

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, June 10, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 70 students of Grade 9 standing, of the Arthur Day school. These students are under the direction of Miss Neelin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour.

We also have 21 students of Grade 8 standing of the St. Joseph's School from Dryden, Ontario. These students are under the direction of Mr. Wilmering, as our guests.

And we have 35 students of Grade 5 standing of the St. Norbert school. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bosc. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions; The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave of the house to make a political statement in a non-partisan way. - (Interjection)-

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member have leave? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order please.

CONGRATULATIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe on Friday, when the session proceeded in the afternoon, we had a slight disturbance and in the course of it, there was some information imparted to the house that was not duly recognized at the time, and I would like to if I may on our behalf, make an official acknowledgement of the information and in doing this, Sir, present a tribute to the individual involved, and with leave make, or present to the house, information concerning another member as well. I refer specifically to the fact that on Friday, it was the Minister of Labour's 22nd year as a member, as having been elected a member of this Legislature and in course of the offer of the ice-cream that was provided by him to the members in the gallery, I believe we missed noting officially the fact that he is the Dean of this House and in turn has marked an event which requires, some recognition because of its significance and so, Sir, to him, may I, on our behalf, offer congratulations for the achievement, and for the recognition of the number of years that he has had the support of the people, albeit we may consider some of the people who have supported him, their views could be questioned, nevertheless, recognizing that in the way that it is presented, the fact that he has worked on behalf of the people, worked in this Legislature, and deserves the particular recognition that we should give him as the Dean of our Legislature. To the Honourable Minister of Labour, we offer congratulations. . (Applause)

And, Sir, while I'm on my feet, may I also at this point, indicate that today marks the 17th year of the entry into politics of the House Leader of our Party the Honourable Member for Morris. I would like to pay tribute to him, in recognition for this achievement, and for his years of contribution to the Parliament of Canada and to the Legislature of this Province, and on our behalf as well to officially pay tribute to him and wish him well in his responsibilities.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, with the extended leave, I would like to associate our party with both messages of congratulations, particularly in view of the fact that there's no Liberal who can have that statement made about them in this House. It's a matter of some considerable regret to me, although I will say that our House Leader is crowding the Conservative House Leader by about, I think, about three years to go. But I do want to say particularly to the Minister of Labour, the former leader of his party, and the former House Leader of this House, that he carries with him 22 years of an incredible record of fighting a cause that has never changed, that he has sought, and successfully, to improve the lot of the working people of this province. It has been a cause with which he's never faltered and I think he can take great satisfaction in the fact that it is true

CONGRATULATIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd). . .that major progress has been made during his term in public office, and certainly no small part of that progress has been contributed by himself.

I can't get too enthusiastic about the idea of saying, let's have another 22 years, but I do think that the honourable member could take into account that members of his own party are suggesting that people should retire earlier to make room in the labour force for others, and while I don't wish him any speedy withdrawal from public life, he might let us have a shot at Transcona one of these times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John): Mr. Speaker, on this notice, I'd like permission also to say a few words on behalf of my colleagues on this side, who have both benefited and learned, become educated and become irritated on occasion in our day to day contacts with the Minister of Labour, who has been our Leader for many years, and who has consistently shown a dedication to the cause of the Party more important to his own cause, who throughout his years, and to this very moment, although we didn't have any discussions today, but as of just so recently ago, has striven hard to persuade others to accept his principles, his philosophy, and has been a constant reminder to all of us that we have a duty to society, and that that duty is one that we must often rededicate ourselves to serve.

I know that all of us are grateful to him for the time he has given and continues to give in an effort of service to people, and all of us have recognized that, and we do that and pay tribute to him for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to say that we in the House have had the benefit of the knowledge and experience of the Honourable the Member for Morris and to the extent that some of his service has not been in this House but has been elsewhere. We do know that his participation in debate in Ottawa has again assisted him, and therefore through him assisted us in being more knowledgeable and more appreciative of the procedural rules. I think one should recognize length of service such as he has given as well because it is a dedication, and it is something that very few people do accept with a sense of participation and a sense of desire to work on behalf of society, something which is very seldom recognized by the people, even the people who vote for politicians have very often an askew idea as to their motives. I think we recognize and pay tribute also to the Member for Morris, congratulating him on his achievement as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I introduce the Honourable Minister of Labour I wonder if the Chairman may be allowed a word too. Since we are on such a cordial note, and since it arises from 22 years of service, and of course for the Honourable Member for Morris a little less, let me say that if this is what it takes then I would hope all of you will have 22 years of service with me so we'll have cordiality at all times. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, it's rather difficult to say anything on an occasion such as this. I do appreciate the tribute that has been paid, and in recognizing that tribute may I just in reply say that in those 22-odd years of participation in this Assembly I have seen many people come and many people go, some by the will of the electorate by being defeated at the polls, others be resignations, and frequently because of physical deficiencies and passing away as the result of the grim reaper.

But I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that after having noted maybe 150 or 200 people pass through these Chambers in that time, that I wouldn't need the fingers of one hand to count those who didn't render real valuable service to the people of Manitoba. I think the people of Manitoba, possibly with the exception of the present Minister of Labour, I think the people of Manitoba have been well served by the men and women who have been members of this august Assembly. All too frequently, politicians are chastised by the very people that they attempt to serve, and I think that an occasion such as this gives me, at least as the present Dean of the House, the opportunity to say to all of the citizens of Manitoba, "You are well served, whether you agree with their policies or not you are well served by the people that you elect to this Assembly".

I thank the Members of the Assembly and you, Sir, for the recognition that they have given me today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

CONGRATULATIONS

MR. WARNER H. JØRGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I could not let the opportunity move by without saying thank you to all honourable members for the kind words today.

If there is one thing about politics that has perhaps interested or intrigued me more than anything, it's the ability of doing exactly what we're doing today, notwithstanding the difference of ideology, philosophy, or views on any given subject, no matter how bitter or acrimonious debate may be in the Legislatures or in the House of Commons, and I think this is something that is not generally known by people at large, that it does not interfere with your ability to make friends on all sides of the House, to have feeling for one another, and to have a respect for one another's points of view. After all that is the essence of democracy to be able to disagree in the place where disagreeing is important, in this Legislature, and yet not necessarily make enemies because of those disagreements. If that lesson can be learned by everyone, indeed this would be a better place to live.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Would the Minister confirm that his department has put a stop order on the printing of new deer hunting licenses for the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware precisely of the mechanics, but I know that the question of the deer season for the fall of '74 is still under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Mines Minister. Will the Government consider appointing a special all-party committee of the Legislature to study taxation policies in the resource area between sessions in order to develop recommendations that can be brought back to this House which will accomplish the objective of a fair return to the public, as well as a fair incentive for development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have a program in principle relative to this question. We have indicated through policy statement what we intend and we've introduced a bill and we would be quite happy to hear from anyone, including members of the industry, members of the public, members of the Legislative Assembly, as to how that bill could reflect the policy position of the Government which we have arrived at, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then more specifically. Has the Government or has the Minister received any information to confirm a statement made to the effect that exploration in Manitoba has dropped by 80 percent due to the uncertainty in the mining legislation and the threats of a different system, which leaves the industry cutting back explorations.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I strongly doubt that in view of the fact that the major mining companies in the Province of Manitoba, plus the Mining Association, have indicated a willingness to participate in joint venture exploration and production with the Government, something that did not take place before, so I strongly doubt the statement. But our mining policy, Mr. Speaker, embodies the statement if there is a withdrawal of some people who have in the past felt that they were going to be paid to remove Manitoba resources as some sort of prize for doing it, our policy statement indicates that to the extent that there is any reduction on private activity this will be replaced by public utility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and I would like to ask him, notwithstanding WestCan and because the 1976 Olympics are an event that belong to all of Canada, is consideration being given, or will consideration be given, to allowing Manitoba Agencies to sell Olympic Lottery tickets?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Yes, Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given by means of the four western provinces together. There was a discussion that took place at the last meeting that we had in Edmonton,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . Alberta, which the four Western Tourism Ministers met and we had a report then. There is still not a finalization on the agreement between the four western provinces and the Olympics themselves, but we're hopeful that this will come about very soon and that all the agencies across the Western Provinces will be given that privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for that information. I would like to ask him by way of supplementary question if he can advise the House who is heading up that committee, who is the chairman, or from which province is the leadership coming in that committee.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the leadership for this purpose is coming from Manitoba and mainly through two individuals being, Mr. Guy Simonis and Laurent Desjardins.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTION

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment on Committee in Law Amendments. I'd like to move, the name Mr. Harry Graham be substituted for that of Mr. George Henderson on the Standing Committee in Law Amendments.

And while I'm on my feet, Sir, I wonder if I may also indicate that I am sending a copy of this Amendment to the Clerk. I understand that he's having some difficulty keeping track of them unless they're sent to him in writing; with a piece of paper in front of him it's much easier.

Also, Sir, at the conclusion of this session I wonder if I may, because I don't know where we stand now there's been so many changes made on the membership of the Committees if we may revert to the original membership on all the Committees - that is from our side of the House at least, I'm not sure what the Government wants to do - so that that list of members that are on the Committee as outlined in the Votes and Proceedings at the beginning of the session will be the list of the members on the Committee after the conclusion of the session. I do this, Sir, because I don't know really where we stand because there have been so many changes made. If that's satisfactory with the House, Sir, I'd like that to be accepted as a motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: The Committee by general agreement and this will apply to the inter-session committees, general agreement accept the fact that or on the last day the names of committee members will be as they were as originally listed in the resolutions setting up Committees.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is he prepared to approve, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba at least, the release of information on the social environmental and cultural impact of the Churchill-Nelson River Diversion to the Committee representing the five communities in Northern Manitoba, headed by Mr. Spence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing program relative to releasing information as it becomes available from the Churchill-Nelson Study group. This is a program that is committed. The reason that we are getting the information is so that it could be made available to the communities and so that we will be able to deal with ameliorating effects. So that will be done, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister been informed that on Friday the board meeting with the Flood Committee informed the board, informed the Flood Committee that they could not make available certain impact studies without the concurrence of both the Minister and the Federal Minister. And if that is the case will the Minister confirm that he will see that that information is released as far as Manitoba's concerned.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt of that, and I consider the release of the Federal Minister to be merely a formality. For my honourable friend's information I signed a letter to Mr. Davis this morning indicating that it is necessary for us to be able to do this and asking for his concurrence, which I'm sure will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if now since the passage of Bill 27 that the legality of lottery tickets in all provinces of Western Canada have been amended by the Federal Government by regulation or by Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite aware that Bill 27 has still not received Royal Assent so the bill is still not law in this province. And even once the bill passed through this House it authorizes the sale of tickets within the province and it does not automatically amend that section of the Criminal Code pertaining to reciprocal arrangements with other provinces in Canada.

