



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XX No. 61 8:00 p.m., Thursday, April 12th, 1973.

Fifth Session, 29th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 12, 1973

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer honourable members to page 7 of the Estimates. Resolution 17 (a) -- The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it's always a pleasure to --(Interjection)-- My colleague says not for us - well, it's always a pleasure for me, at least, to have an opportunity to say a few words in introduction to the Estimates of a very efficient and a very worthwhile department in government. --(Interjection)-- I have a brief, that is true. I come prepared, Mr. Chairman, to give you a few words about some of the good things that this department has been doing and I'm sure that my honourable friends opposite will enlighten me about some of the bad things, but I really don't think that we have been doing anything that's very bad at all. I think that everything has been good. However, you know, the assessment is always biased, I suppose. --(Interjection)-- I see. Well, let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I have every confidence in my staff; we have succeeded very well in the development of further programs, programs that were initiated in past sessions, and the administration of these various programs has been flushed out although the budget reflects still further increases in some areas and I'll touch very lightly on those in my general remarks, and no doubt during the specific items, specific resolutions, members will want further detail and I will do my best to honour that undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, the most significant changes in the budget of the Attorney-General's department this year reflects a very substantial increased apportionment of funds for our legal aid program. In the previous year the budget had provided for a total of \$850,000. This year the total budget budgetted for law reform, pardon me, legal aid in Manitoba is \$1,400,000. In addition, the other area of very substantial increase is in respect to law enforcement, and this involves, this is reflected in the fairly substantial increase in the budget provided there from an increase from \$4,544,100 to 5,833,300 - odd dollars.

I would like to indicate, touch briefly on the work of some of the various segments of this department. First of all, although not showing any priority of affection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about our Law Reform Commission. As you know, our Law Reform Commission is probably unique in Canada inasmuch as it is not entirely composed of lawyers or members of the bench. It does have a number of lawyers on it; it's chaired by Francis C. Muldoon; but it does have lay persons and that Law Reform Commission has been very active in advancing reports in respect to various matters and, as honourable members recognize, already in this session I have had the privilege of introducing a number of bills which are the result of recommendations from our Law Reform Commission. I expect that some time later this session I will be in a position to table a copy of an annual report by the Law Reform Commission, and later there will be copies for each member of the Legislature. I could list the number of specific legislative changes that they have recommended but I think I'll leave that for the members when they peruse the report that later will be available.

In respect to the Human Rights Commission, the work of this commission has seen further development in an advertising program to bring home to the people of Manitoba the varied activities of the Human Rights Commission in respect to the development of a full and effective human rights program. This commission has heard a good number of complaints, investigated them, conciliated some, others have been taken before or have been heard in a formal manner. Orders were made and as a matter of fact two of those orders are still before the courts by way of appeal from decisions that the court made in respect to them.

The Manitoba Police Commission has embarked on a very extensive program of public relations, development of -- Well the Honourable Member for Swan River says why? -- Well now, --(Interjection)-- Well, I want the record to show them --(Interjection)-- I want the record to show them . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. You all know the House rules. When an honourable member is on the floor the rest will not interrupt (Hear, hear) The Honourable Attorney - General.

MR. MACKLING: I want, Mr. Chairman, therefore, if the Honourable Member for Swan River wants to criticize the Police Commission, and he did so from his seat, he'll have an opportunity to rise and register his criticism, but I want to indicate that he appears to be

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) critical of the fact that we in this government recognize the need for better relations to be developed between people in society and those who are charged with the responsibility of enforcing our laws. And that I think is a continuing responsibility and if the Honourable Member for Swan River is critical of that then I think his criticism is very ill-founded. This --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, Order, please. I wish the Honourable Member for Swan River would quit muttering when another member is speaking.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not muttering. I mean what I say, whether you like it or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. --(Interjection)-- If the honourable member doesn't want to behave himself there are ways and means of dealing with him. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I want to implore you - - - Mr. Chairman, I want to implore you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: I want to implore you, Mr. Chairman, to be tolerant of the vexatious remarks from across the way because I intend to be very tolerant of them. I appreciate the fact that the honourable members might disagree from time to time about some of the things I say, and it is their right to criticize in a formal way, or, if they choose, in their informal manner. And it won't bother me, Mr. Chairman, because I've got accustomed to this sort of technique on the part of some honourable members. It doesn't do them any good, and if it does trouble me in the least, Mr. Chairman, I will merely place on the record that fact that these interjections are made, how they're being made, and point out that they're being made in a rude and unruly fashion, and I think that that will have the necessary effect because after all, I'm sure that honourable members sometimes read Hansard and they will wonder about their rudeness being alluded to. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think that -- I hope that you will disregard the mutterings of the Honourable Member for Swan River, and I am indicating now on the record that he is muttering again. --(Interjection)-- Well, now we are continuing to hear these rude interjections from the Honourable Member from Swan River, and when he makes them I will record them. --(Interjection)-- That's right, indeed. In any event, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Police Commission has met on quite a number of occasions. They have developed a very far-reaching program and in due course later during a specific review of my estimates on that particular matter, I will go into some detail about the type of program that they envisage and some of the specifics of it.

I would like to also indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, by virtue of which the innocent victims of crime now receive compensation, has been fully developed. The arrangements with the Workmen's Compensation Board are working very well as the result of which instead of having a separate bureaucracy, a separate mechanism to deal with the assessment of the injuries to victims of crime, we now have the same board carrying out like functions and saving the taxpayers in considerable cost.

You know, from time to time, Mr. Chairman, critics, particularly those in the Official Opposition, suggest you know that we proliferate the bureaucracy, that we go out of our way to develop a larger bureaucracy. Time and again, I can refer to examples and here is one where it is a hard-headed constructive approach towards government program that has been utilized to make sure that no more staff is hired than is absolutely necessary to carry out an effective program. And such is the case with the workings of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act pursuant to arrangements with the Workmen's Compensation Board. And that is as it should be. A person who is injured as a result of a criminal act should be compensated along the same terms and the same manner, and have the same evaluation as the workman, if a workman, individual workman, suffered injury during the course of his employment.

I might say at this stage, Mr. --(Interjection)-- I hear rude interjections again from the Honourable Member from Swan River but that does not dissuade me. He is interjecting again. He's making raucous noises again, and let the record show that. They are not intelligible. They are mean, they are nasty and they are petty, but they don't trouble me. --(Interjection)-- He is making those noises again.

Let me indicate, Mr. Chairman, that approximately a year ago the Federal Government announced with considerable fanfare that they were now going to provide some funding as

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) compensation to the victims of criminal activity, and I think a lot of people throughout Canada felt that this was a very noble and proper act on the part of the Federal Government. We have lately signed an agreement with the Federal Government to accept their benevolence, and it's based on five cents per capita or 90 percent of the actual awards whichever is the lesser, and I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I have drawn to the attention of the Federal Government in more ways than one, what I consider to be their token participation in this field. What we will receive by way of contribution from the Federal Government is a sum of approximately \$50,000 and, as honourable members will probably note when we come to the specifics of that item in my Estimates, we are budgetting for a minimum of \$200,000 by way of awards to victims of criminal activities.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the contribution of the Federal Government is tokenism in this respect, and I had indicated to them that there was no reason why the Federal Government shouldn't have paid 100 percent of the cost of the awards of compensation for victims of crime, because after all, the laws pursuant to which people are tried for those criminal activities, the administration of all of those laws, that is, not the administration, the promulgation, the development of those laws, is an entirely Federal matter and one would have thought that they would have wanted to provide full compensation for victims of crime that have been determined pursuant to their laws.

