

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 p. m. , Tuesday, April 24, 1973

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 39 (a) -- the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Flin Flon wanted to precede me. No? Are you? Go ahead, I have a slight headache.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the effort of the Member from Rhineland. He explains he has a headache, he'd rather speak later, and I think I should say a few words on labour legislation. I will try to be very brief and make my points clear and to the point.

I just made a few notes during the supper hour and I would like to express my views on labour legislation, being a member of labour for many many years, in fact from the age of 14. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that every man in this House has some ambition, some ideal, some are more ambitious than others. I know the Leader of the Opposition would like to be Premier and of course it's a hopeless task, he never will be; especially when he has so many people on his own side that's ready to take his place.

The Leader of the Liberal Party of course, his ambition, would like to be Premier of the province too.

A MEMBER: That's impossible.

MR. BARROW: It reminds me of a mouse trying to take a lion's place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River on a point of order.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if what the honourable gentleman is having to say at this moment has anything to do with the business before the House. Would you kindly exercise your authority, Mr. Chairman?

MR. BARROW: The honourable windbag from Swan River . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order! I think that kind of name calling that's going on in this Chamber is inexcusable. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, I wish he would withdraw that remark.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if it's the truth, what's wrong with it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. That is insulting language and abusive language and that is not permissible in this House. The honourable member I wish he would withdraw that remark.

MR. BARROW: I apologize for the fact that the honourable member is a windbag.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend some of my colleagues on their contributions during the strike in 1969. At the time we needed help in the worst way. Things had come to a very serious impasse. The members of trades and steel were at the stage where they were going to take a very very militant attitude towards the corporations and I needed help very badly.

At that time we were in the speed-up process, we were all tired, I was tired, they were tired. Within four hours the Member from Thompson at that time who was the Minister of Transport and my colleague the Minister of Labour were in Flin Flon within four hours and they met with the unions, they met with the company. The Member for Thompson at that time, of course, he took all the steps to return roadway to people, it was a very controversial thing. They attended the socials and although both members were very exhausted their efforts alone averted a very military unpleasant attitude in Flin Flon and action was averted. They didn't only meet with companys and union, they made a point of attending or visiting people on the streets and got their version of strikes, why it happened and did every thing they could to avert it. And although the federal people got the credit for ending the strike, I would say now and put on record, the biggest effort towards that strike was put in by the Provincial Government. They brought in the Liberal Party, we wired, we phoned, we forced them for action and we ended that strike in five months which could have went much longer. And for this I commend them, both the Member for Thompson at that time, and my colleague, the Minister of Labour.

And I'd like to commend my colleague from Transcona on labour legislation that was never before attempted and which I never thought I'd see. Legislations, Mr. Speaker, that I was looking forward to since I was the age of 14 years old. And in those days when I was 14 years old in the coal mine, and I don't want to be repetitious, but a Shetland pony had more value than a man. In Cape Breton they had an unwritten law, when a man died the mine would

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BARROW cont'd) knock off or quit. In one case, half an hour before quitting time a man who was killed was hidden behind timber till the shift was finished. --(Interjection)-- I'll get you later, my honourable friend, just wait, I'll get you later. You don't believe me? --(Interjection)-- You don't believe me? I'll get you later, Mr. Bilton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Direct your remarks to the Chair, not to another honourable member.

MR. BARROW: Compensation laws were passed that were never before dreamed of by former governments, never dreamed of. And the most important thing -- I'm sorry the Member from Lakeside is not here, I'm sorry he's not here, he's never here when the chips are down. But we passed legislation putting government inspectors in mines that you people never never looked at, you ignored because you didn't care about miners, we did it, through the efforts of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines, and changed the whole aspect of mining in the north.

They nullified the effect of company inspectors who never never never went into dangerous working places because they were afraid and biased of the corporations -- paid off, ripoff, And this is your company inspectors which was changed by this government who has more guts in their little finger than you guys got in your whole bodies.

Union security. You must belong to unions . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, point of order. The Minister whether he meant to or not made a -- the member made a fairly serious accusation that someone was accepting ripoffs or payoffs, were mining inspectors. If that is correct then he has a responsibility to either prove it or withdraw it.

MR. BARROW: I don't think I'm in a position to prove it or disprove it, but why didn't you do it? --(Interjection)-- Why didn't you do it? Because you had no guts.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, if the member has an accusation to make, I repeat he has a responsibility either to prove it or withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Riel, surely anyone in this House has the right of self-expression and self-opinion, and if there is an argument between the Member for Flin Flon and the Member for Riel then the Member for Riel has an opportunity to rebutt that. And until such time as there are any firm foundations for it, it's not required under our rules for a withdrawal unless it's referred to a member of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member, and I use the term loosely, when any member uses a statement such as has been made in this House, Mr. Chairman, any member that makes a statement like that in this House where he accuses a mining inspector of a ripoff or a payoff is demeaning the whole aspect of government and the employees of government in so doing. Now I've never yet heard any suggestion at any time that any mining inspector ever in the history that I've been around here whoever has been accused in any way, shape or form of what the Member for Flin Flon has suggested here. I think that if he's going to make outlandish statements like that -- and even the House Leader, the ex House Leader, the Minister of Labour, knows that you don't make statements about public servants of that outlandish nature without backing it up. And they would show a little more decency than they have shown so far if they censure their own members, the members of the government for making those kinds of ridiculous statements,

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, even a rat will fight when they're cornered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member.

MR. BARROW: The mining inspectors as such were --(Interjection)-- you just want me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BARROW: You hurt my feelings terribly. You hurt my feelings terribly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the honourable member going to continue his speech through the Chair or is he going to converse with other members and not through the Chair,

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, he's hurt my feelings and I feel bad about it. They had mining inspectors, Mr. Chairman, who were as useless as the mammary glands on the female cow. Is it? --(Interjection)-- What's the correct term?

A MEMBER: Mammary gland on a bull.

MR. BARROW: On a bull? Well whatever. Never once did they go to work in places that

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. BARROW cont'd) was dangerous. I can prove it. And if he thinks for one minute that I can't prove that it wasn't done, let him go and ask some of the widows up there, let him go and ask some of the people who suffer from silicosis, let him go and ask some of the orphans that he caused by not putting mine inspectors in mines. No guts. Not one of them people over on that side of the House, and you're all equally guilty, because you wouldn't put mining inspectors in mines. And what your leader said or, you're Minister of Mines he said, and I'll quote: "Production, not safety" that's what you said. I'll never let you forget it. Say something you fat faced bastard!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. ORDER please. --(Interjection)-- Order. The honourable member will withdraw that remark. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: We don't have to take that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I'm asking the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

MR. BILTON: He should have never have said it. Have you got any respect for this Chamber? --(Interjection)-- That's not enough.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I apologize, I withdraw that remark,

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. There has been . . .

A MEMBER: It's unbelievable.