MR. McKENZIE: Supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Am I to assume, or the members of the House then, that no representations or presentations were made to the Federal Government regarding the legality of the Criminal Code re the WestCan Lottery scheme.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I myself have not made representation to the Federal Minister in charge, or given the responsibility of the Criminal Code, because of the undertakings of this session. I can't speak for my colleague the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed we will now have a brief interlude for Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

His Honour, W. J. McKeag, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

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

MR. CLERK:

No. 2 - An Act to amend The Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs Act.

No. 3 - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

No. 4 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

No. 5 - An Act to amend the Garnishment Act.

No. 6 - An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

No. 10 - An Act to amend The Margarine Act.

No. 11 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

No. 12 - An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.

No. 13 - An Act to amend The Boxing and Wrestling Commission Act.

No. 14 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act.

No. 15 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

No. 16 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

No. 17 - An Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act.

No. 18 - An Act to amend The Highways Department Act.

No. 19 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act.

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

No. 21 - An Act to validate By-law No. 719 of The City of Thompson.

No. 25 - An Act to validate an Agreement made between The Provincial Exhibition of Manitoba, The City of Brandon, and the Government of Manitoba.

No. 26 - An Act to Incorporate The Minnedosa Foundation.

No. 27 - The Lotteries Act.

No. 30 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.

No. 32 - An Act respecting The City of Brandon.

No. 35 - An Act to Incorporate The Red River Community College Students' Association.

No. 36 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

No. 38 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

No. 39 - An Act to incorporate Portage Curling Club.

No. 40 - The Presbyterian Church Building Corporation Act.

No. 42 - The Veterinary Medical Act.

No. 43 - An Act to amend The Farm Machinery and Equipment Act.

ROYAL ASSENT

- No. 45 - An Act to amend An Act to repeal An Act to Validate and Confirm a Certain Agreement Between The Town of Dauphin and The Rural Municipality of Dauphin.
 No. 46 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act (2).
 No. 48 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (2).
 No. 49 - The Child Welfare Act.
 No. 50 - An Act respecting Montreal Trust Company.
 No. 51 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate Limited.
 No. 52 - An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.
 No. 53 - An Act for the Benefit of Jessie Ellen Gillespie.
 No. 55 - The Centennial Projects Tax Status Act.
 No. 57 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The North Canadian Trust Company.
 No. 58 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).
 No. 59 - An Act to validate By-law Number 3269 of The Town of Dauphin.
 No. 60 - The Social Services Administration Act.
 No. 61 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba).
 No. 62 - An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act (2).
 No. 65 - An Act to amend The Law of Property Act.
 No. 66 - An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act.
 No. 67 - An Act to amend The Public Printing Act.
 No. 69 - An Act to amend The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act.
 No. 72 - An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act.
 No. 76 - The Heritage Manitoba Act.
 No. 79 - An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.
 No. 80 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
 No. 81 - An Act to amend The Department of Public Works Act.

In Her Majesty's Name His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor doth Assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

- No. 29 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1975.
 No. 37 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1975.

MR. CLERK: His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and Assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

MR. SPEAKER: Question Period. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question, and I may need the benefit of your guidance in whether it is in fact a question of privilege or on a point of order. Mr. Speaker I placed five questions on the Order Paper the day the House opened. Four of those were placed on that day, and I still haven't got any answers to my questions. I raised them, Mr. Speaker, so I could have them for the estimates and for the debate on Bill 27, and they're still unanswered.

MR. SPEAKER: The question the honourable member raises is whether it's a matter of privilege. I must inform him it is not. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can a resident of Manitoba under the age of 16 purchase a fishing license?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the question as notice. I'm not certain.

MR. MOUG: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he could take a supplementary as notice, as well, and let us know if a person under 16 if he can't purchase a license can he bring home a limit of fish?

MR. GREEN: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS

A MEMBER: Can he then take home the fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. The Minister gave us a statement last week regarding the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The statement says there is no - from the Attorney-General, informs there is no basis, no criminal action. Can the Minister inform the House whether there was any conflict of interests on behalf of Mr. Mostoway and Mr. Swiderski?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): No, Mr. Speaker, the report indicated, the report that I tabled, indicated there is no conflict of interest because the province was not involved directly or indirectly in the acquisition of this land or in the purchase of the land.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well a supplementary. Do not the two gentlemen work for the Housing and Renewal Corporation and at the same time were purchasing land?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was only one person involved in the purchase of land, not two. But in any case the conflict of interest had only developed if the province had an interest in the land that was involved, but the investigation indicated that the province had no interest whatsoever either through the Housing and Renewal Corporation or any branch of government. They had no interest at all in the land, in the subject land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the Minister's reply to the Member for La Verendrye a few moments ago with regard to permits, does this ad, titled, "So you want to hunt elks" suggest there is an overpopulation of elks in the Duck Mountains?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I'm not acquainted with the ad referred to, therefore I can't answer that question.

MR. BILTON: The ad is over the Minister's signature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the House Leader regarding my questions that are on the Order Paper. I wonder if the Honourable the House Leader can advise me that I'll have this information before this sitting of the 30th Legislature-- (Interjection)--I can ask the Honourable Minister . . . I can hopefully get the information I've been asking on the Order Paper before this sitting of the 30th Legislature ends.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I couldn't guarantee the answer to a question either before or after the end of the sitting. The honourable member knows that a question is a question that is put. It need not be answered. I'm not suggesting as a matter of policy that it should not be answered, but I couldn't guarantee the honourable member an answer.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the ad that is referred to by the Member for Swan River which is over the signature of the Department of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management, it is an ad indicating how licenses would be applied for. It doesn't indicate, Mr. Speaker, anything with regard to the supply or - the elk population.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary question. Is it reasonable for me to expect that the Minister will ban elk hunting this fall in the Duck Mountains?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the answer that I made to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye referred to deer hunting, and which is presently being considered. It is also a fact, Mr. Speaker, that there may be restrictions on other types of licenses, but whether there are or are not restrictions on elk hunting licenses, apparently within the general terms of reference of the department they published as to how licenses could be obtained for those people who would want them.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the ad in front of me but does it not suggest a closing date for applications to be in for permits?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it indicates a date when licenses will be drawn, and I suppose that that is a closing date, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really relate to the original question. The fact is that those people who want an elk hunting license are being

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . advised as to how they should obtain it. That is considered within the general terms of reference of elk - departmental advertising, and is something, Mr. Speaker, that happens as a matter of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to return to the Minister responsible for Housing and his answer to the question posed by the Member from Sturgeon Creek. To the Minister, while your answer indicates that there was no direct or indirect purchasing by the Housing Corporation, is it probable that members of the Housing Corporation would have been privy to information that the City of Winnipeg intended to purchase land in that area and therefore been able to use that information to their advantage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're getting into an area where we're starting a debate. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs re my five questions that are still on the Order Paper. I wonder can I ask the Honourable Minister if it's impossible for him to gain this information that I'm seeking to acquire.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think basically the House Leader answered the question of the Honourable Member for Roblin. If the information was readily available the honourable member would have the answer that he seeks. Unfortunately I understand that the answer is not forthcoming, so as soon as it can be made available the honourable member will have it, and hopefully that this can occur before the end of the session because the questions that the honourable member is seeking were accepted by this side of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might restate my question to the Minister responsible for Housing. Would officials of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation have information concerning city purchases of the land prior to the purchases being made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the report indicated the purchase of land being questioned was made after the proposal for this Assiniboine Forest Park or whatever it is called, was made known to the public through the media and through the announcement of the Environmental Committee by the City of Winnipeg. So it's not information that would be known only to one group. It was a public document, it was in the press, it was announced in the press, and so the information would be known to anyone who cared to read it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister. Before the announcement was made public, were discussions held between Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and the City of Winnipeg concerning the probable purchase of land for recreation or park purposes?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt that very much because the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation had no interest in that land at all. The decision to form a park was the City's. I believe the matter was put forward as a proposal, oh something like 1965 originally but it wasn't until the City of Winnipeg Act came into being that the matter was then pursued and made official. I think it was in January of 1973 I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD McGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister in charge of Autopac. In view of the rising accident rate in the province relating to vehicles, and in view of the high incidence of accidents that show the presence of alcohol as a contributing factor, has the Minister or his Board given any consideration to providing a discount for people who are abstainers, or for people who are prepared to sign an affidavit that they have been abstainers for a period of years and are prepared to maintain that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, various forms or alternatives in respect to the cost of insurance are being looked at by the board and by the staff of MPIC, as well as receiving information from the Motor Vehicle Branch, Safety Division, but specifically that area has not been discussed at a board meeting or as an alternative. If I may add, some of the matters that have been raised by the Minister of Highways insofar as the merit system, and the driver's license is one avenue

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. URUSKI cont'd). . .that may encourage motorists to drive safely, may have an impact on it, and as well some of the other avenues, insofar as the accident surcharge, may have a different kind of effect on motorists and their driving habits.

MR. McGILL: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then is the Minister and his Board prepared to consider this granting of discounts, as I believe was the case under private insurance, there were certain policies available to abstainers at a lower rate, and I wonder if the Minister would agree to consider this and to perhaps in some subsequent time report back.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether all the information that the honourable member gave in his preface is totally correct, but I must agree with him that there is a high incidence of accidents involving the use of alcohol or drugs, of one nature or another, but we will consider this matter.

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

. continued on next page

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder it was indicated that we would be proceeding with some Third Readings this afternoon but I wonder if members will permit me to have Bill No. 85 called so that the Mineral Taxation Act could be introduced. It was distributed this morning and therefore can be called this afternoon. I don't think I'll be very long in presenting it but I believe that there is some advisability that it be presented now so that some explanation can be given.

Agreed?

BILL NO. 85

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's agreeable to this side of the House. Is it our understanding then once that bill has been introduced for Second Reading that we'll revert to the order in which the House Leader outlined prior to the dinner recess.