I should touch briefly on the Provincial Lotteries Licensing Board, and that is distinct from the Centennial Lottery, the Provincial Lottery. The Licensing Board hears applications in respect to the various lotteries throughout Manitoba that individuals wish to operate where the prizes have a gross amount of \$3,000.00 or more. And there are a very, very considerable number of individual groups in society who want to raise funds for benevolent purposes and charitable purposes, by utilizing the lottery concept and that has been fairly and properly adjudicated by a board which we set up and I think it's worked very well. --(Interjection)-- Now, the honourable member asked me whether we have turned any down. Well I -- you know, I'm sure that there have been lottery applications that have not been accepted, I don't think that if a board is doing its work it merely rubber stamps every application that comes before it or else it's not performing a proper function. If the honourable member has something specific, later on I'll be most happy to deal with it. Now -- I didn't consider that interjection very rude, Mr. Chairman, so I didn't categorize it in that fashion.

The Board of Review is a different board, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it's one of those which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is so critical of; he would like to eliminate that Board, eliminate a lot of boards. And one of these times I'll find out which one of the boards for which I am responsible and I have to report to the House, that he would like to be eliminated, and I will have to consider that suggestion if it's made in a serious manner and I'll certainly want the specifics of his recommendation. But the Board of Review was established pursuant to Federal law and is made up of a number of professional people including two practicing psychiatrists, and they are charged with the responsibility of reviewing periodically those persons who are held in institutions at the pleasure of the Lieutenant - Governor-in Council as a result of either their having committed a capital offence and not having the capacity to stand trial or like circumstances. And as the result of the activities of the Board of Review, some of the persons who have been institutionalized have been released under very carefully monitored conditions and there has been some very humane progress in that field.

I could touch briefly on the Land Value Appraisal Commission, who has been charged with considerable amount of work in respect to acquisition of properties for such developments, for example, as the new Brandon Bridge and so on. It has worked very well, a system that was set up under the previous administration, and there's no question but it was a very desirable thing.

In respect to law enforcement, I do want to go into perhaps just a little bit more detail in connection with the developments there, Mr. Chairman, because that is an area where we have made what I consider a fairly substantial thrust in developing a much more equitable program for some of the communities in Manitoba who have been faced with spiralling costs municipally and have complained from time to time to government that they need, they would appreciate there some increased aid in respect to the cost of police services.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Now one of the things, Mr. Chairman, which we inherited, was a provision in the Municipal Act that any community, village, town or city with a population of 500 persons or more was charged with the responsibility of engaging a police constable as a chief and such other deputies as that community might require, and of course those police services would be paid for by the community entirely at its own expense. For all communities with a population of under 500 people, the province assumed responsibility for policing itself.

Now looking at that system, one could see that there were bound to be some rather rough situations, some very inequitable situations. Particularly was that evident, Mr. Chairman, when one considered that some communities with populations under 500 had a much higher, a considerably higher equalized tax base than some communities with a population of over 500. So obviously some of the communities with a better ability to pay for local services including protection services, were not being charged with that service whereas other communities with a reduced ability to pay were charged with the full responsibility of engaging their own police services.

As honourable members know, some years ago -- I should recall the exact date, I believe it was in 1965 -- the Province of Manitoba entered into a 10-year agreement with the Federal Government for the provisioning of police services through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and this 10-year agreement provided for a gradually escalating cost to the province up to a maximum of 50 percent of the costs of the provisioning of one Royal Canadian Mounted Police constable, including his salary, his automobile and all of the various equipment necessary for that individual policeman's services, and on the basis of the agreement which was signed, as I say, way back in 1965, the total costs of the RCMP Police for all the cars and all the salaries and so on, is tallied up and the number of police, the services chargeable under the contract, are then -- individual police units chargeable under the contract are divided into the total and they come up with an annual costing to the province of an individual police contract, and in 1973 that comes to \$11,208, as I recall it, which is approximately, approximately 48 percent of the total cost of that policeman's salary, automobile equipment and so on.

Now, pursuant to the agreement that we have with various communities in Manitoba pursuant to extension contracts, we merely turn over to the community the services of an RCMP constable pursuant to the same costing arrangement that we have with Ottawa, and thus it is that a considerable number of communities in Manitoba have engaged RCMP Police services, and they have provided an effective provincial police service since they are integrated as well with the police personnel that have a direct charge and responsibility to the province for policing the highways and policing all areas of the province where the population, as I've indicated, does not warrant a charge to the individual town or municipality itself, town or village or city itself.

Now --(Interjection)-- I want to abide strictly by the rules, Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)--If you'll permit me to go beyond the 30 minutes I'll be happy to answer questions as I go along, but I do want to abide by the rules and sit down when I'm supposed to, and then I think the honourable member will be able to fire questions at me and I'll be able to respond, but I don't want to break now and then not finish my overview of the department --(Interjection)-- Well now, the record indicates that the Honourable Member from Lakeside says that I am a fine fellow and I think that's very nice of him. --(Interjection)-- No, I think that we'll have something further to say about steers later on, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Honourable Member from Lakeside has some fine steers -- I hope he has anyway, because it's a good year for steers -- as long as we get some moisture. However, let's not get sidetracked, let's not get steered off course here, Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- Now, you know, the Honourable Member from Lakeside is now getting less polite and he is trying a diversion. I don't think it's a high level diversion this time.

But I would like to carry on, Mr. Chairman, by saying that as a result of an obvious inequity in this relationship between communities of under 500 in number of population and those with a population in excess of 500 but still with a very small tax base, we looked at techniques whereby we could provide some reasonable equitable change in the costing arrangements, and what we came up with was a formula whereby there would be a gradual increase in the assumption by the community of a greater portion of the cost of an individual policeman's salary based on the cost to the communities presently under the RCMP contract of

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) \$11,208. And what we did was we took the equalized tax assessment of each of the communities that would be affected, and divided up, and as each of the communities' equalized tax base increased by sums of \$100,000 there was a five percent reduction in the assumption by the province of the cost of an RCMP -- of that portion of the RCMP constable's salary pursuant to the contract which normally they would pay for if they were paying for the 100 percent service. And as a result, as a result we have provided a sum in excess of \$200,000 for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Well I have five minutes, I'll be able to conclude this item then hopefully, Mr. Chairman, if -- that's providing the Honourable Member from Swan River is interested enough to contain himself.

Thus it is, Mr. Chairman, that the following communities will receive the following sums of money by way of assistance from the province. The Community of Arborg will receive 40 percent of the costs of an RCM Police salary or a contribution of \$4,483.00. And I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that this money is being paid to the individual communities without reservation, without qualification, and where they choose to hire a policeman of their own they do so. If that police, if the costs of that police service is less than the amount which we provide, that is completely up to them. Naturally we would like them to maintain a high standard of police service and we think that arrangements with the extension contracts of the RCM Police would provide the best service. However, -- and I think here the Honourable Member for Swan River might agree -- however, it is entirely up to the community to decide on the allocation of that money towards police services. And I'll read some of the communities then; I think I can quickly run through the communities and the amounts.

