would appreciate. I will be addressing myself on this matter more fully when we consider the bill on second reading.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it's a voluntary bill.

MR. MOLGAT: I will reserve my comments for second reading but I wonder if I can ask a question. One of the wordings here says "To certain persons who have been members of the Assembly". Is it the intention to have this available to people who previously sat in the House and who are no longer members?

MR. ROBLIN: No it is not, Mr. Chairman. This merely signifies that one won't be entitled to the pension until after you've ceased being a member of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 97, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 89, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act. No. 4.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act. No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Have any plans been made or can any plans be made at this stage for an advance poll insofar as the March 31st election of school trustees?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I looked into that matter. Such polls were not held during the divisional plan vote and they were not contemplated at this election.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if possibly the Minister could have another look at this. The reason why there's some importance on this particular occasion is that the vote comes during the Easter holidays. I've received some phone calls indicating that in particular a number of the teachers will be absent during the course of that week and others, being on a Friday, will not be available. Anyone who's a commercial traveller or whose business normally takes him away from his place of residence usually is back only on the Saturday, on the weekend, and the request was - I realize it's late, but if it were at all possible I think it would accommodate a number of people in the province.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll see whatever I can do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. Is it the policy of the Crown in the right of Manitoba as openly expressed in court by your Crown Attorneys in criminal cases to refuse to submit for the perusal of defence counsel, written statements made by a complainant as a basis for laying, or in the course of the investigation into a criminal charge?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to thank the Honourable Member for Selkirk for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question and I must apologize to him for not having the piece of paper with me because the Department have been looking at this and formulating a response to it. I undertake though to bring it to the House just as soon as I can.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a little note here in the House, very beautiful handwriting but I couldn't make out from whom it came, asking if we had any pocket size copies of the Highway Traffic Act. The answer to at least one member, and all the members, is yes, and we have arranged to have a copy distributed to each member of the House by the Clerk when he has a moment to do so.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for what he is saying and to

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . . assure him I didn't write the note.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health or the Leader of the House if he should answer it. We have received the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission and we were not finished with the estimates of the Department. Could we know when we will proceed, finish the Department of Health?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the estimates are being called in order of departments and I think it was the intention to have this matter revert to the back of the list, so as we proceed with the departments I hope to be announcing the next two departments today or tomorrow. When all the departments are through then we would revert back to Health.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. I'm sorry that I didn't inform him that I would be asking him a question. My question is: Has the Honourable the Minister of Public Works been able to arrive at any amendments to the regulations pertaining to this complex which established a curfew?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, no curfew was established. We have not made any changes. I'm anticipating some helpful advice during the time of our estimates.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I understood him to say earlier that some consideration was - at least the school situation was being looked into. If the decision is going to be made would it be done within the next week? The end of the month is fast approaching and I know the people in the country are very concerned about this.

MR. ROBLIN: That's a matter of policy which if adopted will be announced in due course.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Leader of the House, to the one asked by my colleague the Member for St. Boniface, regarding the order of business. He indicated that he hoped to be able to announce the next departments. I wonder would it not be possible to have the complete list of departments now. We have reached I think the ninth announcement, Public Utilities - eighth is Public Works, ninth Public Utilities, which still leaves a number of others. Would he not be in a position to give us complete detail now as to what the course of action is going to be?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have the paper with me and I can tell my honourable friend and the members of the House that the next two departments after Public Works and Public Utilities to be called will be the Department of Labour and the Department of Municipal Affairs. I'm not in a position to give them the balance as yet.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing, with respect to the land purchased for the Portage bypass, the following in each case:

1. Name of the persons whose land was acquired by
  - a) negotiation, or
  - b) by expropriation.
2. The amount paid per acre and the number of acres in each case and to whom.
3. When the land last changed hands prior to this change and in each case who was the previous owner.
4. The amount paid in damages and in each case the name and address of the recipient.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the bills standing on the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bills Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 43, and No. 44 - Sections 1 to 4 were read section by section and passed).

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under section (5) we heard representation yesterday in Committee on this Bill and that they felt that there should be a longer time period bound under this garnishment process. Is the government prepared to extend this time period?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member may recall if he was present at the Committee later on when Mr. Haig reported that he had been in discussion with the solicitor for the Canadian National Railways on this point, that they had agreed that there was really no way in which we could amend the Act which would meet the peculiar situation which the solicitor had raised, that was indigenous to the C.N.R. and their problems as to payment and so on, and that he felt that if any change were to be made to this section it could have a deleterious effect upon creditors and debtors in many other facets of our economy, so the recommendation at that time was that we leave the section as it was.

He mentioned I think a further item that there were some negotiations going on at the present time between the C.N.R. unions and management concerning time period for payment which might resolve the question in any case.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, is it a fact that in the railways they still follow the policy of holding two weeks wages back? They used to do that at one time. Now whether they still do it or not....

MR. LYON: .... part of the problem which the solicitor spoke about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 6 to 9 of Bill 44 were read section by section and passed.) Section 10 (1) ....

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney-General could give me an assurance that the law officers of the Crown contend that Section 10 (1) is intra vires of the province.

MR. LYON: I thought I had a piece of paper here. That matter has been reviewed however as a result of some remarks I believe the honourable member made at second reading of the Bill and the law officers do feel that this is within the vires of the province. They, with respect to the previous section I believe it is, Section 9, they say that certainly this is a moot point but they feel that both sections are within the powers of the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 10 to 13 were read section by section and passed).

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before you pass this Bill. There was a request made at the Committee too whether the fees could not be reduced on the issuing of orders. Is the government going to give any consideration to -- I know this is a matter for the regulations but will they be giving consideration to reducing the cost of the fees?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, this question of the fees is provided of course as the member says by regulation. I have asked the staff to take a look at the question of fees on garnishment orders and the report that I get back is that the present fee that is charged as a flat rate right across the board approximates the actual cost to the public of Manitoba for maintaining the Clerks and the service of it that is required, that is by Bailiff of these garnishing orders. In other words the fee that is charged is approximately the same as the actual cost that is required to fulfill this service.

The recommendation is that we do not change the fee because if we were to reduce the fee, as is suggested, it would then mean that the taxpayers at large in Manitoba would in effect be subsidizing a form of process that a particular creditor is using to exact payment of a debt which was contracted of course privately. This seemed to me to be a pretty compelling argument that we should not ask the general public to subsidize through their taxation a particular form of process to realize payment of a debt which has been contracted privately. So I must say while we have looked at it and looked at it carefully, it would not be our present intention to have any reduction in the fee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 44, Bill No. 45, and Bill No. 46 Sections 1 and 2, were read section by section and passed). Section 3, 14 (a) ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on section 3, 14. (a) members of the Committee will recall that there was a proposed amendment there that was left for the Legislative Counsel, and Mr. Haig to work upon and I have had distributed copies of the agreed wording that they have come up with and I should like to move that the proposed Section 14 (a) of the Executions Act as set out in Section 3 of Bill 46 be amended by adding thereto immediately after the word

(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . . "shares" in the seventh line thereof, the words "in accordance with the act of incorporation or letters patent or by-laws of the company or in accordance with the terms of such an agreement as the case may be".

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

The remainder of Bill 46, and Bills No. 47, 48, 52, 53, 58, 63, and 88 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the following Bills: Bill No. 17, Bill No. 18, Bill No. 19, Bill No. 20, Bill No. 24, Bill No. 26, Bill No. 27, Bill No. 43, Bill No. 44, Bill No. 45, Bill No. 46 (amended), Bill No. 47, Bill No. 48, Bill No. 52, Bill No. 53, Bill No. 58, Bill No. 63, Bill No. 88.

#### IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield the report of the Committee be received.

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

BILLS Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa) presented Bill No. 24, An Act respecting the Establishment of The Manitoba Water Commission for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill at this point. We did on second reading because we wanted to emphasize our attitude insofar as further commissions and further boards, particularly ones on which my honourable friends appoint some political individuals who in our opinion may not have the qualifications necessary.

I think though that there is a wider concern here, Mr. Speaker, than the one just expressed in this Bill, and I refer to the position that the Manitoba Government has taken with regard to the three province water inventory. The province now is proposing to establish a Manitoba Water Commission and undoubtedly there is very much to be done here within the province on matters of water. I am not yet totally convinced that we require another commission to do it. I think that government departments are in a sense equipped to do this job, and it's a normal function of government, but I recognize the need certainly to have a very close control here on our water problems, because while we have been in the past few years in the fortunate position of having good rainfall and if anything a surplus of water, that is not certainly the history of western Canada and we can anticipate that in the future the situation may change; but beyond this provincial concern, Mr. Speaker, there is a very major concern here in western Canada about the overall water situation.

We find ourselves here in the Province of Manitoba as being the most vulnerable of the three prairie provinces. The Province of Alberta being at the headwaters is the one who is in the most independent position of all, and in fact some years ago the Province of Alberta did take a very independent position and said at that time that they would not co-operate with the other provinces; that they were simply going to run their water controls and their water problems according to their own needs and this they could easily do because they are the people who run the headwaters. After a good deal of pressure and meetings between the three provinces and the Federal Government and at the initiative in most cases I believe of the Federal Government itself, the Province of Alberta agreed to go along and they came into the three-province study along with Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Well, the Province of Saskatchewan caught in the middle again is one that is vulnerable; but not as vulnerable as we are, Mr. Speaker, because if both Saskatchewan and Alberta were to decide for reasons of their own that they wanted to withhold waters in their area, they are the ones who control the majority of our whole drainage system. It's true that we do get some water from the south through the Red River and some from the southeast through the Winnipeg River system but the bulk of our water comes to us through the Saskatchewan River system, then partly some of it through the Qu'Appelle, and certainly with the South Saskatchewan Dam now in operation and the possibility of diversion into the Qu'Appelle system this can be to us in the future a very important item. So I think that the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is making a very grave mistake in the position that it takes that we will not participate in the three-province study. The government says that it costs too much money, they can't afford to do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need a reassessment of priorities in this area, because surely when we look at what's going on in the North American continent, water is a major priority. When we look at what our neighbors to the south are



(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . . prepared to do, when we see the pamphlets that they distribute around, they send them up here in fact, indicating that they're going to come along and channel all our water and ship it south, I think that we have to be prepared to make a very clear assessment of where we stand.

Now I'm not taking a position, Mr. Speaker, that we should say, "We will never export water". I think that some years ago that a mistake was made in Canada when we took the position that we should never export power, because we may find ourselves in the very near future where we have Hydro power that we cannot export economically because of new developments in atomic power in particular. So I am not saying that we should say now we will never export water; but I do say this, Mr. Chairman, that we must make an assessment of our water resources, what do we have in the way of water, and then a long term assessment of what our likely needs for water are going to be, and that unless we have those two figures, (1), what we have, and (b) what we're going to need, then we cannot make a sensible long-range program and we cannot have a sensible long-range provincial program unless we take those matters into consideration. And so the item that we should first be moving on from an overall standpoint is a participation in this western program with the other two provinces, because if we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, those two provinces could in the long run cause very serious problems for the Province of Manitoba. We are the ones who are at the end of the drainage system, we simply cannot afford to sit back and say, "We don't want any part of it"; we're in a vulnerable position and we should be co-operating rather than staying out.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will appreciate the fact that my colleague, the Minister of Water Control and Conservation, is left speechless - not by his speech but by virtue of Rule 46 which prohibits him from speaking - so I can say on his behalf however with respect to the remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition that negotiations still are under way with respect to the Nelson River basin study.

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

BILLS Nos. 26, 27, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 58, 63, and 88 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor will be in the Chamber shortly to give Royal Assent to these bills, if we could just delay our proceedings for a moment or two.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . we proceed with Bill 38. I'm sure we could settle it this time.

MR. LYON: I might be able to close debate.

MR. ROBLIN: Since His Honour will take about five minutes, Mr. Speaker, we might proceed with other business.

MR. LYON: If you would be good enough then, Mr. Speaker, to call the second reading of Bill No. 38, we will hold the second reading of Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for St. George expects to be back a little later, and we can call it at a time that may be more convenient for him.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for St. Mathews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Mathews): Mr. Speaker, I rise to accept the challenge thrown out by some of our colleagues that every member of the House should explain himself as to how and why he is going to vote the way he will on second reading in this particular Bill; this being a free vote and we're not having the usual division between government and opposition or between parties.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that as a Manitoban I am very proud of the Bracken Commission and the report that emerged from their years of work and I'm also very pleased to acknowledge the work done by the previous government under the leadership of the Honourable Member from Lakeside in introducing into the Province of Manitoba a law which we can all take a great deal of pride in and which I believe has been used as a model as a statute for liquor control and administration not only throughout our own country but throughout the continent.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is excellent legislation and I must say that the true test of good law is how it is accepted by the people, how it is respected and how it is supported and how it can be enforced, and I think I would be amiss in not paying tribute to the members of the Liquor Control Commission who have served in the various commissions since 1956 in administering this particular piece of legislation and the good work that they have done. Oh, there has been many occasions throughout the years, and I presume there will be many more

(MR. STEEN, cont'd) . . . . occasions on which I have taken their names in vain, but by and large they have done an excellent job in administering, rather an unpopular job that they have to fulfill but a lot of credit is coming to the members of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. I would also like to pay tribute to the work done by the Manitoba Committee on Alcohol Education and the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba because they also have a very difficult job to do and I think we should continue and increase our support of these two worthy organizations.

Mr. Speaker, on the Bill itself I would like to say that I believe that little change is necessary in the present law as we now have it. First of all though I must say I fully agree with the changes proposed in the homemade wine and beer sections of the Bill. I think these are long overdue and very sensible changes. But on the field of Sunday drinking I must confess that I am one of those who personally is opposed to Sunday drinking and whether or not I would ever make use of the facilities that would be provided if this Bill should be enacted into law remains to be seen, but I think that I have no right to impose my own moral code on anybody else and the provisions in the liquor bill, in bill No. 38, would restrict Sunday drinking to consumption with meals in restaurants and dining rooms and this is of course the most civilized form of drinking that we can know of and I would say the least harmful of any method of drinking.

On the question of hours I am quite satisfied as an individual with the hours that now exist and all the various licences that are issued by the Commission. I must say though that what bothers me about the hours that are proposed in the bill is that an exception is made about Saturday night drinking, Saturday night is treated differently than Thursday and Friday night and I would like to see uniform hours for the six days of the week and that Saturday night not be treated differently than Friday night. I think this is a dangerous side to the particular bill.

But one thing I do like about the bill is the recasting of the option provisions that are in the bill where any licence holder can expand his hours to the maximum allowed under the Bill or decrease the number of hours and not take advantage of the increases in hours and I think that this is a good idea. I think that many people who do have liquor licences in Manitoba are afraid to take advantage of the option provisions or don't understand fully the mechanics of them and I think that recasting the wording on it and making it more clear, many more might take up the challenge and reduce their hours in accordance with the needs of their own local community, which after all should be the governing rule.

One thing that puzzles me about the reaction of the public to this Bill No. 38 is the strong reaction in the field of advertising and I really cannot understand -- I presume that much of the reaction is based upon the television advertising that we see over Channel 12 from our neighbour to the south. Now even if we do pass advertising under this Bill No. 38 and allow advertising of liquor in Manitoba, we must remember that the Board of Broadcast Governors has the final word to say about what will go on the radio and television networks and the Board of Broadcast Governors has a very strict code and nothing compared to what we see on Channel 12. The Board of Broadcast Governors for one thing says that only beer and wine can be advertised on radio and television. For another thing it says there will be no spot advertisements, you must purchase an entire program, which, as members will appreciate, can be very expensive. They also determine the length of the ad; how frequently it will be shown during the course of the program; the content of the ad, and members may not realize that it is illegal to show a bottle of liquor, a glass of liquor or beer or anybody drinking it according to the Board of Broadcast Governors' rules. I only wish they had some of these rules governing other types of ads.

Another feature that the Board of Broadcast Governors rules say is the timing of the day at which the advertisements may be shown and I think there's a lot of misunderstanding in the community of our province as to what kind of advertising we would be receiving if the advertising provisions of this particular Bill were enacted and I hope that when this Bill goes to Committee, as I hope it does, that the Attorney-General and others will be able to make very clear the particular provisions and the rules of the Board of Broadcast Governors and the suggested regulations that would govern advertising in Manitoba of alcoholic beverages.

The Honourable Member from Seven Oaks last night in an excellent address managed to -- one point he did make was that he believed, as I do, that advertising will not increase alcoholic consumption by as much as an ounce, and, Mr. Speaker, I agree with him when he says that the liquor pie in this province is just so big and the allowing of liquor advertising is

(MR. STEEN, cont'd) . . . .not going to increase the size of that pie by one bit. One thing a lot of people are concerned about when it comes to liquor advertising is they feel that it will be a method of introducing to our young people liquor and alcoholic consumption, as a method of encouraging these people to make use of alcoholic beverages and enticing them to try it out. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that liquor advertising has ever influenced one person, young or old, to try alcohol. I think if anything influences them to consume alcohol it may be the contents of movies, of television programs where we see so much of it even more frequently now than we have in years past. But I don't think advertising has ever induced one single person to go out and try alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, I remember as a young boy our family always got 'Life Magazine' and Life Magazine used to be one-third liquor ads and two-thirds news and the magazine used to put out full page ads for this particular brand of whiskey or this particular brand -- I can remember only a couple of them which are not available in this country. But I think that the only effect they have ever had on me, or on anybody else for that matter that I know of, is when we have Henry Clay and Daniel Webster enjoying a wee dram after a heavy day in the Senate it may have tied in a little American history for me; or when I see various people diving in the Aegean Sea for purple sharks or something and hustling back to Athens for a quick dram of one of our nation's leading products, that has done nothing more for me than to say that that particular export of Canada is around the world. But it certainly hasn't encouraged me to hustle down to either the nearest bar or to the nearest liquor store to purchase a product of it. There is only so much of a market and the effect of advertising and indeed the intent of advertising is to talk my honourable friends into trying a particular brand as against the brand that they have been using in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this Bill on second reading for three reasons. First of all I think that the Bill deserves detailed study, clause by clause, in the Committee. Secondly, I think the Committee is the place where amendments can be made to various sections of the Bill which may be distasteful to our colleagues in the House. But thirdly, and I think most important, this is the place in which the public can appear and make representations either as individuals or as members of bodies, and we, in passing a particular piece of legislation or considering a piece of legislation such as this, should hear what the public has to say since we are not acting on our party's policies or our government policies but we are acting on our own initiative and I urge members of the House to give this Bill second reading.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the member a question? Would he think the same consideration should be given to the sales tax bill?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I drew a little difference in it. The sales tax bill is a matter of a party policy or a government policy. This is a matter of individuals acting on a particular piece of legislation and instead of the members of the House acting solely on their own particular conscience I think that they should take into consideration the representations of their constituents.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member completely misunderstood my question. What I mean: do you think that the public should have an opportunity to discuss in Law Amendments Bill 56?

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable member?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a question of government policy we, as members, stand and fall as to how our particular party voted on the particular Bill. But when it comes to a question such as this in which there is a free vote on, we stand and fall as individuals.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted a clarification. Did I understand the honourable member to say that he was for a uniform policy in terms of hours so that, for example, he would support extension of hours what might be described as Saturday night or Sunday morning 'til one or two A.M. ?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, the impression I meant to leave with the House is that I believe the hours during the week, from Monday to Saturday inclusive, should be uniform. I don't myself like the extension of hours. No. But I would hope that the Committee or the House, whatever hours they do set, they will be uniform.

MR. LYON: . . . . that the debate be continued. I believe that the Governor is ready to come into the Chamber.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills, which, in the name of the Assembly I present to your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 3 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.
- No. 8 - The Official Time Act.
- No. 9 - An Act to amend The Partnership Act.
- No. 10 - An Act to amend The Planning Act.
- No. 11 - An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Chapter.
- No. 12 - An Act to amend The Companies Act.
- No. 13 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.
- No. 14 - An Act to repeal certain Acts relating to certain Corporations.
- No. 17 - An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act.
- No. 18 - An Act to amend The Mines Act.
- No. 19 - An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act.
- No. 20 - An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act.
- No. 22 - The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act.
- No. 23 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.
- No. 24 - An Act respecting the Establishment of The Manitoba Water Commission.
- No. 26 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act.
- No. 27 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.
- No. 28 - An Act to incorporate The Lutheran Campus Foundation of Manitoba.
- No. 30 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- No. 31 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 32 - An Act respecting The City of Portage la Prairie and the purchase of certain lands from the Government of Manitoba.
- No. 34 - An Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter.
- No. 35 - An Act to validate By-law No. 30-1966 of The Town of Killarney and By-law No. 11-1966 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain and to add a portion of the South East Quarter of Section Three in Township Three and Range Seventeen West of the Principal Meridian to The Town of Killarney.
- No. 37 - An Act to validate By-law No. 770 of The Town of Deloraine.
- No. 43 - The Department of Agriculture Act.
- No. 44 - An Act respecting the Attachment of Debts.
- No. 45 - An Act to amend The Judgments Act.
- No. 46 - An Act to amend The Executions Act.
- No. 47 - An Act to amend The Law of Property Act.
- No. 48 - An Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.
- No. 49 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
- No. 50 - An Act to amend The Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants Act.
- No. 52 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.
- No. 53 - An Act to amend The Land Acquisition Act.
- No. 55 - An Act to validate By-law No. 371 of The Village of Teulon and By-law No. 2233 of The Rural Municipality of Rockwood.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.
- No. 58 - An Act respecting Compensation to Families of Persons killed by Accident.
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- No. 66 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- No. 88 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3).

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56. The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the

(MR. SPEAKER, cont'd) . . . . Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said on this Bill, many points have been raised during the debate particularly on this side of the House. I can't urge the members across the way strong enough to support the amendment which would permit this bill to go to Law Amendments. Each day all members of the House are receiving letters and are being visited by people who are being affected by the ramifications of this bill which many of us in this House have never had an opportunity to realize until it was brought to our attention because those people were aware of just how it would affect them. The trucking industry for example, is one of the latest ones to contact me on this matter and they are deeply concerned because of the discrimination that this bill - it will discriminate against them in relation to other modes of transportation.

People in the shoe repair business are afraid that this tax on services will drive them out of business. Merchants throughout Manitoba are deeply concerned because of the effect this Bill will have on their operations. I'm told by the merchants that in order to collect this tax it will be necessary for them to purchase a cash register worth in the neighbourhood of two to three thousand dollars. Some of the smaller businesses will just not be able to afford such an undertaking.

Another aspect that's causing a great deal of concern to the merchants, at least in the rural parts of Manitoba where credit is given, they are concerned that they will have to pay the tax on goods for which they are not paid. These merchants do not have the staff to handle the bookkeeping that is necessary. I think it is imperative that we take this Bill to the Committee where these people can make representation to us so that an effort can be made to have a better understanding of the problem that they face in the years ahead.

It seems unfair to me and to a great deal of people that we should tax services such as dry cleaning. People pay for the goods in the first place and pay a tax on it and then they're subjected to paying a tax on that same piece of goods for perhaps a number of years later.

The Minister, the Attorney-General in speaking to this amendment the other day, said it was not the policy of the Roblin Government to refer tax bills to committees. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Roblin Government hasn't made it a practice does not make it right. The previous government saw fit to do it and I think it was a good practice so the people who are affected by these tax measures can make proper representation to us.

The Attorney-General also said that it was our responsibility to deal with this tax bill and that if we took it to a committee that we were - I don't know what word he used -but in effect we were not looking after our responsibilities. I suggest to him that if this principle applies to the tax bill it could easily apply to every other piece of legislation that we put forth in this Legislature and refer to the various Standing Committees.

Every day that we - as I said before, we're hearing new problems in connection with this tax. We don't know what the regulations are and I think it's imperative that this government refer this tax bill to the committee so that everyone can let us know the effect that it will have on them. I particularly urge the people on the backbench to support this amendment. This is not a vote of confidence and you people have a responsibility to your constituents and the people of Manitoba to see that they have a proper opportunity to make representation to the Legislature as a body.

There's a great deal of this Bill which I'm convinced is not workable, and representations that we would hear could easily solve a lot of problems that otherwise we would not be aware of until after the Bill is law. I think it's a sad situation that we have not heard from the backbenchers on the government side in connection with this tax bill because their constituents are just as concerned as those that we represent on this side of the House.

But before I take my seat, I would appeal to all members of the House, particularly those on the backbench, to support this amendment. It is not a vote of confidence, and if this tax bill is referred to the Law Amendments Committee you would be doing yourselves and your constituents a service and the people of Manitoba as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. I feel personally that there has been no real reason to impose this type of tax on the citizens of Manitoba and that there were in fact other areas of taxation which this government may have undertaken to get around their financial difficulties. I think the government of today has failed to prove that there are no other sources of revenue. On this point I differ very strongly.

I don't believe that government in Manitoba should take the position of making tax collectors out of tens of thousands of citizens in Manitoba. I don't believe that every retailer should have to worry about keeping records with respect to what percentage of his money in the till belongs to him or what percentage belongs to the Government of Manitoba. I think there's a problem here that's got to be dealt with. We haven't had an explanation with respect to this problem, cases where retailers in fact may not in fact have cash registers. I'm thinking in terms of some of these shoe repairmen, not all of them have cash registers. I don't know what machinery they are going to use to establish what percentage of their total collection per day is going to go to the Government of Manitoba. So I'm looking forward to some answers on those questions.

Imposition of a sales tax, in my opinion, creates a cumbersome administrative department to supervise collections. I don't think that it is the most efficient method by which means the Government of Manitoba should derive its revenues. It's also a great inconvenience to many people, many business people, to have to put up with all the red tape and so forth. But nevertheless, these are some of the minor issues in my opinion. I think the most important consideration with respect to the imposition of a sales tax is how it will affect the average individual. Is this tax really a five percent sales tax? I say it's not, and I'm sure that before we're through we're going to recognize that it's not simply a five percent sales tax.

Let's just examine the procedures as to how this tax is going to apply and how it's going to increase the tax to the consumer over and above the five percent figure. The manufacturer of a product has to pay five percent for certain goods and services; he has to pay five percent in the construction of his factory or building or what have you, that is on the material aspect of it. The wholesaler is in the same position as the manufacturer. If he builds a building, a warehouse, if he buys a truck, he has to incorporate this -- he has to pay this extra five percent on these commodities. Then there's the retailer; he also has to have facilities. The building of facilities costs money thereby the five percent sales tax will also apply. So in the end result we're not going to be talking about a five percent sales tax, we're going to be talking about a much greater percentage. For this reason, I think the idea of calling this a five percent sales tax is ridiculous. I don't know whether anyone can measure truly what percentage of taxation this really means in terms of one dollar of expenditure.

But let's take a look at what is going to develop. Who is going to actually suffer the consequences? Who is going to suffer mostly from this type of taxation? I'm sure that the average business man in Manitoba will take the position that he is not going to reduce his net income for the year; I'm sure that he's going to take the position that he simply has to add on a percentage on his price list. He has to take into consideration his increased cost of production or increased cost of services. So therefore it isn't the business people that are going to truly suffer in this sense, they'll simply pass this tax on to the average customer, to the consumer.

Organized labour -- certainly they're going to suffer for a while, but those that are in an organized position, those that have a bargaining position, I'm sure they're going to bargain tougher the next time around. I'm sure we're going to have more strikes because of a sales tax because they're going to say, "We have to make allowance for this extra cost of living and we're going to hang tough." So don't blame labour if they go out next year and say, "Lookit, buddy, we want more money," because they're going to have to have more money if they at least are going to stay in the same place. I'm not one of those that's going to take the position that labour shouldn't have to bargain for a higher return to cover the cost of the five percent sales tax. Generally speaking, these groups will in fact pass on the added cost.

What about people on fixed incomes though. These are the people that I'm concerned about. Who are they going to pass on the cost to? What about the old age pensioner? He hasn't a bargaining position. He only hopes that some day we'll have another election, by which means he's going to exercise pressure during the course of a political campaign that the parties that are going to the people are going to take cognizance of his position and are going to promise him an increase in his pension. This, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with. I don't believe that we

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . should be putting these people in this position.

What about the low wage earner? The other day we had an interesting discussion on the question of minimum wages. I'm wondering how serious the Minister of Labour is when he tells us that the Minimum Wage Board is going to give us a report soon and that he's hopeful that there will be a reasonable increase in the minimum wages in Manitoba. These people are going to in fact, in my opinion, suffer a reduced standard of living as a direct result of an imposition of a sales tax.

What about our farm people in Manitoba? What bargaining position do they have? Virtually they haven't any bargaining position at all. Who are they going to tap on the shoulder and say, "Well, lookit, I require an additional price for a bag of wheat or my cabbages are worth so much more? and so forth, "or a pound of butter should be increased by so much." They haven't a bargaining position. They in fact are going to suffer a lower standard of living. Regardless of the fact that they now are in a position of bankruptcy and poverty, the Government of Manitoba in introducing this legislation is going to push them further downward.

What will the cost of a new home be? I don't know personally, it'll vary from one person to another, from one home to another. If a home has an approximate figure of \$10,000 in material value, if we take the face value of five percent we simply say that it'll cost \$500.00 more, but we forget that this five percent is going to be applied many times over, not only in a material aspect. We forget that most homes that are built and sold in this country are financed for 20 or 30 year periods of time, and I'm sure that before these homes are paid that the additional cost to an average home is going to be \$1,000 or more. This is what this government is doing to the people of Manitoba. They are in fact placing an additional burden on the homeowner; they are placing an additional burden on all people that require shelter, whether it be the homeowner or the apartment dweller. Who do you think is going to pay for the additional cost in the building of apartment blocks? It's the tenant that's going to pay for it. So don't let anyone tell me that it's going to be a situation where we'll simply have to have an adjustment and will pass on the buck to someone else. It's the average individual that's going to pay the shot.

What about the cost of furniture? A home is one part; what about the cost of furniture where it requires thousands of dollars to furnish a home? Those people that are on a cash basis, whether they buy a home or whether they buy furniture, will pay the simple five percent, if you can call it five percent, but those people that have to finance their home or that have to undertake time payment plans during the purchase of furniture, they are the ones that are going to have to in fact pay an interest rate on the sales tax. So in fact what I'm saying is that it is going to hit the lower income groups harder; they are the ones that are going to suffer. The ones that are least able to pay are going to suffer the most.

What about the family car? A car that costs \$3,500 on the basis of five percent will cost \$3,675 if it's a cash deal, but if it's an 18-month or 24-month instalment program, what is the cost going to be? --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry, it won't be. If you finance the sales tax charges you're going to pay an interest rate on the sales tax. --(Interjection)-- Can you get it for nothing?

The Premier of our province talks about - and he says he's in earnest - he talks about a farm income problem in Canada and indeed Manitoba, but he always sloughs it off, he says this is Ottawa's baby, I've been telling Ottawa that there's something wrong with agriculture. Of course he's only been doing it since the Liberals have been in office. He tells us that 60 percent of Canada's farmers have a gross income of less than \$5,000 - and I know this is true - and he tells us that only 6,000 farmers in Manitoba, 6,000 out of 40,000, have a gross income of \$4,000. This is our Premier that gave us these figures. Our Premier agrees that we have a serious farm income problem; he's still hoping that Ottawa will call that conference - he's very anxiously waiting. But where is his consistency? If he is so sincere that rural people are in this desperate situation, why then a sales tax? Does he not know the large amount of capital that farmers have to have in order to build homes or farms or machine sheds or granaries, or to buy trucks or cars or furniture? Surely he recognizes that instead of having \$4,000 of income - and I'm talking of the top income earners in terms of the farming community - maybe they'll be reduced to \$3,500 now as a result of this sales tax. This is really the effect of the sales tax.

What will the cost be on building materials in total? I for one marvel at the fact that each year the provincial and federal governments are establishing new forms of credit to finance agriculture. They are extending the amount of money that they will lend. You can

(MR. USKIW cont'd).... borrow fifty to \$60,000 now in recognition of the amount of capital that is required now to set up a decent farming enterprise. Just think what five percent means on \$50,000 worth of buildings, on two or three trucks in a farmyard, on a car, on their furniture and so forth? Does this not in fact mean a reduced standard of living for rural Manitoba?

This tax will create an increased cost of production for farm commodities, and then they talk about the cost-price squeeze. We are creating a price-cost squeeze by the imposition of this type of taxation. We are creating a cost-price squeeze; we are aggravating it. So I say that this government has not truly examined its position with regard to where should it derive its revenues from. I say that this is the wrong source, because there are many people in our society that are going to be hurt that should in fact be uplifted in terms of income.

Who does our First Minister think he is really kidding when he says he understands the rural problem, the farm income problem and so forth? Anyone who understands would not impose this type of taxation. Anyone that truly understood agriculture would say, "This we mustn't have, this is regressive." What is our First Minister doing to assist our farmers to pay this increased cost of production? He's not proposing any solutions, he says that's Ottawa's baby. I can tax them here, let Ottawa worry about how they're going to keep up with it. This is really what he's saying. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, he votes against resolutions which are designed to put some money into the hands of farmers. He votes against them; so do his backbenchers; and I don't believe that the people of Manitoba, the rural people of Manitoba, will sustain the confidence on that side of the House next time around as a result. He talks about Ottawa's responsibility; he talks about conferences that should be called; but at the same time he's dipping his fingers into the farmers' pockets, and, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply disgusted with it and I intend to support the amendment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but after listening to the last two speakers accusing us backbenchers of not getting on our feet - and I'm no expert when I do get on my feet, I enjoy a country fair more than I do standing up here speaking in the House - but what amazes me is the Opposition, both Parties across the House there, have been asking for improvements on every line imaginable. A year ago this session, for the last two sessions, I have kept track in a rough way, in a conservative way - with a small "c" - I must say that the money that this government would have to spend if we were to implement and bring into practice the things that they've been asking for, two years ago the sum total as near as I could register was a little better than \$100 million; last year \$120-odd million. -- (Interjection) -- Well a ten percent wouldn't cover everything I don't think.

Now this is what they're talking and they've been criticizing us quite severely for bringing in a sales tax, and I notice quite a grin on the Leader of the Opposition over there - Her Majesty's loyal opposition right now - but it was his Party if I remember rightly along about the year of 1951 which asked permission of Ottawa to implement legislation here to bring in a sales tax with the thought in mind that some day we'd have to use it. Where or how they've lost their reasoning or changed their mind in the meantime I'll never understand. If we have to do or keep on doing what comes naturally, I guess you might say, with the increase in cost of our modern-day living, we have to do it, and some day they will have to face the same problem of explaining to their constituents, their electors, why it's necessary to have a sales tax.

Now I had no intention of getting into this debate, but I just wanted to say these few words.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to get into this debate at all but the Honourable Member for Morris has dragged me in by the misstatement that he made regarding 1951 and a resolution regarding sales tax. If I remember the facts clearly, and I think I do, what happened at that time was that they were talking about a hospitalization - that is national hospitalization - and there was a resolution submitted by the Federal Government to all provincial governments asking the various provincial governments to pass a resolution for an amendment to the BNA Act to allow provinces to impose a sales tax. Now that is what he has reference to.

MR. SHEWMAN: I think maybe that I haven't erred too far in what I said and we'll wait until we see what comes out in the Hansard. In the meantime, I will check it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HARRIS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.



MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: . . . the appeal that my colleague the Honourable Provincial Treasurer and I have been wont to make on other occasions that the members try to postpone adjournment of the debate as much as possible. There is some desire to get along with the progress of the Bill. There's no desire conversely on our side to unduly hurry people, but if members could accommodate and co-operate we would be most appreciative.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs - Bill 65. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. LYON: As the Honourable Minister is absent, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 68. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand, but if anyone wishes to speak I certainly have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 59. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, first of all before I enter into the general debate, on behalf of the Ukrainian Ethnic Group of Manitoba at this time I'm happy to announce our sincere appreciation of the support given to us by the Minister, by the Legislature, and by the university officials in our efforts to have the Ukrainian language accepted at the university level at par with other major languages. Now it'll not simply be just another subject at the university but an accredited university entrance and a full accredited university language. I wish to thank all those who had any part in this.

Mr. Speaker, we come to Bill No. 59, the principle of which is the support to encourage the use of French as a language of instruction in public schools where demand and facilities makes this feasible. My resolution to the same effect stood on the Order Paper since last year, but now I'm very happy that the government has finally introduced Bill No. 59. I for one accept the principle that we live in an Anglo-Saxon part of the world and that it is essential to us that the teaching of English be not allowed to suffer on account of other languages, and to me it seems that this Bill fully supports this principle. The Minister on the introduction of the Bill told us that no change is made in this Bill or contemplated in this Bill as far as other ethnic languages are concerned in the Province of Manitoba.

In my resolution, the (b) part of my resolution read: "support an intensified program for the study of languages in our school system to achieve conversational proficiency in other languages." I regret that this Bill does not follow that up and it hasn't been extended a little further, because I believe that studying any other language and becoming proficient in it is a matter that we should all consider of vital importance nowadays in the shrinking world as we like to refer to it. It would be wonderful if Manitoba would be kind of a mosaic of languages from which we could draw people to go into internationally different areas. But this Bill does not refer to any other languages, as the Minister has said, and I could say right now that the Ukrainian people have never at any time asked that the Ukrainian language be accepted as a language of instruction. They have not demanded that because they could see the problems that would confront the Province of Manitoba if every ethnic group demanded similar treatment, so they have never. But they have asked for the acceptance of the Ukrainian language at the high school and at the university, which we have, and at present the Ukrainian group would like to have the teaching of Ukrainian language extended below the high school level, that is in Grade 8 and subsequently in Grade 7 and so on in the future, and I hope that in the near future we will be able to attain this.

Coming back to the body of this Bill, it follows my thinking on the principle, as I said before, of the use of French as a language of instruction in public schools where demand and facilities make this feasible, and as far as I can see, the different sections of the Bill broadly outline this. The re-introduction of the French language is being instituted again. We know that French as a language of instruction was permitted in the past and it is being introduced. There's safeguards for people of other minority groups in this Bill because any board who wishes to use French as their language of instruction must first submit the proposal to the Minister. They must give the total time the board proposes to utilize in instructional French and the Minister in his wisdom has the power to accept that or reject it, basing it on its merits. I understand that this use of instructional French will be from Grade 1 to Grade 12, not immediately but progressively, starting say at Grade 1 and 2. I think the Minister said in 1967 and probably 1968 and so on.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)....

The Minister also made reference to the fact that those children who are studying French in such a school would readily be able to transfer from one school to another, I presume from a school where there's no instruction in French. These pupils would be ready at any time to go to another school and they'll lose no time. I'm happy about that also.

And again, this will not be compulsory. None of the pupils of Manitoba will be compelled to take classes in these schools, only those children whose parents wish them to, and pupils who are not versatile in oral French will not be forced to take French in such a school. Provision must also be made at the same time that any school which does take advantage of this Bill must make provision also for those pupils, if I understand it correctly, who are not able to take advantage of this kind of instruction, and I think that's well and good.

The main thing, and that is that any school who wishes to take advantage of this must first apply to the Minister. At present, Social Studies -- French could be used as a language of instruction in Social Studies and later, if circumstances warrant and so on, it could be expanded to other subjects.

I'm not going to take up too much more time. I personally feel that this Bill is a very good beginning and I'm willing to support it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, since my election to this House in 1959 I have been known as one of the most outspoken and severe critics of this government. I have tried to be fair and sincere, but realizing that more often than not the causes that I was fighting for were not always popular and therefore were not receiving the support that I felt deserved in this House, I used every method at my disposal to try to get my points across. I begged, I prayed, I implored, I flattered and I even embarrassed the Members of this House to get some action.

I am now pleased to express my appreciation to the Minister of Education, the First Minister, the members of the Cabinet and the members of the government caucus for this Bill, and I wish, Sir, my congratulations to be as forceful now as my criticism was in the past. I would be remiss, I'm sure, if I did not include the members of my own caucus, the Liberal, and the Liberal Party of Manitoba, amongst those I wish to congratulate, and after listening to the Leader of the NDP and the Social Credit Parties, I feel that they also will join to give their support to this Bill. I certainly hope so anyway. And to think, Sir, that the question of this principle which seemed so remote only a few months ago now has an excellent chance of receiving the unanimous support of this House is practically unbelievable, but it is certainly encouraging. After all, Mr. Speaker, it was barely a year ago that the First Minister of this province stated the principle of making French a teaching language should be decided on the national basis, and at this time he also said that there must be a consensus of opinion for such a move and added that there was no such consensus for using French as a teaching language here in Manitoba.

Well the First Minister, to his credit, saw that he was wrong and the Throne Speech made mention of French becoming a teaching language. We now have our Centennial Project, Sir, and we can prepare to celebrate Manitoba's birthday in 1970. The people of Manitoba have come of age. We have finally wakened to the fact that we can enjoy unity without uniformity. Much of the credit for this belongs to the two Dailies, I'm sure, whose many editorials during the past few years have tried to present the situation in its true perspective and I'm sure that this has helped an awful lot.

Now, Sir, this Bill will not revolutionize education here in Manitoba. Many people will hardly be aware that Section 240 of The Public Schools Act has been amended. No one will have French or other languages forced upon them. Why then the excitement? Why the rejoicing? Why the joy? Because, Mr. Speaker, it seems that all the political parties of the province will finally unite to rectify an injustice that has existed for too long. We can now forget our quarrels between the different racial origins and we can start the second centenary united as Manitobans, each of us respected by and respecting our fellow Manitobans and Canadians. Oh, no doubt, Sir, there will be some criticism; some of it by sincere people, I'm afraid, but I'm sure that soon even their minds will be put at ease when they realize that no one group intends to take over or will take over, force itself on others.

Sir, I intend to give this Bill my full and unqualified support. It is true that it confers much power to the Minister of Education, that it leaves much to his discretion, but I give him confidence. It might be that in two or three years some changes will be needed that will have to be spelled out in the Act, but at the moment, not to disturb the public school system and in order to bring in orderly changes, I am more than willing to let him pilot these changes.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . If this is a first step to eradicate prejudice, we must be careful not to impose anything on those who do not wish it but only to give as many as we possibly can a chance to keep their language and to learn others. As far as insisting that for at least half of the school day English be retained as the language of instruction, I'm most happy to accept this. It would be a pity and certainly defeat our purpose if the teaching of English would suffer at the expense of other languages in this province.

I also like the clause that prescribes qualifications for teachers, and I would suggest to the Minister that the training of proper qualified teachers is very important. It is the most important part of this new legislation and I feel that steps should be taken immediately to have a branch of the Department of Education established to train such teachers. That could be done very easily either through the St. Boniface College who is already affiliated with the university.

Now, Sir, we had a proposed resolution by the member that spoke just a few minutes ago, the Member from Emerson, and unfortunately this Bill does not cover all our resolutions. I certainly don't intend to vote against the Bill because of this but I certainly would want to urge the Minister of Education to remember this clause (b) in this proposed resolution and I read: "Support an intensified program for the study of languages in our school system to achieve conversational proficiency." And I might say that although I have gained a point that was dear to me, I still feel very strongly on this and I don't intend to forget about these people.

Now I think that if we're going to learn any languages we should be able to do this in a way that we could speak, and if there's enough people in any communities that wish to learn their languages - I think it was made clear by my honourable friend that the Ukrainians and others do not wish to have their language as a teaching language but they would like to have a better chance, the opportunity at least of teaching their language to the young people - and I think that as long as there is a demand and as long as this is feasible within the public school system that we should try to achieve this conversational proficiency.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge the government to keep on working on this and I hope that some type of legislation will make it possible to achieve the second clause of the proposed amendment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself and make a few comments in connection with Bill 59. First of all, I would like to congratulate the government for bringing in this particular Bill. I personally want to thank the Minister and the government for bringing this Bill and the provisions that are contained in it. I think it's got a lot of merit and certainly will bring about conditions which I most heartily approve of. It will encourage the instruction of languages and certainly we all know that in this day and age where the world is getting smaller day by day because of communications, travelling and so on, that the more languages a person acquires the better he is off, and I don't think it is too late to encourage our young people to acquire the knowledge of more languages in this province. We still have teachers who possess knowledge and who can teach languages.

Then I notice that the Minister will have certain discretions under certain sections and I am sure that he will use them to advantage and bring about programs that will be conducive to the furthering of the studying of languages in Manitoba. I notice that the provisions are permissive, not mandatory, so that people who want to can avail themselves of it and I think this is the way it should be.

I also see that there is provision for a committee to be set up to advise the Minister, and I hope that all major groups in this province will be represented so that he will be informed properly as to any advice that he would want from these people. I think in many cases we will be legalizing certain practices that are already carried on and I don't think there is anything wrong with this either.

Before I sit down, I wish to commend the government for bringing in this legislation and I'm sure it will work out to the advantage of most of the citizens.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General on Bill No. 70. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): In his absence, may we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings: Bill No. 73.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable Member for Assiniboia if it would be okay -- if there would be no objection if I spoke in connection with Bill 70. The indications are that there would not be.

MR. PATRICK: I have no objection.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I listened with an intense interest the other day when the Honourable the Attorney-General introduced Bill 70 for second reading and I find strenuous objection to the postponement of the procedures to establish in our province new electoral divisions. My honourable friend the Attorney-General when he introduced this Bill suggested that it didn't really make too much difference that change should take place at this time. In the -- well, my honourable friend says, "It is desirable that this further study be given, particularly since the basic rules laid down in the Act are now ten years old and they do deserve some re-consideration before the Commission undertakes its work." Then he goes on to say a little later, "The delay of one year should not be construed - and I repeat that - should not be construed as representing a desire on the part of government for a fundamental change in the manner in which redistribution takes place, that is by means of an independent commission." I take the inference from that remark that my honourable friend indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the delay of a year is relatively inconsequential. Now, I don't agree with my honourable friend. I think that when the ...

MR. LYON: I don't agree with my honourable friend because that's the wrong inference.

MR. PAULLEY: Well then my honourable friend the Attorney-General will have full opportunity when he closes the debate to give me his impression as against the impression that I gathered from his remarks. --(Interjection)-- No, I don't say it's wrong at all. I still insist, Mr. Speaker, that my interpretation of my honourable friend's remarks can be substantiated if one would look at Page 1823 of Hansard of March 20th. But apart from whether there is a difference of opinion insofar as the interpretation of my honourable friend's remarks or not, it could be conceived that this is beside the point.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that in 1957 the then government of the day introduced into this Assembly a new proposition for the establishment of electoral boundaries in the province and referred at that particular time the establishing of the boundaries to an independent commission which was comprised of the Chief Justice of Manitoba, the Chief Electoral Officer, and the President of the University of Manitoba, and it took out of the ambit of impartiality or gerrymandering the distribution on a population basis of the divisions within the province.

While we can't find fault with some of the legislation as enacted at that time - and I refer here to the ratio of four rural voters to seven urban voters, and we can have some differences of opinion on that - but nonetheless the legislation at that particular time was laid down so that every so often on receipt of the latest census that this commission should immediately start work in reorganizing the constituencies of the province. And I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend the Attorney-General and to the government, that with the situation in this House today, it could well be that there will be another election held before the commission has time to consider what its job was to have been upon receipt of the latest census.

And why do I say this so pointedly today, Mr. Speaker? I say this because just prior -- or during the last session of the House a Committee of this House had had referred to it changes in The Elections Act in order to bring about, what was considered at that time, changes that would be more readily understandable to all and changes that would make the operation of The Elections Act better than previously. But the government opposite decided in its wisdom - and I say lack of wisdom - not to proceed with changes in The Elections Act at that time and left the whole matter suspended in mid-air, and in the ensuing period of time called a general election.

Now I appreciate the fact that the citizens and voters of Manitoba didn't give the same type of majority to the members opposite that they enjoyed previously, but the fact still remains, Mr. Speaker, that they're still over there. Now if they didn't deal with the Elections Act last year, how much reliance can we put on them of this only being deferred for another year. I think it is true that as far as members in this House are concerned that I happen to represent the greatest number of voters of anybody in the House. --(Interjection)-- Yes, greater than Assiniboia. I represent more than four times as many as some other honourable members in the House and I have no objections really to this, because this is the way that the ball bounced insofar as developments are concerned and we have to accept and appreciate this, but I say that when the legislation was passed in 1957 - and incidentally at that time I represented more voters in the old constituency of Kildonan-Transcona than anybody else in this House too,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... Mr. Speaker - but anyway, on the redistribution at that particular time, these points were considered and a firm date was set for changes in the boundaries of the electoral divisions.

Now my honourable friend the Attorney-General, in his remarks the other day, said that we want to take a look at the whole matter, the whole question of redistribution, and I presume by that that he has in mind that there might be some desire to take into account the ratio of four to seven. But my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, says that they want more time to take note of the Act itself. Mr. Speaker, they've been in office with a firm majority since 1959; I guess that's around about eight years, isn't it? Surely to goodness my honourable friends have had time to consider changes in the Electoral Boundaries Act. Surely to goodness it's inexcusable after the basis of impartiality of the setting up of divisions was established, and I give the previous administration full credit for enacting the legislation, and if memory serves me correctly it was by unanimous consent in the House and approval of all Parties, so I say to my honourable friend the Attorney-General, I cannot accept, I cannot accept his reasons for asking for the delay of a further year to consider something that they've had full opportunity since they became the government to consider. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Party of Manitoba became the government as the result of redistribution and the change in the ratio or method of electing members to this House which was brought about by the bill that was introduced and passed in 1957.

MR. LYON: Give a little credit to the Honourable First Minister, too.

MR. PAULLEY: For what? For suggesting the year's delay? --(Interjection)-- Oh no. This is my point, Mr. Speaker, that while my honourable friend the Attorney-General may give credit to his boss, the fact that he's there - and I will admit, I will admit that the people at that time, at that time....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will allow me to correct him - not boss, colleague.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I don't know who's wagging the tail, the head or the tail, but anyway I'll accept the correction of my honourable friend the First Minister that -- no, by gosh, I will say what I was going to say anyway, despite his interjection. I was going to say that it may not have been particularly the change in the electoral divisions that elected them over there. I'm sure that that aided and abetted by the influence at that time that the present First Minister had on the electorate, was responsible.

Now I think in all fairness we can say today that that is a diminishing sort of an influence on the electorate of Manitoba, and I suggest to my honourable friend the Attorney-General that there's very very little likelihood that even he will be able to replace or enhance the downward trend of his particular party in Manitoba, whether redistribution of seats takes place or not. But it was that, I suggest, and I just sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Attorney-General and the government want to delay this matter for another year so that they might come up with some scheme of redistribution that might put them back in the favorable position insofar as allocations of seats are concerned that they were when they were elected in 1958. --(Interjection)-- No, I think the Leader of the Opposition is correct, that no amount of redistribution. But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, I would suggest though, that we should adhere strictly to the principles that were laid down back in 1957. I suggest that the government has had ample time to consider changes, and if my honourable friends opposite had brought in a bill at this Session to change the ground rules in respect of redistribution - and surely, Mr. Speaker, they've had time to - then we would have considered that matter; I would be quite prepared. But this bill doesn't even suggest; this bill doesn't even suggest that further study should be given to the proposition. It simply says that the matter should be delayed for another year. In order to what? In order to give them time to consider what changes should take place.

Now I suggest to my honourable friends that if they want additional time to do this, that rather than the bill coming into force on Royal Assent that it might be referred to the Committee on Privileges or Elections, or we might revive the Elections Committee whose work was terminated by the impetuosity of the government of last year and just prior to an election, and we're going to have those items to deal with again. I object strenuously to the further delay, but I would object even more strenuously, if that was possible, to a bill just being enacted here bringing about the delay without something being done about it in the meantime that we were fully aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Assiniboia have leave of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . I think it is standing in my name. I was going to speak today; unfortunately I had to go out. But I won't be able to complete it in four minutes; I wonder if it may be allowed to stand again.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think we probably have accomplished all that we can usefully. It might be convenient, having regard to today's schedule, that we call it 5:30, Sir, with the idea in mind, of course, that the House meet again at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, it is my understanding that the morning and afternoon sessions tomorrow will be devoted to government business, and again the private members lose . . .

MR. LYON: Yes, that's correct - government business.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the House adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.