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 85, an Act to Amend the Mineral Taxation Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, members are aware as to the history for the necessity of this particular piece of legislation. In the fall of 1972 oil prices began to rise very sharply and the Federal Government imposed an export tax on all oil that was exported from the country which meant that the Federal Government took as public revenue all of the oil which was selling for more than roughly 3.70 to \$4.00 a barrel. The Government also asked for a voluntary restraint on prices for oil within Canada, so that all the oil effectively that was sold in the country remained at the figure of roughly \$4.00.

Subsequent to that the Federal Government in January and February of this year indicated that there would be permission to the producing provinces to increase the price of oil to roughly \$6.50 a barrel. As a result of that increase charges from the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan amounted to again roughly \$50 million in additional oil prices, and the products of crude oil, to the people of the Province of Manitoba. Since Manitoba is a very small oil producer and imports the large percentage of its oil purposes, the costs to the people of the Province of Manitoba were increased in the area of \$50 million a year, and each of the provinces, the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan have taken a large part of this oil increase into public revenues in the province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan, so the citizens of those provinces are largely protected from the kind of charges that are being faced by the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba did not want these oil increases, Mr. Speaker, and, despite what is being now suggested by the Leader of the Liberal Party, the province went to Ottawa asking that the freeze remain, that there be a one-price for oil across the country, and that the differential in price be related only to transportation but it was apparent, Mr. Speaker, that some concessions were going to be made to the oil-producing provinces and subsequently the Federal Government did permit the voluntary restraints to be raised so that the price of oil was permitted to be charged at roughly \$6.50 a barrel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the province did not want this price increase. The province would have preferred if all the oil in Canada stayed at the same \$4.00 per barrel, in which case the Manitoba producer would not have got any more for his oil, the Saskatchewan producer would not have got any more and the Alberta producer would not have got any more, and the consumers of the country were protected. But to the extent Mr. Speaker, that there has been this price increase and the subsequent cost to the people of the province of Manitoba, we have no alternative but to try to recoup some of those costs that the citizens of this province are experiencing on the product which we have a small quantity of, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba is now introducing legislation with the intention of recovering from the increased

BILL 85

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . value of this commodity some moneys for the purpose of, to some extent defraying the costs that have been charged to the people by the increases in prices in Alberta and Saskatchewan. The rough estimate of the amount that the province will realize from this increased taxation is \$8 million. The Minister of Finance has indicated that there is a 2 cents per gallon reduction on gasoline products in the Province of Manitoba and the financial capacity for which comes from the bill which is being produced.

Now I'd like to indicate Mr. Speaker, first of all, that the Province of Manitoba receives oil revenues from two sources. (1) Crown land - the oil revenues which we receive are 12-1/2 royalty on all the oil that is produced on Crown Land. On freehold land there is presently an 8 mill levy of assessment on the land itself based on the value of oil that exists on the land. It is like a real estate; it is in fact a real estate assessment which indicates that that land has a greater value because of the presence of oil. It is a very nominal assessment; it is 8 mills, which is 8/1000ths of the value of the oil, which it is reckoned at one and one-half times its value, for some reason which is not clearly known to me but which is historical. So that the Province of Manitoba in order to realize revenues from the increased value of the oil is going to do two things, and must do two things: (1) It is going to increase the royalties by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council concurrently with the coming into effect of this legislation, by having an increased charge, an increased royalty, which will be equivalent to the increased assessment which is being provided for on freehold land, and which is outlined in Bill 85, so that there will be two taxes, one in increased royalty, one in increased tax on the assessment on that oil which is situated on freehold land. And the basis of the assessment, Mr. Speaker, is that a low producer, in other words a well which has small capacity and therefore a greater ratio of cost to its productive capacity, is being assessed at a lower mill rate, and a well which has a greater capacity is being assessed at a higher mill rate, the effect of which is approximately as follows:

That if a well is producing up to 5 barrels a day, it will be permitted 90 cents out of the increased cost to go to the producer; if it is producing 20 barrels a day, roughly 27 cents will go to the producer, and the amounts between those figures would be rated proportionally to the capacity of the well. So if we take an example, Mr. Speaker, which I think is the best way of doing this, the price per barrel of oil on April 1, 1974, was \$6.39. The price per barrel on the day before April 1, 1974, was \$3.70. There is therefore \$2.69 which is subject to this increased tax. The \$2.69 for a 5 barrel per day producer would be distributed as follows: The Mineral Tax would go up in terms of 8 mills of \$2.69, which is 3 cents, which you can see is nominal. The incremental tax would be 163 mills, which will mean that the province will get from that 5 barrel per day producer in incremental taxes, \$1.56 out of \$2.69. The freehold mineral owner share would be 12 percent, provided that that is the usual terms of the lease between the freeholder and the producer, so that he would get 15 cents, and the producer would get 95 cents, that is a 5 barrel a day producer, and that totals \$2.69. If it was a 20 barrel a day producer the 8 mills would result in 3 cents additional to the province on the normal tax, the incremental tax would be 233 mills, so that the province would receive \$2.28 out of \$2.69; the freehold mineral owner would get 6 cents, and the producer would get 32 cents, so there would be an increase of a minimum of 32 cents to the producer of a 20 barrel a day field, and a maximum of roughly 95 cents to a producer of a 5 barrel a day well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is of some value to realize the following facts. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government imposed a tax which in effect took the entire price increase between the fall of 1973 and April of 1974, that that revenue was being entirely taken by the Federal Government. But I think that there are - and if that had continued, which is what the province desired, if that had continued the producer in the Province of Manitoba would not have got any of that increased revenue, if the freeze was maintained, and the export tax was applied, the producer would have been producing at the same rate, which was roughly \$3.70 per barrel.

Furthermore Mr. Speaker, I think that these are very important facts to realize. These are the average price per barrel for the crude oil that was produced in the Province of Manitoba between 1963 and 1973. In 1963 \$2.44; 1964 \$2.43 - it went down; 1965, \$2.48; 1966, \$2.50; 1967, \$2.50; 1968, \$2.51; 1969, \$2.52; 1970, \$2.51; 1971, \$2.75; 1972, \$2.77; and 1973, \$3.37. So that if we take, Mr. Speaker, the year 1970 - in 1970 the producers that we are talking about in the Province of Manitoba were getting \$2.50 a barrel for their oil. If we didn't do anything

BILL 85

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . .with regard to those producers at the present time, they would be getting at least a 50 percent increase if we take \$2.50 to \$3.70, they would be getting at least a 50 percent increase on the price of the barrels of oil that they were selling. When we apply the maximum allowance that they are getting out of the increased price, which would bring them roughly to \$4.60 a barrel, if they got the entire 90 to 95 cent increase. We can see, Mr. Speaker that there is an increase between 1971 and 1974 of almost 100 percent on the barrels of oil being produced, \$5.00 would be 100 percent, and if we're talking \$3.70 plus 90 it's \$4.60, so there is a doubling of the price of oil to the producer who happens to be operating in the field which is least productive, not for reasons of his own, but he happens to be in a field which produces less oil.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, given those two facts, (1) that the Federal Government was taking the entire amount with a rebate to the province, because they were making a rebate to the producing provinces; secondly, that the allowance that is now being made still results in almost a 100 percent increase to the lowest producing wells, to the cost of oil that they were selling for four years ago; and thirdly, that the Province of Manitoba is being charged those prices by our producing provinces to the west. It would be unheard of, Mr. Speaker, if the province did not try to recoup what is being charged to us by other provinces and to pass that advantage, or that relative disadvantage, on to the people of the Province of Manitoba because we are still much further behind. - If my figures are wrong I said \$50 million, it's perhaps \$40 million. --(Interjection)--Do you think it's 40? I thought - well maybe my figures are wrong maybe it is \$40 million that the citizens of Manitoba have to pay by virtue of this, and we recover 8, we are still \$32 million behind even with the imposition of this tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to note that in the province of Alberta, where this is set by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as well, the rates on the old oil attempt to capture 65 percent of the price increase. We are between 27 cents and 90 cents, but they have a tax on 65 percent on all old oil, which is the wells that were producing, and 35 percent of the price increase on new oil which is discovered, and we have made new oil taxed at the same rate as the lowest producing old oil wells that we have listed in the legislation.

In the Province of Saskatchewan, there has been an attempt to recover the entire price increase by just taking the place of the Federal Government, and they have then allowed certain deductions as incentives to the continuance of exploration in oil, but I consider, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the situation across Canada, that the Province of Manitoba is proceeding in a modest way. If I have to be apologetic, it is not for being stronger in terms of raising the tax even more, a modest way in recognition of the fact that we are an area where some of the less productive wells are in existence. However, if one looks at the prices, if we look at the prices that are being received, and when one realizes that in the lowest area they are getting almost double what was being arrived at 4 years ago, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can say that we are driving any wells out of existence. Now you may have some of the oil, people say that--(Interjection)--well the honourable member says that we are, and I will tell the honourable member that there are provisions in our legislation passed by Regulation, enacted by the previous government, and I'm not suggesting that they are, that we have to implement them, I am suggesting that what is being done now gives a fair price to the oil producer with no increased - with relatively less increased costs of production. But there are provisions, Mr. Speaker, in our regulations which enable the province to deal with the fact that there will be no waste of the product, and the province can step in and do those things.

I am certain that they should not have to; I am certain that they need not have to, but I also tell the honourable member that if it is required that we do make sure that wells which provide oil, or which have oil in there, continue to operate at a price that the oil can be sold, then those regulations are available to the Province of Manitoba as enacted by a far-sighted previous administration to enable us to do it, and I am not suggesting that it has to be done; I'm suggesting that a fair price is now available, but if it has to be done, Mr. Speaker, then the province can take steps to see to it that oil continues to be produced on those wells on which we have the economic value in producing it at \$6.39 per barrel.

I did not hear, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any of the Manitoba producers saying when the entire increase in price was being expropriated by a Federal Liberal Government, the entire increase in price was being expropriated by a Federal Liberal Government, we did not hear threats of the closing down of the oil wells. The fact is that they were getting an increased price

BILL 85

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . .and they were operating. They are now getting a still greater increased price more generous than the Province of Saskatchewan, more generous than the Province of Alberta, and if on that basis there is a suggestion that they are not going to be able to make money, then I tell the honourable member, and I tell the public of the province, that there is regulations that enable us to deal with this situation, already enacted legislation which we do not now have to enact. However, I consider that to be a non-existent, or a problem that we need not confront ourselves with because of the increase that the oil producers are getting, but if it has to be confronted, Mr. Speaker, it of course will be confronted at the time. I tell the honourable members that 20 percent of the oil that is produced is on Crown land, the balance of 80 percent is on freehold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Act as presented does indicate that the incremental tax is subject to change by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Mr. Speaker, this is necessary because the prices may change, and if the price goes down it will be necessary to reduce this tax, which is based on a mill rate, if the prices go up, then we want to have the flexibility to increase the tax, but that relates only to the incremental tax, the 8 mills remains as it was; the schedule which is attached to the Act can be changed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one further point, the Act is largely technical, there are terms that honourable members will want a clearer explanation of. I think that the best way of dealing with this is to make available the staff to honourable members of the House who wish to ask questions concerning what is to occur, so I have therefore arranged, Mr. Speaker, with my staff, and staff from the Finance Department, to be available 10:30 tomorrow morning, I wonder if honourable members would take note that my staff and staff from the Department of Finance will be available at 10:30 tomorrow morning in the Members' Lounge, right across from the Chamber, to answer questions as to the technical features of the Act, or how the mill rate has been struck off--(Interjection)--In the Conference Room, I'm sorry, the Members' Conference Room across the hall, but I've given, Mr. Speaker, what I have indicated to be the principle of the legislation; the principle of the legislation is that the Government of Manitoba because there has been an increase in price having nothing to do with productivity, having nothing to do with capital investment, having nothing to do with production costs, having solely to do with an unnatural increase in the oil price that the people of Manitoba are attempting to recoup to themselves a fair share of that increase--(Interjection)--Yes, a fair share, Mr. Speaker, of the economic rent which is thus accruing and which has nothing to do with the initiative of the people who happen to be involved in the wells, and Mr. Speaker, in response to the fact that the people of Manitoba had been the subjects - I would not use the term "victims" although some would - had been the subjects of the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan increasing those prices to us while at the same time taking as public revenue a very substantial share of that price increase to the extent that we can make a modest adjustment, through the fact that some of that oil resource exists within the Province of Manitoba, this legislation attempts to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer one question before we adjourn debate. I believe the Minister stated in his address that the Province of Alberta has imposed a 65 percent tax on the additional revenue coming to the oil producer, and he stated that this tax in Manitoba is less, yet by my figures, at the minimum level the 3 cents plus \$1.56 on the 5-barrel limit and the 3 cents plus \$2.28 on the 20-barrel limit adds up to 60 percent of the minimum and well over 85 percent on the maximum. Could you clarify your statement, therefore, that this tax is somehow less than that that Alberta's imposing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I said that it was less than the Alberta situation, perhaps I was loose in making that remark. The Alberta rates attempt to capture 65 percent of the price increase on all old oil - that deals with every producer's, as I understand it - and 35 percent of the price increase on new oil. The Saskatchewan attempt to capture 100 percent of the price increase on the old oil by levying a Royalty surcharge on Crown lands and mineral income tax on freehold lands. Then they introduced some allowances as incentives, and I think that if I said that Manitoba is lower I was coupling the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan. If I didn't then to the extent that those figures do not work out that way, the Province of Manitoba is in a different position. I can tell him that the Province of Alberta has much more to levy slightly less taxes on.

BILL 85

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to question the Minister regarding the meeting tomorrow morning. This is only for members of this Chamber?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We are not meeting with the public, we are meeting with members of the Chamber who wish explanations on the bill.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Can we proceed now with the Third Readings, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 33. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - THIRD READING - BILL 33

BILL No. 33, The Power Engineers Act, was read a third time and passed.

BILL 77

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 77, The Statute Law Amendment Taxation Act (1974) for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have only one point to make and I would like to make it before we approve the passing of this bill. I think that the debate in Committee of the Whole has been a very worthwhile one and I think that there have been contributions made from this side and in the dialogue with the government changes have been made that will make the particular sections of a number of the Acts better. Having said that, I think there is a problem area that should be again mentioned and I think it's important that we take note of it; while there was a precedent again in 1964, that dealing in tax statutes an omnibus tax act, which becomes involved not just in housekeeping but dealing with general principles of taxation - and there were principles involved in the different bills, the exemption of Indians from the Sales Tax, the changes in the Mining Royalty Tax, the reduction of the Gasoline Tax - that these bills do not commend themselves to an omnibus bill but rather should be brought in as separate tax bills. And I would hope that, having participated as we did in a way in which to facilitate the matter, that this precedent - not this precedent but the example, will not be one that will be followed in years to come, and I would commend that to the government as I would comment that to any others who will be here in future years, for other governments, on the assumption that, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of tax matters, they should be dealt with separately, not in the omnibus way in which they have been dealt with in the present situation.

Again, I think that there has been much accomplished in the debate that's occurred in respect to that, and I look forward to the references to the Manitoba Law Reform Commission of suggestions and concerns that were expressed in the House. I would look forward to their recommendations and the ability to be able to amend the statutes even further, so that the concerns and desire generally of everyone here to have the legislation reflect contemporary thinking with respect to civil liberties and the protection of the individual; at the same time, not in any way impeding the normal and proper way in which government must see that there is an accounting for the tax revenues owing to them - and investigate and audit and carry out the normal functions it must have, to be able to see to it that those who are responsible for paying tax, do in fact pay the tax.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 89

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 89. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

(BILL NO. 89 was read a third time and passed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker I wonder whether we could close the report stage now of proposed amendments.

BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: Report stage of Bill No. 7 - shall the bill reported by Standing Committee of the House be concurred in?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable the First Minister, I move that Bill No. 7 be amended by deleting the proposed new subsection 44 (4) to the Act as set out in section 11 of Bill No. 7 - seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this particular amendment, and dealing with the reports made on this amendment, there is a further amendment which would eliminate the particular section - or at least delete the particular section in its amended form - and would substitute a section that we feel would convey what we think this Legislature should agree on in principle. Mr. Speaker, we will have an opportunity of dealing with that particular section afterwards and I'm assuming that I'll have the right to speak on that amendment when it's introduced.

Having said that - on the next amendment - there's two amendments to be introduced; one is the deletion of this particular clause, another amendment to be introduced by the Honourable Member from Swan River. I'm assuming that I'm going to have two opportunities to speak, one on this particular amendment--(Interjection)--two separate ones. All right. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the intent I think of the deletion of this particular section is to basically prohibit civil servants from being in a position to solicit funds on behalf of a political candidate or a political party. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's the intent and I believe that is the intent and that was the reason for the Premier introducing this deletion, then I think, Mr. Speaker, it's necessary to go beyond - and I think leave may be requested and I'm quite prepared to give that - to go beyond the deletion of the section because, Mr. Speaker, what will be required is a prohibition in the Act.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that if the second is deleted, the right still exists as I understand it, there is no prohibition - that is in law - exists today and the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the reasons for the deletion come directly as a result of the debate in the committee and a general feeling expressed that civil servants should not be put into that position. Now the difficulty we have at this particular stage is that there have been statements made outside this House which would indicate that the Government has taken the position - and it's a very fine line, and they understand that - they have taken the position now and have been persuaded as a result of the debate and I gather as a result of a caucus meeting, which there was a majority of the caucus who--(Interjection)--well I'm only indicating what the papers have indicated, what the press reports have indicated, what the statements that I believe the Ministers have made. The only information we have - now this becomes very important because, Mr. Speaker, if in fact there is general agreement in concensus now that there is to be a prohibition with respect to civil servants soliciting for funds on behalf of a candidate or political party, then Mr. Speaker, the deletion of this section does not accomplish the objective. There must be a prohibition in the Act itself. The deletion only deletes the explicit provision allowing them to do it, but there is nothing in law that would prohibit them from not doing it, and so, Mr. Speaker, the deletion of the section alone does not accomplish the objective. If we have reached the point where we have agreed that a civil servant should not be in that position and that the concensus is that they should be prohibited from soliciting, we will require an additional amendment to the Act which will place the prohibition in legal language and will be explicitly included within the Act itself. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I indicate to the Government our agreement at this point with respect to the amendment, but would expect now that there would have to be leave obtained to be able, and we're prepared to give it, to allow the explicit prohibition against civil servants soliciting funds on behalf of a party or a candidate from being provided.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong the debate on this particular bill. However, I've spoken on it with some feeling and with some emotion. There are different times where governments, no matter how well intentioned or with what majority, bring about legislation that they see fit. It's my firm and unswerving opinion that the legislation that we are about to pass is wrong. I don't even equivocate as to the degree that my leader just has done. I think that we are taking a backward step insofar as the Civil Service is concerned, and I merely wish to indicate on the public record my opposition to it. I think the day will come that many people in Manitoba, and most important those who serve the people of

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . Manitoba through the offices of the public service will live to regret the passage of this Act. Thank you.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think that I would echo the words of my leader this morning in congratulating the Government for taking the step that it has by the amendment which is proposed by the First Minister, namely that of withdrawing the entire Section 4. I think that certainly it goes a long way in alleviating some of the apprehension that the Liberal Party had with respect to this entire legislation. I say it goes a long way toward alleviating it, but I'm not saying that it's removing it in its entirety. I think that again we have a demonstration of goodwill and we cannot help but commend the Government for the step it has taken. It's unfortunate that it did not see clear to take the same kind of positive action with respect to the formulation of the Civil Service Commission. We feel rather strongly in that area, and it's really unfortunate that some of the concrete and positive recommendations that were made by both parties on the opposite side were not heeded in that regard. However, I think that we will have an opportunity - as you ruled a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Official Opposition - will have an opportunity to speak on the amendment that's brought forth by the Honourable Member from Swan River. So those are the only comments, Mr. Speaker, we have with respect to the amendment now before us brought to this House by the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there's some confusion as to what we are doing at the present time. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition referred to, pretty well, Bill No. 7 in its totality rather than the amendment that we have before us at the present time, and he was followed in general terms by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

After having heard representations made during second reading of Bill No. 7 regarding the ability of civil servants to solicit funds on behalf of a political candidate or a political party, and after having heard further representations in committee, the Government considered - or reconsidered, whichever way you want to take it - that particular section in Bill No. 7 which dealt with the question of the involvement of the Civil Service in collection of moneys, and after that due consideration the First Minister moved the amendment that we're dealing with at the present time.

Now I would suggest to honourable members of the Assembly that rather than bringing in extraneous matters on this particular section of the Act, we should only deal as to whether or not we have the support of the Assembly for the deletion of this particular clause. That is the proposition that we have before us. The Honourable the Member for Swan River, as I notice the Orders of the Day, will be bringing in a second amendment to Bill No. 7 and we will be discussing that separate amendment when it is proposed. So I would suggest to my honourable friends, the question that we have to deal with now is whether or not the members of the Assembly deal with the deletion of that clause which contained in the bill at the present time would give the Civil Servants the opportunity of soliciting funds. That's the only proposition, Mr. Speaker, I say that we have before us. Either you're for it or you're agin it. And it's just as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? Agreed? Order please. Are the members paying attention? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? Agreed? (Agreed) On division. Very well, on division.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough for me.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour would answer a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit Civil Servants from being in the position to solicit funds on behalf of a political party or a candidate?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, that's the purpose of the deletion of the amendment. Now if my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, want this on division, then I'm going to ask that that division be clearly recorded that whoever votes against the deletion would then be supporting the retention of the present clause in Bill No. 7. I want that clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition have another question?

BILL 7

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Honourable Minister - and I would recognize that leave would have to be obtained from this House - would not agree that in order to accomplish the objective that. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a question, that is a debate. The honourable member stated that once before when he had the floor. Now if he has a question of clarification I'll entertain it. If not the debate is finished, I'll put the question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, does the Honourable Minister of Labour believe that by deletion of this section that there is a prohibition on the part of civil servants not to. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive. Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

. . . .Continued on next page.

BILL 7

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that Section 44 of Bill 7 be deleted and the following substituted therefor: 44(1) An employee of the Civil Service or any employee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that reading be dispensed with providing it's written into Hansard? Agreed? The honourable member will have to read this amendment. --(Interjection)-- That's what I heard from that side.

MR. BILTON: I'd be delighted, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it'll make an impression on the Minister of Labour and also the people of Manitoba. "44(1) An employee of the Civil Service or any employee under any agency of Government other than the Deputy Minister or such other classes or groups of employees as may be designated or set out in the regulations may be a candidate for election or to any elected municipal office, including a member or trustee of an elementary or secondary school board or a trustee of an improvement district; or may serve in such office or activity work in support of a candidate for such office if: (1) Candidate service or activity does not interfere with the performance of his duties as a Civil Service employee. (2) Candidacy - service or activity does not conflict with the interests of the Government; and (3) Candidacy - the service or activity is not in affiliation with or sponsored by a provincial or federal political party.

"44(2) Except during a leave of absence granted under subsection (b) a Civil Service employee shall not (1) be a candidate in a provincial or federal election or serve as an elected representative in the Legislature of any province or in the Parliament of Canada. (2) solicit funds for a provincial or federal political party or candidate; or (3) associate his position in the service of the Government with any political activity. (b) Any Civil Service employee or any employee under any agency of Government other than a Deputy Minister or such other classes or groups of employees as may be designated or set out in the regulations, who declares his intentions in writing to his Minister to become a candidate in a provincial or federal election shall apply through his Minister to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for leave of absence without pay for a period of (1) not longer than that commencing on the day on which the Writ for the election is issued and ending on polling day; and (2) not shorter than that commencing on the day provided by the statute for the nomination of candidates and ending on polling day. And every such application shall be granted. (c) In case of any person who has applied under 44(2) (b) above and has not been successful in obtaining the official candidacy of a political party in the constituency for which he has declared his intentions as in 44(2)(b) above, the leave of absence granted in 44(2)(b) above shall be deemed to have terminated one day after the date the official candidate has been declared. (d) Where a Civil Service employee who is a candidate in a provincial or federal election is elected, he shall forthwith resign his position as a Civil Servant. (e) Where a Civil Service employee has been granted leave of absence under Subsection (b) and was not elected or resigned his position under Subsection (b), the period of the leave of absence or resignation shall be computed in determining the length of his service for all purposes, and the service before and after such period shall be deemed to be continuous for all purposes. (f) Any person who has taken leave of absence under Section 44(2)(b) and who has not been successful as a candidate shall be reinstated in his former position if he applies for such reinstatement within 10 days of election.

"44(3) - Civil servants shall not during a provincial or a federal election canvass on behalf of a candidate in the election. (b) A Deputy Minister or any other employee under any agency" -- I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House. The conversation that is going on is rather disturbing. I don't want to miss a word, Mr. Speaker, so I would ask that the honourable gentlemen give me the privilege of being heard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BILTON: Thank you. Such rude remarks are unbecoming of the Minister of Labour.

"(b) A Deputy Minister or any other employee under any agency of government in a position or classification designated in the regulations shall not at any time canvass on behalf of or otherwise actively work in support of a provincial or federal political party or candidate.

BILL 7

(MR. BILTON Cont'd)

"44(b) - Except during a leave of absence granted under Subsection (b) of Section 44(2) a civil servant shall not at any time speak in public or express views in writing for distribution to the public on any matter that forms part of the platform of a provincial or federal political party.

"44(5) - A Civil Service employee shall not during working hours engage in any activity for or on behalf of a provincial or federal political party.

"44(6) - Conservation of Section 44 shall be deemed to be sufficient cause for dismissal.

"44(7) - No person acting on behalf of himself or on behalf of any other person shall seek (a) by intimidation or (b) by coercion or (c) by threat of dismissal or loss of employment or any kind of threat or (d) by the imposition of pecuniary or other penalties or (e) by undue influence or (f) by any other means to compel an employee in the Civil Service or under any agency of the Government to become or refrain from becoming as the case may be candidate for a member of the Legislative Assembly or Parliament." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Swan River, seconded by - the Honourable Member for Brandon West is missing, can't use him - Member for Roblin, the amendment as read. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: This amendment substantially is the same that was introduced in Law Amendments Committee. It reflects a difference in point of view, Mr. Speaker, between ourselves and the Government as to what should in fact be the right of a civil servant with respect to his ability to be able to run for political office. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the First Minister in a few moments - after we have completed a decision on this, in the event that this is unsuccessful - will reintroduce and ask for leave to alter the section that we've already deleted, and that will correct part of our concerns. And for that reason I would leave that until that portion is brought forward again. But I would like to just express and put on the record, and I don't think there is need to debate this very extensively, the real differences between points of view on our side and the honourable members opposite. We believe the civil servants should in fact have the right to run for political office. They should be put in a position, Mr. Speaker, that they are not jeopardized by seeking political office, and in the course of seeking it being unsuccessful and therefore having to look for a position or a job again. They should be in a position to come back to their original job classification without the loss of the benefits they normally would have, other than the leave of absence that would be permitted and the loss of salary during that period of time. We do not believe that the Civil Service should be politicized, and there is an essential difference between our point of view and the members opposite as to the course and direction that is taking place both in this province and other jurisdictions, and we've expressed our concern over and over again on this matter.

I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that although this session is in the last stages, and although there have been many references to our concerns about the politicizing of the Civil Service, in the months and years to come there will be a greater public awareness of the kind of problems that we have suggested as specific details are presented in this House session after session, because this is a wrong course - the Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated this in his remarks on the previous amendment. We, Mr. Speaker, believe that - and would commend the Government to seriously entertain our position. We understand the position of the Government, it was expressed in the Law Amendments Committee and I'm sure it'll be expressed again here in the House. There is a difference in our point of view. There are inherent dangers in what is being done. We think we have demonstrated very clearly the confusion that exists in the roles of a civil servant who is given responsibility for the execution of policy, and at the same time at various times will be soliciting the support of the very people with whom he or she is dealing with; and the confusion among people as to the roles in the solicitation on behalf of the party that's the Government, and on behalf of the Government in the execution of its policies. Now, we think that confusion has been clearly demonstrated and will be demonstrated over and over again and we think what will happen will have a very serious deterioration in the efficiency of the Civil Service and will cause in the long run great harm to our administrative structure. Mr. Speaker, I would almost suggest that the government may very well be the first recipients of the kind of action that civil servants are

BILL 7

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) capable or will be capable of doing under this Act.

We suggest, Mr. Speaker, and repeat again, that the Government is not a normal business and that the operations of the Government are not the normal operation of any kind of business enterprise in which the employees should enjoy all the rights within the political structure of Government. We think that there is a tradition that non-partisanship and a tradition of non-participation which should be adhered to, and we regret very much that the Government has saw fit to proceed in the way that they have, not to accept out proposal so far; and we have nothing to indicate that the Government will accept our proposal, which we think is a reasonable way of dealing with the situation and bringing it into a contemporary position insofar as political thought is concerned - and at the same time not providing what we consider will be the dangers to our administrative structure and the dangers of the kind of politicizing that will cause problems, and cause serious consequence in that confusion that I mentioned and in the way in which the Government operates.

We commend the Government to consider our proposal. We believe it to be the correct way of handling the situation. We believe that it's been successful in the Province of Ontario, where in the main most of these amendments are in legislation and where the Civil Service is extremely large because of the number of the population of course, and there does not appear to be the kind of confusion that we've already had in a very limited way already in Manitoba and which has been brought forward to the attention of the House. We believe that all the Government is doing is opening up a Pandora's box and it will cause many many problems and it will cause many concerns and require the serious attention of the government and the opposition and will without question have to be reconsidered in any case, if it's allowed to go through in its present form and this amendment is not accepted.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has no illusions that the Government is going to accept this amendment as it beat it back in committee and as it beat back the many amendments that the Liberal Party offered at that time. Nevertheless I want to restate the Liberal Party takes the view that there were three fundamental areas of complaint with the bill, one of which has been partially cured.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are discussing the amendment and amendment only. I am not opening up the whole bill. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, while I commend you for being alert to the debate I had intended - the total framework of the amendment is exactly what I propose to discuss. It was our position on the issues raised in the amendment to 44(1) that any person outside of the judiciary of this province should have the right to stand for public office and that person should be protected in the reinstatement after he wins and comes back, or loses but wants reinstatement. Now had the bill just done that we would have saluted the Government and passed it, but there are three areas in the amendment to 44(1) before us that doesn't quite solve some of the problems that we foresaw.

The first was this - and there's reference in subsection (2) of the amendment: Under no circumstances should a person who has influence or control over the destiny of the taxpayer or a citizen of this province should he be allowed to raise funds - Period. And the Government has wisely withdrawn that - what was I guess 44(4) - and I salute the Government for having gone that far.

Then there were two more problems. By the way I might say, and this is shocking to me, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment before us reinstates that right to solicit funds. Because what it says in 44(2)(II), it says that except during a leave of absence - which means when you're running for office - a civil servant shall not raise money. Which means that when he is not a candidate he can run around raising money. That's precisely what that means, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the law is this in this province: one is free to do everything that he is not prohibited to do. This section says that you are prohibited from raising funds during the time you are a candidate. The First Minister proposes I understand to introduce an amendment which says you cannot raise funds. Now that I can buy. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, the hasty draftsmanship of this amendment - I hope that's the reason it was put this way, that it was hastily drafted -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, there is

BILL 7

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) . . . nothing speedy about the Honourable Member from Swan River I would concede, but somebody might have drafted it and I hope it's a mistake. If it isn't certainly that amendment reintroduces the evil we just had removed from the Act and I hope to see further protection from the First Minister.

There's two other things. We sought - and 44(1) doesn't do it for us - we sought an insulation of the Civil Service. We then believed that once we had conferred or reinstated the right of people to stand for public office that there would be a totally objective independent Civil Service Commission. 44(1) as proposed by the Honourable Member for Swan River does nothing to allay that concern. The Government has indicated that it will not accept amendments in that area - and therefore I find the amendment wanting.

The third area that the amendment tried to touch on, and I recall to honourable members that we moved this in Committee, we moved what I believe is Section 58 or something of the Saskatchewan Act, and we find the Honourable Member from Swan River moving what he calls 44(7) to cover the same subject and I say he misses the mark. What we sought and what we could support is a protection of each civil servant for taking part in public activity and for not taking part. --(Interjection)-- I don't know that you've -- you've accepted the amendment? Then I apologize to the Honourable Minister for Labour. If he has done that he has gone a long way to meeting the criticism; I'll certainly check the reprinted Act.

But this amendment, Mr. Speaker, doesn't go anywhere near far enough. It says that there will be no intimidation to compel a member of the Civil Service to refrain from or becoming a candidate. That's all it does for him. What we had asked for in Committee was that there should - not only candidacy but political partisanship, political activity. The amendment we sought in Committee in which 44(7) is proposed by the Honourable Member for Swan River doesn't come anywhere near solving for us, is protection against loss of office, loss of advancement, loss of promotion because one is a known something, one is a known partisan. That was the amendment we moved in Committee. All this does is say that one will not be compelled to become or refrain from becoming a candidate, and that is fairly weak, Mr. Speaker.

Now I'm going to go back to check the -- the amendments were coming so fast that evening I don't remember what amendment we got. --(Interjection)-- 44(8)? Mr. Speaker, I'll check that. Because if that is in fact the Saskatchewan legislation, or close to it, then that aspect of this amendment is unwarranted. So because the amendment doesn't do the things that the Liberal Party felt it ought to do, and in fact I think does some of the things we found offensive in the original bill or reintroduces them, we don't see much merit in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be only fair for me as the sponsor of this bill to indicate the stance that we took in Committee and that is rejection of the proposal of the Honourable Member for Swan River. When we introduced this bill and the amendments thereto - and most of them are here - dealing with political activity, it was because of a basis of principle.

The Honourable the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, has quite properly pointed out that contained within the amendments proposed by the Honourable Member for Swan River there are references to amendments really that were made in the Act and are not challenged at the present time by way of amendment. So I just want to indicate on behalf of the Government we find that the proposals of the Honourable Member for Swan River unacceptable and we will be voting against the amendment, due to the fact that we want all of the civil servants in the Province of Manitoba, with certain exceptions, to have the rights of full participation in democracy.

MR. ASPER: . . . on a point of privilege. I want to apologize to the Honourable Minister for Labour. I hadn't seen 44(8). It does in effect do what he says it does and I withdraw my observation that we had been thwarted in getting that protection built in. I thank the Honourable Minister.

QUESTION put, MOTION lost.

MR. BILTON: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Swan River to Bill No. 7.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

BILL 7

YEAS

Messrs. Banman	McGill
Bilton	McGregor
Blake	McKenzie
Brown	Minaker
Enns	Moug
Graham	Sherman
Johnston (Stur. Cr.)	Spivak
Jorgenson	

NAYS

Messrs. Adam	Marion
Asper	Miller
Axworthy	Osland
Barrow	Patrick
Boyce	Paulley
Burtniak	Pawley
Cherniack	Petersson
Derewianchuk	Schreyer
Dillen	Shafransky
Doern	Toupin
Gottfried	Turnbull
Green	Uruski
Hanuschak	Uskiw
Jenkins	Walding
Johannson	
McBryde	
Malinowski	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 15; Nays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it, declare the amendment lost.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, perhaps about half an hour ago there was some discussion or debate as between the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable the Minister of Labour relative to subsection 44(4) of the bill. I realize, Sir, it's a rather unorthodox way to proceed but if there is leave, and it is my understanding there is leave, I have checked with members of the Liberal Party, I would suggest that there is good reason to not only move by way of amendment to delete subsection 44(4), but if one is prepared to do that, Sir, then it certainly would make the law even more clear if one goes the next step to put in the very clear and specific terminology to put it in the negative.

And accordingly by leave I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Bill No. 7 be amended by deleting in the second line of subsection 44(4) to the Act as set out in Section 11 of the bill, the words "outside his normal or regular working hours" and substituting therefor the words "not", then that makes it very clear.

QUESTION put, amendment carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader wish by leave now third reading of this bill?

MR. PAULLEY: That completes Bill No. 7. I believe it would be in order for me to move the third reading on Bill No. 7.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think I need leave, Mr. Speaker, according to the rules.

THIRD READINGS - BILL NO. 7

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, we said at the beginning of the debate on Bill 7 that we could not support the bill unless there were several amendments. Now we've accomplished, or the government has accepted certain amendments and certainly the objective of the Liberal Party was to see that all people in this province, civil servants included, should not be precluded from the civil liberty of standing for public office.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dilemma the Progressive Conservative Party finds themselves in. . .

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

MR. ASPER: It's always been difficult for the Conservative Party to understand --(Interjection)-- Not freedom, no, understand that one's position is never rigid. One's position is based on reason and not some rigidity that seems to grip the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, there were three key ingredients in the Liberal Party's position on the bill and the Government has moved to solve two of them: The prohibition against fund raising, and secondly, has moved to partially - not as far as I would have liked to have seen - but partially to insulate the civil servant who did not wish to take part in public affairs from any kind of coercion or loss of promotion through his position in a political party. And 44(8) does that to some extent; not as far as we would have liked to have seen it go.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is the third category of criticism that the Liberal Party levelled and which has not been dealt with nor has it been met. That is the insulation and the guaranteeing of the Civil Service Commission as being a politically objective group. Because, Mr. Speaker, everything we've gotten amended so far through the Minister's amendments becomes really the - I guess at the whim of the Civil Service Commission as to how it's going to be interpreted, and while at least the provisions are there it requires an independent Civil Service Commission to give us the assurance that the Civil Service will be protected and that the public will be protected. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the Minister - as a matter of fact I am confident the Minister is unable to accept any further amendment obviously from his closing of the Committee stage. Therefore we are in the position that with mixed feelings and some regret we have got to oppose the bill.

There is a reason for our opposition to the bill. There are likely three years, there are likely three years before the next time civil servants will have an opportunity to stand for provincial public office. We would hope that in the period between now and that time the Government may reconsider the position and may bring in an amendment which will cure what we consider to be a fatal defect. Because, Mr. Speaker, until the Civil Service Commission becomes like the judiciary, that is totally objective, totally removed from the influence of government, then until that happens, Mr. Speaker, the bill is weak and the civil servant wishing to avail himself of the provisions that we sought, and some of which were added, still is appealing to a Civil Service Commission which may be politically oriented. That's fatal to the bill as far as we're concerned, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately the Government hasn't seen it the same way and I won't take up any time of the House trying to make the case again that we did in Committee. However I do want to put our position on the record. It is with regret and support of the principle of the bill, that we were able to support it through second reading, but with regret we are unable to support it on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, we moved an amendment in the report stage which stated that except during a leave of absence granted under subsection (b) a civil servant employee shall not be a candidate in a provincial or federal election or serve as an elected representative of the Legislature of any province in a Parliament of Canada, and the leave of absence was to allow them to do exactly that; solicit funds for a provincial or federal political party or candidate; associate his position in the service of the Government with any political activity.

Mr. Speaker, that was the substance of the amendment we introduced which was rejected and which was supported by the Liberal Party.

THIRD READING - BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I could probably describe it in more general terms as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has in previous discussion with respect to the Liberal position. But, Mr. Speaker, our position consistently has been as stated in the amendment that we presented. We indicated at the very beginning that this matter had to be debated, that there's a fundamental difference in attitude between ourselves and the members opposite, that we think that the Government is tinkering with a tradition that has served us well in this province and that there are tremendous dangers in the elimination of a non-partisan Civil Service and the politicizing that will occur.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we proposed our amendment, we supported our amendment, the amendment was rejected. We are frankly thankful that as a result of the debate there are other corrections that have occurred within the Act - not everything that we would have wanted. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not in a position to support the bill because our position is that civil servants should be given the right to run but they should not be allowed while they remain as a civil servant to actively campaign on behalf of a political party in a federal or provincial election; nor should there by any confusion, Mr. Speaker, in their roles as servant of the public on the one hand as a servant - or not as a servant, as a participant and as a supporter of a political party who may be the Government today or may be an Opposition Party, because that confusion in the execution of their responsibilities will cause serious problems. And because of that fundamental position, which is the position we have established consistently in this House on this bill and which we have stood up for in this House and in Committee, we cannot support the bill. And, Mr. Speaker, for those who would hold a similar position we ask them why did you not support our amendment when we brought it in Committee to try and - at least in the report stage - to try and be able to achieve the objectives that we tried to determine.

So, Mr. Speaker, our position is clear, it's consistent with what we stated in the beginning and we, Mr. Speaker, with regret, with regret, Mr. Speaker, must indicate that in our opinion the politicizing that will commence with this bill will become more apparent and will be divisive, Mr. Speaker, both for the government of the day, which is the present government, and for the future execution and proper administration of the undertakings of government and of the relationship that government must have with the very people whom it serves.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there was an indication that we would proceed with other third readings but I . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I was going to call for a Division. I was going to call for a Division, Sir.

MR. GREEN: Okay. Ayes and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is entitled to call for a Division. Call in the members.

MR. JORGENSEN: I think we're all here, Sir.

MR. GREEN: Oh no, just a minute.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs.	Adam	Green	Paulley
	Barrow	Hanuschak	Pawley
	Boyce	Jenkins	Petursson
	Burtniak	Johannson	Schreyer
	Cherniack	McBryde	Shafransky
	Derewianchuk	Malinowski	Toupin
	Dillen	Miller	Turnbull
	Gottfried	Osland	Uruski
			Uskiw
			Walding

THIRD READING - BILL NO. 7NAYS

Messrs.	Asper	Enns	McKenzie
	Axworthy	Graham	Marion
	Banman	Johnston (Stur. Cre.)	Minaker
	Bilton	Jorgenson	Moug
	Blake	McGill	Patrick
	Brown	McGregor	Sherman
			Spivak

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26; Nays 19.

MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there was some indication that we would go to third readings, but there is one bill on which the members are willing to speak at the present time, Bill No. 75, the Northern Affairs Act.

BILL NO. 75

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to comment on some ways the concerns and points of views that our group has concerning Bill 75.

When the bill was first read by our group and examined, it caused a certain degree of fright, I suppose, similar to the advanced paranoia that the Leader of the Opposition acquires. We listened to his remarks with some interest, and thought that rather than being sort of a normal kind of advanced state of mental disease that oftentimes accompanies it, it really was in fact perhaps a legitimate exercise. We then took the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of looking at previous bills passed by the Conservative administration and found out in fact it almost said the same thing, which made me begin to wonder I guess that there's --(Interjection)-- No, apparently there's no requirement on the gentlemen to the right of us to read what has gone in the past; although it's the party that presumably pays some deference to the past, it seems that in this case they hadn't. And it just raised the question, Mr. Speaker, about the issue that was raised about the powers of a Minister in Northern Manitoba - in fact have been very much part of the tradition, at least established by provincial governments in this province, to provide one individual, one ministerial member with a wide ranging series of powers, and I suppose that there is some legitimate reason for that. That obviously the very nature of the North itself, in terms of the nature of population and the wide expanse and the undeveloped portion of so many of its areas, requires a kind of control, a kind of series of functions and powers and responsibilities that are out of the ordinary, out of the normal ken of the ministerial responsibilities as we have come to know them.

And so I can accept with some trepidation, but accept at least the existing fact that the Minister in this case did not intend to acquire more legal powers than had been acquired before - that with some amendments, some changes, they've still basically the right to exercise a wide ranging influence on affairs in Northern Manitoba.

It still begs, however, Mr. Speaker, one question that is highly necessary - and that is the issue that hasn't yet really been addressed - necessary in the sense that, at this stage in 1974, in the increasing advancing stages of development of Northern Manitoba are the almost gubernatorial powers, or the Government powers that the Minister has, where he almost has, still treats the area of the North almost like a fiefdom or colonial situation, and I'm not saying that in disparaging terms; whether that in fact, that stage of undevelopment is still there and if so does it still require the exercise of the large powers. Now I recognize that the Minister has as his second objective in this bill, the interest in trying to provide a higher degree of economy of local communities - and I want to speak to that in a moment.

But it still raises to my mind - and I wish that the Minister had addressed more time in his presentation of this bill to the issue as to what are the actual requirements for ministerial power to exercise by the Government exercising in Winnipeg; to still have the almost the total powers of appeal, total powers of intervention, almost really total powers of

BILL 75

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) life and death over the municipalities and communities and different organizations in Northern Manitoba. And I can accept his assumption, at least the assumption that has been an exercise since 1966, that it has been required - but the issue is, is it still required? And particularly, is it going to be required next year and the year after? In other words, there seems to be no willingness by this Minister and Ministers before him to gradually give up their powers, to have a planned program of devolution, of giving up their autonomy and their ministerial rights. And again I recognize that this bill does do that in some ways.

But I would like to see the Minister of Northern Affairs say to this House and the Province of Manitoba, "I hope that some day my job won't be necessary." I hope that some day we can dispense with the Minister of Northern Affairs, because over a period of time there will be self sufficiency and enough autonomy and enough levels of development in the communities of the North that they won't need a special Minister looking over them like some godfather, but will instead be able to work through the normal departments of Government like every other community does. And I say that in the hope that the North will acquire in a short space of time the ability and capacity to be a community, not discriminated, not selected out for special treatment, but have the same rights and privileges thereunto that every other part of the province shares. And I would simply like to see some timetable for that. I'd like to see the Minister indicate what he would expect as a logical timetable for that kind of diminishing of his own authority and the acquisition of increasing authority by the communities of that part of the province. Because I think that would be an important statement to make and it may get into the area of policy statement. It would certainly be informative I think to members of this House to know if the Minister has in mind an almost permanent state of responsibility or requirement for a special Minister of Northern Affairs to occupy these overview powers, these immense panoply of powers, rather than just saying "I really see my job as working very hard to get rid of my job", in effect.

I think that is the first point that we would like to raise, is that we'd like to see some commitment to the diminishing and reduction continually of the over-riding authority of the Minister of Northern Affairs, and I would hope that the Minister would be in agreement with those sentiments - certainly from previous statements I would gather that he would be. That there is certain areas of the North that certainly are going to need treatment. But the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has part responsibility, the Minister of Highways has other responsibilities, the Minister of Housing has other responsibilities. And that should be the basis upon which the Provincial Government governs the North. Not, Sir, providing the Minister with sort of over-riding coordinating powers and developing almost as a colonial government it would have - and I think that the pattern as I say, or that the bill reminded me of what was written in the old Hudson Bay charters, you know, where you send someone out from the metropolitan area to look after the colonies for a year, with powers of life and death really over all the inhabitants. And it seems that's almost the pattern we have in this bill.

It also requires, Mr. Speaker, one other important factor, and this is something that has been bothering those of us in the House I guess for three or four months - that while we can agree to the necessity of a Minister having these powers, because of the state of affairs in Northern Manitoba, we also see that the person who occupies that post must occupy it with a great deal of sensitivity and delicacy to protect against the abuse of those powers. And in fact this House is giving to the Minister, on an act of faith if you like, a great deal of power. And the assumption again has to be that that power will be used within certain ethical guidelines, if you like. And yet the question has come up too often in this House to really satisfy me, is that there has been appearances and suggestions that that power has been abused, and that rather than exercising those powers for the legitimate purposes of Government, those powers have in fact been used for political purposes, to acquire increasing power for one political party. And, Mr. Speaker, if that occurs, then it tends to denigrate and downgrade the exercise of the ministerial powers of the Minister of Northern Affairs. And it may be that partially members on this side of the House have been responsible for seeing hobgoblins and ghosts where they didn't exist, and latching on to all kinds of pretexts for doing it.

But at the same time I think it also requires from the Minister of Northern Affairs a similar kind of formula. I guess the old standard is that not only must one be as virtuous

BILL 75

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) as Caesar's wife, but appear to be. And there are times, Mr. Speaker, when I also would say that I think the appearance and perhaps the substance have given reason for questions being raised. I think, for example, of an Indian organization up North which was given moneys of both Federal and Provincial grants to provide communication of Indian Bands, and yet certainly during the last election and even now I suppose, a reading of it is that it simply is a transmittal device of political advice on how to vote or support the NDP party. And that is the kind of thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm prepared to accept and agree with the Minister needing those powers, but I also believe that the Minister owes us an obligation to ensure that those powers that he has, which are very strong and very authoritative, are exercised with the most rigid and absolutely unbending sort of clarity of purpose, serving legitimate government purposes - not to be used to build a political machine, not to be used to advance the political purpose, other than advancing it in a sense that people accept and recognize that this Government has done good work for the people of north of the North and presumably they will vote for them - but not using it to put people of one political persuasion into powers of influence over other through the exercise of his powers. That's what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that we should clear the air really. We should clear the air probably on both sides of the House, so that we can say that okay, you have powers here and we're going to go along with that, but at the same time it is the Minister's responsibility, in fact a very deep set responsibility to ensure that those powers really are exercised with the utmost regime of discipline; to ensure that at no time and in any way should any question ever be asked that he has used those powers for political advantage or purpose, because once he does that, Mr. Speaker, once he trespasses across that line, then it begins to call into question the whole basis of that Act. It begins to call into question in a sense the credibility not only of the Minister but the credibility of this Legislature in giving the Minister the powers to be so abused. As a result, Mr. Speaker, it places a very strong and abiding responsibility on the Minister, and one I know that, obviously when he has the levers in his hand, may be tempted to use them; but if he is tempted to use them and if he does use them, then it really sort of calls into doubt the kind of responsibility that he's been given, and in fact calls into serious question really whether this is the sort of organizational arrangement we should be providing. So Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to make that case, that if the Minister is asking members of this House to accept this proposal and bill, then I think it poses very severe responsibility and obligations upon him and upon the government to make sure that the powers are not in any way abused.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like then to turn to the other major purpose of the Act, which the Minister explained in his presentation and has since said publicly in the media, that in fact he sees this Act as a way of taking one major step towards giving a higher degree of autonomy to certain communities in the North. Mr. Speaker, there is no question of our support for that principle, there is no question we have in endorsing very much that direction that the government wishes to follow. But I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, some questions about the methods that are being used to do that, because I think that this is a very important aspect of the bill, is that it is very innovative in its own way, and I compliment the Minister for what I think was a very ingenious and a very thoughtful approach to a consultation with the northern communities in arriving at these programs. I think that it serves as a pretty interesting model as to how to go about consulting with the communities that are to be affected by Government programs, and I believe that kind of exercise is one that should be followed in far more circumstances.

So I would like to provide my compliments to the Minister - but in saying that, Mr. Speaker, it poses some questions to us, because obviously out of that consultative process have emerged a number of interesting ideas and a number of interesting proposals dealing with the aspects of local government in the North, many of which depart quite radically from the traditional or conventional forms of local government and therefore deserve, Mr. Speaker, fairly careful consideration by members of this House. Again we're caught in a bind that we have been in for the past two and a half weeks. We are presented with a very important bill, a bill which will have very long range significance, and again we're not really given the time nor even really the form to properly acquaint ourselves with it; to have the opportunity to avail ourselves of the wisdom or the intelligence that the Minister, his staff and his consultants have derived to do their two years of consultation, so that the

BILL 75

(MR. AKWORTHY Cont'd) provisions of this bill not only would be acceptable to us but also we would know what we are doing; so that we wouldn't all of a sudden be caught up short, about a year or two years from now, and saying, my God, did we really pass that? Let me give a specific example, Mr. Speaker - and I know we're not supposed to mention sections, but in the whole area of Section 35 there is a very interesting departure from local government, as I read it. And the Minister might correct me, but in fact it is saying this, we are going to incorporate communities in Northern Manitoba. That's fine. We will allow for the election of a mayor and council in those incorporated communities. That's fine. But then under Section 35, Mr. Speaker, the bill says "within five years after that incorporation the Minister may consult with the adult residents of that incorporated community, and if he so decides after that consultation that he would like to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, he can therefore recommend that the powers of the elected representatives be transferred back to the adult residents of the community." Now that is in the bill. Now that is transferring, Mr. Speaker, in simple terms, the theory of elected representative government - which we all occupy - back to some form of direct democracy; that in fact he is saying that if the Minister, using whatever specified consultative means he so wants - and that can mean using pigeons or talking on the telephone or sending out letters - decides by some criteria which I don't know that something is going wrong or something is amiss, he can then through regulation of Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council take back the powers that have been given to the elective representatives and place them in the hands of the adult residents of the community operating by some kind of community meeting that's going to be called. And I have some ideas as to what their criteria may be.

So let's take the worst, and I will not say, Mr. Speaker, the Minister will necessarily put the worst meaning on it, but let us say that under some circumstances the Minister of Northern Affairs has a dispute with the local Council in one of these incorporated communities, the Council basically tells him to go wash his face or something, and all of a sudden he says, "well, all right, I'm going to consult with the local community." He consults with the local community by some process. Then a special community meeting is called and then the Cabinet decides that they're going to tell the mayor and the elected representative, "Sorry, we're taking back the powers and we're going to give them to these adult residents of the community to exercise under some duration."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very, and I think members of this House would agree, that's a very major departure in the theory of local government in this province. And let me say I'm not necessarily adverse to it. But I would like to know - and then we could have had the opportunity to talk to those consultants that the Minister has, to tell us why, why was that particular provision inserted? It may be that that kind of government may be more suitable to the kind of communities that the Minister envisions being incorporated; that very well may be the case. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know and I don't think other members on this side of the House know that that's the case; and it is something that takes some thought and some discussion and some debate as to whether first this House should be agreeing with that particular principle because it is a very far-reaching principle. I suppose if you want to advance it, you could say, all right in the City of Winnipeg we're now going to say that the resident advisory groups -- that the Cabinet can say they're going to take certain powers away from city council and give them to the resident advisory group. That's the same kind of power that's there. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that may be a perfectly reasonable proposition, it may be that the nature of government the way we're moving should be trying to share power between local residents and citizens and elected members. But that's not spelled out in the bill; it's simply saying that there can be a transfer of power or powers under the Act back to these people.

I think the Minister has made sure that the meetings would be public, that they would be published, but it still is a very critical and far-reaching principle and one that I would think we would require certainly from members of this House, and I feel this way, a good deal of thought about is that the right principle to be endorsed in this bill. So that, Mr. Speaker, again points out in a sense the limitations we labour under by having to kind of rush ourselves pell mell into these very important bills. We're going to be caught by things like that, because I would hate to see this House in a furor a year from now when all of a sudden we learn via the newspaper or by some other media that the Cabinet has all of a sudden

BILL 75

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) taken away the powers of the mayor and council of God's Lake or something like that. And we say, well, why, what's happened? --(Interjection)-- It is here, Mr. Speaker.

Now another question of a similar kind in this whole question of incorporation is that under the bill, 15 adult residents of any community can petition to be incorporated and then it's the right of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or Cabinet to agree. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly agree with the idea that there should be a petition of local residents, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, there should be other criteria established as to whether a community should be incorporated or not. I believe in the fact that the principle of incorporation of municipalities is not to be trifled with, and the principle of incorporation means that that is a community which has a degree of self-sufficiency to it, that it is capable and able to operate at least a minimum of local services on its own right, economically, and socially, and politically, and everything else. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the bill to suggest what the criteria may be to give guidance to the Minister, or to ensure that those incorporations he's about to undertake serve that principle of self-sufficiency. Because if they don't, it simply means that we can be giving the power to the Minister to grant incorporation to a number of areas which are still in an undeveloped state. And I'm not saying - I don't know which ones he has in mind, I don't know what they are, but surely we should be writing more carefully into that bill certain criteria as to what is the base of incorporation. Does it mean you're going to have to pay a certain proportion of taxes? Does it mean that there's going to be certain institutions available in the community? Does it mean that there's a certain population base? Does it mean that there's a certain network of transportation and communication? In other words, Mr. Speaker, there should be some criteria that's set out - at what stage does an area acquire the means and ability to become incorporated by the fact that that community has now become, or reached a certain stage of self-sufficiency or independence or autonomy? Because if we don't do that, Mr. Speaker, we may be making serious mistakes; we may be laying on the appearances and structures of incorporation and autonomy without having the substance to back it up, and therefore being faced again with the requirements to pour resources and people and consultants in just to prop that local government up, just to make sure that it hangs on from year to year - and I expect that it's going to have to be done in any event - but there should be some base to begin upon.

Again that comes back to my thesis, Mr. Speaker, and it is this, that again the bill is being put through very quickly without a lot of these questions being asked and a lot of the examination being undertaken of a very important matter.

Let me point to another area, Mr. Speaker, and I still have a few minutes left. I hope the Member for Swan River can contain himself perhaps till this evening or the next session to reply. But there is another kind of provision that's important, and one which I find is a very progressive and a very open one, and that is that under the incorporation procedures each of these new communities would be required to hold annual open meetings every year for the residents. I'm not sure that's the open meeting that's going to take over the new powers or not, that's not spelled out, but let's just say it's for the purpose of advising the citizens as to what's been going on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again I think from the experience that I've had in working and advising in the case of local government over the past several years, it's not enough to give a local community the right to do things like that unless you give them the means to do it. What's the point really of having under Section 47, I believe it is, the right to conduct public meetings, to open the books, to provide all the information and wherewithal unless you're also sure that the citizens of that community are going to be able to make effective and proper use of the material and information, and so on, that you're providing to them? Other than that it's a great big lump of raw material. And we certainly learned the case in the City of Winnipeg Act where again the innovative aspects of resident advisory groups were set up and then was left hanging, no help, no assistance, no nothing, it was simply there, and people kind of had to scramble to make good with it. And again, so the provision it there, and I would just simply like an explanation from the Minister to indicate what sort of program he has in mind to ensure again that - because this . . . interesting and innovative aspect of his bill will not be simply given lip service, but will in fact become a meaningful part of local government in the north, and if there is to be this kind of community committee meeting

BILL 75

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) annually, and there is to be the requirements for disclosures, and all the rest of the communications, is he prepared to provide the wherewithal, the means to ensure the communication in fact takes place? You know, it's not enough to tack a notice up on the local meeting house wall, because if you're going to provide communication it means that everyone must be equally communicated with.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the more specific examples of the substance of this bill which raise very important questions about this Act of Incorporation and the act of giving greater autonomy, which at this time I feel highly inadequate to properly judge upon mainly because we haven't had much time, almost no time, to avail ourselves of the richness of information which I know the Minister has, and his department has, as to why these things are being done. But I would be more than pleased, if I could, to fully accept many of the innovative aspects of this bill, the provisions that are introduced in them, if I knew why, if I could be given the reasons to justify them, to be shown how this in fact would provide better government, how this would ensure that there would be better control; about how under Section 35 this sort of option of returning powers back to the people, if you like, and taking them away from the elective representatives, that's going to serve some legitimate purpose. But mention was not made in the presentation; we've had no sort of accompanying description as to why it's happening, and so we're really left a little bit in the dark, and again being asked to accept this thoroughly critical bill, very important bill, without really having had an opportunity to kind of get into the guts of it, and to really know what's going on, and to understand it fully so that we can make intelligent responses and feel sure in our own minds.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know, we were being chided about 25 or 30 minutes ago for a split decision, if you like, on the last bill that was decided, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it may go along that one principle we have tried to imply in this caucus over the past two or three months, is that we try to apply at least some rational thought to the bills before us, and we want to know what's in them and that we're not simply going to accept, and I don't want to upbraid the Member for Swan River in his amendments, but using that for example, while the amendments were there, as we read through them we found that many of the amendments were not carefully enough designed or didn't cover enough loopholes or enough holes, that if they had been accepted, if our vote somehow had made a difference, then the bill probably would have been worse than the original one and therefore that's why we decided against it. At the same time, as our leader explained, we weren't prepared to support the over-all bill because the important condition wasn't met.

That simply goes back to, I hope, Mr. Speaker, the principle that we have tried to apply, at least in this group, that when a bill comes before us in this House we want the time and the information to be able to properly think about it, to analyze it, to understand it, so that we give our support, and while there are only five members of us, we think each vote in itself is important because after all, you know, our electors in our constituency are just as important as the electors in every other constituency, and so while we give our vote we do not give it lightly; we want to make sure that vote is given with careful consideration. The problem, Mr. Speaker, we've been facing for the past two or three weeks is that it's very difficult to give careful consideration to very important bills when they're kind of pell-melling on us like hail stones. We just simply can't respond, and can't sort of absorb all this kind of wealth of information; and I'm not even sure, Mr. Speaker, the members of that side of the House have absorbed all that information and know what's in those bills. I'm not sure that we're not passing a lot of sort of blind Acts which are simply going to get this House and this government into trouble in the future, simply because they haven't been considered and the Opposition, which is our role to properly comment and properly critique, hasn't been given the time or the opportunity to properly fulfill its role as well.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we feel that this is an unfortunate situation we found ourselves in, one that we feel frustrated by, as other members of the House have, and particularly in this bill which, as I said at the outset, we endorse, we support this bill, because we think it's important that we work towards the granting of greater autonomy to northern communities. But to look at the pieces by which it's going to be acquired, the means and techniques that are employed, we see on as much reading we we've been able to give it, certain real serious questions we'd like to raise about some of the principles and some of the mechanics. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we can only say that we, I suppose, will have to go

BILL 75

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) along, because we're not sure when this House is going to close and that we're going to have the opportunity to bring in amendments. I would only hope that the Minister - and I'm not asking him to withdraw the bill - I just would hope that somehow if there wasn't a great time available, again that he would see the wisdom in perhaps referring the bill back to a Committee of the House so that that kind of careful examination over perhaps three or four months can be given, and that therefore we can be able to provide, I would hope, a much better bill going on, because I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that while the bill has had a great deal of thought and careful consideration by the staff and the civil servants and the consultants of the department, it has not had what is even more important, and that is, the same thought and careful consideration of this House, because we are passing the law. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I would hope or at least recommend that that would be the most responsible step to take so that the agreement that we share in the objectives that we're trying to attain may be better attained by more careful thought and consideration of this particular piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Call it 5:30. The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 A.M. tomorrow morning. (Tuesday) Law Amendments tonight at 8, Room 254.