The community of Birtle -- \$4,483 contribution towards services, police services, Crystal City -- \$8,406; Deloraine -- \$2,802; Elkhorn -- \$8,406; Emerson -- \$3,362; Erickson -- \$7,845; Ethelbert -- \$8,996; Gilbert Plains -- \$5,043; Glenboro -- \$6,164; Gretna -- \$9,526; Gladstone -- \$5,043; Grandview -- \$3,362; Hartney -- \$7,285; Hamiota -- \$5,043; Lac du Bonnet -- \$3,362; Mac Gregor -- \$6,724; Manitou -- \$4,488; McCreary -- \$8,966; Minitonas -- \$8,406; Melita -- \$1,681; Morris, sorry about this -- \$560.00; Niverville -- \$6,724; Notre Dame De Lourdes -- \$8,966; Pilot Mound -- \$6,164; Powerview -- \$9,526; Rivers -- \$3,362; Riverton -- \$8,966; Rosburn -- \$6,724; Ste. Anne -- \$6,724; St. Claude -- \$7,845; St. Pierre -- \$7,285; Ste. Rose du Lac -- \$7,285; Shoal Lake -- \$5,604; Somerset -- \$7,285; Teulon -- \$6,164; Treherne -- \$7,285; Winnipegosis -- \$8,406; Carberry -- \$3,362. To the Honourable Member from Lakeside, who has been constantly carping away during my reading of this list, I would like him to know that the Province of Manitoba, as I understand it, assumes the full cost of responsibility for policing in that area and there is no apportion.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, I have probably exhausted my time. --(Interjection)-- I have one minute left? That is delightful. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will briefly indicate that in addition to that major thrust, the provision of very substantial increased sums of money for legal aid highlight the significant changes in this budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek,

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised that the Attorney-General was reading off all those amounts of money. It sounded like he was trying to outdo the Premier with his Budget, and quite frankly I would have thought the Premier would have been brought in to read out all the goodies as he has been doing through this session. But we must say that the program that they have for helping policemen in the rural areas, policing in the rural areas of Manitoba, is gratifying and it's been asked for for a long time by the people of the rural areas and we have been pressing for it on this side, and for once, for once we now seem to have gotten through to the government that this is required.

You know, it reminds me of every time you read out a resolution, "the advisability of" and the government has taken for once the advisability of and done something about it. And I don't really compliment the government on that; tonight is the Attorney-General's night, we'll compliment him. But as the Member for Woodlands -- I mean Lakeside said, you know, it's a good year for steers and it seems like a good year for the Attorney-General, but it's not all that good; he's not going to get off quite that easy. He's given us a little bit of a lecture, you know; all of a sudden we now get recorded by him if we make a comment across the House so that our grandchildren can read it, and I wish he hadn't said that because he well knows

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) that if the Opposition will be saying things that will be read by our grandchildren we might say a bit more. So you better be very careful from that point of view.

Lecture, rudeness and will record, one would think that the Attorney-General has never been rude, never been mad, and never said anything that should not be recorded in this House. You know, it all depends whose ox is being gored in this particular type of a debate.

Mr. Chairman, we will be getting down to the Attorney-General's Estimates item by item and I'm sure that there'll be questions on his Estimates as we get through item by item, but we are on his salary. As you know, when we're on the Minister's salary that is the time when we must have the Minister come forward and explain the reasons why he gets that salary or why he operates the department with the policies that he has. And I intend to talk policy because I do want some explanations from the Attorney-General regarding the policy, and I would expect that the Attorney-General would not mind and think he should, during the time when his Estimates answer some questions regarding policy of the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Chairman, a little while back we had a great reporting of the chairman of the Human Rights Commission being discharged. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to discuss personalities in this respect but I would like the Attorney-General to, when he's explaining this or answering my query, that it would seem that the Human Rights Commission that was set up, that every time they got close to disturbing the Provincial Government on the Human Rights Commission they got their toes trampled upon. Mr. Barry when he was on television, after he had received his notice, said, "You know, every time we approached private industry with some problems regarding human rights, that they were taken hold, something was done about it, we received tremendous co-operation." And really, all the reporting and all the indication really shows or leads us to believe that every time the Human Rights Commission got very close to checking the government up on something that they were doing, then there was a very great holler from the government. In other words, it wasn't fair to be doing this to the government when it was fair to be doing it to others. That has to be explained.

Mr. Chairman, I can remember one time, and I quite often refer to the days when the Honourable Attorney-General and I were aldermen together, we set up a safety committee in St. James and the first thing this safety committee did was investigate all the Public Works trucks and every vehicle we had in the City of St. James. They caused us no end of problems but it was good for us. We learned what we were doing wrong and we accepted it; we had to accept it -- we had set up the commission. The same thing applies in this respect, and I think the Attorney-General should explain that all indications show that the Human Rights Commission, when they start trampling on the government's toes, really it is not liked and they get into trouble.

There is one other area where I believe the Attorney-General should give us some explanation in this House, and that is regarding the charges that were brought forward in this House regarding the investigation or criminal charges laid against Mr. Kasser and Mr. Reiser or CFI. It is my opinion that the Attorney-General's position in the government is to handle the law enforcement and see that the law is carried out to the letter. And quite frankly, when it is learned that there is a criminal charge and there is somebody that should be prosecuted by this province for taking something from the people of this province, then at no time should there be any wasting of time to get that prosecution going for the benefit of the people of Manitoba. And I read this once before in the House and the Attorney-General wasn't there, and I'm wondering now if the policy is changed. This is regarding the King Choy -- it's got, "Loans to King Choy have been irregular -- Premier." It says here, "The bailiff notice provided for a seizure of company's inventory of processed foods which is expected to be sold publicly within the next week. Mr. Schreyer said a loan application can be so made as to give good impression of the company's solvency when in fact this is not the case. He said he has some reason to believe that there was an irregularity in King Choy application. Whoever is involved in this King Choy group or firm I have instructed the civil servants on the case if they find any irregularities to nail them and nail them fast. I want no stone left unturned in this case, the Premier said."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the policy of the government, and I'm sure that the Attorney-General agrees that if there have been irregularities against the people of Manitoba in any way,

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) shape or form, in this case the policy of the government was to prosecute or nail them and nail them fast. I think the Attorney-General should explain to this House all the reasons he can within the limits of judiciary and everything that we hear about regarding CFI why, what good reasons were there for delaying the prosecution against these men when there was evidence, evidence to say that they had taken something from the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that is a policy that should be explained to the people of Manitoba and to this House and I'm sure the Attorney-General is capable of explaining it and we would await that explanation.

Mr. Speaker, that's really all I have to say at the present time. I would like to hear some answers from the Minister and possibly somebody else has some items they would like the Attorney-General to explain to them. But I think those two policies that are the government's policies, have to be explained; (a) when the Human Rights Commission got close to trampling on the government's toes they seemed to be stopped and we would like to know why; and also I would like to know from the Attorney-General why he did not move faster than he did regarding the case against Mr. Reiser and Mr. Kasser.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been waiting very anxiously for the Attorney-General's Department, one of the few departments that I have a great deal to say. I'm not going to be able to put it all in tonight but I understand that I can speak again and I certainly intend to. There are several items I want to touch on, legal aid, divorce, human rights, parole, drugs, crime and several other issues in the administration of justice, including the one mentioned regarding why the CFI Inquiry and charges were handled the way they were.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, I would like to really confine myself to the question of the Human Rights Commission which I consider a disaster in this province and I'm glad to see that Peter Warren has finally got off the tangent of chasing the farmers over the high price of meat and he's now talking on his program about inhuman human rights.

I have a clipping before me, Mr. Speaker, dated the 6th of April and some of the recommendations here at Friday's conference. First recommendation: The Human Rights Act should have priority over all other forms of legislation. That's a pretty incredible recommendation and I'm curious to see what the Attorney-General is going to have to say about that. The Human Rights Act should prevent social agencies from visiting or having access to private residences without permission of the resident. Companies studying applications for credit bonding and employment should be prevented from seeking information on criminal or police records. A citizen advisory group should be set up to advise the Human Rights Commission on the public's concern about human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that these are only recommendations but they are pretty frightening when you examine them in the light of the Human Rights Commission or the human rights legislation in the United States that is being promoted and as a matter of fact has been put on the legislative law books down there. As I see the recommendations and the direction that the government is going into it would seem that the Human Rights Act is going to cause a great deal of problems; it'll crush and strangle individual and corporate rights; is going to infringe on people's freedom of speech, freedom and right to hire or associate with one another, and I think we have the best example of that, Mr. Chairman, right at this time where a lady wanted to hire a woman to live with her as a babysitter. She went to the local press and they said I'm sorry we can't take the ad because the stupid legislation that that government has passed will not allow us to take an ad saying that we want a nice little old lady to come and live in with this lady and kids. That is not human rights, Mr. Speaker, that is dictatorship by a stupid government. We have human rights, so-called human rights that doesn't allow an employer to ask a person if he even belongs to a union. Mr. Speaker, you check the legislation that was passed by the Minister of Labour, the strike legislation forcing people to take the right to strike even though they don't want it; and the other section of the Act where you can't ask a person whether he's in a union. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's just the opposite of human rights. It seems to me that it's cheap political, our political year phyness, it's a reaction because there is an election coming.

