



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XVIII No. 38 2:30 p.m., Thursday, May 13th, 1971. Third Session, 29th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 13, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Second Report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

- No. 2 - An Act to repeal The Succession Duty Act.
- No. 4 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act (1).
- No. 5 - An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act.
- No. 6 - An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Recreation Act.
- No. 7 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Finance Board Act.
- No. 16 - An Act to amend The Government Purchases Act.
- No. 22 - An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER : The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

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 35 students, Grades 11 and 12 standing, of the Plumas Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Penner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

Also in the gallery we have 70 students of Grade 9 standing, of the Isaac Newton Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Uzwiushyn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Consumer and Internal Services.

There are also 55 students, Grades 11 and 12 standing, of the Morden Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Wand and Kirk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

I should also like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the loge on my left, where I believe we have a distinguished guest, a former M.P., the Honourable -- or Mr. Alvin Hamilton, isn't it?

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debates. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PETE ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not a member of the committee that sat on agriculture; however, I did have the opportunity of presenting a brief when the committee sat at Dauphin and I was on the other-side-of-the-desk sort of thing. I did make some observations on the recommendations of the Task Force when the committee sat in Dauphin, and since my constituency depends largely upon agriculture for its economic survival, I felt that perhaps I should speak on this proposed motion.

There has been a steady decline in the past five years of realized net income for farmers. This is a farmer's true cash position since it does not include the value of unsold inventory, and according to DBS, figures for 1970 show a net income for Manitoba farmers of

May 13, 1971

(MR. ADAM, cont'd.) \$78,631,000 - a drop of over 100 percent since 1967 and 10.4 percent below 1969. It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that even those elite farmers, most of whom live south of No. 1 Highway, are also becoming apprehensive as well as all other farmers in our province, and I would say justifiably so. However, we still find those who would oppose a change in the status quo that we have here in Canada. We find that they oppose any change, the change that has contributed to the situation in which agriculture finds itself today. This situation can be attributed to policies on agriculture emanating from the Federal Government in Ottawa, and of course backed by those who keep them in office.

The national policy has always been a policy of farm exploitation. It is now clear that, although farm prices were not contributors to the great inflationary spiral which prompted the Federal Government to establish the federal Prices and Income Commission, it is in fact farm prices and farmers who have contributed in a major way toward any Federal Government claims in having successfully combatted inflation. The Prices and Incomes Commission itself has admitted that while over-all living costs rose by five percent in the U.S. in 1970, the cost of living rose by only one and a half percent in Canada as a result of lower food prices. While the Commission attributes the lower food prices at the farm level, it also attributes part of the lower food prices to the supermarket discount war. It is a battle of giants to seek a larger share of markets for which they are prepared in the short run to take heavy losses in return for long term gains through higher prices. Mr. Speaker, it is a simple economic fact of life that if business is drawn away from one supermarket to another by use of discount practices, the end result will be that the net loser in sales will be less efficient and will either be forced out of business or have to raise prices. Prices have already proceeded to move upward at both Dominion and Miracle Mart Stores. One can assume the short term loss is over, giving some immediate credibility to Prices and Income Commission's claim of success in battling inflation. But the motives of the discount wars and the future level of food prices remain highly suspect. Pressure will nevertheless continue on food prices at the farm level. That's what the Federal Government's big farm policy is really all about - lower prices at the farm level so that the appetites of the over-expanded and under-utilized chain store supermarkets can continue to be satisfied.

The designs of the Federal Government for retirement of farmers is simply endorsement of what the federal Task Force on Agriculture has recommended. What it really says is that farmers will be encouraged to liquidate their assets, and other farmers who buy them out will pay for the major costs of the retirement program. It's the same old myth that would have one believe efficiency is in direct proportion to size, a claim which is subject to growing doubt, and the large chain stores are living proof of that.

Exploitation of farmers has become an admitted national policy. Relentless pressures which are directed toward programming them to more efficiency satisfy only the avarice and the greed of profit-hungry corporations. The naked truth of statements made by our Prime Minister is quite clear when he states that, and I quote: "the aspirations of the Canadian farmer are not compatible with those of an industrial state." In effect, he is saying that agriculture must be exploited to build industry. This is my interpretation of that statement that he made. Such has been the case since government first came into being in Canada and since the advent of agriculture in this land.

I would like to quote also from a statement by the federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Bud Olson, in his presentation to the Canadian Agricultural Congress, and I quote: "It is not my intention here to recite agricultural chapter and verse. Policy details are covered in the federal Task Force Report and in our departmental reference paper, which is in your hands."

That was Mr. Olson's introductory remarks which he gave to the Congress in November of 1970. It confirmed what had grown far beyond suspicion in the minds of farmers and that the purpose was to liquidate farmers as fast as possible.

The government's assumption is that, given both the size and total sector and the size of individual units, it becomes possible to determine the number of each type of farm required for an economically viable agriculture. This foregoing quotation is from the government's own explanatory pamphlet on agricultural adjustment. If one accepts this at face value, two other important assumptions have been made: First, that the number of farmers required is much less than the number now existing; and (2), that a major cause of low income is farmers who are ignorant or lacking judgment, or both. Assumption No. 1 is revealed by the fact that many of the program proposals deal with moving people off the land. Assumption No. 2 is

(MR. ADAM, cont'd.) revealed by the fact that many of the program proposals for both people who remain on the farm and people who move off, consist of provisions for giving information and advice. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what went wrong with the advice that we have been receiving up to now.

Another possibility that cannot be overlooked is that the government has decided that the number of farmers who will leave the farm voluntarily will not be enough to reduce the number of remaining farms to the level it considers desirable. These new advice agencies and massive management schools will give the government a good deal more control over the situation, and unless the advice handed out is much better than most farmers have had from governments in the past, many of those who try to hang on, and even the elite from south of No. 1 Highway, and who expand their farms for that purpose, will be forced out as well.

This idea is supported by the fact that there is nothing in the program to provide farmers with the help they really need: money with a minimum of strings attached. There are no grants or forgivable loans such as are offered to other industries. There is no recognition of the fact that farmers who are in trouble have got to that state as a result of a process which has given the rest of Canada cheaper food than available in any other nation. The program's method of operation would be to aid and accelerate the present process in which farmers buy out their neighbours and the bought-out neighbours move to the city or remain resident on their farm and live off the proceeds of the sale until these are exhausted.

The government's proposal for helping these people provides advice and an insignificant grant for five years and training through existing programs. These training programs are already overcrowded with people who can't find work in the urban economy. There are urban people who want to be trained or retrained but can't get into the program, and there are people who have been trained and who can't find work. If squeezing farmers out of their farms does stimulate the rest of the economy and create some new jobs, these people will be first in line for them. The farm people receiving the main benefit would be a fairly large number of farmers' sons who have been through colleges of agriculture and they would get government jobs advising farmers or find employment in the expanding agro-business sector. The Federal Government, who does not accept the principle of a two-price system in spite of the fact that practically every grain exporting nation does subsidize its farmers - and I hate to use the word "subsidize" because when you pay somebody 50 percent what he is worth and then you give him another 10 percent I don't call that subsidy because you still owe him 40 percent but nevertheless, on February 5th, 1971, the Federal Government did subsidize three million pounds of broilers for export market, and I am wondering why they did subsidize these broilers. Is it because it is controlled by the corporate sector?

Mr. Speaker, according to the 1969 yearbook, the cost of producing a bushel of wheat is \$1.80 a bushel f.o.b. farm; oats, \$1.06 a bushel; barley, \$1.47; flax \$4.12; rye, \$2.12; rapeseed, \$2.10; field peas, \$1.98; and buckwheat \$2.43. For farmers to sell grain below these prices is to subsidize other sectors of the economy, in my opinion. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to set prices on farm products for domestic consumption based on prices on the international market, which I consider to be nothing more than a dumping ground for surplus food from other nations, does not concur with sound business practices and until sound business practices are applied to the farming industry or until the Federal Government is prepared to implement a two-price system, the end result can only be mass exodus from the farm and the rural communities.

I would like to say a few words about implement dealer and manufacturer relationship. I happen to have been an implement dealer myself for 20 years so I perhaps might be able to speak with a little authority on this particular subject. I believe the committee did hear briefs on this particular subject. I believe that if it's possible to solve the implement dealer and manufacturer relations, you will have gone a long way in solving the dealer-farmer relationship.

It would appear that the way dealer agreements are written up makes the signing dealer of such an agreement very vulnerable and susceptible to any change in the farm economy. Dealer agreements, by and large, are very one-sided in favour of the manufacturer. In times of stress in agriculture this reflects back in poor service to the farmers by the dealers because of the constant pressure applied upon the dealer by the manufacturer for increased sales of new implements. Because of the deeding on new machines allowed by the manufacturer to the dealer -- (Interruption - baby crying) -- I didn't think I'd make you cry. It sounds bad but I didn't think you'd start crying over it. It sounds pretty gloomy. Mr. Speaker, pardon me for

May 13, 1971

(MR. ADAM, cont'd.) the interruption. I'd better start back where I left off here.

Because of the deeding on new machines allowed by manufacturers to the dealer it further aggravates the situation since, as the due dates on the new units near, the pressure is usually applied for the dealer to go out and sell the machine. This invariably results in the dealer making a rash deal in order to unload and get out from under, a machine that's coming due. In the event that the new machine is not sold by the due date, the dealer is then charged interest at rates of 10 or 12 percent on due but unsold machines, creating a financial drain on the dealer's working capital.

Another factor contributing to shortages of working capital is warranty machines sold to customers. A dealer is required to finance warranty on units bought, brought to the dealer shop for warranty service. This service is provided at cost by the dealer, and until such a time as the account is processed and accepted by the service department of the manufacturer, which in some cases would take several months, consequently a dealer would have several hundreds of dollars tied up in warranty work with no remuneration whatsoever for the services provided, and very often disputes arise as to whether the units should qualify for warranty service or not. In such cases the dealer will tend to feel obligated to absorb the cost upon himself in order to keep the goodwill of his customer, and thereby again the squeeze on his working capital.

One of the main contributing factors to dealer failure is in used machinery or trade-ins. The manufacturer will accept chattel on used machines for the difference between the wholesale price of a new unit and the amount of cash difference received by the dealer at the retail level. Usually these deals are sanctioned by the manufacturer's representative and therefore the chattel and the barter is usually fair marked at value or less, except in cases where a dealer tries to get out from under a unit. Again, the manufacturer is aware at all times of all transactions. However, if a dealer goes out of business, like so many are at the present time, the company starts discounting the used machines which perhaps would run into thousands of dollars. If we can improve dealer-manufacturer relations, we will have gone a long way to solving dealer-farmer relations.

In closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the committee for all the endeavours they have made to come up with a good report. However, I am not happy, because I see no new ideas, no new concepts in marketing, no radical solutions, which we must by now all realize must come if we are to solve the problems in agriculture. But none of these new ideas have been forthcoming, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I accept the committee's report only for want of something better. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I too was on the committee that travelled around the province hearing prepared and oral briefs and listening to farm organizations and other individuals. I believe there was a total of 18 meetings. I enjoyed these meetings very much because it was something with which I was very familiar, and I also think it was a good idea to go out to the country to give the farm people a chance to say their bit.

I'd like to make a very few comments about the former speaker from Ste. Rose. I wonder is he aware that the NDP Party in Ottawa are voting with the Liberals in support of Bill 176, which is really supply-management; and not only that, but the Premier of the province has said that he himself believes in supply-management, and the Minister of Transportation has said about the Liberals in Ottawa that he thinks they're good socialists. So I think you can pretty near tie you two fellows' groups together in some ways. I think you're both socialists. And I also think that the former speaker by the remarks that he made in his first speech, he was supporting a member from our side, the Member from Birtle-Russell, and I think that the speech today really was in support of views that are on this side of the House very much. I think probably we should ask the member to move over.

Now, as we went around this province on this committee, from time to time there really were political overtones in their meetings, and people did try to expound their own political solutions to the problem. There was no doubt this was being done. I really believe, though, that one of the real good things about this committee going around the country was that it gave the government, the people that were on that side, it gave them a good chance to learn something about the farm, because it is true that they know very little. And then this is only natural because many of them are teachers and professors and so on and they're not familiar -- (Interjections) -- This is nothing against them but they're not familiar with the farm problems, and

(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) it was really a good opportunity -- (Interjections) -- Every so often the Member for Winnipeg Centre used to get up and say that he was so glad to be out there to meet them and try to learn their problems and try and find solutions; and by the time he was saying this, he'd always end up by saying that he really didn't know much about the farm; he'd had a degree in agriculture at one time - I see he's going back to his seat. But really, all that he remembered was that at one time he'd been riding on the back of a pig across the yard and had fell off in a manure pile. I shouldn't say it but at that time I said I knew something bad happened to him.

As he went around the province talking to the different people, there was one main problem (and we've heard it before and it's still with us, and I don't know how we're going to get rid of it) is this cost-price squeeze; and there's no doubt that the farmers are in a cost-price squeeze; and they're all very concerned about the elimination of the small farmers, and it's going on. And you can't blame them for being concerned. They're also very concerned about the cost of education as it relates to the farm assessment. Practically all groups of farm people felt that they were paying more than their fair share of the education cost. (Somebody's trying to throw me off by sending me notes, but that's all right.)

Another thing that they're very concerned about in the country is that there's rail line abandonment going on; smaller schools are being closed down which affects small towns and small areas. Their little post offices have been taken out, stores are closing and their implement dealers are becoming less. Generally speaking, all these people really wanted was a chance to make a reasonable living and get a return out of it that was something for their labour and something for their investment. They wanted the right to run their own business without too many controls or restrictions. They do not want to be told what to produce or that they should be moved off the farm because they haven't small units; they want to work this out for themselves. They appreciate this freedom of living and are willing to settle for somewhat less, provided that they have a reasonable return; and when you're talking about supply-management and controls and what they're being told, they all seem to remember the time when they were told to grow more wheat and the problem that got them into. They're thinking of the people, some of the experts and some of the people from the department that went out and told them to get rid of their cows, that the cow-calf operation wasn't paying, and even as late as last year there was people telling them not to grow any more barley and now we have a need for barley. So they're a little bit suspicious of this supply-management and the experts that advise this. What they're really looking for is developed markets, and if the government will develop the markets and there's money in it, they'll take their own course of action. To them it's the bucks that count, and if they can make money they'll change from one occupation to another or from one grain to another.

There were considerable complaints from farmers about dealers, and there were also complaints from the dealers about the relationship with the companies, and this is becoming a pretty serious problem because we know it's getting worse; the dealers are being practically cut in half in the areas. This is a concern to the farm people. There's much should be worked out too in the contracts that are made with farmer's when they buy implements, and I am one that welcomes the legislation that will set these things out far more clearly so as there's less misunderstanding.

Since this committee was to consider farm problems and other things that related to a better way of living, when we were going around the country we had at least organizations, particularly in the south, that were talking about the flooding in our area and they wanted the Pembina Dam put in. This would definitely help the flooding situation, and if they had the dam out there it would also create a lake and a resort, if they had the dam on the Canadian side as was proposed in the plan, and this would give them a better way of life. And there's nothing different from the people in the southern part of Manitoba to the people in Winnipeg in some ways. They'd like to be able to go to the lake on a weekend too. They don't believe that should be reserved for the people in Winnipeg only.

As for myself, there's an awful lot -- I see this area in the south as having a great future ahead for it because we have an awful lot of very fine fertile land out there and it's very suited to irrigation. And if we were to develop the canning industry and things like this, with the population we have, it could mean an awful lot. It's 12,500 acres in that area that's suited to irrigation. And as things are going in the world with the population increase and with all the industries there are and they're moving further west, we have the pollution problem and the

May 13, 1971

(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) criminal problem around the large cities, I see in the years ahead - I don't know, I wouldn't be able to say how far - but I see the west as becoming a valuable place. Surely they have a lot of mineral and other things in the north, but people do need food and shelter and this is a very fine area; and I really feel that I'd like to see the committee have recommended something here that would show leadership and would show long term planning, because I think this area needs it and I really think it needs it now, because it's going to catch up on it.

A great many discussions took place regarding the marketing of hogs, and this was only natural because, at the present time, we have a very poor market for hogs, and then on top of that there was a very confusing news release put out by the Manitoba government which really upset the people. The Member for Morris covered this so ably yesterday when he was speaking on it that I don't think I'll try to say anything about it, this particular angle of it, because he did it so well that I think that anything I might say might more or less detract from it.

I can easily understand the frustrations of the farmers as it relates to their hogs, and really, so many of the farmers have been working so hard that they really don't know a lot of the things that really affect the hog market. They really don't know that in Manitoba we don't raise one percent of the hogs that are consumed in North America. They really think that it's just because we had a surplus of grain here this last few years and that in 1970 a lot of people went into hogs, and they feel this is just what's depressed the price. They aren't really as aware as they should be how we're tied to the U.S. market, and that when we only produce one percent of the hogs in North America, actually Manitoba in any one year could produce no hogs and it really wouldn't make much difference in the market. But I can really understand their problem, because they're short of cash and they're losing money actually, some of them in the hog business now. But I've been on the farm all my life, I've been associated with it, and I know that we always go through cycles of low prices and high prices, and I think that it'll get better again and I would like to see them stay with a reasonable-sized operation on farms. And I'm one of these that believes that if a man runs a reasonable-sized operation, that he can control himself, so that he knows the troubles and can watch it himself. Large operations can't be more economical. I believe that the man that really knows what he's doing and can manage with one or maybe two others helping him, is more efficient than the real large farmer.

What I really think is of more importance to Manitoba than anything else, is that we should be looking for markets, really markets for everything but in particular for grain; and in Western Canada you could say wheat is king and, really, that the price that you get for a bushel of wheat or oats or barley, they're all related because there isn't a feed mill that hasn't got a conversion chart showing the food quality in a bushel of wheat compared to a bushel of oats or a bushel of barley. And there is no man in the feed business that, if he can buy wheat at a dollar, will want to pay ninety cents for oats. In wheat he gets 60 pounds and in barley he will only get 48 pounds for the 96 cents, or 60 cents for oats and only get 34 pounds. So really wheat is the king, and this is where I think that I would like to see our government support this here organization called X-CAN, and I would like to see Manitoba work with the other provinces to get the Canadian Government to support it, because the price that we get for wheat is determining, even to a real large extent, as to whether we'll raise cattle or raise hogs, and so if we keep the price of wheat at a reasonable level, if the fellows that keep hogs or cattle, they're going to make a reasonable amount of money.

Another thing I'm concerned about is that the Canadian Wheat Board is really hampered so greatly by government restrictions that make it impossible for it to deal with other countries. I think you people are all aware of this, and this is -- the Wheat Board cannot operate independently of the government. It cannot trade with other countries and make deals if our country doesn't take produce back, and this is really our problem. And our member from Roblin the other day, he got up and said that this is the real problem; this is something we really should get together on without any party lines and really put the pressure on, so as the government, whichever one it is that's in Ottawa, will go out and make deals that are good for the farm people.

I know that we had some criticism from the Member from Birtle-Russell yesterday; he thought this Agricultural Committee hadn't done a very good job; but I wouldn't agree with that because I really think the Agricultural Committee did do a good job. The hearings were well attended; any of the witnesses were well-questioned; but it's just that the problems that we have are really related federally as well as provincially, and the answers just aren't so easy

(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) . . . to come up with.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Attorney-General. (Stands)

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

STATEMENTS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have the opportunity of making a statement that I'm sure will be of great interest to all members of the House. The statement deals with the matter of unemployment, which is so important these days. It's interesting to me, according to the information that I have received, to note that unemployment is going down in the Province of Manitoba at the same time as there is increasing population. I believe this is peculiar to this province as against all of the rest of the provinces in Canada.

The economic statistics from Ottawa this week represent the bleakest economic news since the great depression. There has been a total bankruptcy of policy and indifference to human need that passes belief. Inflation has come back. The cost of living in a single month increased by 9/10ths of a point, or about 7/10ths of one percent. This means that on prices we are back where we began, with monthly increases now coming in again at the same levels as the worst of the period a year ago. The so-called victory over inflation was purchased at immeasurable cost in lost production, social discontent and the pointless misery of the unemployed, and has proved not to be a victory at all, even in its own terms. Nothing, and nothing, has been accomplished.

Even more striking, the intended reversal at long last on the unemployment side has not taken place. The seasonally adjusted rate for Canada jumped in April from 6 percent to 6.7 percent of the total labour force, and actual unemployment did in fact rise by some 9,000 persons in a month when it should have fallen, for seasonal reasons alone, by 60,000 or more.

Critics of the Federal Government have condemned it for dragging recovery at an absurdly low pace. What has happened this month, though, is that things have gone back to as bad as they ever were, and this is catastrophic. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many more cabinet ministers at the federal level must resign before Ottawa recognizes that the catastrophe has not been exaggerated in hysterical ways to describe what is happening.

In Manitoba, in Manitoba against this dismal federal background . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order by the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is simply that I question the propriety of the Minister of Labour making a statement of this nature which is nothing more than a condemnation of the . . . with which I don't disagree.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is no point of order. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: May I carry on, Mr. Speaker? In Manitoba, against this dismal federal background, the situation actually improved for the third month in a row. Unemployment fell from 20,000 to 18,000 or, in percentage terms, from 5.4 to 4.8 percent. An interesting comparison is now Manitoba's unemployment is only one thousand higher than a year ago, while in Canada as a whole it is 115 thousand higher. Rational expansionary policies at the provincial level have caused this notable difference in performance. There is nothing to gloat about and we do not gloat. At the provincial level we have done something and will continue to do something to offset irrational federal policy, but Manitoba policy can be no full substitute for reform in Ottawa. The overwhelming need is for Ottawa to relieve the provinces of the burden that has been thrust upon them. The Federal Government has the obligation to maintain the general economic welfare of the country, and it has failed and it is failing miserably.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, honourable members would like to have some comparative figures of the present unemployment situation in Canada in order that we may assess our own position more realistically. As I indicated, the actual numbers of unemployed in Manitoba decreased from 20,000 to 18,000. I am also pleased to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the

May 13, 1971

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd.) number actually employed in Manitoba is 5,000 more this month than it was last month.

In the province of Saskatchewan, the total number of unemployed remains the same as it was a month ago, and Saskatchewan has a percentage level of 4.7; and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that were it not for the strike at Flin Flon, our rate of unemployment in Manitoba would be the lowest in Canada.

British Columbia, the home of free enterprise that my friend mentioned the other day during my estimates, at the present time unemployment rate stands at 8.1 percent; Ontario 6.5 percent; Quebec 10 percent, the Atlantic regions, 11.6 percent, Canada 7.8 percent. So you can readily see, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba is comparatively in a favourable position. I reiterate once again that we are not satisfied with the rate in Manitoba but we feel that we have made a contribution to lowering the incidence of unemployment in Manitoba, and will continue to do so to the best of our facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to respond to the statement by the Honourable Minister of Labour on behalf of our side. Let me say that when he initially rose to make a statement coming from the Department of Labour, we anticipated perhaps some good news that the serious labour strike, the most and only serious labour strike that we have in the province of Manitoba, perhaps had vanished over the night and he could announce news that we are all awaiting in the House. However, that wasn't the case. He then chose to indicate to the House, and Mr. Speaker, if it will take me some time, perhaps the next 30 or 40 minutes, to respond properly to the statement, it's only because, through the verbiage that was administered by the Minister of Labour, you can excuse me and believe me why it would take me this kind of time to respond properly.

We, of course, recognize the practice established in the House of Ministers rising to make statements of import to all of us in this Chamber in the House, and to share with us the necessary information, in this case essentially statistical information with respect to unemployment. However, he took us through a fair bit of federal policies, took us to the West Coast, and a few other places before we arrived at that bit of information that particularly concerned this House, and I'm pleased to note that our figures of unemployment are such as the Minister indicated, a little puzzled that at the same time that these figures indicate at least a less worse position than other areas in Manitoba, our own welfare rolls continue to rise at the same time, and that disturbs me because, of course, it underlies or points out the fact that the reliance on statistics and figures is very risky in this particular kind of circumstance. We know that we are not dealing with the vast numbers of unregistered people who are looking for jobs in this province; students, farmers, Indian and native people; and so to put on this kind of a rosy glow of the picture is understandable from the Minister, you know; perhaps it is acceptable from the Minister; but, Mr. Speaker, it does not in any way gloss over the fact that what we are hearing from the government or what we are attempting to hear from the government is the solutions thereto.

Now, I can assume from the speech made, the statement read by the Minister of Labour, that tonight at 8:00 o'clock when the budget of Manitoba is brought down, that we will have our specific answers in the forms of either a 5 or 10 percent reduction of the sales tax applied to building materials in this province, major tax reductions with respect to personal corporate tax in this province, anything that a number of people, a host of people are suggesting that should be done, that this group and this party are suggesting a rollback of taxes that had to be done in order to stimulate the economy and to indeed make any Minister of Labour proud to get up in the House and say that we are doing something constructively, we are doing something effectively, to deal with the situation of unemployment.

Now, I would rather suspect that that is what the Minister of Labour was doing this afternoon, making anticipatory remarks for his colleague the Minister of Finance, that perhaps we can expect this kind of announcement tonight in the budget, but to simply stand up and relate to us and condemn programs of another jurisdiction, namely the Federal Government, programs which it has been amply demonstrated this government seeks so often to ally itself with, seeks so often to ally itself with whether it's farm programs or whether it's other fiscal programs, then to choose this kind of occasion to condemn the Federal Government seems strange at least, but, much more important, has made no real serious attempt to offer the solutions to the unemployment problems that we face.

(MR. ENNS, cont'd.)

Now this evening I know the Minister of Finance is going to put forward the kind of programs, the kind of statements that were missing from the Minister of Labour's statement this afternoon, and we look forward to the Paulley budget being delivered tonight at 8:00 o'clock that will have an effective means of combatting that very serious problem that we have in this province, namely unemployment, which is a serious problem. I know the Minister of Labour will still agree with me that it is serious, despite the level that we choose to set it at for ourselves in this province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I trust I may have leave to make a brief announcement which I had hoped to reserve until my time came up for estimates but which I think, in light of the fact that I did make a statement this morning in committee, I ought to make now. And that is with regard to the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission Report which was received by the government last month and subsequently tabled in the House. The members of that commission, you will recall, were Judge Peter Taraska, President of the Court of Canadian Citizenship, who is the chairman; Dr. Hugh Saunderson, and Mr. Charland Prud'homme. As I am sure all the honourable members are aware, the latter two gentlemen were both members of the independent Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission 1968, and Mr. Prud'homme, of course, was Chief Electoral Officer for this province for some twenty years.

The Commission's assigned task was to review and make recommendations on the Electoral Boundaries structure; ward boundaries, community committee boundaries, names and so on, as proposed in the government's policy paper published last December. The Commission obviously took its task very seriously, did a great deal of hard work, and produced a really quite impressive report. Because some of its recommendations were substantive, we felt that we had to give the report equally thoughtful and thorough consideration. This has now been done. Our conclusion was that the concepts expressed in the government's original proposals would be improved and strengthened by the independent commission's recommendations. We were also most favourably impressed with the thoughts and suggestions contained in the section of the report which the Commission designated as "the longer view - a forward-looking long-term view of the direction in which the Greater Winnipeg community and its electoral structure can be expected to move in the years ahead."

There will, of course, be many points of view on something as dynamic as the electoral arrangements for a community such as Greater Winnipeg, just as the Commission emphasized. We agree with the Commission's view that the continuing change, which must be anticipated, will require periodic reviews as an essential element in the development of the community. We have provided for such reviews in the legislation which was presented to the members of the House in draft a short while ago. Therefore, while there might well be many alternatives, in detail or in substance, which could be considered with regard to the definition of boundaries and grouping of wards within community areas, we are confident that the provisions we propose for a continuing process of review will give ample opportunity for future changes, changes growing out of the experience and wishes of the people of Greater Winnipeg and their elected representatives. The Government of Manitoba is therefore prepared to accept in its entirety the Report of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, 1971.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we would like to respond to the statement just made by the Minister of Urban Affairs by saying that, like the Minister and his colleagues, we had great respect for and appreciation for the work done by the members of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, and found great satisfaction in the conclusions that they brought to bear in their final report. We are pleased that the government, through the Minister of Urban Affairs, has indicated its acceptance, in full and unqualified, of the recommendations made by the Boundaries Review Commission. We would say that we recognize this position on the part of the government and acknowledge this step by the government as a forward, a constructive and a progressive one, where the whole question of reorganization of Greater Winnipeg is concerned. We do have some misgivings as to the scope, the extent of the terms of reference within which the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission had to operate. We would have preferred wider terms of reference, which perhaps would have enabled some broader perspectives to be brought to bear.

May 13, 1971

(MR. SHERMAN, cont'd.) . . . on such questions as the principle of division of the area into wards such as those proposed by the government; but within that frame of reference, within those terms, the Review Commission, it seems to us, brought a very worthwhile additional over-view to the work that the Minister and his colleagues have done on this question, and have made a significant contribution to the course of our deliberations on this side of the House - and I'm sure in the Chamber in full - on the matter. So, while adding that one reservation that we feel the terms of reference were unnecessarily narrower than we would have liked, we are very pleased to learn from the Minister that he and his colleagues will accept the recommendations made.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to draw the members' attention to the gallery, where we have some further visitors. We have some 100 students from Moorhead School from Fargo, North Dakota. These are Grade 6 students and they are under the direction of Mr. E. Frechette.

On behalf of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question that was posed in my absence by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia on May 7th, page 710 of Hansard, in regard to the issue of whether or not the tenants in public housing developments would be permitted to acquire or to purchase the units which they were occupying. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, it is, in fact, possible for tenants to acquire these units, but this works, of course, only in theory basically, because in order for tenants to do so they would have to arrange for financing under the present market at prevailing rates of interest and payments in order to be able to proceed to acquire and to purchase the units which they were living in. So, Mr. Speaker, in order for there to be a change or an alteration in this regard, some type of approach or arrangement would have to be made with the federal level of government in order to obtain some sort of subsidization or assistance towards home ownership. The present payments that the tenants make, in regard to public housing units, would be too low for actual home or equity purchase, because they run over a 50-year period at a low rate of interest, seven and a half percent interest, much less than what would be required in order to meet equity payment in a unit.

This government is interested in investigating this matter further. It's a matter which I have referred to on different occasions in the past while, that some system should be devised by which some assistance should be given to tenants eventually in public housing units to be able to acquire those units without having to be necessarily thrown upon the prevailing money market, and I would intend to pursue this matter further with the federal authorities.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: It seems our galleries are a very popular place and we are having shifts of people coming and going. I should like to announce to the honourable gentlemen - and lady - that we have 20 pupils of Grades 7 and 8 standing, from the Kronthal School, and the name of the teacher directing them is Mr. Friesen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for replying to my question. I know I posed it to the First Minister. I wonder if he is aware or not if any other province at the present time has made arrangements with the Federal Government so that these people, the tenants, can buy these homes.

MR. PAWLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can indicate

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) whether it will be the government's intention to take over the private cable television companies in Manitoba, and if not, would he explain what appears to be ..

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . conflicting positions on this.

MR. SPEAKER: It's a matter of policy. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): The Honourable Member for Lake-side, if I heard him correctly, was indicating that you, Sir, were sitting in caucus, and inasmuch as it doesn't do justice to the position of the Speaker to have that kind of mis-impression rumoured about, let it be clear, Sir, that that is not the case. Mr. Speaker is upholding the impartiality of the Chair, as we would all hope and expect him to do.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he could confirm whether or not the Co-op Implements of Winnipeg are proceeding with their plans to start their combine manufacturing in this province, and does this government have any financial involvement in this connection? -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman like to take my place? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is no policy consideration involved in the question, if I may say so, inasmuch as the decision has already been taken. The event has taken place. I can reply to the Honourable Member for St. George that in fact there has been a signing of an agreement between Co-operative Implements Limited and a Swedish firm operating in conjunction with the Volvo Company, for the manufacture in Manitoba of several hundred combines per year, and that this presumably will start to take place within a matter of a few months and should provide employment for approximately 175 additional manufacturing personnel. I think it's great . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is for the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether he can tell us, has a decision taken place with respect to the takeover of the private cable television companies in Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if a policy decision is to be taken in the matter, it will be announced at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, basically the same topic. On CBC radio this morning, the Minister of Industry and Commerce was quoted for the second time in the last week, regarding cable television and other communications links in Manitoba associated with the MDF.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member place his question? I realize that preface is necessary but it's getting lengthy.

MR. CRAIK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister be good enough to advise the House in all of this what he has indicated publicly on the media?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear to all and sundry by various kinds of media, news media, that I have expressed a personal interest in this question of better television coverage, more complete television coverage for the people of Manitoba, as an individual member of this House. I was on a half-hour television program last night known as Broadway Beat - I'm sure all honourable members are familiar with this - and I'm pleased to note that members of the Conservative Party of this House and members of the Liberal Party of this House agreed with me wholeheartedly in my point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member for Riel got a supplementary?

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I didn't have the good fortune to see Broadway Beat. I wonder if he could advise the House of the position he took on the other radio program last week and this morning on CBC.

May 13, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell the House whether or not the views expressed by the Minister of Industry and Commerce are government policy.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can answer the honourable gentleman by saying that I share with the Minister of Industry and Commerce the great hope that television service to rural Manitoba, northwestern Manitoba in particular, can be improved for the deserving residents of that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether he shares the views, which I believe are the personal views, of the Minister of Industry and Commerce about a provincial bank.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would be equally curious to know whether the Member for Riel shares the views of his Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour as Commissioner of Railways. The CNR has announced that it will be closing some 46 railway points. Can the Minister advise if he has any policy or any actions contemplated in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday that I'm in constant contact with the Canadian National Railways and I also apologize for mininterpreting the question directed to me by the news media. I thought that they were referring to rail line abandonment when in effect they were talking of close-down of some stations in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan. I also informed the House yesterday that the matter has not been dealt with by the Board of Transport Commissioners as of yet, and that there has been a deferment of that consideration, and I assure the House that I will continue to use the facilities of the Department to do whatever we can to see that, if there is replacement or abandonment as a result of methodology changes in the operation of the railways, we will use every endeavour to see that no one suffers unemployment as a result.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. From the Minister's remarks I would gather, then, that the CNR has made application to the CTC. I think they have made application now for the closing, made application to the CTC.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe that is so, Mr. Speaker, and I want to draw also to the attention of the House that an educational program will be conducted by the railroad officials in the communities which may possibly be affected, to inform the local municipal councils, the local Chambers of Commerce and other interested parties, as to the objective in mind, and also to inform of alternative services that will be provided by the railway in communities affected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted some clarification. In the original CN statement that came out, they had not indicated that they had at that point filed application to the CTC and I would gather that this information has come about from the discussions, then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. When I say that I'm not absolutely certain, I do that because I don't like making positive statements when they may not be factual. I can certainly check that out so that I will be able to give a firm answer to my honourable friend as to whether or not they actually have. But I do want to say that the proposition of the change in method of service to the communities was drawn to my attention some time ago and, as I indicate, discussions are taking place between myself in my capacity as Railway Commissioner, Mr. Speaker, and the Vice President of the CNR Railway, as indeed the same applies somewhat to the CPR, and also that I have met with the Chairman of the Railway Committee of the Board of Transport Commissioners.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I'm dealing with the same item, but a direct question to him. Is it the intention of the government to commence a study of the economic implications of a potential closing such as has been proposed?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it depends on the degree of intensity of study that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has in mind in his question. Certainly, certainly economic study and analysis of implications of proposed changes are being carried forward by

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) personnel in at least two departments of the government and under the general direction of the Minister of Labour, and Railway Commissioner.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate how many jobs in Manitoba are affected by this.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I say that we're carrying on discussions with the railways pertaining to the numbers affected, and also the indications that have been given to me as a result of our discussions are very few services will be terminated. There will be alternative employment made available to the vast majority of the present employees on the Canadian National Railways, and also the CPR with their customer service plan indicates the same.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Can he tell us how many people will likely have to take alternative employment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. In view of his statement that he made earlier this afternoon, indicating total bankruptcy in the Federal Government's program, has he offered any solution to the Federal Government as to how to bring about employment?

MR. PAULLEY: Not directly, Mr. Speaker, but on occasions I have suggested a change in government at the federal level to a New Democratic government.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education now inform us how many students, if any, have been employed by the Student Employment program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): 233.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement to the House of the sale of the MacDonald Air Base. The successful bidders were the new Rosedale Colony of Hutterite Brethren, and the selling price was \$271,000.00.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Will you call Bill No. 31, please?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, can I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Special Committee of the Legislature on the Rules of the House, together with the Report of the Independent Committee on Members' Indemnities, referred to this Committee by Resolution of the House on Tuesday, May 4, 1971.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just at the close of yesterday's sitting of the House I had an opportunity, for a moment or two, of endeavouring to put the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition straight as to what transpired during the committee's deliberations considering the matter of how the Standing and Select Committees of the House should conduct themselves. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition went off on a tangent or two and was totally, in my opinion, unfamiliar with the facts of life and in

May 13, 1971

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) particular what transpired during the consideration in the Committee on the Rules of the House. I want to point out to him and to the members of this Committee of the Whole, that when the Special Committee on the Rules of the House considered this matter, there was almost complete unanimity of agreement that we could not, or should not, repeat some of the experiences that we'd had that were made evident the year before in the conduct in committee hearings.

If memory serves me correctly, and I'm sure he will indicate if I am wrong, one of the honourable gentlemen on that committee, namely the Honourable Member for Morris, was of like opinion, that we should give consideration to changes in our rules to make provision for more orderly conduct in committees outside of the House, and also that for the information of members of committees it would be desirable that written briefs be presented to the committee and that the system somewhat similar to that prevailing at Ottawa should be the modus operandi of our Standing Committee here. As I understand the conduct at Ottawa, written briefs are submitted on a given subject to the chairman or secretary of the committees in advance, and then a spokesman or two appear before the committee to express their viewpoint in order that there may not be repetitious comments presented to the committee.

So what we have attempted to do in the final stages of the deliberation, the report which was submitted to the House, Mr. Chairman, did not contain any objections, and that is of course the report that we have before us. It states on Page 8 of Votes and Proceedings No. 4 of April 13th, not a directive to a committee, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in his tirade yesterday, but rather a suggestion of a possible methodology for the consideration of representation made, and if one will take the time to read Page 8, the first paragraph, in the final sentence before we get down to subsections: "The following restrictions are suggested:"

Now that's all that this is, because according to the rules of the House, Mr. Chairman, every committee can decide the order and the method by which they will conduct themselves. I need not say and recall to members of the Committee on Public Utilities of last year that on two or three occasions the committee decided by a vote that no more briefs would be heard, and certain other aspects at that particular time and during that committee. So the guiding principle is that the committee has the right to set the rules under which they operate, and all that this suggestion does is to spell out for the consideration of the committee, not as a definite rule, a reasonable approach so that the committee or committees can conduct themselves more efficiently and that undue repetition would not be encountered.

What does the suggestion say? That all briefs should be in writing and submitted to the committee in advance. I think that's a fair, reasonable suggestion. Then, that repetitious briefs or statements be refused by the committee; and that time permitted for presentation of briefs and ensuing question period should be limited. All to facilitate the conduct at the committee stage. And again I point out, Mr. Chairman, that these suggestions were not objected to when the final report was before the committee for consideration to submit to this House.

Now we've had two or three speakers from across the Assembly raising objections because, in their opinion, attempts are being made to deprive the individual of freedom. To me, it is nonsense. There is no inclination; it's only an endeavour to conduct the business of the committees on a reasonable basis.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that, as far as we are concerned, we are prepared to amend the report in Committee of the Whole by deleting in Section 7 on Page 8, all of the words after the word "the" in the second last line of the first paragraph. In other words, instead of spelling out suggestions for the consideration of the committee, if this would achieve what my honourable friends feel should be achieved, we'll withdraw those suggestions, allow the committee themselves to adopt the same suggestions at the committee level themselves. I think it's a lot of nonsense that we've heard from the other side of the House; that there is no basis for their arguments; however, we're a very, very generous group on this side of the House, and to accommodate the flowery speech which was full of nothingness uttered by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, I'm prepared to propose the deletion of that in order that my friend with troubled nerves will be . . . and that he will be able to go merrily on his way enhancing his education in the Rules of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I have the specific deletion, please?

MR. PAULLEY: The deletion, Sir, would be that all of the words after the period, or the word "public" in the tenth line of Suggestion No. 7 contained on Page 8, be deleted to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) word "limited". All of them out after that word, the word "public".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister just a moment ago as to what he had to say, and that he claimed that we had no basis for asking for a change or even to have this whole thing reconsidered. Yet he comes about and makes an amendment. I don't see -- if we didn't have a basis, an argument, I don't think he would have come up with an amendment. But, Mr. Chairman, certainly if the amendment had not been brought forward, this meant that we would be endorsing the principle of restrictions, of placing restrictions -- (Interjection) -- Exactly, because what we're deleting, it says that "The following restrictions are suggested:" so that -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but we -- by doing that, we're endorsing the principle of putting on restrictions, and this is the very point that I argued the other day. Certainly, now that we are deleting, now that we're deleting the subsections, the rules as they are presently in the book apply - and what kind of rules do we have? We have the rules not to read speeches, so we shouldn't even have the presentations read out to us; they should be verbal. That's the difference.

Secondly, what do our rules say? We have 40 minutes that we can speak. Another thing, speaking in committee we're not limited. These are completely different and not restricted, as they're suggested here in subsections (a) (b) and (c). Therefore, I welcome the amendment that the Minister is placing before us. Certainly I will not have to endorse the principle of placing the restrictions and certainly it makes it much more palatable, although I would rather like to see it, Rule 7, or the whole thing deleted, but certainly it is more palatable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to the course of action proposed by the Minister of Labour. I rather think that perhaps he over-reacted to some of the suggestions that were made here, but we're perfectly happy to go along with it. He did make a statement though, or two, that I would like to deal with, not that I have any serious objections to the statements that he made, but there are a few points where the edges should be smoothed out just a little bit. He suggested that the House of Commons committees are following a course of action that compels people who appear before those committees to write their briefs, and that is true. I'm not disagreeing with that; that is true. But I think it should also be pointed out that in the House of Commons normally the committees are set up to deal with a specific problem, many times in advance of the implementation of legislation -- (Interjection) -- I was coming to that -- many times in advance of the implementation of legislation, to get the views of the public on a particular subject, and so notices go out to interested organizations so that they have plenty of time to prepare their submissions before the committee. So that, I think, is a slightly different situation. -- (Interjection) -- No, not in every case because there are occasions when bills are sent to a committee after they have passed second reading in the House, but normally people that are in attendance at those committee hearings when bills are being considered are the officials of the department. There are occasions when outsiders are invited to come in and give representation. And then, of course, there is also the occasion when the estimates of the department - now the practice in Ottawa is to send the estimates of the department to all committees, in which case again the departmental officials appear before the committee to answer questions. If we were to follow that practice - I seem to get the impression that the Minister was implying that - it would mean that our procedures would be changed somewhat here and it would be an entirely different setup than what we have under the Law Amendments Committee which is an entirely different situation.

So I'm not too sure that there is a complete parallel in what he is suggesting and that's the only point that I wanted to raise because I didn't want the impression to be left that there was a parallel between what is done under Law Amendments and what is done in the standing committees of the House of Commons because there isn't, not completely at least. But we're prepared to go along with the suggestion made by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number 8: That Rule 100 be amended to provide (a) motions for addresses for papers and orders for return if accepted by the government shall not be debatable and, (b) such motions shall not be subject to amendment. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I could not resist an opportunity to make a comment at this stage. I'll not repeat what I've said on many occasions on the subject, my views are well known. But there is one point that I want to raise here in connection with this. I notice that in Rule 6,

May 13, 1971

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) which is the one dealing with private members' motions and we'll probably be coming back to that, but I'd like to make this point now for consideration of the government before we go back to Rule 6; and that is I notice that there is no provision in Rule 6 dealing with this particular item. It says here on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays we'll deal with private members' business which will include private members' resolutions as a priority item, followed by private bills and public bills if there are no resolutions. That's fine. And on Tuesdays and Thursdays between 4:30 and 5:30 the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might interrupt my honourable friend just in order that the record be straight. My honourable friend referred, I believe, to paragraph six as Rule 6. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. I think it would be advisable if he would correct lest somebody feel that it applies to Rule 6 in our present rule book.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I meant paragraph six in our recommendations. As I was saying, I note that following the business for Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays that on Tuesdays and Thursdays it is stated here that the agenda will include private members' bills, public bills followed by private members' resolutions, and the point that I want to make here is that there is no opportunity there, which I think was the intention of the committee, for members to debate notices of motions for papers which had been refused by the government. I think the understanding was that we would provide in the private members' hours, two days a week, an opportunity to debate Orders for Return that had been refused by the government. I completely accept the recommendation that private members' bills or motions for address for papers and orders for return shall not be debatable and that there should be no amendments to them; I completely accept that, but I think that when we get back to Recommendation 6 there should be a provision made for the inclusion of an opportunity to debate these Orders for Returns and Motions for Papers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, even if we should support 8 (a) I feel that section (b) should not be in this particular section. I think we've had the experience so often that an Order for Return is filed and the Minister gets up and he says if certain changes were made they would be acceptable. Well under this section it cannot be amended and immediately this would mean that the government could not supply the information. If we pass this section here this means that it cannot be amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, surely that is not what is being done here. The rule with regard to Orders for Return stays exactly the same as it is. In other words, if a Minister gets up and says we will accept this if the wording is changed and if it's not agreed to then it hasn't been accepted and it becomes debatable. If he accepts it with the changes, the changes are made by leave and the Order goes on as if it had been worded that way originally. What the rule is dealing with is a situation which arose with the Honourable Member for Morris last year when he put in an Order for Return and a member on this side of the House sought to extend that Order for Return so that there would be more information (it was the Member for St. Boniface) and what the Member for Morris' point was is that if the Member for St. Boniface wishes to get this he doesn't have to amend my Order he can put in his own. That means that nobody's rights are going to be restricted and as far as the wording "such motions shall not be subject to an amendment", the word "amendment" surely means a motion to amend, a substantive motion to amend. The statement by a Minister -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. -- I don't think I have to say anything more on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I must still beg the question here because I've seen it happen that we've had amendments placed even sometimes by the original mover of an amendment, it's on the Order Paper, it's printed and the only way to bring about changes is by bringing in amendments. The Minister says that this can be done by leave but I'm not so sure whether this will happen once this section is in here.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me try for a moment to put the member straight on this. What this recommendation seeks to do is to prevent the government from preventing a member obtaining information by getting somebody to move an amendment to it. What it is intended to do is to enable a member on any side of the House to submit an Order for Return for papers or information that he wants and he alone wants. If this is not acceptable in its present form by the government there is nothing stopping him from reintroducing that same

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) motion along the lines suggested or along the lines that are acceptable to the government. There's nothing stopping him from asking leave to withdraw it and submit a new one. There is nothing stopping him from doing any number of things if he wants information in addition to the provision that we're already making for him to simply put a question and hand it to the Clerk without submitting an Order for Return. In other words, what we're tending to do is to enable members of this House to get far more information far more readily than has ever been available to them in the past. I fail to see the objection that my honourable friend from Rhineland raises, because it is certainly not the intention to prevent a member from getting information but rather to broaden his opportunities for getting information.

MR. FROESE: I don't accept the suggestion here by the Member for Morris that the government would amend these motions in order to disqualify them. I don't accept that because I don't think it has happened, not in the experience I've had. But I know of instances, and I've done it myself, where I've made amendments to Orders just to bring in for the clarification, or to get one piece of additional information and there was no reason why it could not be accepted and it was accepted and I don't see any reason why we should be barring this thing from happening.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on Recommendations 8 (a) and 8 (b) and after a voice vote declared the motions carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9. That bills be referred to standing or special committees sitting outside of the House only for the purpose of hearing public representation. Detailed examination of the legislation and proposed amendments will be dealt with in the Committee of the Whole House. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just before this item is put. I gave my honourable friend verbal notice that we would be suggesting an amendment to this particular paragraph. The amendment is going to be moved by the Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister Without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I think one of the major reasons for the committee was to attempt to streamline procedures and this is I think what we've attempted to do to improve some of our procedures and also to eliminate some that just result in duplication and unnecessary delay and debate.

I think that there is really two possibilities here. One is that you could hear -- in other words I think what we have done up to now is there has been a clause by clause examination of bills outside the House and then a movement into Committee of the Whole and a clause by clause examination here. The original suggestion of the committee was that the committee should go outside the House, hear public representations and then not go into clause by clause but do that in Committee of the Whole. I think that we would find that it would probably be a superior system if the procedure was that the Committee of the Whole went outside the House, heard the public representations, did the clause by clause study right at that time in front of the public who would in most cases be present -- committee outside the House -- hear the public briefs, do the clause by clause examination, then bring the bill into the House, report the bill and at that time following the Federal system if there were further amendments that people thought desirable then they could move amendments to the report. In other words, I think that the people who are most familiar with the sections of the bill, people on the committee, would get first crack at the bill, make their proposed changes there, then it would come into the House with those changes tacked on and if any other member of the committee or not of the committee at that time then decided there was need for further change he could then move an amendment to the report.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a better system if we tended to follow our colleagues in Ottawa. Consequently I would move that Recommendation No. 9 be amended as follows: That all the words after "House" in the second line be struck out and replaced with the following: "for the purpose of hearing public representation and clause by clause examination of the legislation. The bill is then reported to the House where amendments may be made and debated. After this the bill passes to third reading. Tax bills are automatically given clause by clause examination in the Committee of the Whole House."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, there is one flaw or one difficulty that I see in the

May 13, 1971

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) proposed amendment. I think that it probably could have been acceptable if the membership on the Law Amendments Committee had remained in the composition of the entire membership of the House as it was last session. The difficulty that I see here is that members who are not on that committee, or not on a particular committee, are going to be denied the opportunity then of engaging in the clause by clause discussion while that bill is in the committee. They will not be denied that opportunity since the entire membership of the House is here of participating in the debate if the bill is considered clause by clause in the House. I think there would be some objections to some members who are not able to be on that committee in that they would be denied the opportunity of participating in the debate while the bill was being considered clause by clause. For that reason I have some reservations about the acceptability of that particular amendment and I think that our original proposition, I believe we discussed that while we were in committee and it was for that reason that the recommendation was submitted in the form that it was contained in the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Morris makes a reasoned case as he usually does in debating the rules of this House. What is being proposed here is based on the simple principle that a bill having been referred to one committee of this House need not and ought not to be referred to yet another committee of this House. Now I know that the procedure that has been followed over the years has been to have all bills, except money bills, referred to a standing or special committee, usually a standing committee, and it's dealt with clause by clause and amendments may be proposed and then finally dealt with in that standing committee and then brought back and then reported back to this House and goes into Committee of the Whole for clause by clause consideration and then subsequent to that with Mr. Speaker in the Chair it goes through third reading clause by clause. I think my honourable friend the Member for Morris, if it wasn't exactly during the time that he was a member of the Commons it was certainly soon after and I'm sure he's aware of the rule change that was adopted in the Federal House, and I may add this proposed change we are talking about right now which was adopted in the Federal House in I think early 1969, has been found to be by all sides of the House very acceptable in its practical operation and application.

Now the Honourable Member for Morris though has one specific concern and that is that inasmuch as members of a standing committee, the membership of a standing committee, is always less than that of the full House, that it would deny members not on the standing committee the opportunity to debate a specific clause of the bill since not being on the standing committee the bill comes back here under our proposal, it would not come to Committee of the Whole therefore the honourable member contends certain members would not have the opportunity to deal with a specific clause of the bill. That isn't quite correct I submit to my honourable friend because in the third reading stage of the bill we do proceed clause by clause although amendments cannot be made but the bill can be referred back for consideration by committee. And -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I appreciate that refinement.

What is being proposed here, and I think for better understanding of the matter it might be just as well for me to read onto the record the entirety of Standing Order 75 of the Federal Parliament and I put this forward in all sincerity in the full belief that it is a practical rule innovation and is one that does not militate for or against any side of the House. And Standing Order 75 which has a number of subsections to it reads as follows: "In proceedings in any committee of the House upon bills the preamble is first postponed and if the first clause contains only a short title it is also postponed then every other clause is considered by the committee in its proper order. The first clause, the preamble and the title are to be last considered." Now that's just stating the obvious and is in a sense preambular. Nevertheless it's a subsection.

"Subsection 2. All amendments made in any committee shall be reported to the House. Every bill reported from any committee, whether amended or not, shall be received by the House on report thereof."

"Subsection 3. The report stage of any bill reported by any Standing or Special Committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to 48 hours following the presentation of the said report unless otherwise ordered by the House.

"Subsection 4.. The consideration of the report stage of a bill from a Committee of the Whole shall be received and forthwith disposed of without amendment or debate.

"Subsection 5. If not later than 24 hours prior to the consideration of a report stage

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

"Subsection 6. When a recommendation of the Governor-General is required in relation to any amendment to be proposed at the report stage of a bill at least 24 hours written notice shall be given of the said recommendation from His Honour and proposed amendment.

"Subsection 7. Any amendment in relation in form only, in a government bill may be proposed by a Minister without notice but debate thereon may not be extended to the provisions of the clause or clauses to be amended.

"Subsection 8. When the Order of the Day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with Section 5 of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

"Subsection 9. When debate is permitted, no member shall speak more than once or longer than twenty minutes during proceeding on any amendment at that stage, except the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, a Minister of the Crown or other members sponsoring a bill, and the Member proposing an amendment may speak for not more than forty minutes."

And No. 10 goes on to say, "Mr. Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment as may enable Mr. Speaker to form a judgment upon it."

And there are still three subsections but I believe that they are - well perhaps it is just as well, Mr. Chairman, to get all of this on the record.

"Subsection 11. When a recorded division has been demanded on any amendment proposed during the report stage of a bill, Mr. Speaker may defer the calling in of the members for the purposes of recording the Yeas and Nays until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to that bill have been considered. A recorded division or divisions may be so deferred from sitting to sitting.

"Subsection 12. When proceedings at the report stage on any bill have been concluded, a motion that the bill as amended be concurred in or, that the bill be concurred in, shall be put and forthwith disposed of without amendment or debate.

"Subsection 13. When a bill has been amended or debate has taken place thereon at the report stage, the same shall be set down for a third reading and passage at the next sitting of the House."

And finally, the last subsection of Standing Order 75: "When a bill has been reported from a standing or special committee and no amendment has been proposed thereto at the report stage, and in the case of a bill reported from a committee of the Whole, with or without amendment, a motion that the bill be now read a third time and passed be made in the same sitting." And, Mr. Chairman, I depart then from quoting to say that in the last case, it is only if there is no amendment that has been brought forward at the report stage, that the bill can be given third and final reading at the same sitting. Obviously if amendments are proposed at the report stage there must be notice and it cannot be obviously given third and final reading on the same day as the disposition of the amendments.

Now, I know that there is something about human nature, which certainly applies to members of an Assembly or Legislature, that resists change, particularly with respect to rules and forms, and I'm not making any argument in favour of change for change's sake, but what I am making an argument for here is that there is an alternative procedure with respect to the processing of bills through this House and through committees and back to this House. There has been a change with respect to this process of bills that has been initiated in the federal House. It has worked just in a very acceptable way. There is no substantial disagreement or criticism of the new Standing Order 75 after two years of use, and I recommend to honourable members that it receive their concurrence and incorporation into the rules here.

There would be a few changes that would have to be made - I think the term is *mutatis mutandis* - and Standing Order 75 could be incorporated in full body in our own rules. The advantage of it is that it respects the principle, and I think it's a very good principle, that a bill, having gone through one committee of this House, ought not to have to go through yet another committee of this House before it can be given third and final reading. Surely the introduction here in the Assembly, the debate on second reading, the submitting of it to a committee, the consideration of the bill in committee, the bringing back of the bill from committee to the

May 13, 1971

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) House in a report stage, the filing of notices of amendment to the bill at report stage, and then the third reading stage, surely this taken in its totality is adequate assurance that deliberate consideration, due deliberation has been given to the proposed legislation, and I think it's just a bit much to keep insisting on bills having to go through two separate committee processes on its way to passage.

Now let it be clear in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal would not apply to money bills in the sense that money bills would stay in the House, be handled and treated in exactly the same way they are now, which is they go into Committee of the Whole and are not referred to any outside standing committee, and in fact, you see, Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, there is a degree of consistency, there is a point of consistency in what we are proposing as between the treatment of money bills and other bills. Money bills have, over the years, always been dealt with by means of first, second reading, submission to Committee of the Whole, and back with Mr. Speaker in the Chair for third reading, and have never been submitted to standing or special committees. We are suggesting the same principle be respected in respect to other legislation, other bills, except that instead of it going to Committee of the Whole, that it go to a standing or special committee.

MR. JORGENSEN: With one of the final statements that the Premier just made, I agree wholeheartedly. I am not attempting to suggest that the committee stage of a bill should be dealt with on two occasions, in the Committee of the Whole and then in the committee, whichever committee it is sent to, whether it be Law Amendments or any other committee. I, along with him, was just as anxious to eliminate one consideration, and the only point I make is that I feel that if you are going to consider a bill in committee, that this is the proper place to do it rather than in the standing committee. What happens, you drew the analogy -- I beg your pardon, Sir, the Premier drew the analogy of what they do in the House of Commons and what they do here, but he knows also that in the House of Commons it's unlikely that a member of that House is interested in more than two, or at the very most three departments. There is no way that members of the House of Commons can become familiar with all aspects of government because the work load is just too great, so most members tend to concentrate on two or three departments and interest themselves in those committees and in the work of those departments, and engage in debate in those departments.

It is somewhat different here in the provincial level. You find that in your consistency you're involved in almost every facet of a provincial government's operation. Some way or another it affects almost every member. And so therefore most members are eager, if not to participate in the debate, at least to have the opportunity of listening to those who have heard the representation, who have had the benefit of the experience of those who have appeared before the committee, and are presenting their case in the Legislature; and I think there is a slight difference in the situation that the members find themselves in Ottawa and what they find themselves in the provincial level.

I don't want to be adamant on this particular point. I think it's one that is worthy of consideration. One saving grace, however, in this whole thing is that the final recommendation of this committee report is that they be adopted for a trial period of one session. If, at the end of that period, we find out that there are serious flaws in the manner in which it is proposed to deal with these bills, then they can be reconsidered, you know, on that basis. I am quite prepared to try the suggestion of the Premier on the clear understanding that, before they are finally adopted for approval, we have a trial period and that we have an opportunity then to review them as we are reviewing them now, to see if they are working to the satisfaction of all members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I must express extreme gratitude to the honourable member for taking that position. Obviously an innovation ought to be, if it appears to have any serious merit at all, really has to be tried in order for a full determination to be possible, and it's altogether logical, therefore, that since we are proceeding with all these rule changes on the basis of a trial period, that it is an ideal circumstance, therefore, in which to try out the application of Standing Order 75 in the provincial context; and if the Honourable Member for Morris is right, that members in a provincial legislature find that it really doesn't suit the circumstances of this House and of their own desires, then after the trial period of one year, one session or one year, it is in the reconsideration of the rules, it can be then simply dispensed of or disposed of and we can revert back to whatever was in its place prior to that.

May I just then make one very brief and final observation with respect to Standing Order 75; that is, that it seems to me that the Honourable Member for Morris has the misimpression that there is no opportunity for members of this House who are not on a standing committee considering a particular bill, to debate the substance of the bill after standing committee stage, and that isn't correct because there is something entirely new substituted, incorporated into this, and that is a report stage which, I suppose, in a sense exists now, but the report stage would be expanded so that notices of amendment can be filed and obviously any member of this Assembly will have the opportunity to debate the proposed amendments and has the opportunity to move amendments himself upon notice. All it would require on his part is a liaison with his colleague or colleagues who happen to be serving on the Standing Committee. If a particular member isn't on a standing committee doesn't mean that he is therefore precluded from getting involved in debate on the merits of the legislation at the report stage, because he'd only consult with his colleagues and find out what amendments have been made to the bill in standing committee, when the bill is going to come up for report stage here, and then he can proceed to file amendments if he so wishes and to debate them, or to debate amendments that are filed by his colleagues or by members opposite. So I really do believe that ample opportunity exists for all members, including those not on the standing committee, to have adequate opportunity for discussion and debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't agree with the amendment that is being proposed. I think the original motion as listed on Page 8 in much more acceptable except for one thing, and that is that amendments should be considered in the standing committee. I don't see the necessity of going through it clause by clause. I think we can drop the clause by clause consideration in the standing committee but I feel that we should have the opportunity of presenting amendments at that time. So the section

MR. SCHREYER: Can I ask a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member under the impression that what is being proposed now would mean that there would be no clause by clause consideration in the standing committee? That's not what's involved; there would be clause by clause consideration in the standing committee and then the bill would be reported back and at the report stage amendments could be moved and debated and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, but I don't think the amendment is an improvement. I think this is better than the amendment except for one thing, and that is that I think we should be hearing representation in the standing committees, and if there are some amendments to offer let's hear them and let them be presented, not go through the bill clause by clause in committee. Let's do that in the Committee of the Whole so that everyone can participate. I think this is much more superior and this is the way it should be, so that everyone could participate in the final debate of the bill before it is passed and given third reading.

So all I would like to see is that we insert in the clause 9 here that bills be referred to standing or special committees sitting outside of the House only for the purpose of hearing public representation and any amendments that may be proposed; not detailed hearing and consideration of clause by clause in committee but just that if there are amendments to be proposed at that time that we hear them, because I have seen on too many occasions that amendments have been brought in at that stage and the government as well as the opposition then had time to reconsider before they came to Committee of the Whole and I think on many a time you had improvement in the legislation as a result. I would much rather prefer it that way and I think

May 13, 1971

(MR. FROESE cont'd) the government should consider making that change in this way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: To clarify the amendment, the amendment was worded in accordance with the motion by the Honourable the Minister without Portfolio. I wonder if we can agree that what will be the actual wording of the rule would be the Standing Order that the First Minister read from the Ottawa Rule Book, Standing Order 75, that that would be the rule -- (Interjection) -- mutatis mutandis, that's right. Well, I know that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not in agreement, I'm not intending to say that there's general agreement on it, all I'm saying is that the motion that is put be with regard to the Rule 75.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is glad it had an opportunity to look that word up last session. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I object very strenuously to what is being proposed now, that we are now going to have the Rule 75 of the Ottawa rules to apply here. We've had no chance to even look at them. I don't even know what's in them except what the Minister read. Certainly just by reading it over once and hearing it you can't give due consideration to this. Therefore, certainly this should not be passed at this time if you want to bring in matters of that type into our rules at this time. I would appeal once more to the government to reconsider, and rather than support the amendment leave the Section 9 as it is except that we are allowed to bring in amendments at the committee stage. -- (Interjection) -- No, because it will not be considering the bills clause by clause in the Standing Committees. -- (Interjection) -- No, they should not be, for the very reason that all members should have an opportunity to bring in amendments and in the committees this is not the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has put his case; it seems to be the will of the committee that the question be put.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation No. 10.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, yes I think we can pass that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation No. 10. The committee recommends that the House Leader will, on Friday of each week, indicate to the House as closely as is possible, the business to be followed for the ensuing week. (Agreed)

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, we had a vote on the amendment but not on the clause as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 9 as amended. All those in favour . . .

MR. FROESE: Before you put the question, I want it on the record that I opposed this amendment and the clause very strongly because this will deny me as a member from putting forward amendments to legislation. -- (Interjection) -- No, it is not, because amendments will now only be considered where you go clause by clause; this will only be done in committees, and I'm only on one of the Standing Committees that is considering legislation so certainly this will deny me the right to participate and to actively propose changes in legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't want to prolong the argument because I don't think there's any useful exchange of information any more. The Honourable Member for Rhineland has just become adamant that he will not have an opportunity to propose any amendments to a bill under the proposed Standing Order 75 arrangement, and the fact of the matter is as clearly provided for in that Standing Order, you will have ample opportunity to propose amendments to the bill even if you were not a member of the Standing Committee and you may do so at the report stage which will be a new provision of procedure in the processing of legislation.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the committee to consider Resolution . . .

MR. GREEN: No, 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, 6.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are left with No. 6, and it's possible that we will not be able to resolve this question, but I do make one plea to the members of the other side, again on the basis of this being a trial period and on the basis of the fact that actually what we propose in practice will work out to private members' resolutions being considered on two days of the week at 4:30 - that's two-fifths of the week or forty percent of the week at 4:30 - and the other three days at 9:00 o'clock. We just find it difficult to accept

(MR. GREEN cont'd) the suggestion that a government day will be broken up perhaps after a half hour of government business, an hour of private members' business and back to government at 8:00 o'clock, just doesn't seem to be a smooth way of operating. We can envisage being in the estimates at 4:00 o'clock, going from the estimates 4:00 to 4:30, stopping at 4:30, an hour of private members' resolutions, coming back at 8:00 o'clock and being back in estimates for two hours.

We don't think that the hour 9:00 to 10:00 is a bad hour for private members' resolutions, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, and I urge this on the members really from what I hope is an all-House point of view, that a private member has got an opportunity in speaking from 9:00 to 10:00 of having people who would otherwise be occupied in the afternoons being in the gallery - to do it then. It is a better time for public attendance in terms of private members' resolutions and I don't see the media being as hard to attract for one hour, 9:00 to 10:00, as they are now from 2:30 to 5:30 on private members' afternoons. So what will happen if we proceed with the government proposal is that twice a week it'll be at 4:30 anyway - those are Wednesdays and Fridays - the other three times it'll be at 9:00 to 10:00 and if it works out terribly then of course we can reconsider it, but at least we'll have the chance to see both procedures in action, the afternoon procedure and the evening procedure.

We don't feel amenable at this time and we don't wish to be completely hard, but we are asking for an acceptance of an experiment on the basis of the last hour of every day, rather that way. I have no sensitivity at all about getting advice from my honourable friend, legal advice or any other kind of advice -- (Interjection) -- That's right. That's right. I assure you that you could do no harm in listening sometimes yourself. We're talking about -- we were getting along so well, that's right. We were getting along so well. We are talking about the last hour of every day, and on that basis we hope that we aren't creating a debate just because we are on one side and they are on the other side, and this procedure would give a little bit to both positions; it would of course give more to our position by one day, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, that's an intriguing suggestion put forth by the Minister of Mines and Resources, but I must take now the reverse of the position that I took earlier which puts my honourable friend in the opposite position as well, so we break about even here. I didn't find that any time in the consideration of private members' business in the House of Commons that the hour of 5:00 to 6:00 was a bad hour for anybody. It seemed to me that that particular hour worked out very well. The Minister didn't mention the earlier suggestion that I made, that instead of the hours of sitting being from 2:30 to 5:30 that we extend the hours of sitting from 2:30 to 6:00.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if my honourable friend will then let me interrupt him because I didn't answer that particular situation. The difficulty with that situation is that many of the Ministers are often busy with luncheon meetings and I'm sure that it'll be confirmed to you that if you had to get back at 2:00 it makes a big difference than having to get back by 2:30, so that is a problem, getting back to the House after -- many many meetings are conducted at lunchtime.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend didn't quite hear what I said. My suggestion was that the hours of sitting be from 2:30 till 6:00. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I made both suggestions. I'm coming back to the 2:30 to 6:00 now because I think essentially it's a better one, and it's not going to interfere, as a matter of fact -- and it's not going to interfere with the -- well, I'll have to wait until the caucus is over here. If my honourable friend will just wait until I have made my presentation he'll perhaps see the wisdom of my argument, but you can't realize it unless you heard it.

Private members' hours being what they are, people that are interested are the private members, and my suggestion is that we start at 5:00 o'clock at private members' hours and deal with them until 6:00 - every day - and private members being what they are, I know that there's going to be a lot of Ministers that are going to leave at 5:00 o'clock. In other words, I'm giving them a half an hour. I'm prepared to give them a half an hour earlier to get away at 5:00 o'clock instead of 5:30, so that they can go about their business. Private members are the business of private members, and unless a Minister wants to participate in a private member's debate or is interested in the particular subject matter under discussion, then there is nothing that compels him to sit in the House. In Ottawa there was an occasion where they sat between 6:00 and 7:00 during the lunch hour, on one condition that no votes be held at that time. If there was any votes being taken they would be deferred until the House

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) met again at 8:00 o'clock.

Now certainly there are any variety of arrangements that can be worked out, but I think the one that I'm suggesting to the government is the best one that the House sits from 2:30 to 6:00 o'clock, and between the hours of 5:00 and 6:00 we consider private members' business. Now, I'm suggesting that it is unfair to private members to delay the consideration of private members' hours from 9:00 to 10:00 o'clock because not only will the Ministers all be gone by 9:00 o'clock but the press gallery will be gone too, and one of the reasons why I am suggesting that one hour each day during that hour is to give the private members a better break in the press, so that they will get better coverage in the press, and I hope that this is taken into consideration. I would prefer to see that we adopt a change in the rules as they relate to private members' hours and leave this in abeyance and work out something between now and the time that they are to be implemented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I agree with my honourable friend that the press sometimes leaves at 5:00 o'clock or at 4:30. In any event, the fact is that maybe what we should do is rise, you consider everything that we have said and we'll consider I assure you everything that you have said, and we'll see whether we can get together on it in discussion between ourselves. So I would suggest that . . .

MR. JORGENSON: . . . rise, Mr. Chairman, there's one other point that I think we must deal with and that's No. 2; I think that was left in abeyance as well. We're prepared to let that thing go, that recommendation go just as it is right at the moment. -- (Interjection) -- On Page 3, yes.

MR. GREEN: Oh yeah, that's the one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this other item, it seems like rather a peculiar situation that the Minister of Mines and the Member for Morris, they accept the responsibility now of making all negotiations; other members have no say in what's going on in this House this afternoon and that is highly improper, Mr. Chairman. There are other things that have happened in this committee, particularly with considering these rules; that proper amendments were not made, the changes were made without having a right to consider the exact wording, and as a result you couldn't make proper amendments. The thing that was just being considered now about the hours that will be devoted to Private Members' day is subject, even though we pass this, apparently is subject to change now and the changes will be made by the Minister of Mines and the Member for Morris. Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot condone this and I think you as Chairman of this committee should have better order and make sure that things are handled more properly than they are this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps the better order would be calling the Member from Rhineland to order when he is out of order. I suggest the committee rise.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of things. First of all, let it be clearly understood that the Member for Morris nor I have no authority to bind any other member, and we saw that the other day. The committee came in with a report and the members didn't like it and they got up and could speak against it, and the honourable member can also do so, but it seems that the Member for Rhineland would like to try to ignore the realism that there are political parties in this House, that from time to time the political parties get together to see whether there are issues upon which agreement can be reached and issues upon which they cannot be reached. These agreements have no effect in law; they don't affect the honourable member, but if he wishes to know whether they do in fact take place, as to whether discussions are held, yes they are held. They can in no way upset the rights of any member or the rights of the members themselves who have participated, but to suggest that they not take place is to ignore one of the features of parliamentary activity. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland thinks that they can be ignored, he can go ahead and continue to think so. There's absolutely nothing improper in the conduct; it doesn't affect any member's right to do exactly as he pleases when the time comes, but it's not going to stop us from trying to make arrangements where arrangements can be made to facilitate the business of government and the business of the House itself - not the business of government because that's something which the government has to undertake, but the business of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, certainly if we're going to be subject to the federal rules as has been read out here this afternoon, members of this committee should be provided

(MR. FROESE cont'd) with a copy of those rules so that we could study them, so that we would know just what we are letting ourselves in for. We have not had the opportunity of doing so and I too want to complain on this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, I'm not rising to debate with the Honourable Member for Rhineland, but it seems that if I recall correctly, a remark made by the Honourable Member for Morris mentioned some agreement or understanding that private members' resolutions would not come to a vote in the absence of Ministers, or somewhere along that line at Ottawa - not necessarily at all times as I understood my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, but on occasion.

Now it's my understanding, Sir, that in Ontario there is a rule of the House that no private member's resolution comes to a vote. The purpose behind a private member's resolution, if I recall correctly, is to put a proposition before the House for the consideration of the government, and then after debate ceases on that particular resolution no vote is taken - and it's generally appreciated that the government takes note of the observations of all members of the House in respect of private members' resolutions. I had an opportunity of discussing this with the Speaker of the Ontario House and it appears to work out reasonably well. It obviates the necessity we deem sometimes of an amendment to change a resolution to the fact that the "government give consideration to," in order that they're not bound by the passage of a resolution. Now possibly that might be a consideration and then the hour 5:00 and 6:00 may be more amenable. I only raise this because the Honourable Member for Morris I think mentioned agreement for no vote.

Now another point that was raised by the honourable member so properly, Mr. Chairman, dealing with paragraph No. 2 and Rule 3. I would like to offer a suggestion of dealing with this. We had quite a debate the other day, that we should delete the words "until the 80 hours in Supply are completed" from that recommendation. In other words, in other words, the hour of closing of standing and special committees at night shall be the same as that of the House at all times. And then if the so-called speed-up resolution is brought into effect, it's normally not brought in until after the 80 hours and sometimes not even then, that the committee would observe the hour of closing of the House. I think this would be, in my opinion, should be acceptable because it could conceivably be that after 80 hours of consideration, Mr. Chairman, of the estimates the House is still not in the extended hour but under this a committee could be or would be and I make the suggestion for uniformity that the deletion of recommendation of the 80 hours in Supply would accommodate this because I do know from past experience that on a considerable number of occasions the speed-up resolution did not come into effect until a week or two after the 80 hours of debate on the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may. If the Committee is going to not consider Recommendation No. 6 at the present time I would appreciate not considering No. 2 at the present time because it is my recollection that this was agreed to after the defeat of the amendment which had been offered and I'd like an opportunity to check Hansard in this regard because -- (Interjection) -- I understand it can be reconsidered. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: proposed to this. I think there was some suggestions made but I don't think a formal amendment had been proposed to this particular section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . by the Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: At the time that we finished the discussion on No. 2 the Leader of the Opposition said we will go ahead with this item provided you will not foreclose us from bringing in an amendment when we've finished everything. We are now finished everything; there is no foreclosure on an amendment if somebody wishes to bring it. That's all the undertaking that was given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. That's what transpired. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister says is correct and what I rise to say at this time is that we're prepared to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Labour. It seems a reasonable one to us and we're prepared to let it go, but my final remark though must be in connection with the statement that he made dealing with private members' hours in the Ontario Legislature, where it was suggested that there were no votes taken on any of the bills and I -- (Interjection) -- On private resolutions, yes. I wouldn't like to see all the fun taken out of opposition and I'm not too sure that I can agree with that suggestion because one of the joys of being in opposition is putting the government on the spot, just

May 13, 1971

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) occasionally, and I hope that my honourable friend is not going to deprive us of that opportunity.

MR. PAULLEY: Never, never. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the suggestion of reference to the 80 hours in paragraph 2 is acceptable to my honourable friend, and lest there be no favoritism would the other honourable members agree with that too?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? The Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Do I understand correctly that if we accept the proposition that the Honourable Minister of Labour has submitted this means that we could be in speed-up during the estimates? This is not the understanding. . . . ?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I answer. Legally we can, because the House can do anything it so desires, but it's traditional that the speed-up resolution is not brought in until estimates are completed, except Mr. Chairman, for the edification of my honourable friend, there have been sittings of the House where estimates have not been considered and the speed-up resolution can come in, after due notice of course, on the second or third day of the sitting, when the House meets for the specific purposes. I'm just using that as an illustration of sittings of the House that have taken place without consideration of estimates and that the so-called speed-up motion, Mr. Chairman, has been introduced rather quickly, in order to expedite the business of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to know whether there is an amendment before us or not.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe my honourable friend will write out an amendment if it's needed. The Minister of Labour asked whether there could be acceptance of the change by all members of the House; if there can't be he will put a formal amendment.

MR. FROESE: asking a question and I would give my comments on it. If there is an amendment coming forward then I would like to know whether this is the case or not. This would be subject to clause 2 rule 3, "that the closing hour of the standing and special committees of the House sitting at night during the session should be the same as the closing hour of the House." That is what is being proposed here? We would then be removing "until the 80 hours in Supply are completed." So I think it is more firmer if the portion is left in there, but on the other hand, I can see you can also now go beyond the 80 hours in Supply before you bring in the speed-up motion and before you would apply it. So I'll go along with what other members agree to.

MR. GREEN: I take it that all members of the House are agreed that clause 2 will read without the final words, that it will read "the session should be the same as the closing hour of the House," period. That's accepted? (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed. I would direct the Honourable Members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 15 students from Roblin Collegiate of grade twelve standing under the direction of Mrs. Kines. The visitors are from the constituency of

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) the Member for Roblin. On behalf of all honourable members I wish to welcome you to this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution under consideration is 21 (c) -- passed; (d) --

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a brief comment on section (d) and ask the Attorney-General if he would -- (d) - 21 (d). I wanted to say a word and also to ask the Attorney-General if he would explain one matter, because a week ago I was on a TV show with the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the Honourable Member for Lakeside and there was some controversy as to the need for a provincial lotteries licensing board. Their argument was, Mr. Chairman, that this was another encroachment of freedom on the part of some of the people who wanted to conduct a lottery, that the government was attempting to limit freedom of choice and all sorts of other fantastic notions as that.

It is my understanding and I wanted the Attorney-General to clarify this, that this is in fact a requirement of the Criminal Code and that therefore the provincial government is only acting in accordance with federal requirements. In addition to that, however, I think one could make the argument on the grounds of common sense, namely that there is a need to prevent unnecessary duplication of lotteries. For example, if a dozen organizations in one small town are attempting to hold a lottery I think it would be a fact that they would not all succeed and as a result there might be losses and that in the end these organizations might come to the provincial government itself and ask to be bailed out.

I also think there is a need for somebody, whether it's an individual or a board, to look at the administration of the lotteries to see whether or not the organizations that are applying for them are first of all legal organizations, not ones with bad or criminal elements behind them, just to check them out to see whether they are service clubs and community organizations, to see whether they have some sort of idea of what they are doing and then to grant them their license. I think ultimately it's a question of whether this is best handled by a board which the Attorney-General has proposed or a bureaucrat, could be done by somebody who is simply in charge of licensing, but certainly it was not for the purpose of the provincial government or the Attorney-General to limit lotteries in a negative sense but simply to attempt to put them on a sound basis and to meet the requirements of the federal criminal code.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) -- passed. (3) -- The Attorney-General,

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Chairman, I thought I would just briefly indicate to the House and to my honourable colleague that I felt that I had answered all of those matters in some detail earlier and I won't repeat what I had to say, which I think has been recorded and covers all of those questions I thought reasonably well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e) -- passed. The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: The Minister Without Portfolio chose to reopen the discussions on the estimates on this occasion by referring to a past program on which other members participated from the Opposition and by him placing these few comments on record makes it necessary for me to make a few comments, put them on record. I think when he started out to ask the Attorney-General whether or not by federal law or statute it wasn't a necessary requirement to appoint a licensing commission. I think towards the end of his own presentation he answered himself by saying that it was not necessarily a provincial licensing commission that had to be set up by law, indeed it could be some other appointed person or bureaucrat or organization to comply with this aspect of the federal legislation, so that aspect of his original question is dealt with.

The suggestion, and really, Sir, the suggestion was enforced by the Attorney-General's opening introductions to his estimates and the suggestion has been made and I will make again, just by way of closing, that the government having chosen to go into the lottery business, two or three lotteries I think that they have talked about, as a means of raising funds for specific purposes, at this particular time, it's not unnatural to assume that if they are also the licensing agency that they will in the first instance make sure that any other lottery activity that takes place in the province is not detrimental to the lotteries so sponsored by the government. It's a very natural assumption. I would say more than natural, Mr. Chairman, because this particular government has shown a considerable degree of sensitivity to the business of competing with the private sector or other than the government sector. They have shown this indication on a number of occasions, the most noteworthy one of course being namely in the field of auto insurance.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

So the remarks and the suggestions and the concerns being expressed by some organizations that with the government in the business of lotteries, with the government in control of who is going to have a lottery or not, with the government naturally wanting their lotteries to succeed, it's not an unwarranted fear or assumption that in fact under that kind of a setup the odds are weighted in favour of making sure that the government sponsored lotteries are successful, and if indeed the others are not, they may not even get -- they should not be licensed under those circumstances. These were some of the comments, some of the concerns that were expressed earlier in the debate on the lottery bill and on that particular program that was referred to by my honourable friend the Minister Without Portfolio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 22 (a) -- passed; (b) -- The Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate I had proposed to discuss a problem, and I began by relating it to the License Appeal Board and the Minister rightly pointed out it was not in his department, but the problem relates not only to the appeal board but also to the normal administration of justice, where a magistrate may, under the Highway Traffic Act, have suspended the licence of a driver, he has the authority I believe under law at present, if the person whose licence is suspended depends upon that licence for his livelihood, he has the authority to grant him a 30-day restricted licence as it presently stands and it would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I wonder if I could ask the honourable member if he would direct his particular remarks under 25 which is the Administration of Justice. We are on Land Titles now, item 22. The resolution under consideration at the present time is 22, Land Titles Office, Salaries - 21 having been passed - and in my opinion the remarks that you have made so far would be better directed to Resolution 25.

MR. MCGILL: Would this not be properly under 23?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 22 to 24 read and passed.) 25 (a) -- The Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I had explained the general premise of the problem was the problem of the driver who had had his licence suspended by the court and who depended upon that licence for his livelihood. The magistrate could then, after reviewing his case, decide whether or not it would be in order to grant him a 30-day restricted licence. It would be during the period of that 30-day licence that he would be required to present his case to the Licence Appeal Board under the Minister of Transportation but, in Manitoba, rurally, the appeal board I understand is very busy and perhaps gets out to places like Brandon not as frequently as might be required in order for the man to achieve his purpose in the 30 days which the magistrate is permitted to allow him, and I wonder if the Minister has considered this difficulty in view of the heavy workload of the appeal board.

I think they are working to full capacity, but it's my understanding that they are unable to get to rural courts as frequently as would be required when the maximum period permitted for a magistrate to grant a restricted licence is 30 days. It's quite important for these people to have their driver's licence otherwise it would not have been granted on a temporary or restricted basis in the first place, but if it's impossible for him to have his case reviewed by the appeal board within that thirty days then he again is in trouble and it may result in him losing his job if he has been unable to have his case reviewed by the appeal board. I wonder if the Minister then would not consider that the magistrate might be granted the right to grant a restricted licence until the case has been considered by the Licence Appeal Board rather than for the maximum of 30 days. Either this should be the direction in which the law should go or there should be more frequent visits perhaps of the appeal board to outlying areas.

There is also another related problem. The man who has had his licence suspended, and who has perhaps got a temporary restricted licence from the magistrate because of his employment, has a subsequent charge placed against him, and I understand that the appeal board under these circumstances is loath to review his case because of another charge pending. If this is so, Mr. Chairman, I think there may be a point of law here that the second charge has not been substantiated and the appeal board, if it is delaying their decision on his first application because of a second charge which is still not dealt with, is in a sense pre-judging the case. It would seem to me that even though a second charge has been brought, pending its hearing there should be no delay by the appeal board in hearing the original charge and in perhaps reinstating the licence or otherwise as they would see fit.

These are the points which relate to both the appeal board and to the magistrate's court

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) and to the authority of the magistrate to grant a temporary restricted licence. I would very much like to hear the Minister's comments on this problem because it does exist in rural Manitoba and I think is one which is causing considerable concern at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the honourable member speaks from the knowledge obviously of some individual case or cases where hardship has taken place - and I don't doubt that the law is far from perfect. I note that the law in respect to the provisional licence of 30 days that the magistrate may grant was an innovation that was introduced since we've come to office to provide for a remedy for the problem that existed before where either there was an automatic suspension or the magistrate had a discretion to suspend and then that person was without a licence at all unless or until the Licence Suspension Appeal Board gave him a restricted licence. What we did - I believe it was the last session - in introducing the 30-day temporary certificate was grant relief to the problem. Now there may be some cases where 30 days is insufficient, but my understanding from my colleague the Minister of Transportation is that they looked at that question very very seriously before deciding on a 30-day period.

Now maybe in light of experience after a long enough period of having this legislation in being, it may be that further consideration will have to be given to an extension of that period or some changes in order to allow those particularly in remote areas, and I think some of the northern areas are probably more difficult to service than just some of the rural areas, but it's something that I think is of genuine concern. My colleague who was in the House and heard the concern may perhaps deal with it in consideration of his estimates, and if there is any change contemplated in the Highway Traffic Act in that sector that certainly would be borne in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . adjournment, perhaps he could pursue this matter when the committee next meet. Committee rise.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now recessed, it being 5:30, until 8:00 p. m. tonight.