MR. BOROWSKI: There has been various types of languages in this Chamber from both sides and there has been complaints from both sides, but there are limits, Mr. Chairman. That work is -- it's almost like blasphemy, it's the second time - Mr. Chairman, that word has been used by that member a second time and there are, I think it's just going beyond all bounds of decency and tolerance and I ask Mr. Chairman, that something be done to the member. This is language that simply, that type cannot be accepted in this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that some action be taken against the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member has apologized and withdrawn the remark, I can do no more.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Thompson knows full well that the word bastard in mines is not a bad word. It's a good word. Everyone, my friends in Flin Flon . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I don't care whether the word is acceptable anywhere but it's certainly not acceptable in this Chamber and whilst the honourable member has withdrawn he's not forgiven in my mind for having said it in this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member has apologized and withdrawn the remark. The matter is closed. Is the honourable member going to continue his speech?

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I feel very very sorry for the Member from Thompson. A man who I admired, respected and looked up to, and he's lost his, he's lost his . . . balls. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER! ORDER! I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark and discontinue his speech and apologize.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, Order please. I'm asking the honourable member to withdraw and apologize for that remark.

MR. BARROW: I retract and apologize and say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I ask the honourable member to discontinue his speech. Order! ORDER! Order please!

A MEMBER: A point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order before the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or a point of privilege. I do appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon did make some statements that did not conform with the procedures of the House. The honourable member on two occasions has risen from his seat and apologize and withdrawn the remarks, and I would suggest Mr. Chairman, that if the honourable member is prepared to proceed with his observations dealing with the Department of Labour, which is before us at the present time, in a more, shall I say mellow manner, then he should be given the opportunity to proceed. But on the other hand, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable colleague from Flin Flon that if he is so

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) highly exorcised that he feels that he could not proceed in that manner then it might be advisable for him not to proceed at this particular time. The Honourable Member for Riel said that the only way in which the Honourable Member for Flin Flon would be deprived of his privilege of speaking would be, Mr. Chairman, for you to name him, then of course the House Leader then has to present a motion. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we can be somewhat tolerant -- and I don't agree with the procedure that has been going on insofar as my colleague is concerned at this time. But after all, aren't we all from time to time individuals who blow our top or the likes of that. I do it and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Riel has done it on a number of occasions as well. But if we can continue the conduct of the House in a reasonable manner, Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest for the consideration of all members of the House -- and as I indicated a moment or two ago, that if the Honourable Member for Flin Flon is prepared to make a contribution without the language or the type of phraseology that he has been doing, that we let it go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the same point of order that the Minister of Labour was speaking. He can talk about the member of Flin Flon's privileges all he likes. This House has privileges too. Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough to get up to use the language he has used and then apologize and two minutes later to continue with the language. I am shocked that the government, the front bench . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Order please!

MR. BOROWSKI: That the front bench sits there and smiles and laughs about it like they were using language like bums or dead beats or something to that effect. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had all kinds of language, like fascist and like pimping for the press, but I think the Premier and the Cabinet have a responsibility, in the final analysis they'll have to answer for the type of conduct that goes on on that side of the House. I could turn around or any member on this side could accuse the Premier of being a homo or some other pervert and then say, oh I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Well that's not good enough after having made that kind of a statement, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that naming the member would be an act of kindness in this case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances I don't think that there's any alternative but what if the regular House Leader were here the person involved would be named. I can't help but remark that from what I've seen take place here in the last 15 minutes, you can't help but make the observation that this is not a government, it's a gang. If you're going to sit and allow that to happen from one of your own members then I say you've taken politics in Manitoba to a new low. So I leave it entirely in your hands what you want to do. In this particular decision it's entirely in your hands, but I know that if the Member for Inkster were in his seat he would not allow this nonsense to take place in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I have directed the honourable member to discontinue his speech. The floor is open. ORDER. If the member persists I will name him.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was unable to listen to the Minister of Labour's introductory remarks last night. However, I heard him answer or reply to some of the statements made by honourable members this afternoon and I would briefly like to point out some matters that I feel are important and also that need attention. Certainly I think all members of this House should take an interest in the proceedings when it comes to the Labour Department because we are all interested to see that people in this province have jobs and can acquire a job and receive remuneration of the type so that they can make a living and also to make some money on the side -- people should not only get enough from their labours to barely have a bare existence but something so that they would have some margin and acquire something in the way of a nest egg for the future. Although many people today believe or come to the thinking that, well the way the social programs are being brought forward in this province and this country generally that there is no need for acquiring an equity to provide for their future, that the state will take care of them when the time arrives. In a way I feel that the thinking in the older days or in previous days that was in my opinion much sounder, that we should provide during the days when we still are able to work and perform useful services that we provide for

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd) a nest egg for our older and our retirement days.

Just the other day we heard where the Federal Government is coming out with a proposal in connection with the family allowances and that they propose to increase them very substantially. Certainly this would be a big improvement to those people and those wage earners that have larger families to support. I'm sure this would be of great benefit to them. But at the same time I feel that it is very essential that we as members concern ourselves with the fact that we should see to it that as many people have jobs that want jobs and want to earn their living and that want to work while they may. And I think that in order to provide jobs it's not only the job of the government, it depends so largely on the money supply and on the local initiative, the initiative of those people that can provide jobs. I think the two go hand in hand, If we don't have the money supply, well then we've seen from past years that jobs dwindle and become less and less and therefore I think it's very important that our money supply is of such a nature so that the jobs will be provided.

I would like to hear from the Minister on this very point, what he considers, whether the money supply today in Canada and especially in Manitoba, is of such a nature and is readily available so that jobs can be made available either through employers or through self-employment. I think we shouldn't forget self-employment. I think many of the people today are too reliant on other people to provide jobs for them, that we should have more of the people that are resourceful and try to provide jobs for themselves, through their own means. I think we've lost a lot of this. It used to be that people would more readily find a way of employing themselves but certainly as far as the farm is concerned today, it seem to me that this is no longer the case, that you have ever and ever larger farms and fewer people going into it on a self-employed basis. The investment certainly has to do a lot with this because it takes a lot of capital today to set himself up as a farmer.

So because of this we might have to turn more and more to industry and I would like to see much more in the way of industry in rural Manitoba, especially agricultural industry. I think this is lacking to a large extent. We see quite a bit of new industry in rural Manitoba but it's not of the agricultural type, the ones that we need. We need these secondary industries which would use up the raw products coming off our farms, and while we have a cannery at Modern we closed down one at Winkler. Certainly this took away quite a number of jobs. During the summer months I'm sure that we employed more than 100 people. Well these jobs were lost when the cannery closed down. I think these are areas that we should take a good look at and see whether something can't be done about it.

I noted from the report that was put out by the Department of Labour -- I think it contains quite a lot of information. I think it's a well drafted report. I was very interested how the new Labour Relations Act or the Labour Act that we passed last year how it was working out, and there are various sections dealing with this particular piece of legislation that was passed at that time.