The Minister is now coming out and saying that he's going to change certain things because there's complaints. You know last year we were talking about some people down on

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) Main Street who were cashing T-4 slips at half price and the Minister at that time stated that he couldn't do anything about it because it was federal jurisdiction. Now he is saying to us he's going to pass legislation to stop this what appears to be out-and-out robbery by buying T-4 slips at half price.

On the other hand we have the Member for Flin Flon asking a question of the Attorney General yesterday, are they going to stop the banks of offering \$25.00, \$25.00 cash I believe to get a 1,000 loan? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what the bank is really saying, we'll give you a loan at a lower interest rate. --(Interjection)-- A lower interest rate. Well if he want to talk about being sucked in I think there's worse examples where they're saying whether you can afford it or not, come into our travel agency and we will let you fly around the world with nothing down. That I think is sucking you in. A person is not going to go into a bank and get a loan and pay \$50.00 or \$75.00 just to gain 25, because in the end he's a loser. It seems to me the bank should be commended for bringing forth a proposal if a person who borrows money is going to get a better deal than he has been up to now. But the Attorney-General gets up in the House -- the Attorney-General gets up in the House and he is suddenly very concerned. He's going to look into this terrible practice. But the shysters are operating and taking half of the money from the poor guys that have to have money, they can't wait for the slowpoke civil servants in Ottawa to return their income tax cheques, they've been swindling them for several years and the Attorney-General sits there and says, well what can I do? That's the name of the game. Well I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it's phoney cheap politicking to be suddenly concerned about a situation like that. --(Interjection)-- Absolutely. I think the longer we listen to the pious utterings from the government the more one comes to the conclusion that when it comes to an election they really are no different than those terrible Tories or those terrible Liberals.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the objective of the government with their Human Rights Commission -- I think the fault has to be divided between the Human Rights Commission and the government because the government set it up, laid down the guidelines and the human rights people have to struggle along with it somehow. But it seems to me that they have almost a women's lib objective, to smash so-called male supremacy, to drag everybody down to the level of the prostitutes and the perverts and the homos, the anti-marriage and anti-religious --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm going to read something for the Minister of Education that will cause him to turn green when he realizes just exactly what the objective -- and under the legislation what can be achieved --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry, the Minister of Colleges and Education.

Mr. Chairman, there's been a lot of injustice in this country, there's been a lot of injustice in North America and certainly some kind of redress was necessary. But what we have today, Mr. Chairman, is a drive for social change that seems to have gone wild and is on the verge of extremism. We have a system that's going to really victimize the rest of society because someone else -- and I mentioned the babysitter epic as just one example, because someone else wants to drag somebody to their own level. So we're going to pass legislation saying everybody is going to be the same. And, Mr. Chairman, if they are allowed to get away with it the next thing is going to be the Human Rights Act will be applied to the clergy, and you know very well that under certain religions women are not allowed to be a priest and if this Human Rights Act and this legislation is going to be brought to its ultimate then we're going to have to say to the religious organizations that it's a lot of bunk and we don't give a damn what your church stands for. Let me just read -- let me read an article from the Phylis Schafely Report, January, 1973. This is a statement by the Rabbinical Alliance of America . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I can't hear what the honourable member is saying. There's too much muttering and whatnot going on in this Chamber. If you want to have caucus meetings or other meetings other than to hear the honourable member then I suggest you go elsewhere and do that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the legislation that's called the equal rights legislation in the United States and the Rabbinical Alliance of America has made this statement to the state government and the federal government of the United States. "We demand that the equal rights amendments as now worded not be ratified until adequate protection for

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) our religious rights be written into it. We ask the states to send the amendment back to Congress to be reworded with clear, specific guarantees that our religious freedoms and practices shall not be jeopardized. We are not now prepared and we are certain that freedom-loving Americans of other religious persuasions are similarly not prepared to see religious rights in America harmed by politicians hurriedly pursuing the latest political fad."

Mr. Speaker, if a government through its board can order a person that they have no right to say that I want a woman to babysit in my house why can't they have the right under the same legislation to say that we don't care what the Jewish Church or what the Catholic Church says, we say that you cannot exclude women from the priesthood. And they can use the force of it. I don't know if they're going to. Mr. Speaker, that is what the human rights legislation is all about and if you look at -- I know the government has looked at the American legislation and I know some Ministers have said that it's a model that they want to tailor theirs by, and if that is a fact Mr. Speaker, then I think that more members of the House should read the legislation that they're bringing in the United States. It's pretty frightening legislation. And let me just read some of it: "Will make every wife in the U. S. legally responsible to provide 50 percent of financial support of her family. Will wipe out a woman's present freedom to choice to take a paying job or to be a full time wife and mother supported by her husband. Will make women subject to the draft. Will put women on warships and make them subject to combat duty on an equal basis with men regardless of whether we have a draft or not. Will eliminate the preferential social security benefits women now enjoy. Will wipe out many protective labour laws which benefit women. Will knock our present laws protecting women from sex crimes such as statutory rape and forced prostitution." --(Interjection)-- Well you let them stay in office long enough and they will. "Will integrate boys and girls physical education classes in high schools and colleges. Will jeopardize present lower life insurance rates for women"-and in Manitoba the driver's licence. "It would create havoc in prisons and reforms by preventing segregation of sexes."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this: That I certainly do want to hear all the contributions of the honourable members in respect to the operations of my department but I really don't think that we want to take up the time of the House to learn what the operations of human rights commissions are elsewhere in the world other than Manitoba or what their laws or what their recommendations are. I think that the debate has to be relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: I think that debate has to be relevant and I would appreciate it being focused on this Human Rights Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. That the honourable member should stick to the items that are under the jurisdiction of this House, the proposed legislation that the honourable member is reading about is something that is outside the jurisdiction of this House, outside the jurisdiction of this country and I think that his remarks should be . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I will read . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think his remarks should be directed to the estimates of the department we're under and the jurisdiction under which it operates. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to read something that I'm sure that's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order that the Attorney-General brought up. Earlier today in this House we had the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources tell us that the Ontario Government put on a two percent increase in sales tax. Now that is not relevant to the Province of Manitoba and if the members on that side can bring up things like that I think that the members on this side can compare Manitoba to other provinces as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I don't think that is relevant to the point that is under discussion. ORDER! I was not in the Chair at the time. We were dealing on a point of grievance at that time. The honourable had a point of privilege or a point of

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . order at that time. That was the time he should have raised it, not now.

MR. ENNS: On the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. We are dealing with the operations the possible, the potential and the future operations of a human rights commission --(Interjection)-- Yes we are. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the item under consideration under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General entails the operations of a human rights commission. It is only fair, just as when we deal in the broader matters of taxation that we talk about taxation practices in this jurisdiction or another jurisdiction the member has to be given leeway to discuss the broadest implications, the broadest implications of an organization that we have established under our legislation in this province. I think that's what the member is trying to do whether you agree with it or not, but he is referring to the kinds of actions that are possible or that he can see is possible in his mind under this kind of a board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General, the same point of order.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Well then I assume that the Honourable Member for Lakeside will be happy to hear me give some dissertations in response to all of these contributions dealing with the relative human rights programs in the Soviet Union, in China, in Albania, wherever he wants I'll draw comparisons and I'll go into a complete evaluation of that kind of program. I don't think that's what we're here for.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the Attorney-General we will await with eager ears, we will await with eager ears all the contributions that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . Attorney-General may have to give on the . . .

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with the Human Rights Commission which I'm trying to point out is destroying more rights than it's creating and I am trying to give some background on which this so-called phoney human rights legislation of theirs is modelled on and I want to indicate which direction we're heading. And I will talk about something that those Sodomites understand, and this deals with Sweden.

Time Magazine, August 17th, 1970: "The country is a model for feminist groups around the world. In order to prod husbands into encouraging wives to take a job the tax laws have been rewritten so that next year married men will be taxed at the same rate as bachelors, a financial jolt to men with non-working wives. Stay-at-home wives are frowned on as a luxury housewife by the ruling social democrats. Sweden's education system recently has been deliberately changed to eliminate the difference in the assumed sex roles. School boys do needlework and study homemaking while the girls take courses in auto repair and manual training. Nobody should be forced" -- well you see, Mr. Speaker, they're already admitting that they like this legislation and I tell you that this is what they had in mind for this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: No I will not answer any questions. No none. I'm sorry you wasted enough of my time. "Nobody should be forced into predetermined roles on account of sex says Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Plume whose own wife works as a child psychologist." Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if we go back into history we will find out where this government and the Swedish socialist government are getting their ideas, and I'm referring to a book called, "Women's Lib - One-Way Street to Bondage." "Communists consider themselves the great emancipators of women." --(Interjection)-- Christian Crusade Publications, it's not Catholic and it's not Jewish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. ORDER !

MR. BOROWSKI: August Babel, a German socialist pioneer wrote a book published in 1902 called "Women under Socialism" which was highly praised by Lenin. Babel's conclusion after analyzing the lot of women in all forms of society in ancient and modern was, Communism is the most favourable social condition of women. Lenin himself wrote into the Communist emancipation of women and I quote, " Take the position of women. Not a single democratic party in the world, not even the most advanced bourgeois republic has done in tens of years a hundredth part of what we did in the very first year we were in power. In a literal sense of

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) the word we did not leave a single brick standing of the despicable laws which placed women in a state of inferiority compared with men; of laws restricting divorce, of disgusting formalities connected with divorce, of laws on illegitimate children and on searching for their fathers, to the shame of bourgeois and of capitalism to be said numerous" --sorry-- "and of capitalism to be said, numerous survivals of those laws exist in all civilized countries. We have a right a thousand times to be proud of what we have done in this sphere" --Lenin.

Mr. Speaker, as you look at what has been happening in this province since they brought in the Human Rights Commission which I think everybody in this House supported because they realized there were these injustices, but they have mongrelized it now where it's being used as a weapon and a club to beat down people who happen to have views contrary to those dead-beats sitting on that side. And we object to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party considers that women working in the house, it stultifies, degrades her, chains her into a kitchen and to the nursery and wastes her labour on barbarously unproductive petty nerve-wracking stultifying and crushing drudgery. That is their idea about women. Mr. Speaker, if you're going to have equal rights among men and women --(Interjection)-- No, that's not my idea. That is -- I am quoting from the book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order, please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock -- the Honourable Attorney- General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would give us the reference to that noble work he's reading from because I would like to at least have the benefit of checking it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's called, "Women's Lib -- One-Way Street to Bondage" and it's a Christian Crusade publication from the United States. I would be very happy to give him a copy for 50 cents. The previous one, Mr. Speaker, is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please,

MR. BOROWSKI: The Phylis Shafley Report from Alton, Illinois, January, 1973 issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have adopted certain resolutions and have directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PUBLIC BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: First item on Thursday night - the Honourable House . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there has been consensus that we will give consent to the second reading on public bills that have been printed and not yet introduced for second reading, namely Bill 28, 29 and 27. I believe there is consensus and agreement on that, Mr. Speaker, and I would appreciate you calling the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

BILL 28

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: (Brandon West) presented Bill No. 28, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can be very brief on Bill No. 28. At a previous session of the Legislature there was a bill passed that gave the City of Brandon authority under its Charter to enter into the construction of a parkade in the core sector of Brandon. Subsequent to the passage of that bill and in the process of selecting a site it became evident that the best site involved some land belonging to the T. Eaton Company. The company is prepared to grant a long-term lease to the City of Brandon but in order to build upon land which is owned by the city and also land which is leased on a long-term basis an additional authority was required under the City of Brandon's Charter. This bill if passed would provide that authority. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: I thought that there was an agreement here that those bills would be passed this evening. Was there not . . . agreement to receive second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion -- Order, please. Order, please. I was informed that it would be introduction of bills. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Bill No. 29.

BILL 29

MR. BARKMAN presented Bill No. 29, an Act respecting The Town of Steinbach for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House Leader and other members of this House for allowing leave. In the case of Bill No. 29 it has a deadline on it and I appreciate very much that this was granted.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a bill if passed allowing the citizens of the Town of Steinbach an opportunity to hold a referendum on May 14th of 1973 instead of the regular prescribed date in the Act being the date when civic elections are normally or usually held, which this year would fall on the 24th of October. I have no intention at this time to endorse or reject the intention of the referendum but I ask the members of this Legislature to leave that up to the people of Steinbach by giving them an opportunity to oppose or to favour such a referendum. So, Mr. Speaker, the bill is merely asking for an earlier date for the referendum than the Act specifies.

I would like to make a few comments in this respect. I was quite concerned for a while that those opposed in allowing liquor, beer and wine sales would not have enough time to organize in opposition of these sales. I'm now satisfied and I hope with co-operation that we are receiving tonight these people will have ample time to present their views and to present their principles before the referendum would be held.

I wish to leave another thought with all the members of this Assembly. If this referendum were held at the time of the local civil elections as the Act specifies, in my opinion this could very well change the outcome of the annual fall municipal election. I'm simply trying to suggest that this referendum could be of quite a controversial nature, I believe the people of Steinbach would not want to see a councillor defeated or elected because of a stand that he or she took for or against this issue. I say councillor or councillors because the mayor's term is not due or up for election in 1973.

BILL 29

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)

I have perhaps one last comment that I would wish to make in regard to this matter. The Town of Steinbach passed a resolution on March 8th, 1973, and it was duly moved and seconded. I just wish to read it into the record. "Resolved that the town council go on record as having no obligations to an application for or the initiating of a private member's bill to amend The Liquor Control Act which would permit the holding of a liquor referendum in the Town of Steinbach at a time prior to the annual fall municipal election." This was carried and of course the secretary-treasurer hereby certifies that this is a true statement and if anybody wishes it to be tabled I will be glad to table it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it to be clearly understood in this House and by the people of the Town of Steinbach, the aim of the bill is to change the date of the referendum only and shall not in any way encourage the outcome of the referendum in any way at all. There seems to be a contention of some people that if this bill passes then I for one am encouraging a "for" vote in the forthcoming referendum. I think members in this House and myself realize that that decision will be left to the people of the Town of Steinbach and that this bill in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, shall not influence the outcome of the forthcoming referendum.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my honourable friend that as far as the government is concerned that we have considered his representation and have considered the bill and realize the position as is existing at the present time in the Town of Steinbach; it could be even in the Town of Transcona under similar circumstances, Mr. Speaker, but it is not. So I want to assure the honourable member, through you, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the government is concerned we are prepared to agree to this bill being given second reading tonight if that is the desire of the Assembly as a whole, and I also give my honourable friend the assurance that as quickly as possible the responsible committee will be called to consider this bill and hear representations in order that the deadline of May 14th can be achieved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection at all to the bill proposed by the Member for La Verendrye receiving second reading tonight. Having represented the City of Steinbach for a number of years in the House of Commons I'm aware of the very strong feelings that could be generated on this particular issue and I think the course of action proposed by the Town of Steinbach in asking for a referendum at a time other than when the normal referendum would be held, that is during the course of the civic elections, is a wise course, and for that reason we approve of the passage of this bill in second reading tonight and sending to committee.

I understand that there are peculiar situations that do arise from time to time which could not at the time of drafting of any legislation be taken into consideration, and there are occasions when legislation has to be drafted in order to take into consideration those particular situations. I think this is one of them and there may be one or two others that my honourable friends will be learning about in a very short time.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

BILL 27

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the first explanation is by the mayor. I'll read it to you and I'd like to give an explanation of my own following this. I'll be very brief.

"The amendment to the City of Flin Flon's Charter will extend the city's boundaries to include the First Avenue-Church Street area which became a problem during the 1971 strike. A portion of Church Street, First Avenue, North Avenue and portions of some of the city's lanes crossed this area. These streets and lanes were on Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited's property and thus outside the city limits, were of necessity used by the public and were considered to be public roadways since the beginning of Flin Flon.

The way in which the streets were laid out in Flin Flon itself made it necessary to cross company property as well as the municipal boundaries in this particular area. Through the

BILL 27

(MR. BARROW cont'd). . . . years no problems arose over this arrangement with the public as well as the city council being relatively unconcerned with a system that was working smoothly. Unfortunately during the 1971 strike the Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited applied for and received a court injunction preventing picketing by strikers on their property. This of course meant that no picketing was allowed on the portions of the streets on company property. As a result picketers were required to picket within the city to avoid being on mining company property. Much distress resulted from the situation as picketing was now some distance from the portion of Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company property on which the plant and mines are located. The people became quite annoyed at suddenly being denied free usage of streets and roads which had been considered public. It soon became quite apparent that only through the extension of the city's boundaries to include this area could the public interest be served. Many discussions between City Council and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company as well as with elected officials of the Provincial Government have taken place as a result of this situation. The City Council now has obtained the consent of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company to have the city's boundaries extended by this amendment. We hope that the Legislature will give the matter early attention and thus resolve a situation which arose as a problem some two years ago. What actually happened, Mr. Speaker, when a strike broke out in Flin Flon in 1969 the pickets were on the gates, eight on each gate, and the company in their ignorance and utter disregard to people moved these people two blocks over, two streets down. This caused more than a little concern because this land that people had thought was theirs for 30 years suddenly wasn't theirs. The fire hall was on company property, so if a fireman refused to cross a picket line we had no fire protection. The hospital or the clinic, you could see the doctor but you couldn't go in and get your drugs. To honour the picket line this was out. The building of the new hospital was also on company property. They were building an extension at this time and if they all had honoured this picket line that would have been held up. The curling rink, the skating rink, also on company property, was not available to people who honoured the picket line.

Now, there was a lot of pressure put on me at that time to pass a bill exonerating councils of spending money on property that wasn't theirs for cleaning grains and so on. I did this because the present council wasn't the only ones guilty of this offence, it was former councils too.

Finally we got the bill through all right, and then became a problem of how we obtained this land. So I met twice with the council in camera, asking them to give me authority to expropriate. But for some strange reason this word seemed very very hard to them to get out, and to me it's a good word. The dictionary says: to expropriate - to take land and give it back to people. But anyway they wouldn't do it and the reasons they gave, the first reason, it would break their agreement with the company. My argument was agreements are broken every day, and amendments are made and this is no reason at all. The second reason they gave, it would weaken our bargaining position with the company, who of course receive grants in lieu of taxes. My argument was, you have no bargaining position; when you go you go with your hat in your hand, and the company knew exactly what they were going to give and there's no way you have any bargaining position. But anyway, they still wouldn't use that dreaded word. So finally I went to a public meeting and luckily there were some union people there and we put it on the line. Either you give us the word to expropriate or the steel people and the trade people will pass this on and we'll do it their way. Of course what happened, word gets right back to the company; the next day we got the word, "we will turn the land over to you." And what this bill does is give the land back to the people who rightly owned it in the first place. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, we had originally intended to allow the bill to pass second reading tonight, and up until the time that the honourable member departed from his prepared text, we would have been prepared to do so. But since he injected a good many other imponderables into his explanation of the purpose of the bill, brought in the old class warfare, the fights and his disagreements with the city council, and many other things, we are now come to the conclusion that it may be necessary to examine this bill somewhat more carefully in second reading and make a few more enquiries before we permit it to pass for second reading. So if my honourable friend had not been so vindictive or so prone to expounding on something that could have been a relatively simple matter, he would have very easily had this

BILL 27

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . bill passed tonight. So I have no other comments to make on it other than to inform my honourable friend that the bill will be adjourned and we are intending to cause a further examination of the intention of this bill to ensure that my honourable friend has properly informed the House as to its proper intent. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend the Member for Radisson, who continues to interject, has just suggested that what we're doing is filibustering. Sir, it's nothing of the kind. My honourable friend has made statements that cause us to have a second look at this bill. Had he not made those statements we would have taken them at his word if he'd have stuck to his prepared text.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

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

MOTION presented and passed

BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Bill No. 21. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, lest I be accused of deviating from a prepared text, I'll sort of clear my desk in front of me so that the Honourable Member for Morris if he hasn't already taken part in this debate, could make such an oration as he just has done on Bill 27, I believe, and indicate that they were going to take some course of action but as a result of that changed their mind.

Bill 21, Mr. Speaker, is a very interesting bill. I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I believe he comes from, if he wants to speak in the House would he kindly get back to his seat in order that he may be in order. --(Interjection)--

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, could you indicate to the House what matter of business we're now dealing with.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Bill 21.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. If my honourable friend from Lakeside would stop rattling his head he would be able then to hear what is being said in the House and not be disturbed by the rattlings therein, of his head. And the same, of course, applies to my honourable friend from Swan River and some of the other honourable gentlemen opposite. I am glad to note that at the present time, though, the one who is a representative of the Conservative Party of the fairer sex at least is quiet. And maybe it would be a good thing if the male components of the Conservative Party would take an example from the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, at least at this time.

As I was attempting to say --(Interjections)-- as I was attempting to say, Mr. Speaker, I have followed with a great deal of interest the debate that has thus far taken place on Bill 21, which basically deals with the question as to whether or not the person who would be the mayor of the City of Winnipeg should be elected by the Unicity Council or by the citizens as a whole. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that originally it was thought advisable to select or elect the mayor of the City of Winnipeg by the councillors of the City of Winnipeg. And then it was decided that for the first election of Unicity a change would be made to provide for the election of the mayor by popular vote of all of the citizens of Winnipeg and, as honourable members know, this was done.

There has been some thought in some people's minds --(Interjection)-- have you taken part in this debate? --(Interjection)-- You haven't heard any comments from this side at all, Mr. Speaker, as I say to my honourable friend, because I am the first spokesman from the government in respect of this bill. But Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Rupertsland gives me the opportunity of indicating what I believe to be a fact and the truth in respect of this bill, because the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the members of the Liberal Party, the members of the Conservative Party, who have spoken in this debate, feel that this is a great political opportunity for them to sound the trumpets on behalf of the election of a person to be the mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

Time after time, and I believe even my honourable friend for Lakeside indicated, without any expression from this side of the House, that the Government of Manitoba does not like the present Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform my honourable

BILL 21

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . friends that during the first election for mayor of Unicity, in my window at 435 Yale Avenue West in Transcona was a sign indicating support for Mr. Steve Juba who was a candidate for the mayoralty in Winnipeg. My honourable friend, the House Leader of the Liberal Party (and Lord knows where his leader is tonight, out scuttling somebody in the hustings somewhere) my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie asked me why I don't support him now. Well, Mr. Speaker, he's not up for election. He's not running. --(Interjection)-- I'm not scuttling him and if my honourable friend would only be courteous enough --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie would only be courteous enough to hear me out --Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised at my friend from Portage la Prairie speaking the way he is right now, because I believe it was only about three or four days ago that the same gentleman said he had two favourite cabinet ministers or cabinet ministers that he likes, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour. And now he's not even giving me the courtesy of really agreeing that I am at least a half decent individual. He may not like my policies, and here again --(Interjection)-- Yes, and you're the greatest shoveller of that muck that sometimes is raked around that I've ever seen in this House. Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Even a moment or two ago. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member state his point of order.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I fail to see anything about the bill in the remarks of the Honourable the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, on the point of order I can see the failures of my honourable friend from Roblin because he's consistently failed to comprehend anything that goes on in this House. But, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- the Attorney-General gave you heck! Boy, you sure deserve it. You sure asked for it, you sure deserve it, and so far as the blubbing friend of mine from Lakeside --(Interjection)-- who fails in his forwarding of a suckling pig to the Minister of Labour, I think he should just desist and keep quiet lest I make more reference to that. But the point though, Mr. Speaker, that I'm endeavouring to make tonight --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I am trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are those in this House who were wont to use any threat, as flimsy as it may be, to condemn this government because they think that an election is in the offing. And they may be right. They may be right. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they should fear an election for the mayor of the City of Winnipeg --(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, did my honourable friend have a point of order? --(Interjection)-- Yes. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland talks about hanging on to the tails of Juba, which he is doing. I don't know who put forward the 250 bucks, or whatever it was, that the Member for Rupertsland says that he paid for to get a couple of thousand letters back through the press media. But what, Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland indicates quite firmly the attitude of the Opposition, that they are trying to hang on to the coattails of Steve Juba because they think that it would be in their stead. And this is the whole emphasis that has been placed by the Member for Rupertsland and I guess maybe some of his friends outside of the House, the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Member for Lakeside, we have --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that he contain himself. He has had his 20 minutes. I think he should be courteous enough to offer it to someone else as well. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Labour permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: When the Unicity Act was brought in, after some pressure and discussion the government decided that they should allow the mayor to be elected for the first term. Now I ask the Minister, what has changed in the democratic process where, if it's right in the first term, it now becomes a wrong thing after that?

BILL 21

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the point that I am trying to make to my honourable friend. I would say, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Those little caucuses that desire to have a tête-à-tête can step outside. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this substantiates the question of my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, validates what I am trying to say. You know, we often talk about British justice or justice. We condemn, we condemn prosecution, or persecution and sentencing before a man has been heard. That is the import of the question of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie because he turned around and said in his question, what has changed our approach, without knowing whether that approach has been changed, or not. This is the idiocy that is being practiced by members opposite, Mr. Speaker. They have not given us an opportunity of expressing our position, and it hasn't been expressed in this House.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: When will it be?

MR. PAULLEY: In about three minutes if you'll only keep quiet. And you will be surprised --(Interjection)-- The time limit, Joe, only gives me that much. But, Mr. Speaker, one would think, one would think that we're going to have to have an election for a mayor tomorrow. I ask my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie, I ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and even I'll go as far as Sturgeon Creek, and ask them if they know when the next mayoralty election will take place in the City of Winnipeg. Will it be tomorrow? Will it be this fall? Will it be next spring? Will it be over a year hence? And yet that outfit, Mr. Speaker, and in this instance I say that outfit across the other side of this Chamber collectively, have attempted to get on the coattails of the present mayor of the City of Winnipeg and say, here is our champion, and those of us on this side of the House are opposed to him. Well I would suggest to my honourable friends opposite that this government has done more through its programs to aid the present Mayor of Winnipeg to continue a firm position in the City of Winnipeg. We haven't persecuted him and my friend from Swan River . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, because this government has assisted the Mayor of Winnipeg and the City of Winnipeg in providing the necessary finances in order that they might buy buses, whereas that money-pinching outfit that we threw out wouldn't give them a red cent. And there's this --(Interjection)-- here is this muttering Member for Swan River who cannot conceive at all and cannot comprehend the contribution that this government has made to the citizens of Winnipeg, and he, Mr. Speaker, he, Mr. Speaker, in past debates has always criticized and condemned the distribution of the resources of Manitoba --(Interjection)-- No, I'm quoting you now. --(Interjection)-- Oh you wouldn't understand because you don't know from one day to the other what you said the day before. --(Interjection)-- Yes they are. Yours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: About seven minutes ago the Minister said that within three minutes he would tell how he was going to vote on the bill and I would ask him to inform us how he's going to vote on the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: You know, if my honourable friend but would --(Interjection)-- Yes, thanks, Gordon, I guess it's on beam with your inept thinking. If my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie --I was almost going to say if he had a half an ounce of intelligence he would grasp what I'm saying but I guess I can't give him credit for that --(Interjection)-- It does escape you, I know. I'm trying to penetrate his skull and I'm having a heck of a job. I'm trying to establish --(Interjection)-- Yes, I made a solid promise that in due course or in a few moments whatever a few moments are, and let you decide what the twinkling of an eye is.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to my honourable friend that I will say where I stand. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, and I want to repeat that that outfit across this Assembly have attempted with any bets they had or to use any excuse at all to find an election issue. They have found, they have found none thus far that has any basis in foundation or fact. They couldn't challenge us on our budget; they voted for it. So they go muckraking and they do it-- but, I want to tell them, Mr. Speaker, that in this instance it's not going to pay off, because this government has never yet said that it does reject the election of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg by a popular vote. I hate --I hate like heaven, Mr. Speaker, I hate like heaven --

BILL 21

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . --(Interjection)-- Why was the bill introduced? Because you're stupid, that's why it was introduced, because you can't comprehend for two minutes any logic or any legal or proper approach to any of the problems of the Government of Manitoba or the City of Winnipeg. But you thought that you would become a champion like Joan of Arc of years back. I want to say to my honourable friend that it's absolutely ridiculous and his endeavours will be scuttled because he jumped the gun, he got in the front part of a horse where he actually belongs at the rear end of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, of all the examples of second reading of bills that I've seen in this Legislature all the years that I've been here, where you're supposed to talk about the principles of bills and talk about the issues of the day, and this front bencher over here who is supposed to be giving this province a thrust to move into tomorrow, and talking about all the wisdom of this government going in to meet an election, and stands up and make a speech like that, Mr. Speaker? My, I feel sorry for the people of this province if that's the best they can offer on Bill 21. And, Mr. Speaker, this great orator, who sometimes reminds me of a statue that stands behind me with a piece of paper in his hand and that big pencil that he waves around from time to time . . .

A MEMBER: And the Havana cigar.

MR. McKENZIE: Could you imagine this province moving ahead tomorrow under the thrust of that speech that we just got tonight? Unbelievable. Unbelievable. Especially when an issue is at stake that's a very important issue such as : do the City of Winnipeg elect their mayor at large, Mr. Speaker, or do they have that done by the City Council? And, Mr. Speaker, this great philosopher over there from Transcona said, "We'll sound the trumpets." My God, they must have heard the trumpets clean past Transcona tonight with that speech. And he said -- did he say that the government doesn't like the mayor? I didn't hear him say that, no. I hope he didn't say it. But, Mr. Speaker, I rose to my feet the other day on the meat boycott issue and I in my remarks said that the people of rural Manitoba are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with our urban friends at any time to meet the challenges and the issues of the day that are to move this province forward. So, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 21 I give you the support of the people of my constituency to meet this issue and I support the bill most wholeheartedly. And I'll give you the reasons, Mr. Speaker.

The First Minister of this province has made speeches outside this House and said he supports it, and who can quarrel with the First Minister? The First Minister says he supports the bill and the First Minister is an honourable man. The Mayor has been out in my constituency from time to time and has helped us with some of the problems in rural Manitoba, and we're prepared to come in and offer our advice to the Honourable the House Leader - and I don't think he's going to take it - but nevertheless, electing a mayor at large, not only in Winnipeg. The philosophy, as I support in this bill, is that they elect their own mayor all over this province - all over this province. And, Mr. Speaker, don't let the Honourable the House, or the Acting Premier - I don't know what his capacity is tonight - stand up and tell me that he can deny the people of this province that right. I hope that this government does not stand up on this bill and deny the people of this province the right to elect their own mayor because if you are, that's the most regressive step that Manitoba has had for a hundred years of its history. We've always had that right. Mr. Speaker, if this government or --(Interjection)-- the Premier? No, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the Premier is with us.

A MEMBER: Oh yes.

MR. McKENZIE: He's supporting us, and the Member for Rupertsland. But there's some problems over there, and I know where they are. It's not the Member for St. Boniface, no. It's not the Member for Burrows, no. It's not the Member for Ste. Rose. Then I get lost. From there on I get lost. Who supports what?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a real gut issue - coming into an election year. The Member for St. Allard, or for Rupertsland, pardon me, the Member for Rupertsland tells me that he has in his possession 4,750 letters, 4,750 letters with some 9,300 signatures. Now that's pretty important. --(Interjection)-- Have you got as many opposed to that? Have you got any letters in your pockets in opposition to this bill? Have any of you members over there got one or two letters or even ten letters in your pocket opposing? The Honourable

BILL 21

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . . Member for Rupertsland tells me that he's got 4,750 letters in support of that bill, with some 9,300 signatures. --(Interjection)-- Well I think it's the duty of the members of this House to move that bill to committee as fast as we possibly can. Let's get it over into the committee room and let the people make the decision. Let the people .-- (Interjection)-- No, they won't. Mr. Speaker, this philosophy of this government - you know, big government can do things better than people. They don't understand what the people want. Big government with the socialist philosophy, the old steamrollers I could spot this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in the debate about the problems of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. We saw it. We saw it. The big steamroller government rolling over the people of this province said "No ill will," and this is going to happen in this bill. Mr. Speaker, no doubt somebody's going to get blamed for stalling with this bill, and I heard the Honourable House Leader espousing, was it this afternoon, about stalling, yes. In one of the matters he said red herrings or stalling tactics from over there. --(Interjection)-- Well, be very careful who you accuse of stalling in this House because I guarantee that on this issue we're not stalling. We'd like to move it to Committee as fast as we possibly can.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage introducing this bill one year ago. I also recall the debates on the Unicity bill where the opposition warned the government of some of the problems that they were going to have to legislate. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, the government agreed that there would be certain problems with the Unicity legislation. As many amendments as we could bring in the Law Amendments there, some were passed, some were not passed, that the government agreed that there was going to be some problems. Here is a real problem. And that's denying the people of the city their democratic rights. And are you as a government going to stand up and deny the people of the City of Winnipeg their democratic rights? Are you going to deny the people of the Town of Roblin the right to elect their own mayor? Or the people of Grandview the right to elect their own mayor? Are you going to deny the people of Roblin the right to elect their own mayor? Are you going to --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, no. They're going to do it like they did with the Guidelines or the old manifesto. I read that manifesto, that's a skillful document. Where they're talking about municipal corporations where the Minister will appoint the mayor. -- (Interjection)-- Yah. Read the manifesto. The one that they cooked up in Brandon. What a beautiful document. What a beautiful document. Where in a municipal corporation structure the mayor will very skillfully -- because the people haven't got the wisdom to elect their own councillors out in rural Manitoba, the Minister will look after it. So you can see the reflection in the thinking of this government when they try to deal with a simple little bill like this that asks for the City of Winnipeg the right to elect their own mayor. And my gosh, Mr. Speaker, I hope we never see the day in this province, ever, that the people of the City of Winnipeg are denied the right to elect their own mayor, or the people in Roblin are denied the right to elect their own mayor, or Grandview or any place in this province. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill most wholeheartedly, all the people in my constituency support that kind of democracy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, listening to the Honourable Member for Roblin was most interesting and amusing. In fact, during the first part of his speech I wasn't quite sure whether he was debating the bill or whether he was campaigning for the re-election of the present mayor, and it puzzled me somewhat because I'm not really aware of any mayoralty election being on at the present time. In fact if the honourable member would read the -- (Interjection)-- Well, I wasn't aware of the fact that the Honourable Member of Roblin has such powers that he can call the election of a mayor at will, at any time he chooses. But -- well, however, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is about all the comment that the remarks of the previous speaker deserve. It's rather --(Interjection)-- If the Honourable Member for Thompson had been listening to the Honourable Minister of Labour carefully, and it's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because during his closing remarks he did indicate, he did indicate his position on this bill, but obviously it just went right past the honourable member's ears and --(Interjection)-- It probably is, it probably is.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of the legislation creating the present structure of the City of Winnipeg, we have brought in a bill making certain amendments to it and it may well be that during this session we'll bring in another bill making further amendments to it. --(Interjection)-- The other Minister . . .

BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The other Minister, Mr. Speaker, made no reference to this particular fact at all, none at all. None at all. Mr. Speaker, if you would examine the bill passed during the last session of this House you will find that the amendments that were introduced and passed, which are now law, were those of a housekeeping nature, clarifying certain anomalies, ambiguities, omissions, of a technical nature. They're amendments which are designed to assist the City Council in going about their job performing, discharging their responsibilities in a more effective and efficient manner. And, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing unusual. As I've said before, it's quite conceivable that another bill dealing with amendments of a similar type will be introduced during this session because as the activities of the council proceed now into another year of operation, from time to time different problems do arise and Council becomes aware of need for further amendments. In the provinces' dealings with the City, from time to time again the need becomes apparent for making certain amendments, again to streamline the operations as between the City and the Province of Manitoba.

Then of course, Mr. Speaker, if you read the present legislation, and it does specifically state the term of council, and course coupled with that, of the mayor, and this was for a very very definite and a specific reason. And the reason for it was, Mr. Speaker, to give both the City and the Province an opportunity to - it's a trial period, it's a new concept, a new system of government that we had introduced, a system of urban government which we are proud to say that we have pioneered because there is none other like it in the whole North American continent or perhaps anywhere in the world. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned that the government of the City of Winnipeg grows and develops in an orderly and systematic manner, that we do not just simply pick on single issues as the Honourable Member for Rupertsland did in his bill and --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland did speak when he introduced the bill - I think, I think; I would check the journals but I'm sure - the Votes and Proceedings - I'm sure of this. He mumbles, he mumbles --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, apparently the honourable member even despite the fact he's been in the House for - how many years? he still doesn't know the rules. He doesn't know one of the basic rules of this House. That one must stand when he speaks. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a moment ago, we did introduce amendments of a housekeeping tidying up type, but any amendments of more substantive nature dealing with the administrative structure of the organization of the government of the City of Winnipeg, dealing with the matter of elections, dealing with the matter of powers of a council, dealing with the matter of powers of its various committees, the executive policy committee, standing committees, community committees, to deal with that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we ought to give the City of Winnipeg a fair chance. Give them an opportunity, not on the basis of one year, or a year and a fraction, but give them the opportunity, give them the time, the period that was assured them in legislation, and then at that time, Mr. Speaker, would be the proper time to re-examine, to re-examine not only the matter of election of mayor, not only the question of powers --(Interjection)-- the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, he wishes to make a contribution to the debate?

MR. GRAHAM: In due time

A MEMBER: He'll be a hit if he does make a contribution. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should not hold my breath waiting for the honourable member to make his contribution. But there will be a time, there will be a time, Mr. Speaker, to deal with amendments of a substantive nature governing the - related to the operations of a council of the City of Winnipeg and not in a piecemeal fashion such as the Honourable Member for Rupertsland suggests.

I don't feel, Mr. Speaker, that you can deal with this issue of election of mayor in isolation, that you can just lift it out, set it separate and apart from the --(Interjection)-- obviously the Member for --(Interjection)-- no, no, no, no, the other one, Sturgeon Creek -- the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek in his years on council, I believe that he did sit on the council of the suburban municipality, right, and . . .

BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived . . . Order, please. The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning.