

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, July 7, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of the privileges of the House. I notice a change of seating in the House and I would have expected that the House would be notified of any change such as was indicated during prayers. Accustomed as I am to sudden changes in politics this one does amaze me.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, just on the question of privilege raised by the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose, may I suggest that I just wanted to see what it was like on the other side because I suspect that the members of the Conservative Party are going to be on that side very shortly.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): I would think that that kind of wishful thinking, unrealistic as it is, really doesn't deserve any response, but I thought that it would be appropriate to say to the honourable member since we are concerned for his health, that he shouldn't hold his breath.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would recommend my honourable friend, Charles Dickens' works, "Great Expectations."

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): . . . safe to say it's the kind of wishful thinking that built this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if I could get some clarification as to the role of the municipalities now concerning the initiation of housing projects; for projects for 1971 are the municipalities still supposed to be the initiators or has the government taken over that role along with the take over of housing in Section 35 of the bill we passed last year?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): The honourable member is making reference to policy in respect to 1971 and there's been no definitive position taken in respect to that year. In regard to this year the initiative is resting with the province, hopefully with the concurrence of the subject municipality as it was agreed that any public housing starts this year by the province would be assumed with the province undertaking the full operating losses for this year. Whether or not that policy is continued into the year 1971 is still subject for policy consideration.

MRS. TRUEMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the length of time that it takes to start a housing project could those who are interested in initiating such projects expect to hear in the near future what the government's policy will be?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, I would expect that this matter will be clarified very shortly insofar as 1971 is concerned. We are very anxious to undertake our '71 program because the '70 program appears to have been most successful insofar as our being able to utilize the funds made available to us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister or his department has reviewed and evaluated the effectiveness of the Manpower retraining programs in Manitoba? That's the first part of my question; and the second part I'll perhaps ask him now: what percentage of the people got employment after completing their Manpower retraining programs, and how soon they got employment?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may, the answer to the first question is that the matter is under constant review as I indicated in the House some time back.

I'm sorry that I cannot give, Mr. Speaker, precise information to my honourable friend in regard to percentages and particularly in respect of employment. I'm sure my honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) friend is aware that at the present time there is a considerable amount of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba as there is in other parts of Canada and some of those that have had the benefit of the retraining programs are not able to obtain employment but I will take a close look at the questions raised by my honourable friend and endeavour to answer them as quickly as possible.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Perhaps the Minister will take another question under advisement and that is: what was the average earning per month - or what was the average earning per month increase after the people had completed their retraining programs and got employed, per male and female, that's the second part; and the last one, perhaps the Minister as well at the time that he's giving the answer give us the latest unemployment figures as of the last month.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as the differences in pay as a result of retraining I doubt very much whether I may have that but I certainly will take a look at it and see whether I can come up with the information. The last unemployment figure that I had was for the month of May for Manitoba which stood about two percentage points below the national average of 6.2, we were about 6 percent; and at that particular time the indications as far as Manitoba was concerned, that our unemployment rate was higher than that of Alberta and Saskatchewan. But again I say, Mr. Speaker, this was the figure for May. I have not received the figure for June as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question. The reason I posed the question because I'm sure it's quite relevant and would be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member another question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister would agree or not agree that these statistics would be very helpful to the Minister himself in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is aware that's an argumentative question. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Yesterday I directed a question to him or inquiry with respect to a consultant hired by the government to investigate into the drug situation in Europe I believe, and Israel I mentioned. It seems that I was in error with respect to some of the information insofar as suggesting that a company, Sabra Pharmaceutical Limited of St. Boniface, was directly involved. I didn't pretend to know all the information, I was making inquiries of the Minister. I wonder if the Minister would in the interests of having the correct information before the House indicate to us precisely what the terms of this investigation are or at least correct me where I was in error yesterday with respect to the questions asked.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have this opportunity to elaborate on the brief answer that I gave yesterday. A consultant has been retained to look into the feasibility of establishing a pharmaceutical industry in the Province of Manitoba. The consultant fee is \$2,400.00. In addition, we have agreed to pay related costs, transportation costs, hotel costs, etc., up to a maximum of \$2,800.00. That particular consultant will have to supply us with vouchers, receipts and other documentation to prove to us and to show to us, as is normal, as is the usual case, his expenditures. They will not exceed \$2,800., they may indeed be very much less. But if they were \$2,800 the total cost would be \$2,400 plus \$2,800 which is a total of \$5,200 and at the very maximum. I'm pleased to inform the members of the House that under the program established by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion one-half of the cost of this is recoverable from the Federal Government. So at the very most the cost to the Manitoba treasury will be \$2,600 and very well may be closer to \$2,000.00. As a matter of fact when you look at the fees that have been paid by the previous administration over the years, in fact I have a list of about 30 pages long here of consultants retained by the previous administration, I see figures such as \$31,000, \$19,000, \$116,000 and so on, so this is really a very small figure.

With respect to the terms of reference I might say quite categorically that we are interested in obtaining a pharmaceutical industry for Manitoba and we are attempting to update our information on this. There is some hope of establishing contact with a European research oriented type of company and in this way stimulate this industry in the province. I've pretty well given up on trying to attract the select club that exists in Ontario and Quebec into this province, and this is a real way, a very meaningful way to bring about industrial development

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) in this particular type of industry. I might say also it's one way perhaps of reducing the drug costs to the average Manitoban which I think we should all be concerned with as well.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister for his statement. Really I think rather than having statements made outside of the House it's helpful to have the information given to us here as he now has done. Is it the government's further intention if this consultant is successful in establishing the contact that the Minister mentioned would it be their intention to establish a government drug house or pharmaceutical house to be in the business of dispensing drugs directly to the citizens of Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference of this particular consultant were essentially technical in nature. We were not, and are not necessarily now concerned with the type of ownership, but I've been on record many a time to say that we're prepared to go into partnership with private enterprise if that's what's necessary to make things happen in this province.

MR. ENNS: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the partnership perhaps be extended to Sabra Pharmaceuticals Limited of St. Boniface?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think this question is entirely out of order. We're interested, as your colleague who sits beside you I'm sure will agree with me, we're interested in developing a particular industry in this province and I trust the people who are going to show the leadership in this will be qualified people who can bring about a very successful manufacturing enterprise.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, relative to the questions between the Member for Lakeside and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Minister was quoting from a document of a list of consultants employed by the previous government, I think he said. Would he mind tabling that document?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been an Order for Return submitted and agreed to by this government and I believe the Order for Return will be filed shortly. I'm just looking at that section that pertains to my own particular department, but the Order for Return pertained to all departments of government and I believe this is in process and will be forthcoming in due course.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question to the same Minister on a similar subject. Earlier in the session I had tabled an Order for Return requesting the names and all the pertinent details of the 63 new companies which had established in Manitoba in '69. That is about two months ago. When can I expect that Order to be tabled?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to look into the matter for the honourable member and expedite it in any way I can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder in view of the explanation given by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in reply to the Member for Lakeside explaining the arrangement between this individual who went to Israel, is the Member for Lakeside going to withdraw and apologize for the slanderous accusation he made yesterday in the House and on television last night?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce can indicate to me that the expense allowances that he listed do not include secretarial or make no provision for secretarial expenses than I'd be happy to withdraw the remarks. I understand, and I have spoken to her since, that she is indeed accompanying her husband on this trip to Israel and Western Europe to offer what services she can to her husband on this trip, and certainly this is as it should be. I'm not suggesting that she is being paid directly by the government or such but as a normal situation of expense allowances, if the Minister of Industry and Commerce will indicate to me that the expense allowances will not cover what I would accept to be very normal expenses of having secretarial services to this consultant available to him and covering expenses, then I would certainly accept the Minister of Transportation's suggestion and withdraw that portion of my remarks.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that this particular consultant was going to take his wife or any secretarial service or what have you. I would submit, however, perhaps the accompaniment of his wife might prove that he's much more productive than he otherwise might be, giving him the moral support. Well having been married seventeen or eighteen

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) years I'm pleased to say that I'm much more productive since I have been married than I have been in single days. I better quit while I'm ahead.

I just wanted to state that there is perhaps an erroneous impression here. The countries that the individual is visiting include the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, France, Italy, Israel and for the purposes of testing equipment plants in eastern Canada, not drug companies in eastern Canada but drug equipment manufacturing companies in eastern Canada. The vouchers, getting back to the point at hand, the vouchers, the expense vouchers, the documentation will pertain only to that consultant and this is normal -- I think this is normal good sound business accounting, or rather government accounting practice.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, coming back to the point of order. I'm still left with a little bit of a dilemma. I'm prepared to be chastized by the Minister of Transportation if indeed I suggested that this consultant was taking his wife along and using her for secretarial services and that those secretarial services would be reimbursed. If the Minister of Industry and Commerce can just help me a little bit and say that, categorically, that the term of expense allowances absolutely prohibit that and that only single expenses, for instance for hotels, something like that, would be entertained, then I was obviously wrong. But I'm not getting much help from the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we hired one consultant and we're paying for the expenses only of that one consultant.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a point of order on the floor and I suppose that affords me the opportunity to request the Honourable Member for Lakeside, rather than have him offer to show a chastened mood and all that, I suggest to him that it would be better if he would simply come clean and indicate in what particular or specific way he regards this transaction, hiring a consultant, to be not in accordance with standing and previous practice. If he feels that there is something that is specifically untoward about the whole arrangement he should so indicate and then we can advise him whether or not he is right or wrong in our view.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't seriously believe that I suggested that it was any untowardness in terms of the arrangement. I suggested it was a convenient arrangement in my statements, and I think in terms - quite frankly the First Minister is taken up in terms of the fact that every dollar of public money comes under very legitimate public scrutiny here and certainly we ourselves are scrutinized very closely how we spend our monies. If I thought that the honourable members opposite took their wives on government paid expense trips to Japan and so forth at full cost to the public, then you would certainly expect us to raise all due furore. I knew that that was certainly not the case. -- (Interjection) No, no, you see he's just demonstrating, Mr. Speaker, the precise point that I'm making. Now I'm just suggesting that in that general terminology when the public money is being spent that we have a perfectly legitimate right to question all arrangements and under what arrangements they are being spent. Now, the Minister of Industry and Commerce today has not indicated, he has simply said and I believe him that a \$2,800 expense account is there in addition to the consultant fee of \$2,400 which would cover the normal services of a consultant, which I would certainly believe includes a secretary. It's my privilege to suggest that whether the consultant chooses his wife or decides to use secretarial services available to him on the continent or in Israel or in Scandinavia, that that may have been a better position to take in terms of the fact that he's doing this on public money, but that's up to him and that's up to the government.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, you know on a point of logic here. You know, this particular consultant, you know, could bring - perhaps he could bring two or three research assistants with him as well you know and therefore his study may be that much more detailed, and complete and comprehensive, this would be very good but he's still only getting \$2,400 and the cost involved in this trip is still pertaining to that one individual. So you know, to raise this question of secretary I mean is an irrelevant question really. In fact I would indeed hope he has a research staff of 20 and maybe five secretaries and six general factotums, you know, and we'll get a 100,000 dollar product for the sum of \$2,400. So this secretarial bit is highly irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the debate, there are some facts that I think are not clear and there may be some in the House who are misled. Really the government in the past few months has conducted a policy that was not the policy of the previous government which was to hire private individuals in

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) business as consultants to carry out the functions of the Department of Industry and Commerce. It's true that the Department of Industry and Commerce hired consultants, but these consultants in the main in almost all cases with the exception of specific trade missions, were people who had some research capability or some expertise in their particular field and were in the position of being a consultant per se. Now not only in the case that's mentioned before us but in a number of other cases that have not been mentioned in this House -- Mr. Speaker, this is important in connection with the point of order, because in connection with this there has been suggestion that the honourable member for Lakeside has . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPIVAK: There's no point . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member speaking to a point of order related to procedure in the House?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there's been a challenge made the Honourable Member of Lakeside on the question that's asked with respect to secretarial fees and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this is an unusual case because this was not the practice of the previous government and people who were businessmen were not hired and paid to act as consultants for the government unless . . . a specific project.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of privilege which I believe takes precedence over a point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: If you have a point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: I have a point of privilege as a member of this Assembly and whether my friend would recognize me as a member of this Assembly I leave it to his judgment, but my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that whether or not in your judgment the point of order that has been raised and been discussed is a matter that was before this Assembly or is it something that has transpired outside of the Assembly and therefore is not in possession of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to honourable members that surely there must be a more effective and efficient way of handling this matter than on questions before Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister. Over a month ago, the First Minister intimated that the second audit on the C.F.I. project was nearly ready and he would table it at the earliest possible moment convenient to him. So my question is: Is he in a position to table the report on the second audit of C.F.I.?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, I can advise him that the report that he is referring to is not yet quite completed. I am unable to say exactly when it will be completed but it's only a matter of days, I should think.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . if I may. I'll have to clarify that further. The work involved in carrying out this audit has been completed in the main, but the preparation of the report is just under way, it'll perhaps be more than just a few days -- sometime this month that's about all I can tell my honourable friend. I'm not in a position to say whether it'll be next week or the week after but some time in the month of July.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the newspaper report correct that was attributed to one of the Ministers of the Crown that upwards of \$33 million were dissipated in consultant fees and overcharging?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have two points to make in response to the honourable member's question. First he used the term dissipation of funds in payment of fees. I'm not sure that that would be an accurate way of describing the amount paid out in fees inasmuch as this was what was provided for in contract and I don't want to engage in a debate at this time as to whether or not monies legally paid out under the terms of a contract amounts to dissipation of public funds so I'll have to beg off on that point for the moment. The other part of the question is asking for comment from me on an opinion expressed by another Minister and, Mr. Speaker, that's not to be expected in the question period and in any case it would be treading on dangerous ground.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question of the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether any monies at all are being paid by the Manitoba Development Fund to any of the companies of the four companies involved in the Forest project or into the Trust Fund Account of the Fund and any of the companies.

MR. SCHREYER: I believe that the latter applies, Mr. Speaker, that further advances of monies from the Manitoba Development Fund are being made into the agreed upon Special Trust Fund.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then I take it if the government is in possession of information but the report is not completed, that obviously there is nothing wrong otherwise there would be no monies paid out.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I said that monies were being advanced from the Manitoba Development Fund into this Special Trust Account, that monies are not being paid out from that Special Trust Account, they are not being disbursed except upon certification that comes in in triplicate from three different sources.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Does the First Minister not agree that the statement that I made even if they're paid out of the Trust Account . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable member is aware that type of a question is out of order. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. In, shall I say, the fond expectation but not too hopeful one that the House might adjourn before the end of July, if the report were to come in after the adjournment of the House, will the First Minister make the report public immediately and give it to members in the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose I hope knows us well enough to expect that when the report is ready that it will be made available. If it would be made available while we are in session, there's no reason why it could not be made available alternatively by means of having it available at the Caucus office or through the mails.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce - his statement just a little earlier today about the consultant going all through Europe. Do you agree with going into partnership . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is aware that that type of question is not proper before Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Lakeside is going to apologize for his scurrilous remarks made yesterday against an individual and his wife.

MR. ENNS: If the Minister of Transportation persists on this course I'm going to demand an apology from him to refrain from making those kind of remarks. I indicated very clearly to the House, the minute that the Minister of Industry and Commerce indicates to me that under the expense provisions allotted to this trip, there's no provision for payment of secretarial expenses, I'll withdraw or apologize or make the remarks that I want to make, but the Minister of Industry and Commerce has said no such thing and until he has said such a thing, I'm obviously not in a position to do anything about it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I'd made it clear to the members of the House that we are paying the expenses of one individual, the consultant, and we will accept the vouchers pertaining to that one consultant as one individual.

MR. ENNS: Okay I won't press the matter. I take it then that secretarial expenses are not included in the consultant fees and if I asked for an Order for Return next session with respect to this particular trip, I can be assured that there will be no secretarial fees paid, because this is very important.

MR. EVANS: It gives me great pleasure to do so.

MR. ENNS: That's fine, Mr. Speaker, in that event, I certainly wish to withdraw the remarks that I made yesterday with respect to this honourable gentleman's wife and have the record so show that.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would submit to a question. Would the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is well aware that questions to the other side of the House are not permitted at this time. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate to the House whether the government had made the decision to flood South Indian Lake?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I did explain to the House I think approximately three weeks to a month ago, the general timing with which we hope to be able to announce a decision relative to further development of Hydro in Northern Manitoba and I've not received any advice subsequently to change any of the dates that I mentioned at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if it's going to be the policy of the government to go into business with European companies in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, you know, he's obviously contravening the rules, he's asking a question of policy which a member of the Treasury Bench need not answer, and not only that, it's a hypothetical question. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no - personally I'm prepared to accept all kinds of industries from various countries. Do you not want industrial development in this province or do you want industrial development?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I've just asked a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question to the First Minister relative to the question asked by the Member from River Heights. Can the First Minister indicate whether or not the government has met latterly with the Manitoba Hydro Board with respect to the decisions having to be made on Southern Indian Lake. I phrase this question in the context that at the hearings Mr. Cass-Beggs indicated that on or about July 1st we would be having further major decisions in this respect.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been meetings between members of the government and members of the Hydro Board, but when the honourable member uses the term "latterly" I'm afraid it's a little too precise for me to be able to respond to that. The meetings did take place approximately three weeks to a month ago and I anticipate that there will be meetings held between the Minister reporting for Hydro and officers of Manitoba Hydro some time in the next ten days. That's about all I can advise my honourable friend at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is he aware of the fact that there are a number of companies who made applications to the Manitoba Development Fund who find that their applications for loan have been delayed in the past few weeks?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware if that is a fact but if the honourable member will provide me outside of the House with more detailed information, I'll be pleased to look into the matter.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Does the Minister know whether there is in fact a number of loans before the Manitoba Development Fund that have not been processed?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Development Fund, as the honourable member should know better than I in fact, is in continual receipt of applications for loans and I indeed hope there are many applications, the more the better. I think that's a good sign. And I say that the MDF is carrying on as per usual.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the First Minister and relates to the allocation of Federal funds for Manitoba Centennial projects. Can the First Minister confirm that he has now received a further allocation of federal funds in the amount of 2.7 millions of dollars?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that yes, but it is not additional monies involved, it is simply the payment of an installment of the \$5 million that was announced several months ago and announced several times - it's the same five million.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister indicate which centennial projects in Manitoba will receive the benefit of this grant from the Federal Government, that is the total five millions of dollars?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, about the only way to answer that question is to say that all those centennial projects which the administration of Manitoba, present and past, and the Manitoba Centennial Corporation, agreed would be eligible to receive amounts of that money, those are the ones that are receiving the money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to have a question to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. MCGILL: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister indicate if it is true that there are six such projects that are going to be under the benefit of these funds?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe if I made a real effort I could itemize, but it would be better I think for the honourable member to submit an Order for Return and then I can provide him with the specific information in a way that is certain to be correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if your government is considering some means of compensating the farmers who have not been able to seed because of weather conditions this spring?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, questions pertaining to that have been asked in this House a week or two ago, and I have sent a communication to the Prime Minister in that respect and I believe that the Minister of Agriculture here has also been in communication with the federal authorities. I have no response as yet which I can report on.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I understand that there are several large forest fires raging in the north, one 90 miles wide front. Could he give a report to the House on what steps the government are taking to fight the fires and the number of people employed?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a similar question was asked by the Member for Roblin about a week ago and I have an answer to it which I have neglected to bring into the House. I'll try and have that this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the other day - I think it was the Honourable Member from Elmwood asked a question in connection with the distribution of bursaries and I have information from the Department of Education, Youth and Education, as follows: "There are two kinds of University bursaries, the undergraduate for students already in attendance and entrance bursaries for students beginning study at the University. The undergraduate bursaries are assessed by committees at each of the universities. It is expected students can be notified by early August. Entrance bursaries are being assessed in our own Youth and Education Department at the present time. Everything then has to wait for the results of the High School Examination Board examinations which are normally ready about the end of July. Generally the processing takes about one month so that students receive word in the latter part of August. With the end of this system of final examinations in June, next year it should be possible to complete these bursaries earlier."

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Education in the absence of the Minister. The Government Student Employment Program - could he inform the House how many high school students have been employed under this program?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not in a position to give those specifics because I think as my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education has indicated, there is a rapid development in this area and to give a specific figure at any given date would be very difficult, but from what I'm given to understand, employment or the location of employment has been much better.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister undertake to give a report in the next few days? I ask for a reason. I know of students who applied whose family income is very very low and they haven't even received a reply.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that a type of report could be given, but how definitive and how satisfying it would be I don't know. I'm sure that there's - there's just one thing, Mr. Speaker, that no one can assure that all high school students in this province will be able to get employment and that's something that is beyond, I think, our capacity. However, I'm satisfied that the department, under the leadership and the instigation of the Minister - who, hopefully, will be able to confirm what I say - has been doing everything possible to secure the widest application of employment for high school and university students, and to suggest anything otherwise I think is demeaning of my colleague.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that prompts a supplementary question. Is he aware

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) that there are high school students and college students working around this building whose parents' incomes are in the neighbourhood of \$18,000 a year, and there are students who have applied whose parents' incomes are in the neighbourhood of four and five thousand a year and they haven't received an answer?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the First Minister correctly? Did he indicate in reply to a question from the Honourable Member for Emerson constituency that the First Minister had approached the Prime Minister of Canada relative to assistance for people who have been unable to seed because of flooding?

MR. SCHREYER: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. I addressed a communication to the Prime Minister in that connection. It was about ten days ago now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, then I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate to the House what contacts he has made with Ottawa, and when?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the position of the government is that the Premier communicated directly with the Prime Minister with a copy to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: But, Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Agriculture as to what contacts he made with Ottawa, not the First Minister, but what contacts the Minister of Agriculture made.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that was explained in the House about ten days ago.

MR. MOLGAT: It was not explained in the House ten days ago, because when I asked the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, it is a question, Mr. Speaker, and in the light of the answer of the Minister then I must refer to Hansard, and I'm referring to Hansard Page 3111, the 23rd of June, when in reply to a question from myself the Minister said: "I have had people consulting with Ottawa on this point." Then secondly, on Page 3112, when I persisted in my questioning, the Minister said: "I've had some discussion with members in Ottawa yesterday." And my question to the Minister, whom did he contact in Ottawa?

MR. USKIW: I think my honourable friend ought to know that there are 265 members of the House of Commons with whom some of which I had discussions.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Agriculture, whom did he contact in Ottawa?

MR. USKIW: Well, I think to answer my honourable friend, I would have to say that I was in touch with the members of the NDP caucus in Ottawa on the subject matter and that they were involved in getting information for me in connection with the possibilities -- (Interjection) -- that's right, and that subsequent to the question of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I had said that we are undertaking a study of the seriousness of the problem after which we will prepare a communiqué to the Government of Canada.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. I wonder, could the Minister tell us what the NDP caucus in Ottawa decided what they were going to do about the flooding conditions here?

MR. USKIW: Well, I think the events since have been relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will inform the House how many members there are of the NDP Party in the Federal House of Commons of 265.

MR. USKIW: I think there are sufficient numbers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable the First Minister. Can we read from your answer that unless there is assistance given from the Federal Government that the Provincial Government wouldn't undertake any kind of assistance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure that the honourable member is aware that he is at liberty to interpret replies in any manner he chooses . . .

MR. GIRARD: No, I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: He is.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind replying to the question even though, whether

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) it's in order might remain a moot point. I'd like to say to the Honourable Member for Emerson that our experience in negotiations with the Federal Government is such that we have found that every time the province does undertake an expenditure, be it even in matters that hitherto have always been federal in jurisdiction such as Indian Affairs, as soon as the province undertakes an expenditure the Federal Government in many cases has used it as a pretext for reducing its input of expenditures in that same field of responsibility. Therefore it would be imprudent on our part to make any kind of special payment of compensation in agriculture of this kind until and unless we have a clear understanding, meeting of minds between the two levels of government. Failure to do so will result I am afraid in an even larger decrease in federal involvement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the First Minister. I wonder if that statement is the reason or an explanation why the Provincial Government has not lived up to its responsibilities with the fish processing companies who have been declared redundant.

MR. SCHREYER: If I may, Sir, be so bold as to suggest to you that that question is out of order on the grounds that it is argumentative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. A number of weeks have gone by now in regards to the mercury content in fish. I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate to this House whether the situation is improved or is it the same as it has been over the past summer months, or when it was first noticed.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the fish situation, it remains the same.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I made a press release in the House on this, I believe last Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House - I know there have been discussions with the fish processing companies - what progress has been made in settling their claims of redundancy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Mines and Resources has had some meetings with representatives of the fish processors and I believe that some agreement was reached as to times for future meetings of the same kind.

While I'm on my feet may I say to the Honourable Member for River Heights that his allegation that we have not lived up to our responsibilities under the agreement relative to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board and Fish Processing is something which he may allege but which has never been alleged to us by the Federal Minister of Fisheries, and that point should be clearly understood.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Is the First Minister not aware that legal action may be commenced against the government for failure to live up to its obligations in connection with the redundancy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that of course is an eventuality which may well take place, but I'm not suggesting that there's anything wrong with it. The courts will decide.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Does the Minister, the First Minister not feel that the more decent and humane thing would be to settle with the people who have been put out of business?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking the Honourable First Minister for an expression of opinion, and that type of question is out of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I'm aware that the question is asking for an expression of opinion, but I would like to answer the honourable member saying that if he wants to start talking about humane treatment by government, I can think of a few instances in the past few years where people have had their properties expropriated for certain purposes and the sequence of events was such that in many cases they had to wait more than just two or three years. -- (Interjection) -- No, but I'm suggesting that he should look in the mirror first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Honourable Member for Assinibola offered a suggestion to our department insofar as posting signs indicating as to where boat launching facilities are available and I would

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd.) He to report to the honourable member that our department has taken that suggestion under advisement.

Some time earlier the same member also asked a question in regard to drownings in the Province of Manitoba. I believe he meant total drownings, or overall in the Province of Manitoba. Back in 1966 - I can give you a record of four years - back in 1966 there were a total of 57; in 1967 there were 69; in 1968 there were 50; and in 1969 there was a considerable increase, a total of 74. Now this is drownings in Manitoba in general, but drownings in Provincial Parks, supervised areas, in 1966 there was one drowning and in a unsupervised area there was also one; in 1967 there were four in supervised areas and two in the unsupervised areas; in 1968 there was only one drowning - that was in the unsupervised area; and in 1969 there were four in the supervised area and one in the unsupervised area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. During the session I questioned whether quarterly financial statements would be made available to members of the House. I passed on to him copies of the Province of Alberta that was issuing reports of the kind. Has the government now given consideration and will members be provided with quarterly financial statements of operation?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, this problem is pretty low in my list of priorities and I just haven't gotten around to it. I've asked the department to look into the feasibility of it but I have not received a report and I've indicated to them that the pressure on this is such that I feel there are more important matters before us.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, it might be more important to the Minister but I think honourable members

MR. SPEAKER: . . . a question?

MR. FROESE: . . . high priority, and would he not give a greater priority to this situation than he does?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will not give it a greater priority because we are all very busy in this House, and the honourable member has now been a member of this House for much longer than I have and has managed very well in all that time without that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On the 29th of June the Honourable Member for Rhineland asked a question as to whether or not the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations would be meeting either during the session or after the session, and it is my understanding that it is rare for the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations to meet during the session, but it is the intention to have a resolution moved here authorizing that committee to meet after the session, between sessions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the last announcement of the First Minister, I wonder whether he can indicate, in the event that the Standing Committee on Economic Development does not meet before the end of the session, whether there'll be a resolution introduced so that the Standing Committee will meet in between sessions.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is on the Order Paper.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, and by way of explanation, I note with pleasure that we had a federal MP sent out at the request of the Minister to help open the Portage la Prairie Old Home Week of celebrations on Saturday, so my question is, is this going to be a continuing practice of this government to detail a federal MP who has no provincial responsibilities to act for this government at functions throughout the province?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't suggest that it would be a standing practice, but inasmuch as it is our centennial year and I was not able to be at that event personally and there wasn't really enough time to arrange for a colleague in the Cabinet, it was one of those ad hoc arrangements that was made. I think that on a similar occasion I did make a similar arrangement with some honourable member opposite, which just goes to show that I'm capable of doing some pretty unorthodox things from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Some days ago I asked him his position on Bill 160 and 96-C, and at that time the Minister indicated, Mr. Speaker, that he would be meeting with the Provincial Ministers of Agriculture. My question, Mr. Speaker, is will the Minister be making a submission and will that submission and his position be made known to the farm organizations of the Province of Manitoba and to this Legislative Assembly?

MR. USKIW: I think my honourable friend ought to know that that is one item that could be very well considered by the committee which is going to meet between sessions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable First Minister on Page 3 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition,

THAT on the fifteenth day of July 1970, there be tendered to Her Majesty the Queen an Address of Welcome on her visit to the Province of Manitoba expressing the delight of all her people of our Province that she does them great honour of visiting Manitoba on this One Hundredth Anniversary of our Province's entry into Confederation, such Address bidding Her Majesty a sincere and warm welcome and setting out the loyalty and devotion of all of her subjects in Manitoba to Her Majesty as our Queen.

And that the said Address do further set out a particular reference to Her Majesty's husband, His Royal Highness The Prince Philip who accompanies her on this visit, thanking His Royal Highness for again honouring our Province with his presence and reminding His Royal Highness that the people of the Province of Manitoba recollect with gratitude his previous visit to Manitoba when he opened the Pan-American Games in Winnipeg in 1967 and when he endeared himself to our people.

And that the Address further set out a particular reference to His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales on this his first visit to Manitoba assuring His Royal Highness of the goodwill of all Manitobans to His Royal Highness and the prayers of our people as he takes up his heavy burden of state responsibility as our Prince of Wales and assuring him of the loyal support of all our people.

And that the said Address set out particularly a warm welcome to Her Royal Highness The Princess Anne on her first visit to our Province and assure Her Royal Highness The Princess Anne of our delight at her being with us during this our Centennial year and that our hearts are open to her.

And that the said Address to Her Majesty the Queen do set out that this her Legislature Assembly of Manitoba recognizes that the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, His Royal Highness The Prince Philip, His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales and Her Royal Highness The Princess Anne is a heavy one for them all and that their personal sacrifice in visiting us and paying us this great honour in taking part in our Centennial celebrations is not only recognized and acknowledged by us but most deeply appreciated by all her devoted and loyal subject in this her Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be fitting I think to say a few words, a few brief words in support of the Resolution, and I presume of course that the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will want to do likewise.

I think that inasmuch as this is our Centennial Year and the Royal Family is visiting the Province of Manitoba, it is altogether appropriate that we do vote in this Assembly to tender such an Address to Her Majesty as is referred to in the Resolution itself. For that matter, even if it weren't our Centennial Year, if there were a visit from the Royal Family it would be appropriate to do the same.

I believe honourable members will agree that since time immemorial there has been debates between people as to the best possible form of government, and there are those who would argue with great feelings that since the beginning of the recording of history the one form of government that has demonstrated itself to be the most efficacious is parliamentary

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) democracy and that parliamentary democracy seems, in the light of human experience over past decades and centuries, to work best under a constitutional monarchy form of government.

There are some who might say that democracy may not be the best form of government, that it lacks certain arrangements to bring about greater efficiency, but for anyone who might be tempted to think in this rather negative way of some of the shortcomings of democracy under a constitutional monarchy, I refer them to, I think, a very telling declaration once made by the late Sir Winston Churchill when he said that he readily agreed that democracy was not a very good form of government, but he hastened to add that it was the best form that man had yet devised, and I think that that statement in itself is one that should be handed on from generation to generation.

In our times we have no reason to be blasé in discussions as to the best form of government. There is need to keep in mind some of the principles of government, forms of government that have been refined only after many long centuries of human effort, and so today I would like in a brief way to re-dedicate our support and to ask for re-dedication of support for parliamentary democracy under a constitutional monarch. It is, in other words, a time now for all of us to make a reaffirmation of our affection for the Royal Family and also a time for us here in the Legislative Assembly to reaffirm our support for our form of government under a monarchy, under a rule of law, or, in other words, the constitution. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I say that I would like to, on behalf of our caucus and myself, associate us with the words of the First Minister as he represented this Resolution asking for an Address to Her Majesty and the comments that he made related to it.

Rather than cover the same subject matter, I indicate my support of the sentiments that he has expressed and remind members of the House that I think that we had a unanimous resolution of this Legislature last fall expressing the confidence of the members of this House in the monarchy as it has existed in Manitoba and in Canada over these many years.

Speaking of the Royal Family, we are aware of course of the fact that there are two members of the family that will be in Manitoba for the first time, and we look forward to their presence and we look forward to the opportunity of showing the respect and the honour that we have for them as individuals and the responsibilities that they hold in relation to the form of government that we enjoy.

I can recall the last time that the Queen was in Manitoba and I can recall very well the reception that all Manitobans generally gave her. I think that as members of the Royal Family spread out across the province of Manitoba to varying areas, that the reception that they will receive this year will be such that it will certainly be the highlight of the celebration of Manitoba's Centennial, not just as we reflect on our first hundred years but, Mr. Speaker, as we project ourselves over these next hundred years.

So without going into any greater detail, Mr. Speaker, I say I associate myself and members of our caucus with the Resolution as it has been presented by the First Minister.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party would like to associate ourselves with the well-spoken sentiments of the First Minister and the Leader of the Official Opposition. I think that many, or practically all Manitobans look forward to the visit of Her Majesty and her husband, Prince Philip, and the Prince of Wales and Princess Anne, and I'm sure that we'll all try to be as gracious, as hosts and hostesses, as our visitors.

I think if we examine our short history in working with constitutional democracy, that this form of government has been hastened along by the unifying and the continuing type of government that we have enjoyed here in Manitoba and in all of Canada, and I think that we recognize the strong bond with Great Britain and we look forward to continuing association with the Commonwealth for many years to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) --

MR. FROESE: Leave? My goodness!

MR. WEIR: On a point of order, I don't think that I would like to see the record clouded on this particular issue by asking any member to speak in terms of leave, because every member of this House has an opportunity - this is not a statement, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, this is a formal Resolution - and I think that it should be pointed out that no

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) member needs leave to speak on this Resolution.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I take strong exception to members calling for leave when I get up to speak on a resolution of this nature and especially on this occasion. I feel that I want to join in with other speakers.

MR. GREEN: I think that I let my sense of humour get away with me and I apologize to the honourable member.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too want to join with leaders of the other parties who have expressed their hope and desire in that we will have Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, as well as His Highness the Prince of Wales and Her Royal Highness the Princess Anne, to visit Manitoba on this Centennial Year and this year of celebration that we have in Manitoba. I certainly am in accord in welcoming them to Manitoba. For many of us, this will be the first and the last experience of such a nature and I feel that it is of great importance.

I certainly, and the group that I represent, would wish them an enjoyable stay and one in where we hope the weather will co-operate and that many of her subjects in this province will be able to turn out and show to her their allegiance. This is really an honour for the people of this province to have Her Majesty pay this Royal Visit at a time when many of the monarchies are threatened in this world, and during the latter years we have seen many of them vanish from the various countries. I feel that we should be very proud and that we are very privileged in still having the monarchy retained over these many years, and I certainly do hope that the monarchy will be there for many years to come.

On behalf of my group, I certainly want to convey best wishes that they will have a very pleasant stay in Manitoba.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Monsieur le président, j'aimerais à cette occasion prendre un peu de temps de la chambre dans l'autre langue officielle de la chambre et de notre pays. Je tiens à signaler notre attachement à la souveraine et à sa famille. Certains ont cru dans le passé que la Reine était cause de division dans notre pays. Je crois bien au contraire qu'elle est une cause d'unité et quelque soit notre origine ethnique, quelque soit la langue dans laquelle on parle, quelque soit notre passé, nous pouvons voir dans ce symbole une importance significative s'il est bien compris. Je regrette que notre souveraine ne se trouve pas au Canada plus souvent. Je crois que ce serait une valeur acquise si chaque année certains membres de la famille royale nous visitaient. A cette occasion, je veux ajouter quelques mots à ceux qui ont déjà été prononcés pour souhaiter la bienvenue à sa Majesté et sa famille et répéter le dévouement que nous avons envers elle. Beaucoup de canadiens considèrent sa Majesté non seulement comme un personnage important en soi mais comme le symbole de l'unité canadienne.

English Translation

I would like, on this occasion, to take up a few minutes of your time to speak in the other official language of the House and of Canada. I wish to point out, as others already have, our deep attachment to Our Sovereign and her family. It was felt in the past that the Queen was a cause for dissent in Canada. I believe on the contrary, that she helped to further unity in our country. Whatever our ethnic origin, whatever our tongue, whatever our past, we can realize the significance the symbol of sovereignty holds for Canada. I only regret that our sovereign cannot visit Canada more often. I think receiving certain members of the Royal family could become a valued tradition.

I would like to extend our welcome to Her Majesty and her family and reiterate our devotion to her. Many Canadians consider her not only as an important personage but as a symbol of Canadian unity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I just want to endorse everything that has been said on this debate on this occasion in this Hour this afternoon, and especially congratulate the Member from Ste. Rose, who I think wanted to show that the two official languages here in Manitoba and Canada certainly have the same, the people of the two official languages have the same warm feeling for the Royal Family. If he allows me, I think that the main thing that I was getting ready to say before he did, but I would certainly like to unite with him and maybe just say these words so that everybody could understand and won't have to listen to Hansard, is that we feel in Manitoba that the visit of the Royal Family will

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) serve to unite all the people of Manitoba.

I know that the French community has expressed the desire to do something special to show how warmly they felt towards the Queen of Canada and her family and this will be done, and I know that all the many members of the different ethnic groups have done the same thing, have asked for the same request, certain presentation for the Queen. There may be times in certain other provinces when this hasn't been as happy an occasion, but I am sure we are all congratulating each other for being fortunate enough to be here on this occasion, our Centennial, when the Royal Family will visit us. Again I agree, especially with the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose, that this will do nothing but unite us as Manitobans and as Canadians. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take advantage of this opportunity and congratulate the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and those that have taken part in this discussion today. I think it's a tremendous thing that members of the Royal Family are going to spend some five days with us on this hundredth birthday.

I look at the Royal Family, Mr. Speaker, with the thought of the Monarchy and the Crown being symbolic of the unity of the Commonwealth representing as it does some 34 nations and some 800 million people across the world. This I feel, Mr. Speaker, is quite an accomplishment, and the respect that the people of Manitoba will show the Royal Family during their five days amongst us, will be the respect that the number of people that I've just outlined to you would afford her had they the opportunity that we as Canadians are going to have in the few days that lie ahead. I hope and trust for many, many years to come, and in fact for another century, that our parliamentary way of operating and governing and doing what we can in the interest of the people will be sustained for that length of time and I deem it an opportunity and a privilege to have added my few words on this auspicious occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Pane Spiker, ya makoj chochu prylyuchytys go sliw Premiera u prywity do koroliwskoyi rogyny wig Manitobctw z Ukrainskoho pochodjenia.

English Translation

Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the words of the Premier in his extension of greetings to the Royal Family, and particularly from Manitobans of Ukrainian origin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I feel as a representative not only of government but also of one of the ethnic minorities, one of whom has spoken, that I too must rise on this occasion and express my great pleasure at the visit to Manitoba of the Royal Family.

The Icelandic community of which I am a member, settled in Manitoba five years after Manitoba became the first province after Confederation. They settled here in 1875. About three years after that the community on the shores of Lake Winnipeg was visited by Lord Dufferin who was then the Governor-General of the country and he brought to them greetings from their homeland which he had visited just a few years before. Lord Dufferin was a great admirer of Iceland as a nation and of the Icelandic people and he gave that admiration expression on that occasion when he visited them. Then several years later the Icelandic community was visited again by another representative of the Crown. It gives me pleasure to add these few words to those that have already been spoken and if I might launch into a word or two in the Icelandic language I would say:

Thad gleður mig meira en ég get útskýrt að drottning thessarar thjodar kenur hingad nú á næstu dögum, hún og maður hennar, prinsinn, sem ber sama nafnid og ég, Prince Phillip, sonur theirra og dóttir. Thau verda hér með okkur thessa næstu fau daga, og okkur thykir öllum vaent um tækifaerid til að geta tekid á móti theim á veglegan hátt.

Eg thakka fyrir herra forseti.

English Translation

It pleases me more than I can say that the Queen of this nation is coming here in the next few days, she and her husband, the Prince who bears the same name as I, Prince Phillip, and their son and daughter.

They will be here with us for a few days and we are all pleased with the opportunity of

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) being able to greet them in an appropriate manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I can't bring greetings in Eskimo, Mr. Speaker, so I'll have to rely on English -- at least I call it English. I think it's rather appropriate that the Royal Family follow the tradition of Europeans in coming to Manitoba through the Port of Churchill which of course was where the first white men set foot in Manitoba. I join with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the many others who have spoken today in welcoming the Royal Family in Manitoba. I think it is welcomed by the people of Churchill, the Eskimos, the Indians and the white people especially so now that they have found out that the Premier will be there with the Royal Family to join in the festivities on that first day in Manitoba. I trust that the weather will be good. The ice has left the harbour and I am sure that all will be well when the Royal Family touches down for the first time in Manitoba.

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

. continued on next page

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I won't call the bill now but I did wish to call Bill No. 138. I believe the Member for River Heights wants to speak on it so in the meantime could I call Bill No. 114.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 114. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GREEN: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Churchill was speaking on Bill No. 87. Had that been concluded?

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

MR. MOLGAT presented Bill No. 114, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act(2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I'm proposing the bill I guess members won't be surprised that I say I consider it to be an important bill. They wouldn't expect me to think otherwise. In seriousness though, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is in fact an important bill in setting down in statute what I believe has been the practice in the British House, which occasionally has happened in the Canadian House, but has not been really accepted as part of the traditions of this House and for that matter of the Canadian parliamentary structure, and I think that this Act is a very important one in making this House a more important instrument of government. By putting into statute what this bill proposes, I submit that we will be making the members of the House more meaningful individuals and at the same time more responsible individuals. It will mean that the debates of this House will be relative to the question then before the House and that every decision taken will be taken in the light and in the merits of the case before us and not with the possible threat of an election.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the members of the House would all look upon this bill not in terms of their party position, not in terms of their specific responsibilities in this House, be it as Premier, Cabinet Ministers, Leader of the Opposition, Leader of another party, but as individual private members of the House, and how can we make the House more effective. How can we make the debates in this House more meaningful? How can we transfer into this House the decision-making process which should be here which I feel too frequently does not reside here but resides in the party caucus of the governing party of the time.

I think that by putting into the Legislative Assembly Act the amendments that I have here we will in fact be doing exactly that. It will mean that the debates here will be the real debates concerning the issues; that the Ministers will come here with their proposals and will have to convince this House and a majority of the members in this House that the proposals are in fact sound. It may mean in some cases that they will get support from others than their own party members. Some of their party members may not support a specific measure but they may find support in other parts of the House.

I know that some will object, Mr. Speaker, and say that this is a departure from the standard British parliamentary practice. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in fact it is not, because I think that in the British House of Commons they have been much wiser than we have in many instances by moving ahead and not being hidebound by tradition themselves and being practical about their developments, and this is the real genius, to me, of the English parliamentary structure, for that matter the English legal structure, that it adapts, and I think that very frequently we have failed to adapt in this country. We've accepted the British practice; we've brought it here and then we've solidified it at that point and ceased after that to let it develop as the British have. So because of that failure I think on our part to adapt, I feel that the answer is at this time to put it into the statute. So I think that this merely reflects what in fact does happen in the House of Commons in Britain at this time, that the government does not consider simply a defeat of a government measure as a defeat of the government, but only when it is a want of confidence motion or a money measure does it become a real defeat of the government. Now I suggest then to those who would say that this is a departure from tradition, think it over again; I think it is simply ensuring that we are in fact keeping up with the times.

Others might be tempted to oppose the bill on the basis that it removes from the First Minister a prerogative which has been accepted as his, and that is the one of deciding when an election should be called. Well it doesn't, Mr. Speaker. I know that the First Minister has indicated at some time previously that he was somewhat interested in the American system of having fixed dates for elections and I think he has given this matter some thought. This

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) does not go anywhere near that far. I see some problems with fixed dates for elections and the British parliamentary structure of a responsible executive, because it would mean that if you had a fixed date then this House really would have no means of making the executive responsible because there would be no obligation at any time for the executive to do anything if in fact it were defeated in this House.

This does not do that. This bill retains the flexibility of the British structure; it retains for the First Minister the right to call an election whenever he so decides; it retains the right of this House to determine at any time that the government does not have the confidence of this House. All those things remain. But what it does do is it takes away that shackle that we presently have, in our minds at least, that a defeat on a major measure means a defeat of the government per se, because what this bill would do is simply this, that if a measure recommended by the government or by one of the Ministers were to be defeated in this House, that defeat by itself would not mean the defeat of the government. What it would mean is that the following day, either by decision of one of the members of the House, or if that should fall by decision of Mr. Speaker at the end of the day, a specific second question would be asked: Does this government have the confidence of the House?

It would then remove in the process of our debates the question of whether a measure is right or wrong from the question of whether or not the members want to have an election or don't want to have an election. I submit at this time that too frequently the decisions of the House are predicated by the fact that if a vote goes a certain way it is going to mean the defeat of the government, which is going to mean an election, and that that is not the basis on which this House should be debating issues, that we should debate the issues here on the basis of whether the issue is right or wrong, or whether a measure proposed by the First Minister or a Cabinet Minister is the right thing for Manitoba per se, on the basis of that measure, not on the basis of a threat that should that not pass an election will be held.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not making that suggestion because of fears of elections. I've fought many elections during my political career and I recognize that that's the way the system works and I'm not afraid of elections, but I think that the people of our province do not want perpetual elections -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon? -- (Interjection) -- A few more left in me, yes, by all means. -- (Interjection) -- Not at all, not at all. It's what keeps the system going. But I think that the people of the province have the right to expect that there will not be constantly recurring elections merely because there is a disagreement in this House on how a certain issue should be handled, that if there is to be an election it should be on whether or not the government in fact has the confidence of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this bill in a sense is the Magna Carta of the private members of the House because it gives them the independence to vote as they wish. It means that the private member then will be an individual who will make his decision based on what he thinks is right on the issue, not on a statement by a Cabinet Minister that if you don't vote for it it will mean the defeat of the government and an election. I suggest that this is a major forward measure in parliamentary reform.

Now it's happened before, Mr. Speaker, because this is exactly what was done in the House of Commons in Ottawa, and I think my honourable friend the First Minister was a member of that House at the time when the government of the Honourable Mr. Pearson was defeated on a major issue, mind you, a money matter, a money bill, but defeated in a sense on a technicality, because what happened was basically that the Whips failed in their count. I think that's the only explanation for it, that they called the vote without knowing in fact how many members were in the House that night. The vote was held; the government was defeated on the measure.

Technically, the government should have resigned; in fact many members in that House at the time called for resignation. The Prime Minister said no, it was a technical defeat, and what we will do is we will give the House the opportunity to vote on whether or not they want a change of government. The following day a regular vote was held on the question of did the House have confidence in the government or not. The government was sustained and there was no election called.

So the precedent is there within our Canadian parliamentary practice, and, Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is really in the interests of the Canadian people because that defeat that night in the House of Commons in Ottawa was not really a reflection of how the House really felt about the government at the time, it was an accidental defeat because there happened to

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) be some people out of their seats.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the government here, in spite of their very small majority, should be defeated on a technicality and I don't think that the people of Manitoba want it that way. If the House on an issue is determined that the government is wrong, wants to vote that way, the House should be able to vote that way. If the House feels that the government does not have the confidence, the House has the right to vote that way and defeat the government, but I don't believe that a technical defeat should carry an election as a complete and immediate result, because I don't think that that's in the interests of Manitoba or of the people of Manitoba or that is the reason why we are here as members of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the members of the House to look upon the bill as private members of the House. Forget your present position, Cabinet Minister or ex-Cabinet Minister or what may be, but think of it in terms of how can we make this House a more meaningful instrument of government; how can we have the private members of this House participate more fully in the decision-making process in Manitoba. It may be that some of my friends from the Cabinet will say this is going to reduce some of the power of the Cabinet. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that might be a good thing. I would like the Cabinet Ministers - and it's difficult to appeal to them I suppose to take that sort of an approach to it - but I repeat to them, what's the purpose of this House? Wouldn't it in the long run be better for Manitoba if they had to really convince this House that their measures are right per se, not through threats of election but per se, that the measure that's proposed is the right measure.

And my honourable friends had sufficient grounds to make that case. No. 1, it would force them to do their homework much more adequately; they would have to have their case much more completely developed. There would be, I think, a more wholesome discussion here in this House because it would relate back to the prime issue at the time, that is whether the measure is right or wrong, and I think that the whole of the process would be better. We've heard many times, Mr. Speaker, particularly in Ottawa, how the private members in Ottawa, particularly on the government side, have little to do; how there must be some means devised of making them more meaningful, of giving them really more participation in government. We've heard a good deal talked about participatory democracy and so on. I believe that these measures would give every member of the House more participation in government. It would make every private member an individual who had to make his decision on every issue on that issue. He would be unable to hide behind the skirts of his Party and say my party has decided so and so and therefore I have no alternative. He would be a free man who could vote as he wished on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make it clear that my proposal is not related to any bills that are presently before this House. And that question was asked of me, as to whether because of Bill 56 that I brought this in. I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that a group of people who have been working with me on questions of parliamentary reform, not just here in Manitoba but on the whole question of Canadian parliamentary reform, have been working on this for some months and that this proposal was not one that was brought in for the purpose of one particular bill before this House. It is unrelated totally to that bill. It is based on a fairly lengthy study by a group of people as to how we could make the Canadian parliamentary structure, and here in Manitoba our own structure, a more up-to-date modern part of government; how we could make this House a real instrument of government where we would participate in the decisions and not simply be a debating society, where decisions made really on the outside came back here for stamp of approval. The decision process would rest much more here in the House. It would mean that every member would have his immediate, individual responsibility in that process.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the members of the House to look upon this not from a Party sense, not from a sense of their immediate responsibilities, but from a sense of how can we make government more effective; how can we make the legislative process a more meaningful process; how can this House really relate to the people of Manitoba better than it does now and convince them that it is in fact a body that can make decisions and can do the things that the people want done, not necessarily that the executive wants at that time, that the Party wants at that time, but that the people, through their 57 individually elected members, want to have done.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say at the outset when I first took a look at the bill as proposed by the Member for Ste. Rose that I had several reservations. Mr. Speaker, today I'm not entirely sure that all those reservations have been explained. However, in the interest of the business of this House, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that every member in this Chamber consider carefully the words that we have received today from the Member from Ste. Rose. His record in this House alone merits that attention. But further than that, Mr. Speaker, the depth of study that this member has placed into the work that he has now provided for us to consider, I think is something that each and every one of us must study carefully. I personally believe that the effects would probably be more far-reaching than what the member has indicated, and probably they should be. The business of Manitoba must come ahead of private and Party principles. We as elected MLA's must do everything we can to ensure that the people of Manitoba get the best legislation that is possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the amendment such as is proposed by the Member for Ste. Rose would accomplish that - and, Mr. Speaker, I qualify it with an "if" - I am 100 percent behind it. I think there are a few points that he has to convince me of yet, but I would urge that at the present time this piece of legislation should be considered by either a Committee of the Whole or a special committee because I think it is important and the people of Manitoba are waiting for legislation such as this.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I go back and recall the Member for Brandon, Reg Lissaman's remarks in respect to what he felt was the weakness of government in Manitoba and under the British system. There were times when we compared it with the American government and their ways, and we found that in debating it at times it was difficult to fit the two of them together and come out with something that was realistic, but I think if there was any one point that the two of us did agree on, was the fact that if we could in some way allow for a vote such as the Member for Ste. Rose is suggesting in Bill 114, it would be in fact a good thing for this Legislature.

Therefore, I am going to endorse it as far as I am concerned. The reservation I have, and it goes back through the years in thinking about it, is whether we would give up the assurance of the good attendance that we do have in this House, and we have had in this House up till now. This is the one real crux that comes back every time Mr. Lissaman and I used to talk about it, was what assurance would there be that we would have attendance of the calibre that we have in the Manitoba Legislature, for I'm sure it is equal to any on the North American continent. I think that somehow or other that would have to be overcome, or else we would have to just forego the problem of attendance because I think that the policy behind this bill is even greater and better than the attendance figure, because if somebody isn't interested enough to attend, then certainly if you force them to attend then they are not going to be a good member anyway. -- (Interjection) -- As the Member for St. James-Assiniboia says, the electorate will catch up with those who do not want to do their homework and pay attention to the job of trying to assist the legislation that is set forth for Manitoba.

The Member for Ste. Rose is very concerned about Bill 56 at this time and the fact that possibly there would be some criticism on his bill and some reflection that it is giving government a way out if they were defeated on Bill 56. This may well be right, and there would be two thoughts that come to my mind. First of all, the bill could be brought in at a later date, or proclaimed at a later date. If this is what we have to fight about and call an election about, and we have to go to the people and fight about Bill 56, then that's up to government.

On the other hand, I suppose we could use this bill as the way to get around Bill 56 and allow a proper registration of the thinking of all members of this House. And maybe that is more important, Mr. Speaker, than trying to force somebody who is in a Chair to cast the deciding vote. I think that perhaps the fact that if there was ever a need for us to reconsider this type of legislation, maybe it is now. Maybe we have come to the decision, to the time to decide. Maybe there needs to be a cooling off, and if this is the way to do it, then I say that we have in front of us the legislation and the way in which we can quickly do it, and that's by passing Bill 114 and making it our legislation as quickly as possible. And that can be done, we know, by leave within a very few days.

I believe that in my experience sitting in government caucus that there were times, just as there are with all members, all back bench members of any government caucus, in which they come out of caucus quite frustrated because they have not been able to make their point and they're being forced to vote against something or for something that they're not entirely in

(MR. BEARD cont'd) agreement with and Party discipline has taken away their right to vote as they please. -- (Interjection) -- It certainly has, Mr. Speaker, it certainly has, and if this Cabinet feels that they can say that it hasn't taken the right away from their caucus members, then it is something that I would like to debate with them, because you just don't do things that way in politics today. You've got to debate it in caucus and you've got to make your decisions in caucus, and those decisions you made behind closed doors; and this is the way government has operated for many years -- and perhaps it's the right way, perhaps it's the right way. But I don't think we have to accept it as the right way just because it's been done for years.

In the Throne Speech they said that they were prepared to review those things which we had been doing for years because somebody had made the decision many years ago to do it that way. I think that it would give a freedom to backbenchers, not to vote against Cabinet Ministers particularly but to better represent, to much better represent the area in which they are voted in as members of this Assembly. Because you cannot tell me that the Member for Flin Flon has the same problems to deal with as the Member for Emerson in his constituency, in their constituencies rather. They have to make their own decisions. There are many cases in which the thinking of members themselves are different, different to that of their party. Individually, and he was voted in as an individual.

More and more in politics we find that people are voted in on an individual basis rather than as a collective party basis. And I think that each man that is voted in here, did it, got in on his own. If they depend on the leader of a party to get into this House they will find they will rise and fall on the importance or the popularity of the leader of that party and they become lazy MLA's, and this is not good. I think that people have to get out and support the things that they believe are right; but secondly, they also have to keep in mind that they are here to make representation on the things that the people in their constituency feel are right. And they have to get up and be able to express themselves not only in talking on things but in voting.

So as I pick the difference of the Member for Flin Flon or myself, it doesn't matter which, and the Member from Emerson who cannot have the same problems in their constituencies, must have different ideas, and different priorities, and it would be good to be able to hear more and more from the backbenchers in the government side of the House so that they don't feel left out, and locked out, of the debates within this House. And they do not feel frustrated in that they cannot join in the debate the way we do in opposition. And I would say that it would help and make a healthier legislative session. I think we would have healthier debate in this House and I think it would end up in many many cases by the votes that any one particular Cabinet member lost on one particular bill from his own caucus, he would probably get support from members of opposition to balance those that he loses in his own caucus, and there is nothing wrong with this.

We are looking for majorities in this House and we're looking for a way in which we can go to the people at one particular date every four to five years, and this is what should be done instead of politicians being able to make a decision -- in fact one man, the Premier, making a decision as to when he is going to call an election. I think that it is time that we take that prerogative away from the party, the Premier -- and I don't pick on this particular party or this particular Premier, I'm sure the members will realize that. But this bill, it's the first time it's come before us; I think it's good legislation and I think if I talk too long I'll talk it down, so thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we could now go into Committee of the Whole House. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bill standing on the Order Paper.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, in a question to the government House Leader. Is there some reason that the bill that's in my name is being passed over?

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, but we are desirous of having one or two bills, Mr. Speaker, pass the Committee of the Whole House. There's one that may be very important in connection with the visit of Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. PAULLEY: Bill 99, it's a relatively short bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 99, The Thompson Charter. (Bill No. 99 was read page by page and passed.)

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 3, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 3, The Local Authorities Election Act. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand that to refresh the memories of members that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek moved a motion to amend Section 3, I believe it is, wait till I get a copy of the bill before me. Maybe he has a copy of his amendment available that he could send over. I think it's an amendment to Section 5, yes, the qualification of an elector.

The essence in any event of the honourable member's amendment was to reinstate a qualification of citizenship to a basic qualification of an elector. The qualification of citizenship had been retained in respect to the qualification of a candidate. Members of our caucus discussed the amendment during the interval and as you recall, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I moved an amendment to the amendment which would have had the effect of making provision for a landed immigrant to have the status for the purpose of voting in an election of a citizen. However, this is kind of an awkward arrangement; there was some second thinking on the part of some members of our caucus, and I'm prepared and advised, Mr. Chairman, that this side of the House is fully prepared to accept the amendment which would have the effect of reinstating the qualification, the essential qualification of citizenship as a qualification for an elector in essence then accepting the proposed amendment, but with the assurance to all members of the House that so far as the government is concerned we are concerned to find a suitable technique to provide that those who become, or come to this country with a fixed intention of living here may have a right to opt for fuller participation in government or in society.

It seems to me that perhaps we would want to have discussions with the Federal Government respecting the whole question of when an immigrant or when a person who has a landed immigrant status may be deemed to have some further rights - and it's a question of according rights to immigrants and perhaps this does touch on the question of the vires of any law that we may enact which would have anything to do with according additional rights to persons who are merely landed immigrants.

So it's the consensus of the thinking of the members of this side of the House that it will be very difficult to readily grant those extended rights even though we are concerned that people who come to this country and have manifested an intention to live permanently here do not, are not in a position to effectively exercise those rights of fuller participation in their society for such an extensive period of time, and five years we think is far too long. However as I've indicated there are problems associated with any amendment which will deal with that question.

In the interval we are prepared to accept the amendment reinstating this basic qualification of citizenship. We can certainly live with it; it's been lived with for decades and decades in this province in the past. The discussion that took place at the committee level was I think a frank exchange of opinion which brought out the feelings of members that there has been too much -- well the technique or the qualifications seemed to devote a one-sided evaluation on the right of a person to vote and I think that some change can logically be expected in due course of time. As I say, hopefully, the Federal Government will recognize the desirability of some earlier participation by those who have attained a landed immigrant status in positive participation in society.

So with those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I think that we can then proceed with the section of the bill at which we had stopped. Now I believe that that was 5(1)(c). I still haven't the amendment before me but the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek can correct me if I'm wrong. I think the amendment was that in 5 (1)(c) there would be an amendment: "A citizen who is an owner of land" - and so on. Maybe the honourable member can -- have you got a copy of the amendment before you now, Mr. Chairman? Maybe the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek can send us a copy of the amendment.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is the amendment that you have before you reinstating a Canadian citizen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I have one - I'm not sure - there's one referring to the word "is" and "a Canadian citizen of" and there's another one referring to "landed immigrants".

MR. MACKLING: No. The one which refers to landed immigrant, Mr. Chairman I've indicated is being withdrawn with the consent of the seconder; and the amendment which was proposed by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek I think was to 5(1)(c).

MR. MACKLING: Well, I have this one from last day, that Clause (a) of Subsection (1) of Section 5 of Bill 3 be amended by adding thereto immediately after the word "is" in the first line thereof, the words "a Canadian citizen". That is now again in motion, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry -- are there no further debates?

MR. MACKLING: They all passed.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: This Bill I presume is by page. Page 8. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I had a further amendment and I find now that it is not complete. I move that Clause (a) of Subsection (1) of Section 5 be amended by deleting the word "eighteen" in the first line thereof and inserting the word "nineteen" in its place.

If I may speak to it, I know that a number . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secunder?

MR. FROESE: I don't think we require a seconder in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the amendment, I know that more amendments will be required if this particular amendment passes. This means that the voting age would be changed from 18 to 19 years. I feel that we should not reduce it as far as is contemplated from 21 to 18. We know that there are other provinces in Canada, in fact there are three provinces that have the voting age of 19, and I feel that we should follow likewise, and therefore I am moving this particular motion. I do not only feel that this should be the matter as far as voting is concerned, I have the same feelings on this matter as far as the Age of Majority Act and I feel that this should be run right through in all cases. In my opinion, if we are going to use the 18 years of age for all purposes in the Age of Majority Act, and if that should be changed to 19, then certainly we should change the Elections Act as well.

I don't think that the young people of this province have really requested a reduction from 21 to 18. Certainly as far as I am concerned, I have yet to hear any representation for this change and surely enough, as has been pointed out on previous occasions by other speakers, naturally the responsibilities have to go with it. If you are giving them a certain right, they also have to accept certain responsibility, and I am not sure whether the young people are willing and have expressed their desire to assume these added responsibilities. Further to that, I feel it certainly wouldn't hurt for them to wait a year longer, to be more mature, so that I think the 19 years is more proper and certainly in my opinion a better age to be qualified as a voter in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I respect the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I realize he does a lot of work, homework and research, but I would like to suggest that there is nothing magical about 18 or 19, and if we are going to be consistent, the Federal Government is going to 18 and a number of other provinces have too, our Bill of Majority is also 18, and I can't see where we can deviate from that now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Last winter when the Municipal Affairs Committee met, one of the things I think we pretty well had unanimity on was to try and get the Local Authorities Elections Act, the Provincial Elections Act and also the Federal Elections Act, we tried to make as many of the sections for eligibility for voting and other pertinent facts as close as possible to each other, and I think in view of the fact that last year this Legislature reduced the voting age to 18 and the holding of office to 18 and the Federal Parliament in Ottawa has also done the same thing, I think it would be really silly now on the Local Authority Election level to change the age to 19. I think we should maintain the continuity all the way through and I am going to vote against the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Pages 8 and 9 were read and passed.) Page 10 -- The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on page 10 I have an amendment. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that Section 5 of Bill 3 be amended by adding thereto at the end of thereof the following subsection:

Certain British subjects deemed Canadian citizens.

5(10) For the purpose of this section, every British subject other than a Canadian citizen who is resident in Canada on the date that this Act comes into force and has not since that date ceased to be ordinarily resident in Canada shall be conclusively deemed a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Chairman, just to explain that, that means that the British subjects who are presently in Canada will not lose their right to vote and, from the date of this Act on, everybody arriving in this Province will be treated on the same basis.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my remarks, the amendments were considered and we think, as we've indicated - as a matter of fact in the committee it was the understanding of all members that the rights which had existed in the persons of those who had British subject status, it was not the intent of the committee to take away or remove any vested rights of persons who were resident in this country and had vested rights to vote, and thus the final compromise wording obviating this whole problem by making citizenship not a factor of voting was finally agreed upon by the committee, that when citizenship is reintroduced this further amendment is a necessary concomitant and therefore all it does is ensure that British subjects who were resident at the time of this enactment do not lose their citizenship and their right to vote and we therefore go along with this amendment as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member of Sturgeon Creek.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Pages 10 to 130 were read page by page and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On page 131 there are three different forms, Form 8A and 8B as well. Don't you have to read them separately?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 3 was read page by page and passed.) Bill No. 108, an Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act. (Sections 1 to 6 (7)(b) were read and passed.) (c) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, section (c) of 6(7), the period of ten days is mentioned in this clause. Mr. Chairman, many service stations employ the services of bookkeepers who come in periodically, and I was just wondering if a period of 30 days would probably not be more applicable in this particular case. It would simplify the procedures for the people who sell the gasoline if they knew that they had to submit once a month rather than within ten days after the sale. I think that it would simplify the bookkeeping for the man who operates a gasoline agency and I don't think that it would be of any serious consequence to the government. They would have a monthly period here rather than a ten day period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has brought this to my attention, but I would point out to him it has nothing whatsoever to do with his bookkeeper or indeed anything to do with his accounting or his books. The invoice must be made out at the time of the sale so the bookkeeper isn't involved in it at all. What should be done, a careful operator should every day take his invoices, or the copy for the Minister, and mail them in, but he's given ten days so he can accumulate them and send them in once a week. I think the great danger is that he would accumulate them and lose them because they're really not part of his bookkeeping record at all, and therefore since they're made up at the time of the sale he does have ten days which is ample time within which to mail it in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6 (7)(c) -- passed; 6(8) -- The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, you'll note that there is a typographical error, and I therefore move that the proposed clause (a) of subsection (8) of Section 6 of The Gasoline Tax Act, as set out in Section 3 of Bill 108, be amended by striking out the word "for" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the word "before", so it will read "apply for the refund before the first day of September."

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 108; Bills Nos. 34 and 50; and Sections 1 to 3 (2) of Bill No. 77 were read section by section and passed.) The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, there was approval to an amendment to subsection (3) of Section 3 of the bill but they were not distributed. I believe they're being given to the members now, but it was approved by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3 (3) --

MR. PAULLEY: The amendment was passed, I believe, in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3 (3)(a) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have an explanation of the wording that is used in this particular section, "in accordance with the terms of any existing practice." There might be a practice to probably pay only on a seasonal basis even though they worked at an hourly rate. Does this qualify, or can he be charged and taken to court on this very point afterwards if the labour decides to deal otherwise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The purport of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that where at the present time, as I understand it, (b) says "payment of wages within five days of the pay period," and the purport of the amendment is that wherein the practice is that they may be paid on a monthly basis or a semi-monthly basis, provisions are made for that payment to be within the expiration of that time and also insofar as collective agreements may be concerned, or that where an application is made for an extension of the time to the Minister due to computerizing payrolls and the like of that, authority may be granted. It's a matter of convenience to the employer.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm thinking in terms of farm help. Very often there are not written agreements as such. It's a verbal arrangement and there is nothing to substantiate this later on if a labourer decides differently and takes action on it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, this Act does not apply to farm help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: What section is the exception made?

MR. PAULLEY: 1(c), Mr. Chairman, under the definitions my honourable friend will find the exemption. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, (ll).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 77; Bill No. 91; and Sections 1 to 4 of Bill No. 92 were read section by section and passed.) Section 5 - 9(9) -- The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On that point the page boys are now distributing copies of the amendment to Section 5 agreed to in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 5 - 9(9) as amended -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could we have an explanation just what is the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: A representative for the construction industry that appeared before the committee took exception to the words "is not required", which means take into consideration the constitution of a union, and he made the suggestion that they shall not consider the eligibility requirement of the constitution and the committee agreed with his proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 92 and Sections 1 to 12 of Bill No. 93 were read section by section and passed.) Section 13 -- The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, copies of the amendment are being distributed. It spells out more clearly the "Commencement of the Act" to make it clear that with the changes in the legislation any omission of payment is not retroactive for the period from, I believe it was July '66 until '70, that is due to the change in the legal interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 93 was read and passed.) Bill No. 117, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder -- we have some amendments to Bill 117 and I'm going to ask one of my colleagues to formally present the motion because of course I cannot as the sponsor of the bill. The purport of the amendment being suggested would make it clear, spell out more clearly that where there is an arrangement by a collective agreement, a contract of service, in an industry if it worked on a general holiday that is more favourable than the Act, then the collective agreement or the agreement will apply; and where the reverse

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) is true, that the collective agreement makes less provisions than the Act, then the Act will apply.

And then honourable members will have received, I am sure, within the last few days a copy of a submission made by the restaurant and hotel industry in respect of the effect on the tourist industry and themselves if in effect they close down on a general holiday within the Act, and after further consideration it is suggested that the provisions of the present Employment Standards Act would apply in that the employer would be able to grant the employee another day off with pay at some other time than on the actual statutory holiday in order that it would not disrupt or be too costly to his business - and this would apply to a service station, a hospital, a hotel, place of amusement, and there is the exception of the construction industry. The construction industry is covered in the Employment Standards Act in a different section.

There's one slight change that I'm proposing, and that is that the employer should give to the employee a couple of days' notice of the alternative day in order that the employee would be aware that, say, a couple of days from now he will have his day off, with pay of course, rather than coming into work in the morning and the employer say, well today is the day you're going to get your holiday. I recommend this after the representation of the industry to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment for a moment, I commend the Minister for introducing particularly the latter amendment. It was made plain to us at committee that within these particular industries some undue hardship could arise in view of the nature of the industries mentioned. I had proposed to put in an amendment of my own at that time which is essentially the same thing as the Minister is now proposing. I'm referring to the amendment 34(16), the last one. I think the Minister's amendment is more complete in that it sets out more specifically the industries that this section would apply to and I would then ask the -- I would not present my own amendment, I withdraw that and again commend the Minister for accepting the considerations of these industries in this particular situation in this Act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader for the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Only by way of clarification, on Page 2, Section 34(16), and you go on to name certain places that can make other arrangements. What about people who work in private clubs like the Union Centre or Veterans clubs? They're not covered by either the word "hotel" or "restaurant", I don't think. Also, would this include taxi drivers and bus drivers?

MR. PAULLEY: There's no specific reference that I understand in this Act to them. I believe they're covered under the Employment Standards Act. The workers and the like of the Union Centre would be covered under the general interpretation of a restaurant; I'm sure that they're covered the same as the private clubs. I think they would come under the broad definition - and I may be corrected on this - in domestic service. I think that's embracing enough to cover the points raised by my friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, as a matter of clarification, I would like confirmation from the Minister that my interpretation of 34(16)(4), "a person employed in a continuously operating plant," could this be interpreted as being municipal services in the broad sense - and I'm speaking primarily of those engaged in the protection of persons and property, namely police and fire departments?

MR. PAULLEY: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that it will apply to the likes of fire departments and policy departments in municipal services. I might say too, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend, knowing his position as Mayor of his municipality, this was another reason why I was led to change the rigidity of the original provisions in the Act, due to some agreement between the fire departments and the police departments where the holiday day is added on to the annual vacation. Had we have not changed this, then that would not have been possible and the municipalities would have been faced with the time-and-a-half pay for the day. So I think my honourable friend can be assured this has been taken care of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 117 - Sections 1 to 4-34(8) were read section by section and passed.) Section 34(9) -- The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX I move that subsection (9) of 34 of the Act, as set out in Section 4 of Bill 117,

(MR. FOX cont'd.) be amended by striking out the words "subject to subsection (16), where" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the word "where".

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 34(9) to 34 (13) of Bill No. 117 were read section by section and passed.) Section 34(14) passed -- The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I move that subsection (14), (15) and (16) of Section 34 of the Act, as set out in Section 4 of Bill 117, be struck out and the following subsection substituted therefor:

Other arrangements as to holiday work.

34(14) Where the provisions established by any other Act or by any agreement, contract of services" -- have all the members got this before them? Then I don't need to read it to them. -- (Interjection) -- All right. ". . . contract of service, or any custom, for the payment of overtime rates to a person employed in an industry for work done on a general holiday are more favourable within this Act to the person employed, provisions so established prevail over this Act. Less favourable arrangements supersede it.

34(15) Where the provisions established by any other Act or by any agreement, contract of service, or any custom, for the payment of overtime rates to a person employed in an industry for work done on a general holiday are less favourable than this Act to the person employed, the provisions of this Act prevail over the provisions so established."

Compensatory time off.

34(16) Notwithstanding subsection (4), a person employed in a continuously operating plant or seasonal industry, except the construction industry, a place of amusement, a gasoline service station, a hospital, a hotel or a restaurant or in domestic service, is not entitled to receive pay for working or being on duty on a general holiday in accordance with the provision of that subsection if in lieu thereof he receives, in addition to any annual vacation with pay to which he may be entitled to under any Act of the Legislature, equivalent compensatory time off with pay

(a) within 30 days after the general holiday; or

(b) where he and his employer agree at his request on a date more than 30 days after the general holiday on that date. But in the case of clause (a) the employer shall give to the employee at least two days prior notice of the day to be taken off by the employee in lieu of the general holiday.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 34(14) to 34(16) as amended were read and passed.) Section 34 (17) --

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the members would just allow another minute and I'm sure the bill will be completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 117 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has considered and passed the following Bills: Nos. 3, 99, 108, 34, 50, 77, 91, 92, 93 and 117.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): . . . acting House Leader would tell us what order of business he intends to proceed with tonight.

MR. PAULLEY: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that we'll start out with the normal question period. I believe there's one or two bills that we may be able to continue with, then we would go into the Committee of the Whole House. I believe that is the understanding. I might say too, Mr. Speaker, just to forewarn my honourable friends, that it is the intention to have His Honour come in around 9:30 or thereabouts to give the Royal Assent to bills passed for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Tuesday night.