I would certainly like to hear from the Minister on some of the contentious parts that we amended such as the one dealing with the union dues, where we had people who came out very strongly at the time that the bill was under discussion and an amendment was brought in whereby people would not be required to pay union dues if they felt it was against their conscience to do so and that in its place they would be contributing to some charity. How many of the people today are taking advantage under this particular section. The report doesn't say so, but then too the Act only came into effect recently so that there might not be any record at this time on this very matter. So if that is the case certainly I would like to hear from the Minister on that, and if that is the case I will be satisfied to get the information sometime later on.

The matter of advertising has been discussed in this House on previous occasions especially in regard to the legislation that we have on our books today which is supposed to be non-discriminatory, so that when people require persons for certain jobs that they cannot specify whether male or female. I feel that we've gone too far in this legislation and that it should be amended and reverted back. Certainly I feel that people should have the right to specify in their ads the type of person, the type of qualifications they want and they should have the right to specify whether they want a female helper or a male helper. I wonder whether the Minister and the government hasn't had requests from time to time that this be changed and changes brought in. I would like to hear from the Minister on this point too. What --(Interjection)-- Yes it has to do with the human rights but certainly at the same time I feel that the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd) government can deal with the matter regardless. I'm sure if the Minister of Labour prevailed upon the government, if there was sufficient pressure or if the need was there that it be changed certainly it could be changed. And whether they consider making changes at this session or at some future time.

The matter of employing older people has also been mentioned by other speakers and I think this is also a very important item because we find that -- I think while it might not be open discrimination and I wouldn't want to tag it discrimination, but certainly some people once they get beyond 40 that the jobs aren't as readily available and that there are employers who will definitely make the selection so that some of the people who are getting over 40 they find it harder to get a job. --(Interjection)-- The Member for St. Boniface mentions 50. Well, if he and I were supposed to apply for jobs we might be walking the streets for quite some time before we could get a job. --(Interjection)-- Well yes, maybe we both should lose some weight first, We might do it by walking the streets.

Anyway is there anything that we can do about this? --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Maybe the Member for Crescentwood will take part in the debate later so that we can hear what he has to say on some of these points.

But certainly this is a thing that we should take cognizance of and if there's something that we can do about it let's do something. Certainly some jobs will lend themselves much better to older men and experienced men, especially in administrative jobs. I feel that that's where we need experience and skill and good judgment and I think this is where we find a need for older people. Not necessarily old people but older people.

The teachers are mentioned in the report. I think there's something in the neighborhood of 8,000 mentioned in one aspect of the report. What is the situation now? Are they still asking to come under the Labour Act -- that we've had different decisions from time to time by the Teachers Society as to their recommendations. I don't know what the present one is because they've changed it several times as far as I know at their conventions, and whether they're still requesting to have the right to strike or not. I wonder whether the Minister could enlarge on it and tell us what the latest stand is and whether they intend to proceed in providing legislation whereby these people will come under the Labour Act. They were excluded from the Act last year --(Interjection) -- I couldn't hear what the Minister of Education had to say but I hope he gets into debate later on too and let's hear from him on this. I am sure that the -- well I shouldn't say sure, but I think the majority of teachers in my area would not prefer the right to strike. They would like to remain as is. But that might not be the case in other areas and I certainly -- if they wanted it, let them have it. As far as I'm concerned, they can have it, if they feel that they're better off, but certainly in my opinion they would then no longer be considered professionals. So here too, the matter is raised in the report and if the Minister has anything further to add I would appreciate hearing from him.

The report mentions an increase in the number of jobs or in the number of people employed and there's a figure of 6,000 increase or 1-1/2 percent over the 1971 average of \$390,000.00. When we still have unemployment, I don't know whether one and a half percent is good enough. On the other hand too, I don't feel it is completely incumbent on government to provide jobs. I don't take that attitude at all. I feel society has a responsibility and not government. I think government is there to provide the proper climate that is conducive to jobs to come forward and that people will expand their various businesses and so on so that more jobs will be available. I don't believe in the idea that government is there and they have to provide jobs. This I certainly don't go along with, but I feel that we are there also to look after that the money supply is there and I think these are the two items that are fundamental to providing jobs. It's money supply and the initiative. So --(Interjection)-- pardon? Oh, I'm not talking about funny money. I think what we have today is funny money if the Minister of Tourism would like to know. The Chairman would rule me out if I started to discuss that item but I'd love to discuss it right here now with him under this particular department, because it involves labour and it involves jobs. And to increase the jobs, so much depends on the money supply because two years ago, when Mr. Trudeau brought in the tight money policy in order to keep down inflation, what did we see? A rise in unemployment, and Bennett in B.C. certainly didn't accept it and I never accepted it in this House. I've spoken at that time and I'd certainly rather have some inflation and have jobs and have a good economy than to have it in the reverse. Under our present system we can't help but have some inflation. It's

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . impossible to not have inflation and have a booming economy. It's just an impossibility. So the two go hand in hand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention one other thing and that is the Workmen's Compensation Board or Act. I had a case referred to me and I referred it to the Minister a few weeks ago, and it involves a gentleman from my constituency who was unfortunate and had an accident and then for awhile he received compensation -- I think it's 75 percent under the Act -- but then later on he was denied this and all he was getting was 25 percent. I asked him to see another doctor, an outside doctor, and we now got another report from him. He definitely feels that this man is unable to work, he has to use crutches; and yet they are not acceding to give him the proper share of Workmen's Compensation. And certainly with the amount that he's getting, and it's around \$100.00 a month, I think, well he can't live on it. He can't, he had -- no, he got lesser, a lesser amount. In the beginning he got the higher rate but later on it was reduced and, as a result, this man and his wife they just can't live on what they're getting, and yet he's unable to work. I feel with the amount of reporting that we have from the medical people that certainly this is a case where they should recognize, at his age too, age 58 or 59 now, that he is unable to use his right foot and he has to use crutches all the time, he has pain all the time, and yet to be rated down and to that level. And I certainly would like to see that something has to be done. If it's legislation that is wrong, well let's correct it; if it's the board that they are too tight, certainly let's have them know that when people of this type appear that they should be entitled to a just reward. The Minister knows the case I'm referring to and if the pages would come forward I'd like to pass this new report that I have to him, to the Minister of Labour, so that he can peruse it and probably give him his views. He'll find that the final paragraph in the statement certainly is one that he would and should concur in, and I definitely feel that when we have legislation of this type set up for a purpose that that purpose be held up and any judgments or any rewards be made in conformity with it. I feel that at the present time this is not the case, especially with this particular case.

So the only other course would then be for him to get help from the Welfare Department and I don't see where it is necessary where we should have this type of situation arise, that we would then have to go to other departments to get that same type of assistance which should come forward regardless.

One other point I would like to raise with the Minister is, what about pensions for farm labour? We seem to provide pensions for all the other various groups but when it comes to farm labour there's nothing of the kind. He may argue that farm labour doesn't come under his department which may be correct --(Interjection)-- Well, in all the various organizations or corporations you have pension funds of one kind or another; we have the Canada Pension to which farm workers do contribute, but with the passing of that legislation federally it certainly just didn't mean that other pension funds were dissipated or were abolished. Certainly we have one right here in this Assembly as well, and I feel that if farm workers did want to become part of such a plan that it could be voluntary but it should be available, in my opinion, where it is desired.

Mr. Chairman, these were a few of the points that I thought I wanted to raise. There's one or two final ones and one has to do with firefighting. The estimates of his department deal with that particular matter and I would like to know from him, as far as firefighting is concerned, are seminars and schools being held for people throughout the province so that they can avail themselves of it and so that we have uniformity in this regard? One other matter, I talked to one of my friends who is in their employ now of, I guess it's Unicity now, formerly he was in the firefighting force of one of the suburban municipalities but now because of Unicity coming in and taking over, their seniority rights are lost because it's united into one, and as a result before some of them had pretty high seniority and now they fall down the ladder. I don't think this is what was intended originally, if I'm correct, by bringing in the Unicity Bill and by bringing in that type of legislation, that the purpose was to have demotions of this kind, if you could call them that, but certainly they've lost seniority. While they may now get higher wages as a result in some areas because of that legislation and because of Unicity taking over, nevertheless this is the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. FROESE: Thank you. And I would like to hear from the Minister on that as well.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Finally, the matter of investment by Manitobans and I think this goes, I forgot to mention this before when I discussed the matter of jobs and so on, but certainly if Manitobans invested more in Manitoba, I think this in itself also would be an inducement and a means of providing more jobs. Whether we want to regiment this I don't -- I wouldn't suggest it -- (Interjection)-- but sometimes you can give encouragement for people to take certain actions and to invest moneys in certain things so that more money would be invested in Manitoba industry or in Manitoba entrepreneurship, so that instead of investing in national companies that might provide jobs outside the province, I certainly would feel that some leadership should be given where the return is the same or just about the same on your investment dollar, that why not invest more in Manitoba stocks and bonds or enterprise? Certainly I think there is a lot of room in this respect in this area, to provide for a healthy climate in Manitoba. Certainly I would ask the government to seriously consider as far as that is concerned. We haven't come to the point that Manitobans are afraid to invest in Manitoba, because once we reach that point that our own people are afraid to invest in Manitoba for fear that there might be further takeovers and that they don't bother using local initiative and also the funds that are at their disposal and that should be made available to them. I for one at least would feel that we should never let it come to that point that people would not want to invest in our own province. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Honourable Member for Rhineland for his reasoned approach to the problems of labour in Manitoba. And I want to join with him and congratulate him on his approach insofar as investment by Manitobans in the Province of Manitoba -- Mr. Chairman, I agree with him when he says that if more Manitobans were to invest in Manitoba and industry particularly in Manitoba, it would help to resolve many of the problems that we have in relation to the creation of jobs for our citizens. He mentioned that particular point and then he also, in his first remark or two, made reference to the money supply in order to create jobs for Manitobans and I think they're correlated. He started out dealing with the matter of money supply in order to create jobs for Manitobans and finished up on a similar note, and I agree with my honourable friend. There may be some disagreement in that I feel that under the leadership of my Premier that more confidence has been established in Manitoba by Manitobans and by those outside of Manitoba than has been created for many a long year, and the very fact that the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Finance was able to suggest in his Budget Speech the abolition of hospital and Medicare premiums, increases in a rebatement insofar as school taxes is concerned, is an illustration of the confidence the people in Manitoba and outside of Manitoba have in the conduct of the economy of Manitoba by this particular government.

But I do suggest also, as I indicate, Mr. Chairman, that much more has to be done. I can see many areas where Manitobans can put their dollars into development companies particularly development companies in the field of secondary industries in order to utilize the benefits of our natural resources, and thereby creating jobs for Manitobans. I think it's a travesty, really, that we extract at Thompson and other areas in Manitoba ores; we refine them; and then we send them outside of the boundaries of Manitoba to be produced into products that we need here in Manitoba, and Manitoba labour has not been utilized to the degree that it should be. So I would commend the Honourable Member for Rhineland for his suggestions and I would join with him in an appeal to Manitobans to consider investing more and more in the development, particularly of secondary industries, in our province in order to utilize the benefits that we have given us by nature in our natural resources. And he is so right, and I join with him, Mr. Chairman, in his remarks.

He also mentioned a matter dealing with the new Labour Act and he wondered what the effect has been so far insofar as the deduction of union dues as the result of our new Labour Relations Act, and we all recall that while we were hearing the representations dealing with the Labour Relations Act and the deductions of dues, that there was quite a controversy at that particular time, Mr. Chairman, and quite a lot of opposition; and if I recall correctly the section of the act dealing with the deduction of dues came into effect, I believe it was the first of November, it could have been on the first of October. However, the information I have, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of my honourable friend, is that after all of that hullabaloo in

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the Labour Relations Committee, there have been three applications made to the Labour Board for consideration of the deduction of dues going to charitable organizations, two of which were dismissed and one withdrawn, so apparently, according to the information I've just received, there have been none really since the new act was put into effect. Now it could be, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of people at that particular time did not really understand that the deduction of dues was only applicable where there was a collective agreement. Maybe some people at that time had an impression that a checkoff was automatic whether they were under a collective agreement or not, but for the information of my honourable friend, as I understand it and been informed as of this date, only three applications have been made under the terms of the Section 68 of the new Labour Relations Act.

My friend from Rhineland, Mr. Chairman, raised the question of pensions for farm labour and coming on after the announcement that I had the honour of making today of the increased benefits for the civil servants of Manitoba, I can appreciate his concern but I would suggest to him that this is a rather difficult area to institute a system of pensions other than the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Plan, and the only solution I can suggest offhand at the present time is possibly the purchase of annuities on an individual basis by the farmers of Manitoba for themselves and, if at all possible, for those who are working for them. But I want to say to my friend I'm prepared to take a closer look than I have into seeing whether or not there can be some feasible plan for an expansion of the coverage under pensions, and in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to my honourable friend from Rhineland that he join with those of us on this side of the House in further appeals to the federal authority for increased benefits under the security plans, Old Age Security and indeed also insofar as the Canada Pension Plan provisions are concerned, because I really think, I really think that the concern of pensions for farm labourers and farmers is a national concern more than just simply a provincial concern, and I would welcome going arm in arm with my honourable friend from Rhineland down to Ottawa to see some of the dignitaries down there to see if they cannot become more reasonable and more acceptable to better provisions for pensioners in Canada.

The honourable member also raised certain questions dealing with firefighting. He asked me, Mr. Chairman, whether or not seminars and schools are held for the purpose of instructing, and I presume my honourable friend basically was thinking of voluntary firefighting squads in some of the smaller communities. My answer to him is yes, through the aegis of the fire commissioner's office. We do hold schools. As a matter of fact there was a school last weekend down at Pinawa in cooperation with the Fire Chiefs Association of Manitoba, and annually we have been holding fire training schools down at the City of Winnipeg training school just down on Ellice Avenue or in that area. And we're mightily concerned, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the firefighting is concerned in Manitoba, and I want to say to my honourable friend that we have increased the fire inspection staff in the Department of Labour in order to give a greater coverage, particularly in northern Manitoba, insofar as the incident of fire is concerned. And while I may not be able at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, to fully document what we are doing, I do have a report that I think the House would be interested in receiving after the man hours spent in Northern Manitoba by the Fire Commissioner's Office in order to try and control or at least and instruct volunteer fire sections in Northern Manitoba and also investigations into the incident of fire. We've had a number of tragic fires in northern Manitoba this past winter and we are deeply concerned and have investigated them, and, Mr. Chairman, we are hopeful that we will be able to issue instructions to the people in the general area as to what they should do if a fire happens to arise in this area.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - Bill 21

MR. SPEAKER: Tuesday night, Private Members' Hour. The first item is Public Bills or Private Bills. We are under Bill 21, proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Ten minutes left.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, you may recall a week and a half ago when I commenced speaking to this bill, I had mentioned that since the enactment of legislation creating the form of municipal government for the City of Winnipeg that we now have, we have had occasion to bring in a bill, bring about certain amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act, and if need be during this Session we may bring in further amendments but, as in the past session and similarly in this session, the amendments will be by and large those of a housekeeping nature as correcting anomalies, ambiguities and omissions which may occur within the present legislation, amendments designed to streamline the general operations and activity of the City Council. But, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the administrative structure, the powers of council are concerned, of its various committees, of its standing committees, community committees, executive policy committee, Mr. Speaker, it is felt by this government that ample opportunity should be given to the City and then on the basis of that experience, upon the recommendations from the city, upon the advice from all those other interested in city government, citizens at large, various other interest groups, the city council itself, and ample time prior to next election, that whatever amendments may be necessary that they be brought in at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the question of the election of mayor is concerned, I had suggested this a week and a half ago and I wish to repeat and make this known in no uncertain terms, that this government does favour the election of mayor at large. However, I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that this session is the proper time to bring in legislation dealing with that matter. We have received suggestions for a number of amendments from the City Council, but those too are of a procedural nature, although I am aware of the fact that the City Council did deal with the question of election of mayor and the majority of the council members present at that council meeting did express favour for the election of mayor at large, but insofar as the city's recommendations to government as to what amendments ought to be introduced during this session, the matter of election of mayor was not one of them. Because, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the matter of election of mayor cannot be dealt with in isolation but it would be a more appropriate time at another session at which time we'll be able to deal with the question of election of mayor in its proper context and we'll be able to examine the role of mayor in relation to the role of council and in the light of the overall structure, in the light of the overall power and authority of the council of the City of Winnipeg.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways, that the motion that Bill No. 21, entitled an Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act, be now read a second time, be amended as follows:

THAT the word "now" be left out and the words "this day six months" added at the end of the question.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll just take a minute or two to comment on the hoist. Since I seconded the original motion I think I should say something on the hoist that's just been introduced by the government.

As everyone knows, there has been about 4,700 letters and 9,300 signatures come in regarding this, plus many phone calls and office visits, and as a result of that we had the Premier make a commitment regarding the action that they will take. We all know that the Premier, one of the few men on that side is a completely honest person and when he makes a commitment publicly that there will be elections for the mayor, then I'm certainly prepared to accept his word for it, there will be elections; and therefore I am not disappointed or angry that there is a six-month hoist. It's meaningless and if we're going to vote on it then certainly it doesn't really matter which way we vote, the objective has been accomplished, there will be elections of mayor by popular vote, and I think that's really all that this side is concerned about and I'm certainly prepared to accept a hoist on the basis of the Premier's commitment to free elections.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the -- I want to speak on it. I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that debate be adjourned.

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL 21

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. Matthews wish to speak now?

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Yes, I would like to.

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I rise to speak on this bill is because of the fact that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has made certain public statements about my views on the bill. I am one of those, I am one of those who, like the Member for Morris, believes that the Legislature is the place where people should make speeches primarily. This is the place where decisions are made in a responsible form of government.

On the principle of the bill in the past I opposed the election of the mayor at large within caucus. I have noted that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has been running around telling the news media at great length about what took place in our caucus meetings, which presumably members of a caucus are bound by their honour to abide by caucus secrecy but the honourable member feels no such compulsion. However, I have, in the past I . . .

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. ALLARD: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member state the matter of privilege please.

MR. ALLARD: I think that the question of caucus secrecy is one that's a serious one and I'm being accused by the member of breaking it. I'd like to tell the member that what I did state was as a function, as a function of what the House Leader stated to the press. The House Leader stated to the press that when the amendment was brought into caucus . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege?

MR. ALLARD: I am speaking on the matter of privilege. I am being accused of breaking caucus secrecy and I'm denying it and I'm explaining why it is false. Now, the Member for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I am not aware that our rules of procedure call for matters of caucus being aired in here and whether they are matters of privilege.--(Interjection-- It appears to be clear that there may be a difference of opinion and if there's an explanation being made I'm willing to accept that, but I do not see that it is a matter of privilege at the moment. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I said, in the past I was not a supporter of the concept of election of a mayor at large. I never at any time was terribly excited about the question one way or the other - I didn't regard it as a matter of life or death at any time. I still don't regard it as such. The Premier has made an announcement that the government will act on this matter next session and I am prepared to support that measure. However, I certainly will support the hoist. I stated to the honourable member before that I would not support his bill and I certainly wouldn't and the reason why I wouldn't support it is because I regard this as another in a long list of publicity stunts that the honourable member has indulged in. It started with his little necktie incident the first session we were in this House. -- (Interjection) --

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Emerson state his matter of . . . Order.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to rule so that we don't get personal. I think that our weakness in this House, at least today has been that members tend to get personal rather than talk to the matter at hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If the honourable member will read the speech of the person who introduced the bill, it was all based on personal attacks of members on this side. --(Interjection)-- Now I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that type of an attack is not effective and probably will not do a good job, but it is in order if a person wishes to try to belittle the arguments or the position of another member, that is in order. It is probably not effective but I believe it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. GIRARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I agree with the House Leader that belittling the argument is quite in order but belittling the person is below the dignity of this House.

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL 21 (cont'd)

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

MR. JOHANNSON: I find that a rather amusing argument seeing that the Member for Rupertsland is a specialist in that sort of argument, belittling the person rather than dealing with the substance of the issue. In fact, if one examines, Mr. Speaker, the press statements made by the honourable member, the transcripts of radio shows, his whole campaign has largely been a campaign against personalities, directed primarily against the Mines Minister. It seems to --Mr. Speaker, this seems to be part of a vendetta which perhaps dates back to a certain issue that was fought last session.

Mr. Speaker, I'm dealing with the question of the urgency of the bill. The Minister of Urban Affairs has moved a six months hoist on the grounds that this is not a question of urgency, that this matter will be dealt with later, and I'm dealing with that question of urgency. I think the honourable member faces political oblivion. He's about to be destroyed politically and he's desperately looking for an issue on which he can find some sort of political base. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? He found Steve Juba. And Steve Juba, he thought, had coattails. Mr. Speaker, during American election, presidential election, a candidate in New York State, democratic candidate, approached Jim Farley who was Roosevelt's, FDR's campaign manager. And this democratic candidate was very concerned and very irate because he wasn't getting any help from Farley. Farley's entire effort was directed to re-electing FDR, Franklin Roosevelt, and the candidate approached him and was irate and concerned, and Farley told him, he said: "Don't be concerned. When the tide comes in the flotsam and jetsam comes in with it." And the Member for Rupertsland is accepting the logic of that kind of statement. --(Interjection) -- I understand it.

I think the Premier effectively killed the question of urgency when he made his statement on the bill, and the Urban Affairs Minister has made a similar statement now. There has been no formal request from the City of Winnipeg, as I understand it, for this election of the mayor at large.

The Member for Thompson just raised the question of popular demand and stated that the Member for Rupertsland had received 4,700 letters, 9,300 signatures. You know, Mr. Speaker, I find that really interesting. Here are two members from the North, who formerly posed as spokesmen for the north, who have now apparently left the north and they're now becoming spokesmen for the City of Winnipeg, the people of the City of Winnipeg. And the member has argued that the reason he sponsored this bill was because of popular demand for it. Mr. Speaker, since Bill 36 was passed and Unicity was established, not one single person in my constituency, not one, approached me demanding popular election of the mayor after the first three year term was up. Not one. Not one. After the member introduced his bill, it's interesting, two people approached me. Two people. The first was my wife and she gave me holy hell because she likes Steve Juba and she believes that there should be a popularly elected mayor. --(Interjection)-- I won't get into personalities. But my wife was the only person who was really concerned about the issue. As I say, she gave me proper, proper H.

One other person approached me on that matter, a member of my executive, and she also favoured the concept of the election of mayor at large. But other than those two, not one person ever even bothered to talk to me about it. So that is, I think, a measure of the amount of popular demand for this particular measure. And I happen to sit, Mr. Speaker, for a central city constituency where Mayor Juba got a very, very sound majority in the last mayoralty contest.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with that I'll cease my remarks on this question. I think the question has now been properly dealt with and the bill will wind up where it properly deserves to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington. Sorry, I thought the Honourable Member was rising to speak. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I had the time to put down a few little points here, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I could speak on the bill at the moment.

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL 21

(MR. ALLARD cont'd)

The member finds it strange that I should introduce a bill that has to do with the City of Winnipeg. He will recall, I presume, that I introduced a bill or an amendment to a bill that had to do with liquor and beverage rooms some three years ago and that a considerable number of members in all the parties voted against it. There seemed to be no purpose to the bill except that it did serve a useful purpose and that people are very happy with it. There have been no negative reactions from it as far as I can see. Now I have received no calls from the people at large since that measure was introduced but I have reason to believe that it's reasonably popular.

I find it interesting to hear the Member for St. Matthews refer to coattails. I prefer to be an honest man. --(Interjection)-- I came in, in . . . I was elected in 1969, Mr. Speaker, on coattails. I don't mind admitting it but that's a fact. I and some dozen at least of the members on that side were elected on coattails, very effective coattails. I would suggest that they not only were but they are an increasingly necessary set of coattails, and they are those of the First Minister. And without those coattails, notwithstanding what the Leader of the House would have to say, you know, you'd be out in left field. Is there anyone on your side who questions that? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask through you if there's anyone who questions that. Would the Leader of the House question that? Mr. Speaker, coattails, being accused of looking at coattails by that side of the House is the funniest thing I've ever heard of. Does the Member for St. Matthews believe that he would have got elected or would get elected without that present set of coattails? --(Interjection)-- He does. One fool. Does the Member for Windsor Park --(Interjection)-- Radisson believe that he would get elected without those coattails. Does the one for --(Interjection)-- Oh Flin Flon . . . --(Interjection)-- I can see, Mr. Speaker, that the government is developing a new spokesman for the north, but we'll leave that aside and we'll ask the Member for The Pas --(Interjection)-- we'll ask the Member for The Pas whether he believes he could get in without those coattails. I think that he'd be sensible enough to agree that they're essential. Mr. Speaker, I got elected as one of those who rode a set of coattails in 1969 and I don't mind admitting it. It's the truth. --(Interjection)

--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I was told that there was a lot of flotsam and jetsam that came in and I quite agree those coattails brought a lot of it in. Indeed.

Mr. Speaker, there's another question that's involved that was brought up and that's the one by which the Member for St. Matthews questioned my performance in the matter of caucus secrecy. Mr. Speaker, when the bill -- let's go back to the way this bill for Unicity was brought in. It involved no provision for the election of a mayor at large. That was a decision of the government to bring it in that way, and that's the way it was brought in. Then there was a travelling troubadours group. The former Minister of Finance was responsible as the chairman to take a sampling of communities in Winnipeg to go and see what was happening, and the father, mother, and godfather of the bill, of the idea of it, went along to see what was happening to it. And the fact is that there was a severe reaction to the fact that there was no election of a mayor at large. There was. And then, and then there was a measure, there was a proposal, and I'm using the public statements of the House Leader, there was a proposal by the House Leader, you know, to have an amendment brought in for the first election so that the mayor could be elected at large for once. And Mr. Speaker, it's the statement of the House Leader to the press, made some weeks ago, that this measure only passed caucus by one vote. That was the first statement of what happened in caucus. I extrapolated from that that obviously the large majority of caucus was against the election of mayor at large. Does that make sense? --(Interjection)-- It seems to me that it was the Member for Inkster who was telling caucus secrets, not I, and I just drew my conclusions from that and I said obviously since it only passed by one vote, that shows what it was like, you know, which way the measure was dealt with before that gambit, gambit was brought in. And I knew what the attitude of the government side was in terms of the election of the mayor at large. They have had a change of heart and I would suggest that those 4,700 letters and 9,300 signatures had some little bit to do with it.

The Member for St. Matthews was against it. --(Interjection)-- The Member for St. Matthews was against the election of the mayor at large. He is now going to support it. And

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL · 21

(MR. ALLARD cont'd). . . . I would suggest that if I had received not one letter that he wouldn't have changed his mind. And remember that when I mention the Member for St. Matthews' name it is because in this session I met him and I asked him, I said, "When are you going to start supporting my bill?" And he said, "never". --(Interjection)-- Yes, and you said, "no." And the member said never. I said the member has been against the principle in the past, he has said that he will never support this bill, he is against it. That was what I said publicly. Is that wrong? It seems to be the truth. He is not embarrassed by it, is he? Why was he embarrassed? Well why does he bother talking about it? I just stated the facts as I saw them, as I understood them. In any case when there's a matter of caucus secrecy I've made every effort, Mr. Speaker, when I left the caucus and I left my responsibilities as a member of Planning and Priorities to state --(Interjection)-- I kept purposely quiet for the rest of the session. I said nothing in the last session and I'd be very curious to hear what anybody --(Interjection)-- well, I'm trying to imitate the Minister of Urban Affairs.

I'm happy, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister has stated that as a matter of government policy and that the Minister of Urban Affairs has followed suit and stated as a matter of government policy that the measure will be passed in the next session. --(Interjection)-- Now in the context that the Minister wants to call proper, I'll accept that. I'm not going to argue, Mr. Speaker. It's the First Minister himself and I'm quoting - I trust that after he hears what I have to quote of his statement he won't be angry with my quoting. But I think he said to me once, he said, "You know, if a man doesn't mind not taking credit for something he can accomplish a great deal of good." So I don't mind not taking credit for this measure or for the change in attitude of the government, Mr. Speaker. I think that the ones who have to take credit for it are the 9,300 people who signed their names to a piece of paper and sent it in, and that they really effectively dealt with this problem, and now we have a statement of policy on the part of the government, the First Minister and the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I accept this as a normal thing. It's a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that I learned a long time ago to get through a visit to the zoo without getting angry at the monkeys, you see, and I can manage to deal with a new spokesman for the north on that basis.

And I want to congratulate the First Minister on this statement of his. I don't know whether the bill will be changed in this session or whether he will wait until the next one. Whatever it is, in the name of 9,300 people who wrote in, I want to say that I'm happy and I trust that they will be happy with this. I think they would have preferred to see it in this session but as long as they're assured that it will be done, that is really what they had in mind.

And so with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to see the bill dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather distressing bill for myself personally because the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has first chosen to make it in his address in opening it and his campaign for its approval, an issue which somehow focused on me in a very peculiar way, and he continued to do that, and the more he did it, Mr. Speaker, the more tangled the process became and the more obvious it became or the more difficulty he got himself in with regard to the position that he was taking. Until tonight, Mr. Speaker, he further compounded the situation by trying to explain away what was without any doubt any discretion on his part, first of all an indiscretion because of the position that he was in, secondly an indiscretion because it was so obviously false. And tonight in attempting to extrapolate himself from these two problems, he had to proceed with another assertion, Mr. Speaker, which is so patently false in chronological sequence that there can be no doubt that he has fallen into the couplet which I've heard quoted although I can't give the author of it. "Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when once we practice to deceive".

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member got up today and said that his assertion that a great number, or a great majority of the New Democratic Party caucus was against the mayor of election at large, was an extrapolation that he made from something that I had said. The difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is that the assertion was made on the night that he introduced his motion into the House when he said that the House Leader and a great majority of the caucus are against the election of mayor at large, whereas my remarks that he is referring to were made, Mr. Speaker, after the bill was introduced. So the honourable member, in addition to all of his other capacities, has the capacity to extrapolate a statement before it is made. Because what occurred, Mr. Speaker, was a very unusual thing.

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL 21

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

We had the honourable member at large introduce this bill, point out that I would not let it go through, that there were members on this side of the House that wouldn't let it go through. Then appeared, Mr. Speaker, on television, appeared on news broadcasts, appeared to the extent that Peter Warren in response to a call about why is the government not proceeding with the election of a mayoralty at large, Mr. Warren said, "Well, between you and I," or words to that effect, you know, Mr. Warren talking over radio, "between you and I, it's Sid Green who is stopping it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I then went, or was interviewed by the media on something which was not a matter of secrecy but which was a matter of common knowledge, which could be found in all of the newspapers of the period when the mayoralty was changed. And I said that at caucus when this matter was discussed there was a close vote on it. Maybe I said it was passed by one vote - that is possible. But, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member to find that information in the newspapers at the time which, whereby it was almost a common universal secret that everybody knew about, and where we got that, Mr. Speaker, is interesting because, you know, the suggestion from certain media that when our caucus was reduced by one at a certain period of last year, the suggestion to me by certain members of the media was that this was a very bad problem for them. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the facts that my honourable friend is referring to were common knowledge in the time, I was not revealing anything which had not already been printed in the paper, and furthermore, I was put in the position of having to say it because the honourable member had gone about with the suggestion that I had opposed the election of mayor at large. Mr. Speaker, you can find statements on the record, in the papers at the time saying that I was - not only was I in favour of it but I think that it was commonly, again, knowledge, as a matter of fact, Bernie Wolfe made a story about it, that the reason I pushed for a mayor at large was because I wanted to be the mayor. There is a story in the newspaper at the time to that effect as well. That's how common it was. That I had pushed for this thing and I gave the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg could become so community committee oriented in its structure that every single candidate, ward candidate would be looking for election on his own basis, on his own ward level, he would be attached to his community committee, that if a mayor was elected from those community committee people, the mayor would have to be beholden to them and that would further entrench the community committee structure, and that there was no politics encompassing Greater Winnipeg. And for that reason, I was going in favour of a mayor at large to focus political attention on Greater Winnipeg.

Now so definite was that position which the honourable member, for reasons best known to himself, wished to represent, and wishes to further represent tonight, and that's why I say, "oh what a tangled web we weave when once we practice to deceive." That, Mr. Speaker, it was such common knowledge that again I appeared -- on the day that the Member for Burrows was made Minister of Municipal Affairs I was participating in a public forum at the Fort Garry Hotel. Elswood Bole got up and said: Will you assure me - before my honourable friend brought his resolution before this was an issue - will you assure me that the City of Winnipeg Act will not be changed before the next Winnipeg election so that the mayor will be elected by the councillors and not at large? My answer to him in public, without any prodding from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, without any signatures having been achieved by him and not because of signatures but because of the structure of the Act which has to be looked at as a whole, I will not give that assurance. And as a matter of fact, if it is necessary to have further steps taken to have Greater Winnipeg become a political issue rather than the ward issue in the next election that will remain and other things will be done.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Rupertsland in spite of that wished to weave this tangled web. Why he does so I don't know. He has --(Interjection)-- Well perhaps I feel I know, but it becomes an issue so personal, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes of no consequence to other members of the House. We heard a little bit of it from the honourable member today. You know, that all of the members on this side came in on coattails, and that we shouldn't even be sitting here, that he wouldn't be here if it wasn't for coattails. Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with that. I agree that I am here on the coattails of other people. I have never said otherwise. In every election that I have run, Mr. Speaker, in every single one no matter where it was I have always run ahead of what has been the traditional New Democratic Party

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL - 21

(MR. GREEN cont'd) , . . . ticket. Always, in every single area, in every single election. Mr. Speaker, I still say that I am here on coattails. But those coattails are very very long coattails. And I'll tell you something. The First Minister is here on coattails. That those coattails extend back to Fred Dixon, J.S. Woodsworth M.J. Coldwell, Lloyd Stinson, Mr. Hanford, the coattails --(Interjection)-- Well Mr. Speaker, the coattails have stretched out a very very long way and it is no shame to me that the New Democratic Party is able to produce people of stature and that the public will recognize that people of stature can be found within the New Democratic Party, and that one of them will reach such stature within the province that he will attract a great deal of other people with him to be elected to this Legislature. But there's not a single person, and I include the First Minister, in that list that is not here on that type of coattail. And that's something, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland will never understand. He will never understand that the ideas are the things which are the strongest and that strong ideas attack strong people and that those strong people provide very very broad coattails for other people to attach them to, some of them stronger than others, so that you end up, Mr. Speaker, with what I believe is a superior - and when I say superior I'm not wishing to be moralistic about it, I'm talking about a group of people who I feel as a group, because I am partisan, are better able to govern the province than the group on the other side, and I would respect the feeling on the other side because they are part - I respect that very much. And that when that occurs that they would feel the same way and there's nothing wrong with having that feeling.

But for the honourable member to try to suggest that this group is nothing and wouldn't be here except on the coattails of one person - Mr. Speaker, he'll have to find, he'll have to examine his logic. You know, the New Democratic Party under the leadership of David Barrett in the Province of British Columbia got 45 out of 57 seats. David Barrett is a man of stature, but he was produced from the coattails of many predecessors in the New Democratic Party. The New Democratic Party under the leadership of Allan Blakeney got 45 out of 57 seats in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Blakeney is a man of stature. But he became a man of stature following the coattails of many predecessors in the New Democratic Party, including Tommy Douglas, who himself rode in on coattails.

The Premier of this province is a man of stature and captures the government of Manitoba with less a majority than the others but possibly with a more difficult task ahead of him and there is nothing to take away from the stature of that person. But he is here on the cases of riding the coattails of hundreds and thousands of New Democrats who founded this movement and has brought it to the position where it is the government, his three provinces in this country. And if somebody would have said that, Mr. Speaker, in 1968, that the New Democrats were then the government in no provinces in Canada and who had something like 20 seats in the parliament of Canada, somebody said that four years from now you will be the government in Saskatchewan, you will be the government in British Columbia, you will be the government in Manitoba and you will have 31 seats in the House of Commons, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland who understands nothing, would have said that that person belongs in an insane asylum, because that will never happen. And I want the honourable member to understand, which he apparently didn't understand when he was a part of this group, that yes, we are proud of the stature of the individuals which this group has produced and there's nobody who's going to minimize that pride. But we do believe that the ideas that we are fighting for are what gives us strength and which gives us the strength to produce the kind of individuals which the honourable member says is the reason that all of us are here. Well Mr. Speaker, he says not all. I would say every single one of us, including the First Minister, including myself, including the Member for St. Johns, I have never said that I would be - if I was here I wouldn't be worth anything if I hadn't adopted, and you know, again that becomes very very chauvinistic and I respect the Conservative who says that as well. As far as I'm concerned, I'm here because I'm a New Democrat and I'm proud to be here as a New Democrat with men of stature who have attracted public attention so that more New Democrats can be elected. The honourable member will never understand that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the important thing is that the honourable member for some reason, and he knows what it is, decided that there is something that he would have to do when introducing this bill to reflect on the person, of one of the members of the government front bench. You know the honourable member was my Legislative Assistant for several months; he, I

PRIVATE MEMBERS - BILL 21

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . presume was as close to a Minister as a person can get. And if all that he can say about me now that he is in a position of attack, is that I was in favour of having the mayor elected, and that I would prevent the mayor from being elected popularly, if that is the one thing that he can find about me which is itself so patently false as to reflect on the charge that the honourable member is making, then, Mr. Speaker, I think I come off not bad.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34. Proposed by the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSSON: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: We go now to Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 15. The Honourable Member for Wolseley is absent.

MR. PATRICK: Have it drop to the bottom, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. No. 1. It's open, I believe. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

RESOLUTION 1

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some mistake and I ask the members of the House to indulge with me that there is a mistake, that I got up with approximately 15 minutes left on the clock. I indicated that I was going to introduce an amendment. I spoke for those 15 minutes and the Clerk says that I overspent my time. Unless I am not entitled to as much time as every other member I did not over speak my time and I ask the indulgence of the House to give me the few minutes that were left to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I must admit that I don't have my original book here. Well, there's apparent discrepancy between the timekeeping and the honourable member's recollection and I'm willing to go by the wishes of the Assembly. Should the honourable member have the extra time? Agreed? (Agreed). Five more minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was waxing very philosophic at the time indicating that the notion that private ownership and public ownership and the philosophy that was expressed by the Member for Lakeside and what we were fighting, were clearly different and that we welcomed debate on that, and I did so because of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia's suggestion that somehow we were opposed to people owning their own home. The difficulty that we have with this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is that we don't think that it gives the honourable member the relief that he is seeking. He is suggesting that interest, giving people the right to claim interest on their dwellings would be a relief from income tax which would help people.

Mr. Speaker, I am not by any means certain that that will occur. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I had a long drawn-out battle which for once I didn't follow through with the Income Tax Department with regard to one of the properties that I myself own, because I claimed that the mortgage against that property was a mortgage loan which was obviously being used to earn income in other investments. And I tried to indicate to them that that mortgage interest was properly a deductible expense. And if it had been done, Mr. Speaker, in a way where I had taken the money, paid off my house, then loaned money on the house and invested it, I could have done it. And if I had -- it's trying to indicate that the two were related even though those mechanical steps had not been taken, somehow didn't register with the Income Tax Department. But the fact is that if I was entitled to do that, and if everybody was entitled to do that, I think that the honourable member would find that the tax relief that would be given would not favour the people who he is trying to afford relief to. And he should always remember, Mr. Speaker, that every time there is a reduction in revenue, there has to be a collection of taxes, if we assume the government services remain the same. And the honourable member has not convinced me that the collection of taxes would then mean that people would pay those taxes in a more equitable form, and as a matter of fact, if I follow the logic of the Leader of the Liberal Party that you have across-the-board tax relief and you therefore don't have income tax high and have other forms of taxes higher, I'm not at all sure that the honourable member would do any good by providing a tax relief and then taking it up in a worse form than which it is now levied.

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

And in order to make that perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to introduce an amendment. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the resolution be amended by deleting the last four paragraphs thereof and substituting the following:

AND WHEREAS the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is able to facilitate a wide spectrum of housing accommodation including individual home ownership, condominium home ownership, co-operative housing, elderly persons housing, and rental housing;

AND WHEREAS the effects of permitting mortgage interests on individuals homes to be deducted from taxable income have not been properly analyzed;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that there is necessity for considering the effects of such a measure as it relates to (a) the equity of such a measure as between different persons living in various forms of accommodation; and (b) the incidence of taxation which would fall on various groups in society to recover public revenues which would have to be raised to compensate for the reduction of revenue which would result from the adoption of such a measure.

MOTION as amended presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 20. Does the House wish to adjourn? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a little bit unfair to the Member for Flin Flon who no doubt wants to inflict the full force of his eloquence during a period that he will have the time to do so, and I would suggest that perhaps, Sir, the House do adjourn because if he does introduce the resolution at this time it will then drop to the bottom of the order paper and he'll not have an opportunity to have it properly debated. I think he would like a full hour to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that what the honourable member is saying is correct. If we call it ten o'clock then the next time Private Members' Resolutions comes up the Honourable Member for Flin Flon would be first and we would be able to go for an hour.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. GREEN: Well I'd like to call it ten o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed). The hour being ten o'clock the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday).