

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, September 19, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the very important resolutions affecting not only the area normally concerned with labour but also with the whole industrial climate of the Province of Manitoba, and I want to express my appreciation to those who have taken part in this debate for the value of their contributions, for their concern of labour, for their concern of what we normally call small management, and I appreciate it very very much. I want to say in particular to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry that we are concerned in this government with the struggle that small management is having in order to compete with large cartels, with large complexes in the industrial field. I don't try to date myself although others do, but I have grown up in an atmosphere of where we used to have the little corner grocery store, the little family enterprise -- (Interjection) -- Ah, but not to the same degree my honourable friend.

And may I say to my honourable friend the Member from Souris-Killarney that such is also the case insofar as the agricultural industry is concerned, that corporate farming is expanding rapidly even to the degree that my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney may be in a position before too long that he finds himself in a position that he will no longer be the rugged individualist that has been so historic of the farming community in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker - and I do not mean this derogatory of my honourable friend - he has found it necessary, as I understand my honourable friend, to go into the selling of insurance because he is not able to get from his farming enterprising the wherewithal to look after his charming wife and family.

MR. McKELLAR: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that's not true. I was in the insurance business industry 22 years ago, the same time as I went into farming.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long my honourable friend was in the insurance business. I'm sure he will grant to me the right to refer to him, affectionately of course, as but a mere illustration of what is happening not only in the farming community but in the industrial and merchant industry as well. Not because of desire, not because of desire primarily on his part but because of the trend that is taking place. So I recognize the problems of my honourable friend, as indeed I recognize the problems that have been raised by my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry, as what is happening in the industrial field and in the field of the small merchant.

I want to say that while it has been my sphere in life industrial-wise to be connected with an industrial complex that may in some respects be considered as something separate from merchandising or farming, even though I went farming for three years and married one of the most loved daughters of agriculture, that I am cognizant and appreciative of these other problems as well. And I want to say again to my friend the Member for Fort Garry, who in his contribution drew to our attention the problems of the small merchants

MR. SPEAKER: Order may not have been aware of the rule, but The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and possibly the person in the gallery wanted to throw their lenses and their cameras down because they too realize that I am speaking so factually and so righteously, and it could well be that they're not as conversant with the rules of the House as of course indeed the Member from Lakeside, and I appreciate the fact that it was the Member for Lakeside at least in this instance who knew the rules of the House even though on some other occasions I question it.

However, I do appreciate

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder on a point of privilege

MR. PAULLEY: On the point of who?

MR. ENNS: The point of order or privilege of the party as a whole, but there have been several occasions, Mr. Speaker, where during the tenure of this short session pictures have been taken from the gallery. Now if this is permitted - and I do not know for what purpose these pictures are being taken - I would want to have permission to indicate to the House, to yourself, Sir, explain the absence of any empty chairs; explain the reasons for persons not being in their chairs at any particular time because of maybe the conduct of their affairs commends them to be looking into the interests of their constituents or other matters.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

I hesitate to interrupt the House Leader on this occasion but I think that we have passed over very lightly these instances when pictures have been taken. I have no knowledge of what these pictures are going to be used for. If they're merely a passing tourist who wants a picture of this Assemblage, this gracious Assemblage and the Honourable House Leader making a speech - and he makes such a photogenic subject - this is fine. But on the other hand, as all of us who are in this House realize, there are times when we cannot all be in our desks and our chairs. There are many times that Government Ministers, including the First Minister, cannot be in his chair at a particular given time. I think that all of us are conscious of a fact that a photo taken in this Chamber, unauthorized, can be used from time to time, at some time that none of us are aware of at this particular occasion, to one advantage or another advantage.

Now the fact so happens that a photograph was taken of this House at this time when my Honourable Leader and other members of this first House, my colleague particularly because of a religious occasion right now, and there are other areas, that I take some objection to the fact that in the short time that I have sat in this brief session the violation against the taking of pictures in this Chamber has occurred at least three times. While I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that you have acknowledged the fact that this is not the procedure to be followed in the House and that you've admonished those that have done so, I think at this stage, after the third occurrence, that obviously some further instructions should be given, either to those who are in charge of the public galleries or indeed to the Leader of Government Services that this is not going to be a normal practice of the House. If so, I think then we should want to consider much more seriously the little problem that seems to have bothered us about proper decorum and dress in this House, because after all the pictures are going to be taken and we may want to be concerned about that question.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this point of privilege I guess the Honourable Member for Lakeside called it, to say simply this, that I'm very surprised that he should imply - and I certainly inferred it from his remarks - that the taking of photographs, which I admit is not permitted under the rules, that he should imply however that this is being done at the behest of the government is entirely uncalled for. I noticed the particular young lady that took the photograph but I can assure my honourable friend that she didn't do so at our request.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, without prolonging this debate, let me make it abundantly clear that that was an implication not intended by me. I'm simply suggesting that, as the First Minister is well aware, there could be a multitude of reasons why people take pictures and a multitude of interpretations of the results of that picture for a certain seat being empty at a certain time. It could be a constituent of mine that wants to know whether the Member for Lakeside is always in his seat when representing the people of that constituency that I was elected to, or for any other reasons. I withdraw, or I make it very clear that any implication that I made that this was at the behest of the members opposite is completely unfounded, and I concur with the First Minister that that is not the case.

But I do think, I make just this final point. I do think that in all our collective interests here that unless there is an established procedure which we know that the taking of photographs is authorized and will take place in the House, then we judge ourselves accordingly. On the other hand, it's a rule of the House that it does not take place and I think it's a rule that the Speaker has made abundantly clear in the past, and one that should be enforced more so than just the admonition of the Speaker from his dais, but perhaps to some concern about the people that are in control of the public galleries.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion if I might make it at this time. I had the same trouble in days gone by. I wonder, Sir, if you would take under consideration a prominent notice at each of the doors in the entrance to the gallery instructing that this shall not take place and not put the responsibilities on the guards. I think they do an excellent job as it is.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable members for their suggestions of ways and means of enabling the House to maintain the rules which we have imposed upon ourselves, and may I assure them that the Speaker will take the suggestions under advisement and will undertake to implement such controls and procedures as may be suitable and effective to maintain and preserve the rules of the House.

I also add that incidents of this type are difficult, in fact impossible to check, and I also

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) feel, and I will continue to feel that way until such time as some evidence appears to the contrary, that the photographs of this type are taken by interested visitors to the gallery wishing a photograph of the Assembly for interest sake and no ulterior motives.

However, I do agree that this practice is not allowed and the Chair will undertake to curb that practice. Whether we'll succeed in eliminating it, that is extremely difficult.

MR. ENNS: the House Leader's debate please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the interruption of my honourable friend and I may say that I agree with him, but when else can some of the visitors to the gallery have the opportunity of taking a picture of a most handsome member of the Assembly than when he's on his feet in debate, and I trust and hope that I might be able to receive a copy of the picture that was taken and which was the subject matter of such a debate.

MR. BILTON: that has created this long discussion. I think the less said about it now the better.

MR. PAULLEY: And may I say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend who had the privilege of being the Speaker of this House, that the taking of the picture was not instigated by myself, although again I say, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the reasoning behind the taking of the picture.

Now then, shall we get down to the subject matter under debate. I thought, Mr. Speaker, and I tried to say to my honourable friends opposite that I appreciate very much as Minister of Labour their contribution in this debate. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think he's complimenting members on this side. I was going to speak on it too. Too bad that you're speaking ahead of me, so I don't know whether the compliment will apply.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I say to my honourable friend, if I may, that if I or any other member took as much time in debate or the lack of time in debate than my honourable friend from Rhineland, we'd be here until about nine Christmases have passed.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to my honourable friend from Rhineland, I do appreciate the comments that have been made by members opposite. When I had the opportunity of introducing the estimates of the Department of Labour into this House for the first time as its new Minister, I indicated at that time that we were prepared and that we would have a review of labour legislation, including the subject matter of this resolution. I acknowledge the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when I was on that side of the House I did on a number of occasions raise propositions respecting labour legislation in the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside remembers then, -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside is very faint in many of his recollections. But I want to assure to this House that I have very vivid recollections of what I said as the Leader of the New Democratic Party on that side of the House. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. I want to say to my honourable friend that I was one of those that endeavoured to have the establishment of a record of Hansard so that my friend could read back to me what I said on that side of the House, and it was with a considerable degree of reluctance that his government, his government accepted that we should have a Hansard recording system in this government. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, it is. And my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney was not in the House when this -- (Interjection) -- Oh no you weren't.

MR. ENNS: Was it not the Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba that instituted the Hansard into the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: My Honourable friend is perfectly correct. They were dragged very reluctantly into accepting it.

MR. ENNS: We did it.

MR. PAULLEY: You did it?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order here. I would like to ask the Honourable the House Leader at what particular session of the Legislature, whether it was 1958 or '59 that Hansard was brought in. To my memory, it was the first session that our government was in power.

A MEMBER: How much dragging was involved there, my friend. How much dragging?

MR. PAULLEY: Dragging was done, Mr. Speaker, long before the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney came into this House.

MR. McKELLAR: No it wasn't not before my time.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, and I give them full credit for reluctantly having been dragged into the establishment of a Hansard, because this proposition came before they were the government of Manitoba and they voted against it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not making issues, but is it not a fact that with all due despatch when we had the first occasion as being government, that we did in fact institute the institution of Hansard?

MR. PAULLEY: I have no argument, Mr. Speaker, with my honourable friend, -- (Interjection) -- I have no argument with my honourable friend. All I do say, Mr. Speaker, is that when they, the Conservative Party of Manitoba were the official opposition they didn't give two cahoots as to whether or not we had a record in this House. I give them credit for reluctantly having been dragged into the establishment of a recording system which gives us Hansard. I give them full benefit. My honourable friends, including even the Member for Swan River, the Minister for Lakeside, former Minister for Lakeside, the Member for Souris-Killarney, never did their party propose a resolution. And I want to give credit to the honourable party of the Social Credit. Long before my honourable friend came into here as the Member for Rhineland, it was a Social Credit Member from Dauphin, Bill Bullmore that introduced the first resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, I may be the dean of this Legislature but I have a memory. I have a memory. I have not reached that age of dotage or the likes of that that some ascribe to me; I do know what has happened in this House and it was Mayor Bill Bullmore -- (Interjection) -- who was a Social Creditor, by name, who first introduced that resolution into this House. So I'm not unmindful of what happened. But I am happy, I am happy that the Member for Lakeside, and Killarney, or Souris-Killarney now raise these questions.

But apart from all of that, back to the resolution. I want to assure all honourable members of this House, no matter what they may dig out of Hansard of the speeches that I made while serving on that side of the House, that in my present position as Minister of Labour, I'm not unmindful of what I said. I still intend as a Minister of the Crown, to take those matters under consideration and develop them. And I want to assure to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure to the business community, the concern of my friend from Fort Garry; I want to assure to the labour organizations; I want to assure to the workers, whether they be organized or not, that what we said when we were on the other side of the House is still of our concern.

But as I said, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the estimates of the Department of Labour as its Minister, I appealed to the House at that time to give us an opportunity of making an assessment of information available to us at that time. I have been accused, Mr. Speaker -- and I say this quite frankly, -- I have been accused -- (Interjection) -- That's right, and will be accused, because of the fact that I have been but the Minister of Labour since July 15th, of not bringing into effect those things which we mentioned on that side of the House. I take this criticism, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that all reasonable individuals in Manitoba - all reasonable individuals, even reasonable individuals opposite, will accept that and give us the new government of the Province of Manitoba an opportunity of full consideration. We do not reject, we do not reject the proposition contained in the resolution that we have before us. We do require, and I think that it is only fair and reasonable we should have the opportunity.

Mention was made the other day of the collective agreements prevailing at the present time that make provision for three weeks vacation with pay after five years. Mr. Speaker, is it unreasonable for me, or the Government of Manitoba, to ask for an opportunity of seeing what that position is, the number of agreements that contain this clause? I think not. This is all that I'm going to ask, Mr. Speaker, in an amendment which I now propose for the consideration of this House. So I say, Mr. Speaker, fault me if you will, fault me because we are not proceeding at this session with legislation, but do not fault me because I have forgotten what I said when I was on that side of the House. And may I say to my honourable friend from Lakeside, these are not crocodile tears. I can understand my honourable friend from Lakeside pulling out his handkerchief and giving at least evidence of wiping the tears. The tears of my friends opposite are so well known to us and had no substance in the past.

So Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment to the resolution -- (Interjection) -- Now. Even my colleagues to give us the opportunity to make an assessment, and therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assinibola be amended by (1) Deleting the word "and" in the seventh line; (2) Deleting all the words in the fourth paragraph; (3) Deleting all the words after the word "Manitoba" in the first line of the operative part of the resolution and substituting

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the following: -- (Interjection) -- Maybe my honourable friend from Morris should stay to the packinghouse industry -- "Consider amending the Vacations with Pay Act to provide employees with five or more years in the employ of their employer three weeks annual vacation."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: We've got a copy so let's have a look at it.

MR. PAULLEY: There are copies for the Opposition, including the Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just on a small point of order. I was wondering whether there was reference in the motion to my honourable colleague, the Member for Morris' referral to the pack yards, the stocking yards or something or other got in the

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest to my honourable friend there's room for an amendment to the amendment.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Honourable the Minister of Labour in debating the resolution that is before us and now proposing the amendment that is also before us now. I was rather astounded when the Throne Speech was read this year, or this last session. I had hoped to see a large list of legislation coming from the new government in connection with labour. My goodness, my ears are still ringing from the many speeches that we heard on this side on that group championing labour and the legislation that they would provide. Now we see nothing of it. It's a delay. This is rather odd, in my opinion. -- (Interjection) -- Well, in a way I am because I figured that we'd really have a lot of legislation in connection with the labour department. -- (Interjection) -- If it's good, sure I want it if it's good. But there might be a difference of opinion as to what is good.

I rather liked what he had to say in connection with the Social Credit bringing in some good resolutions in connection with labour. Surely enough this is what they've done in B. C. They've certainly brought in good labour legislation in B. C. -- (Interjection) -- Well sure, the labour people were the ones that supported Social Credit in B. C. and this is what elected them in B. C., so no doubt the labouring people are supporting Social Credit. And they sure have reason to because where do they have higher wage rates and better employment conditions than in B. C. ? So it stands to reason that Social Credit has been providing good labour legislation. I had hoped that since the members of the New Democratic Party in years gone by always were very vocal when it came to labour, that we would certainly see something much more aggressive before us, and especially in connection with the wage rates and vacations with pay and so on.

I, too, remember so well my seat mate for the last couple of years, the now Minister of Health, who was also championing labour to a large degree, because I think in the first session he brought in something like six resolutions in connection with labour legislation, and to find now that they're the government, to find the first session without any of this type, rather leaves me aghast.

Then, too, the other thing that surprises me is that they will need other people to make up their minds on this matter. For all the years that they were here they had a mind of their own and they were propounding issues and matters of this type. They didn't have to have anyone else to make up their minds for them. Now we find that they are proposing delay tactics in this way. Mind you, I questioned the Resolved part of the resolution that was before us myself because there was a certain amount of compulsion or regimentation in it, which I don't like. I feel that our industries should be free to negotiate their own salary schedules and their own conditions and certainly I think this should be left that way.

MR. JENKINS: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: If I can answer it, sure.

MR. JENKINS: The labour legislation that is currently in effect regarding strikes, does the honourable member not agree that there is a certain amount of compulsion in that also?

MR. FROESE: Yes, but there I think the government of the day certainly has a right to step in. I don't believe in any group of people having that power to affect the livelihood of the people of a province. I feel that the government in a situation like that should have the right to step in and act. So with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I will take the amendment under review. I do hope that now that they have brought in the amendment that we will see something coming forward at the next session.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks at this time. I'm very amazed at the Honourable Minister of Labour because I think he has certainly abandoned labour in this province. Because when he was sitting on this side he seemed to have had all the answers as far as labour problems was concerned and today he's telling us that he needs more studies, because that's all his amendment says, changing the word from "amending the Act" to "considering amending the Act" and that's all that he's doing. As far as I'm concerned he could just as easily have said that they'll take it under consideration for the next session and I think this would have been agreeable to this side. However, I have no choice but to support the amendment but I do not agree in total with it, that he requires more studies.

Yesterday the Minister of Finance told us that 43 percent of taxpayers in this province make less than \$3,000.00. We have had the Department of National Revenue tell us that Winnipeg is in the 49th place as far as per capita income is concerned. Now I don't think this legislation requires much study and I can't understand why the Minister has taken that attitude. According to the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change, it was pointed out quite well in this book that Manitoba ranks sixth among provinces in average weekly salaries; and in income Manitoba is increasingly resembling eastern Quebec and shows much slower signs of growth than any other parts of Canada. Manitoba's average per capita income and wages is trailing Quebec by more than 10 percent, and there is no guarantee that the more highly skilled workers will be staying in this province. Also, Manitoba's income position per capita is some 20 percent below that of Ontario.

So I think that we had considerable studies in this province in the last few years in respect as far as minimum wages or the type of resolution that I have proposed here today. Even your TED commission, the TED report was very critical of the situation in Manitoba. It stated quite strongly that the wages paid in this area compared with those in other parts of Canada, and the argument was used that many of our more qualified people have been leaving this part of the country and this province, and one thing we have to get are qualified or able people to stay here and we have to increase our wages and working conditions in this province.

The second point, I'm sure that most members are aware at the present time the welfare schedule of the City of Winnipeg is higher than what the minimum income will pay. Winnipeg's welfare schedule is higher for, say a family of four or five people or six, than what the minimum income can provide. This is the reason that I have talked for increasing the minimum wage. I realize that the minimum wage will not solve the problems, it will not give people an opportunity to save money for such necessities as housing or saving money for housing or other things, but all what we're doing is stopping exploitation of wages.

Now the other point, I know if any of the members have read the Social Service Audit Report, it's been pointed out quite clearly that over 2,000 families in the Greater Winnipeg area - and these are families living in their own homes with more than average sized families - are making less than \$2,500 a year. So I would like to say that we have at the present time a considerable amount of knowledge and studies in this field. I know that there are members who would say, well why if we don't employ these people below the minimum wage or below wage, they would probably not be able to get a job and would be unemployed. Well I certainly do not agree with that, because at the present time we have the Canada Manpower retraining programs which have been working quite successfully, so somebody who has not got any skills or an opportunity to get a job, why perpetuate his condition? Why not retrain this person and give him a better opportunity in life so that he can take a proper place in society and have a proper living.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Is not my honourable friend aware of the fact that the Minimum Wage Board is presently sitting to consider all aspects pertaining to minimum wages?

MR. PATRICK: Yes I am, Mr. Speaker. I just made a brief comment. I strayed a little bit from the track, but I had to because I still feel that the Honourable Minister in this instance is suggesting more study or stalling tactic, which I don't agree. I think he just as easily could have said he agrees with the resolution, there's no time to implement it this session, he's considering it for the next session, and I think it would have been the proper course because in this instance it doesn't give us any indication that it'll be considered next session.

MR. PAULLEY: It will, I'll guarantee it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the resolution and I'd like to speak to the amendment at the present time, and I'm speaking at the present time to compliment the Honourable Minister of Labour. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm complimenting him on the fact that he is saying in his amendment that he will take more time to study the aspects of the resolution presently presented, and I know full well that the Honourable Minister of Labour, reading reports from previous sessions, has been working on this type of legislation. And I must say that I am one person who firmly believes that sometimes when you're on the outside looking in, when you're on the inside looking out, things can be a little bit different. And I am only saying this, referring to my Honourable Member from Assiniboia, there is no doubt about the legislation as to the people that it will help, but let us not close our eyes to the people that it might not help. This is what I said when I spoke to the resolution originally, that I thought the Minister of Labour should take time to talk to all aspects - unions, business, big business, whoever it may be, before deciding on this aspect.

Now I say this because I can only relate to the industry that I know best where the men receive six percent from previous negotiation for holiday pay. Now there may come a time, if they've had a man working for them who's been with them for over five years working with them, that this man may not want to go on holidays because this is the best time of the year to work and he's receiving these monies. So let's not just rush into it whole hog. There are men who are receiving a percentage because they do have to work in the summer part of the year, are very happy with it, and you could quite easily see a situation where if I had worked there six years and all of a sudden you had three weeks holiday with pay, an employer could maybe save a lot of money by doing away with that employee or letting him go if he didn't want to have this situation.

So I agree with the Minister that all aspects should be looked into, and I'm not saying that I will agree with him when he brings in the bill, but I am saying I appreciate the fact there's going to be a study into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland indicated he was going to take the adjournment, did you not? -- (Interjection) -- Oh. Okay, I'm sorry.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just interject at this time. I understand His Honour is just about ready to enter the Chamber to perform certain functions of our democratic process, and I wonder if it would meet with the convenience of the House that we just suspend operations until that is done.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the bell could be rung, so that we.....

MR. PAULLEY: We don't need the bell. We are a Legislative Assembly.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

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

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 4 - The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act.
- No. 5 - An Act to amend The Pipe Line Act.
- No. 6 - An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act.
- No. 7 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
- No. 8 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.
- No. 11 - An Act to adjust Certain Benefits arising out of the Operation of the Group Life Insurance Plan for Public Servants.
- No. 15 - The Transit Grants Act.
- No. 16 - An Act respecting The Keystone Centre.
- No. 22 - The Financial Administration Act.
- No. 23 - The Provincial Auditor's Act.
- No. 27 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.
- No. 35 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate in the name of the Minister of Labour, to whom I yield, -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry. Am I confused again? In case anybody wonders, Mr. Speaker, it's not the opposition that frightens me, it's this instrument in front of me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not going to repeat, I'm not going to repeat what I said on the previous resolution. -- (Interjection) -- Do you want to hear it again? Mr. Speaker, I think it was really one of the most enlightened speeches that has been made since the House commenced, but I'm not going to impose it again upon my honourable friends, I'll refer them to Hansard. Sufficient for me to say that here again is a resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia who of necessity had to become the spokesman of the Liberal Party for labour. I say of necessity, because as far as my knowledge of my honourable friend is concerned, his relative association internally with labour is very very remote. I don't know whether or not my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia has ever had -- (Interjection) --

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member for Assiniboia has just as much connection with labour as my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services has with Agriculture. I would say he has much more connection with Labour and I feel that he is quite competent in his critique of that department and I don't like that remark.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I love the interjections of my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie. He rises on so many occasions on a point of privilege, privilege of which he has no association at all. But if my friend the member for Assiniboia had a point of privilege it should have been him that rose, not my dear beloved friend from Portage la Prairie. It appears as though - it appears as though the Member for Assiniboia was perfectly content with my remarks, and if my dear friend from Portage la Prairie wants to chastise me on behalf of his colleague, may I in all due respect suggest to the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party that I have more confidence in his colleague from Assiniboia than apparently he has, and I'll leave it at that. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has now got my point.

But I do want to say that I do not intend to repeat the points that I had made on the previous resolution. Sufficient for me to say again, that on the introduction of the estimates of the Department of Labour I had given the indication to this House that as the new Minister of Labour it was my intention as the head of that department to conduct a comprehensive review, if possible, into all matters under the control of the Department of Labour, to make a comprehensive as possible assessment of labour legislation and to eventually bring into this House an assessment of that review. Now among other matters that we will be reviewing is the question of general holidays, a question as to how far can government really go in imposing conditions on labour, imposing conditions on management, as to the observances of general holidays as suggested in this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER, I want to take this opportunity of saying that I doubt very much whether or not anyone was more chagrined than I was on Labour Day as I left my home in Transcona, on that great day that labour has fought for for so long, Labour Day, the day when we pay due recognition to labour and their struggles that are historic, to hear over the radio that a certain firm or certain firms were open on that particular day - "Come down and see our bargains" or "Take advantage of our bargains." And I was chagrined, I was keenly disappointed on that occasion and I'm sure my honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia heard the same advertisements. That here on Labour Day, September 1st, of course which is different than the original Labour Day of May 1st, and the first Monday in May, that it did appear a contra-vention of the concept of the setting aside of one day a year in recognition of the fight that labour has historically waged for recognition. I think, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not attempting to put words in the mouth of my honourable friend for Assiniboia, that he will join with me in the type of thinking that I'm trying to express, as inadequate as it may be at this particular time.

So I want to say to my honourable friend and to members of this Assembly, that I do want

September 19, 1969

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) as the new Minister of Labour to have an assessment again made of the prevalence of this operation, the prevalence of this -- I can't call it a violation of our labour laws because it is within our labour laws providing time and a half was paid to the employees of any firm or corporation that worked that day. But I do want to make an investigation into the same.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia and the members of this House, to give us an opportunity of looking into the full significance. Again, Mr. Speaker, I realize, and I am prepared to accept chastisement, because while I was on that side of the House I raised these questions. I'm not equivocating; I accept that. But I do want to say to honourable members of this House that I would like an opportunity, now that I'm in a position when I can make a real assessment, without having to rely on somebody else's assessment - and I do not mean by this that I did not trust the officials of the Department of Labour before. But I do want members of this House to give me the opportunity as the Minister of Labour, to review this legislation and other legislation as well in this general area. Because you know, Mr. Speaker, there are so many people, so many people who are really not in a position to assess the true situation insofar as labour is concerned; not only as far as Manitoba is concerned, but other jurisdictions as well. Labour, the employees make the headlines of the press when there is turmoil and there is strife and there are strikes. That is the time, Mr. Speaker, when labour becomes prominent. That is the time when labour is in a position of chastisement and criticism. I have suggested in the past in this House it will be the endeavour of this House and of this government to see that the functioning of labour and management is in such an atmosphere and climate so we don't make the headlines, so that we unitedly in government and management and labour can make our united contribution to the forward thrust to the economy of Manitoba, without the accompanying headlines, this firm on strike, that firm on strike and related matters.

I suggest that the content of the resolution proposed by my friend from Assiniboia comes into that picture. All that I am asking for, all that the government is asking for is to give us an opportunity of looking at all of labour legislation, including the subject matter of the resolution proposed by the Member for Assiniboia, so that we can at the next session hopefully come into this House with concrete proposals, after due assessment and due consideration.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia be amended by deleting all the words after the word "government" in the eleventh line and substitute the following: "continue its announced plan to review all labour legislation in Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, I hear from the other side "shame!" I hear from the other side "Oh, no!" I want to say, because the motion has not been presented, I want to say to my honourable friends opposite, who are now saying "shame!", who are now saying "no!" this government has no intention of sending in to Woods Committees, or any other committees as they did, consideration of very important matters of legislation. We'll stand on our own feet; we will make our own review; we are competent; we are desirous of having an atmosphere in Manitoba that will be conducive to the further thrust of our economy; and if this is shameful, I say to my honourable friends opposite, you judge it. The people of Manitoba have made their judgment and we will carry through in the light of their judgment.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

..... Continued on next page.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I know that it is Friday afternoon, Private Members' day. There's a certain atmosphere of congeniality in the House and one does not like to disturb it unnecessarily. Maybe certain members have fishing trips planned and what have you. But to listen to that sniveling nonsense and hogwash coming from the Minister of Labour is just too much to ask for any group of sane people. Look at, my friend. All you have to do -- pardon me. I should address the Chair. Right. You're my friend because I'll get exercise. Now I do have a great deal of admiration for my colleague the Minister of Labour but we just went through the performance, not once but twice, and no doubt if we have a few more bills or resolutions presented by people who are concerned with labour like the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and others, then we'll have other amendments added and attached to that. Essentially, of course, what he's saying, what he's finding out, what he is finding out is that, you know, it is not that easy, it is not that simple to do the kind of things that look so easy on the surface -- five weeks holidays; this or that; increase that; do that; that he was so wont to suggest and to commend governments to doing when he was on this side of the House, and all I'm suggesting -- I would not even participate in this debate today if he were to get up as a responsible Minister, that I'm prepared to accept that he is, and say, "Gentlemen, the government will consider it," but it's obvious that these resolutions have touched him, because whenever the Honourable Minister of Labour or the House Leader is in a bit of a bind -- we already acknowledge it, particularly the veteran members of the House -- he begins to embellish his arguments; his methodology (I knew I would get that word in pretty soon because we heard it so often from this side of the House) -- his methodology waxes eloquent. He has not quite resorted to wearing that red vest that he usually wore when he was on this side of the House which he could really add colour to the speeches that he made when it lacked certain facts -- when it lacked certain facts. All he had to do with these resolutions, with these resolutions, was to accept the fact that government, any responsible government can't accept in a helter-skelter manner resolutions that have grave implications with respect to the labour employee-employer relationship, that have grave economic implications, acknowledge that fact and sit down. But you see, in doing so, he would have to give at least tacit approval or tacit acknowledgment that when some of these same resolutions were put before our group when we were government and we reacted in a somewhat similar manner that he is now reacting to, and he suggests that the reference to such matters to committee, expert committees, Woods Committee on labour relationships or something like that, that there's something bad about it. I would have to ask the Honourable Minister what is the matter, what is wrong with investigating some of the pressing problems, or referring some of the pressing problems of our day to the experts.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I really did not want to disrupt the tenor of this afternoon, but I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour; you know, if you're about to make a conservative decision, make it as a conservative. Just accept the responsibility of it, sit down, and don't have anything more to say about it. But if your NDP conscience bothers you because you find yourself turning over to every side of the picture, because that you are letting down the people that put you into office, because you were the deceitful persons in this circumstance, because there are a lot of people in Manitoba that have thrown out this government because they thought they would have a new approach to some of the problems facing us, because they thought they would have a new reason . . . -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order. I do not believe there is room in our parliamentary language for these words such as "deceitful".

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw if it's unparliamentary but I would suggest that there are a good number of members in this House that would have to, in that event, apologize to me, because it was used in many instances with reference to my person by the Member of St. Boniface, I believe by the Liberal House Leader, and indeed . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Not by me.

MR. ENNS: Not by my honourable friend the Leader of the . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the first time I recall hearing that word used in connection with my honourable friend was by a lawyer appearing on behalf of the Indians of South Indian Lake, and perhaps that adjective caught on at that time and it has now stuck with my honourable friend.

MR. ENNS: . . . accept the defined definition of the word and its usage by the House Leader of the Liberal Party. I make no further issue of it.

MR. PAULLEY: Would my honourable friend permit me to make one minor observation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I thought for a moment that the observation that my friend had to make was minor, I would permit him to do so. I have a certain feeling somewhere deep in my stomach that it will be a major one, and that perhaps I should not allow him that privilege, but, Sir, I believe in the free exchange of opinion in this Chamber, and by all means, Mr. House Leader, make your opinion known.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just make this -- I am so happy to hear from my honourable friend when he indicated a moment or so ago that we have a conscience in the New Democratic Party, which by inference of course means that there wasn't any when they were over on this side of the House.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader can make whatever inferences he wants. I am merely suggesting that his actions, his amendments to these bills that were so important to him when he was on this side of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, has he a point of order or privilege or . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will be finished very shortly. I just make my little point, and the point has been made before, that when we had the responsibility of government and sat on that side of the House, we did not suggest, we did not suggest and we did not have the presumption to suggest that we could, with the passage or acceptance of a resolution here or a resolution there, or a particular piece of legislation here, a particular piece of legislation there, correct all the wants and needs of this province, all the problems associated in the labour field, the relationship between employer and employee, but the speeches emanating from this side of the House never left us in doubt, never left us in doubt that from day one that that group from this side moved over to that side, it would have the answers, it would have the action, and would have the problem solved.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestion that has been made so often, and a very fair and a very valid suggestion, made by the First Minister, made by individual ministers, made by as a group as a whole -- It is unreasonable or unfair for our group on this side -- that is the combined opposition -- to expect them to have the answers in this session, in the short time that they've had assuming responsibility. Indeed it's unfair to have them have the answers next session but, Mr. Speaker, it's not unreasonable for me to ask or for him to recognize and for him to admit, rather than give us flowery speeches which bring forth, you know, tears to my eyes, about all the reasons why he can't proceed with the legislation at this time. Simply say what we had to say, that the answers aren't that easy come by, that there is a great deal of consideration that has to be taken when any basic change is made, that there are a great number of persons to consult with, many considerations that are over and above the immediate ones that I'm now sure that the Minister, in his new responsibility, is aware of. But he doesn't say that in this House when he moves these amendments. No. He gives us some folderol-dee-daw about goodness knows what have you, and I label it all as a bunch of hogwash, and insincerity on that part. And I wish that he would -- indeed if there is an interest on the part of the members opposite to accelerate the action and the business of the House, particularly on issues such as this, that they refrain from the long-winded approach to what essentially amounts to a short answer -- no. And if this should happen on their part, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to sit down. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: When I first came into this House, Mr. Speaker, I said I had a lot to learn, and boy, I'm sure learning. And one thing I've learned from the Honourable Member from Lakeside -- if you want to make a point just stand up here and you holler, especially if you haven't got anything to say.

The Honourable Member from Assiniboia pointed out something which is crucial, I think, a few moments ago in another debate, that Winnipeg has deteriorated to forty-ninth as a city on the economic scale -- sixth provincially. Now the people of Manitoba spoke on the 25th and they elected this New Democratic Government, and if you people want to make a contribution then I suggest that we get out of this House and get on with the program.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): The Honourable the Minister of Labour has left and I was maybe in the position of complimenting him again, and I don't really know that I want to do that twice in an afternoon, but frankly he has done again what I asked him to do on the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) previous motion, to say he wants to take a look at it, but by the same token we're not talking to an amendment now, we're talking to the main resolution and there's something that's very crucial in this.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has made a statement that Winnipeg is a very bad state and the Honourable Member from Assiniboia says we're in a bad state. I don't know that it's all that bad. Let's take a look at some of the brighter side of the pictures as well.

But just taking a look at the resolution in general, if you have two more statutory holidays and you've got 100,000 people working in the Province of Manitoba at an average of \$2.00 an hour - average of \$2.00 an hour - and you've got an eight hour day, you've got \$16.00 a day. In two days you've got \$32.00, and at 100,000 people you've got \$3,200,000 that has to be paid. And also you have to pick up the production of those people, the two days they're off, so you can double it. It's \$6.4 million. And for a government that says they're going to continue to raise productivity in this province, I say take a look at it. -- (Interjection) -- This is an answer I continually get from the Member of Kildonan because he doesn't know anything about business at all. It's as simple as that. Elmwood - I'm sorry.

Now facts are facts when you're in industry, and all I have said to the Minister of Labour previously is take a look at it before you walk in. I'm not saying that I'll agree with him when he does bring it in but I'm asking for it to be looked at. You're talking a lot of money and productivity in this province. Then you can end up harming the people by saying you're going to help them. Think about that.

Now you may say this is awfully funny. I'm talking as a Conservative. I want to help people, too, and I can help them very much. I've been involved with helping people a lot longer than some of the members on that side. But take it this way. For some reason or other, and the Honourable Minister of Finance has taken many occasions to say "when you were on that side of the House; when you people were in government" this could happen or that could happen.

Now let's just go back to a statement of the Honourable First Minister that he made when he was asked a question on "What is your opinion now on the tax freeze of Greater Winnipeg, and that your party had opposed it previously?" His statement was: "We were an eleven man caucus then; we're 28 of a man caucus now, and we can take a look at other things." And obviously he has listened to new members of his caucus. I say this. I've heard many occasions that "you people did this then." I say we have eight new members, and the older members of our caucus have listened to some of the new members very carefully, and we intend, and our Leader has invited new ideas, and you may get some new ideas from the Conservative caucus on this side. -- (Interjection) -- Well you've got one, but the one I just gave you is constructive. Don't go around taking productivity out of this province just that fast without looking at it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BOYCE: Would the member allow a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Certainly.

MR. BOYCE: When you said the average, I didn't quite understand. You said the average was \$2.00 an hour? Who? Where?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The average income in the Province of Manitoba ranges at approximately the \$2.00 mark. This is over-all.

MR. BOYCE: Gee, there seems to be some conflict. I see statistics in the DBI that says 43 percent of the people in the City of Winnipeg make less than \$3,000. I wonder . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I said the over-all average in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BOYCE: Oh.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Hourly rate.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. BILTON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, if I could have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.)

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.) On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.) On the proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. This was the amendment to it which I have taken under advisement. There was a matter previously existing on the Order Paper which prompted me to take this amendment under advisement. This morning it has removed itself. So I therefore rule the amendment's in order, moved by the Honourable the First Minister, seconded by - could the Honourable First Minister refresh my memory as to who his seconder was?

MR. SCHREYER: I believe that when I moved this motion of amendment it was seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "whereas". Are you ready for the question?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the proposal of the First Minister to establish a standing committee to investigate and report on all matters pertaining to the conduct of elections in Manitoba and in particular to "inquire into and report upon desirable and practical measures to limit and control provincial election expenditures" I think should go down as one of the more important pieces of legislation established at this or any other Session, because it doesn't take much delving into the problems connected with political parties and the political system to realize that something should be done. I don't particularly feel that this is true of the moment of history that we are in, but I think if one looks over the past hundred years in this country at some of the scandals that have come to light, and in particular at some of the problems which face political parties and some of the dangers and danger signals connected with the whole question of election fund-raising and election expenditures, I think that one can only come to the conclusion that something should be done.

The Federal Government established a report on election expenses some three years ago and I think that any committee of this Legislature would do well to spend almost all of its time - not all of it but a great majority of its time - on reading that report. And there is an unfortunate cycle which occurs in this report which perhaps is in evidence in our province at this time and has come about at many times in Canadian history, namely, that there is some crisis or some scandal that arouses public reaction or public interest, then there is some kind of an investigation, some legislation is passed, and usually it is legislation that is very weak, the result being that nothing very much comes about in the end. I refer to some of the famous scandals in Canadian history: the Pacific scandal of 1873 and the Bornay scandal of 1930, and so on and so on. I don't say that this is relevant in any sense to the situation in Manitoba. I think the important thing is that, for whatever reason, we are now going to investigate or look into this whole question of financing and expenditure. I think it's long overdue and I'm happy that we will now have an opportunity to go into this whole area.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of electioneering in the modern day are, I think, becoming intolerable for the average candidate and for the political parties which stand behind the candidates. It's no longer possible, as it used to be at one time, for a man to be a good speaker, to stand up on a soap box or a tree trunk or a hay rack and address his electors -- (Interjection) -- a tractor. I'm unfamiliar with those techniques of campaigning. It is now necessary to, in effect, meet your voters via the media, and in particular radio and television. -- (Interjection) -- Well perhaps in Swan River it's more easy because of course there's a newspaper which spreads the gospel.

Mr. Speaker, the average political party and the average candidate is confronted with enormous costs in campaigning. I happen to have a fairly good idea of some of them. It's not good enough for a man to have some ability or a man to have some desire to be a candidate.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) He has to get himself across to the electorate. And when you start translating this into dollars and cents it becomes almost prohibitive. Television time, for example, to the average candidate is out of the question. TV studios and TV stations, for example, in the Winnipeg area - and there's only one we can really deal with - the average cost of a minute of television time, at least up until recently, was \$250.00 a minute.

Now it's not good enough for a person to attempt to buy a minute's TV time. That's useless, because repetition is a fundamental need of selling. In other words, if you wish to sell your product you don't have one ad; you have a series of ads. For example, if you want to buy TV time for an individual or a party, you have to buy dozens of minutes or packages. At \$250.00 a crack it's pretty expensive. If you're buying radio time, per minute it tends to be of the order of \$30.00 a minute. How much radio time can you afford? If you buy newspaper space, it tends to be, for both our big dailies in the metropolitan area, it comes out to about \$10.00 an inch for both. So if you look at some of these problems -- and mailing costs. I don't know what we pay for stamps these days - is it going to be six cents for our political mailings as well? How many thousand voters do you have? The cost of mailing and so on. I think it's getting out of hand. Billboards - \$150.00, \$200.00; \$400.00 if you buy a large one. And one of the problems is this: That where you get two candidates, and let us say they are both equally good, the man with the greater amount of money has a decided edge because the public unfortunately sometimes measures people by the amount of publicity that they get. For example, if one candidate sends out one pamphlet, another sends out four, and another can't afford to send out any, I would think the man who sent out the most pamphlets has an edge. I don't say he will win but I think he'll have an edge, and I've heard people say this to me. They have said that they didn't even get a pamphlet from a certain candidate or they got several from one candidate, and it seems to impress the public. So there's undoubtedly a decided advantage in having large funds available.

The committee that we hope to establish and the committee, for example, that was established by the Federal Government and reported three years ago, had tremendous problems in obtaining information and in obtaining the co-operation of people in giving information. In fact, they found it was quite necessary to on numerous occasions hold confidential or private interviews because it was only in this way that they could really get sufficient information. They also found that the response to questionnaires was not very good.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the report that we have, the federal report, could really be taken by the committee, and with very little hearings all the material happens to be, in my opinion, for all practical purposes, contained therein. The need is for legislation; the need is for new controls or new methods of financing or new procedures - new directions; it is certainly not in the perpetuation of our present system. I have always been concerned about our present system of fund-raising, and I only know it second or third hand and I only know it from what I read and from what I hear basically, but it seems to me that when a person makes a sizeable donation to a political party, in some of those instances I am sure he expects some consideration and some favour in return.

I am also sure that on the other hand that the opposite position can be taken, and that a fund-raiser or bagman for a political party can go to some person in business or private life or industry or whatever and ask for a donation and in effect, without saying very much one way or the other, coerce or pressure that person into making a donation out of fear of losing favour with the people. So I think it can work both ways. I think on one hand the person who donates sometimes - I say a percentage of the time, some of the time - expects favours, but I also think it works the other way, namely that the person raising the funds also expects a contribution and can do so in either explicit, or more likely implicit terms, simply ask for a donation on the tacit understanding, without a word spoken, that well if you don't donate to us it may not go very well for you.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member accept a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. McKELLAR: In his speech right at the present time, he is intimating that political parties are asking for money from people and, in turn, they are asking for something in return. Can he give us an example of this actually happening in the City of Winnipeg or in the Province of Manitoba or is he just talking up in the air? Give us an example.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I was suggesting -- (Interjection) -- I am talking the truth as I see it. I believe that if you will listen to me that I said that I think -- (Interjection) --

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) that's right, I am giving you my opinion. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I don't believe.-- we are now going to get into a philosophical debate of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney will have an opportunity to express his views in this matter.

MR. DOERN: I would be very happy to hear the opinion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, because I am giving him my opinion and it is honestly held. He may not just agree with me but he is entitled to give his opinion, and I will repeat my point in case he didn't understand it. I said that I feel that in a general way - is the member going to listen or would he prefer not to - that there are obviously donations given at times, and if he is not aware of this I will refer him to historical precedents of 1873 and 1891 and 1930, and more recent times perhaps, where donations were uncovered where people gave hundreds of thousands of dollars in the clear understanding of being favoured in contract. Now all I am saying is it went on before. If my honourable friend wishes to say this has not occurred since 1930 that is his opinion. It is my opinion that this sort of thing continues to go on. I also said that I think that we ourselves are sometimes guilty either in an explicit sense or an implicit sense that some of the fund raisers may, by speaking openly or not saying anything, give the impression to a person whom they are approaching for funds that if they do not in fact contribute they will lose favour with the party in power. I am not accusing my honourable friend, I am not accusing his former government; I am talking on the basis of a general impression that I have. If he wishes to disagree with it, then that is his right and he will have this opportunity.

Since 1920, Mr. Speaker, there has been very little legislation in this country, and particularly at the federal level, to deal with election expenses and I think that it is time that we looked at some of the high costs. For example, is it healthy and is it fair that one candidate should enter into an election contest with ten times or a hundred times the funds of his opponent. Now I think that it is fair in the sense that any man who is popular or any man who knows how to raise funds should be allowed to have a certain edge. I don't say that every candidate should have, say, \$2,000 to fight a provincial election and no more and no less. I don't say that, but I just wonder whether there shouldn't be a limit on the amount of money that can be spent in an election and at the same time whether there also shouldn't be a floor so that each candidate, who is a serious candidate, should have a general minimum level of finances to fight in the election.

Mr. Speaker, I recall reading a study of the federal election held I think in 1958, and if my memory serves me correct - I have the book either with me or at home, I have several books on it - but I believe that the figures quoted were that the Liberal Party of that day spent \$10 million on the election; the Conservatives spent an estimated 3 to 4 million dollars and the New Democratic Party, that poor cousin, spent \$150,000. Now I know that my honourable friends will be so shocked as a result of that that they will undoubtedly donate to our political party during the next election. But I think the question really is, not that all parties should have the same amount of money, but is it fair when there is a strong support for all of these parties that one should be able or should be in a position to have 10 times or 100 times the funds of another, because the problem is that one party can dominate all the media. One party can dominate the radio and the television and the newspapers. -- (Interjection) -- It's a Riviera - it's an inexpensive car. I thought my honourable friend was going to ask us how some of us got elected when we do so with a fraction of the funds. -- (Interjection) -- That is another interesting question, and I might say that perhaps in time the public sees the light. If we had had more funds in the past, if we had had some of the monies available to my honourable friend, I would wager to say that you would have seen a New Democratic government in this province 10 or 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by just mentioning some of the points that I think should be carefully studied by this committee and which have been brought out in other previous studies. I think that such suggestions for example as more free time on radio and television is a very good suggestion that was proposed by the federal committee. Perhaps some additional mailing privileges to allow members one free mailing throughout their constituency. The suggestion of such things as giving income tax - what do you call them - income tax rebates, is that the right word? Exemptions - my honourable friend from Thompson assists me - exemptions. In other words, if a person donated \$100 he should be able to claim this for a tax exemption to a certain percentage. This is I think a very good idea in the sense that one of the things we must try to do is involve more people in donating to political parties. I speak to people

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) who are supporters of the New Democratic Party and they think quite frequently that the party has all the money that it needs. They are sadly misled, and I am sure that my honourable friends in their own private campaigns often attempting to raise funds run into problems with people who feel that they may have all the money that they need. Maybe they do, but I know in our case that certainly isn't true. Other suggestions like limiting the period of expenditure - if the campaign is six weeks or five weeks or whatever it is, limiting the basic expenditures on radio and television to the last three or four weeks of the campaign so that this cuts down on the total expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, I think those are most of the points that I wish to raise. I think that if all of us share the common belief in democracy, we all share the belief that political parties have an important role to play in the democratic process in our nation's history and in our nation's destiny, surely we should examine the key question of election and the question of fund-raising and the question of expenditures and attempt to, if improvement is needed, make improvement so that we get the best people elected, so that we cut out any possibility if we can, diminish it or exclude any possibility of people looking for favours or groups unduly influencing the people who represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I think the proposal of the Honourable First Minister is excellent. I am very glad that it has come up at this session and I think that some support for his proposal should come, and I would not be surprised if we get some considerable support from members opposite.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, before I make my remarks, perhaps on a point of order, would it be in order for me to ask you, Sir, on what authority you based your ruling to accept the amendment made by the First Minister? I was out of the House at the time and I missed the ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I mentioned at the time -- I realize I made my ruling, but for the benefit of the mover of the original resolution, at the time that I took the amendment under advisement there was a notice of motion which I felt stood in the way of moving the amendment. Since that time the notice of motion or the mover of the motion decided not to proceed with it, so then the obstruction no longer remained in the way. Therefore, I ruled the amendment in order, even though it appears on the Order Paper as of today, but I think Hansard will show that the Honourable First Minister stated to the House that he did not intend to proceed with the resolution and it received the approval of the House.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, according to the rules your ruling stands. I was not here to speak on a point of order before you gave your ruling so I shall confine my remarks to the resolution as amended, but I might say that the resolution, the content of the resolution has been changed from a discussion about political kickbacks to a discussion about the cost of elections, and I find that in my opinion to be two different subjects altogether. But as you have made your ruling I will say no more about that, but I would like to make a sub-amendment to the amendment and I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that all the words in the amendment after the first "whereas" in the second line be struck out and the following substituted:

WHEREAS the Premier of Manitoba has inferred that previous administrations received political payoffs on government contracts,

AND WHEREAS this is a serious charge that strikes at the root of our democratic system,

AND WHEREAS the charge has left a cloud of suspicion over the integrity of many present and former honourable members of this Assembly,

AND WHEREAS this charge implies that unjust inflationary costs have been inflicted on Manitoba consumers to finance the political activities of the governing party in the province,

AND WHEREAS this charge implies graft in government and is not to be confused with regular and normal donations to political parties which are perfectly legal,

AND WHEREAS no evidence has been presented to date to substantiate this charge,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Premier be requested to immediately table in this House his evidence of political kickbacks having been received by previous administrations in this province,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House consider the advisability of establishing a Special Committee immediately to investigate this matter fully, and that it be

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) empowered to call witnesses, hear evidence and make a report and recommendations to the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before you make your ruling on the acceptability of this proposed amendment to the amendment, Sir, may I just ask you to consider the following argument, that a motion to amend an amendment that has the effect of putting the motion back on the status quo ante must obviously be out of order. The effect of the honourable member's ruling would be to reassert the original motion which has subsequently been amended - to which an amendment has been moved and which has been accepted by Your Honour. Perhaps Mr. Speaker would wish to take it under advisement. Certainly in the interval I do put forward the argument that any proposed sub-amendment that would have the effect of restoring the initial, the original wording, according to my understanding of the rules, was clearly out of order.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Before you make your ruling or take the matter under advisement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer you to Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Page 171, Citation 203 (1) in the second paragraph - I won't read it all - "The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject matter with the original motion they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto." So, Mr. Speaker, my point is that an amendment has to be relevant to the original motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, while my honourable friend is citing Beauchesne 203 (1) that's dealing with the question of an amendment, it is my understanding this would be an amendment to the amendment which would restore the original motion, and I suggest that on that basis you should take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my intention to take the sub-amendment under advisement. I intend to give my ruling when this motion next appears on the Order Paper.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): May I have the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in amendment thereto which is standing in my name. I have considered the amendment . . .

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, are we on No. 19 now?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes we are. The procedural issue posed by the proposed amendment is indeed a rare one. I have perused the recognized authorities but I regret to say that all texts are silent on issues arising from the extension of a courtesy. The texts deal with prescribed rules and the observance thereof and not with unanimously agreed to courtesy.

In this instance debate on the resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel was adjourned by the Honourable Member for Logan. On Tuesday, September 16th, the adjourned debate of this resolution was reached on the Order Paper for the first time. The Honourable Member for Logan did not proceed. He rose in his seat and said, as reported on Page 769 of Hansard: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to let this matter stand?" At this point, pursuant to the provisions of our Rule 60, subsection (5), the Speaker was empowered to proceed to the next item on the Order Paper and the adjourned debate would have continued on the Order Paper in the same position.

However, before taking his seat the Honourable Member for Logan continued with the following words: "However, I have no objection if any other member wishes to speak." Now what does "to speak" mean? In this context at this point on Orders of the Day it can only have one meaning and that is to debate, and so it has always been recognized by this House. The Votes and Proceedings for that day so indicated in the following words on Page 5: "The House resumed the adjourned debate" - and later - "and the debate continuing."

Now what is the meaning of "to debate"? Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition 1958, Citation 120 subsection (1) defines "debate" as follows: "The proceedings between the rising of a member to move a motion and the ascertainment by the Chair of the decision of the House constitutes a debate, and this process affords an opportunity for and usually involves discussion, although a decision may be reached without discussion. The interval between the proposing and the putting of the question, which is usually used for discussion, gives an opportunity for further proceeding such as moving of an amendment." In the normal course of events where a member has the floor as a matter of right granted by the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) rules there is no problem. In this instance the Honourable Member for Assiniboia entered into the debate, not as a member with right granted by the rules but by virtue of the extension of a courtesy granted by a member who previously moved adjournment of the debate.

In considering this matter three questions arise in my mind. (1) Do the rules provide for the affording of varying degrees of latitude in extent of debate on motions of this type to different members. (2) Does the courtesy offer by one member to another of the right to speak imply any restrictions on the latitude and extent of debate to be allowed a member taking advantage of such a courtesy offer. (3) May a member in extending such a courtesy offer impose any restrictions on the latitude and extent of debate entered into by any member acting on such a generosity.

In the rules I can find only one definition of a debate and it is that which I previously quoted. Therefore, I must assume that once having acquired the right to debate, by whatever means, a member is entitled to all the freedom of debate accorded by the rules. May I remind the House that by definition of debate this includes the right to move an amendment. Furthermore, the rules do not state that this right could be varied or denied depending on the manner in which a member became entitled to exercise his right to debate any motion.

In considering the second question, in granting another member by courtesy the right to debate, in my humble opinion, I find that it carries with it the right to full debate as per the definition. May a member making a courtesy offer of the right to debate impose his own restrictions? The answer is obvious. It would be tantamount to allowing each member to write his own rules to suit his own particular needs. The grant to another member of one's right to debate must have no conditions attached, expressed or implied. Attaching any conditions is a denial of the right to full debate. A denial of the right to move an amendment could place a member participating in debate in a very difficult position, particularly if the entire purpose and intent of his debate is directed toward moving an amendment. A prohibition against moving an amendment in a situation such as the one under consideration could open the door to further restrictions on the freedom of debate.

It has been suggested that a member offering to another his right to debate deserves a reciprocal courtesy in regaining his right to debate the same motion in unchanged form. May I suggest that if it is of paramount importance to a member to debate a motion in the same form as that in which he adjourned debate thereon, then he ought to take advantage of the rule that offers him that protection. On the other hand, if he cannot resist the desire to accommodate other members in the House, then in offering his right to debate he ought to accept the fact that every member is entitled to the equal rights of debate and that he runs the risk that upon regaining his right to debate he may find himself debating a resolution in different form from that in which it was at the time he adjourned the debate.

I therefore rule the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in order. Having ruled the amendment in order, I cannot return the adjournment of debate to the Honourable Member for Logan because I would be returning something different from that which he held in adjournment, and the Chair has no way of determining whether the honourable member is desirous of proceeding on a motion which has now an amendment moved thereto.

However, in view of the fact that a predominant characteristic of this House is the ready willingness to extend courtesies to accommodate another member, I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Logan be extended the courtesy to proceed with or adjourn debate. If he chooses to adjourn debate, in view of the fact that the motion has now assumed a different form, it should be treated as a first adjournment, in which case his position would be governed by the provisions of our Rule 60, subsection (5).

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to challenge your ruling, but if I may just make an observation. I believe that in accordance with the rules of debate there's no argument at all. I just want to merely point out that this is the first time that this has occurred in this House and your ruling will be a guidance to members of this House.

MR. BILTON: . . . that we had the ruling that you've explained to us today and I appreciate your extensive, exhaustive enquiry into acquainting the House with what you have done this afternoon.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I see nothing wrong with this House going strictly by the rules, and if it's any help to you that this has happened well then perhaps we could all take a lesson from this. But after having said that, I would say that if any member wishes to allow another member to speak, then the other member perhaps should indicate that he does not intend to make an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the -- Mr. Speaker, pardon me. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the exhaustive work that you have come to on ruling the amendment in order and I certainly think that it is a good one and I'm not going to dispute it.

In speaking to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, may I first state that while I am not in contradiction with the ruling that you've made, the amendment in itself is in some ways kind of in doubt because the main motion states a provision for opting-in and the amendment for an opting-out. However, I'm not going to quarrel with that. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks made by the mover of the amendment, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and also if I might say the mover of the original motion the Honourable Member for Riel, that neither of the honourable members have a working knowledge of the trade union procedures.

As an active trade unionist of many years standing and as President of Jubilee Lodge No. 6, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, I would like to enlighten the honourable members with regard to the procedure for union affiliation with a political party. In the first place, political contributions are not checked off the union member's salary, wage or other remuneration as stated in both the amendment and in the main motion. The dues of five cents a month for political purposes are taken off the members' monthly union dues. Union members who want to opt-out, as has been stated, merely indicate to the financial secretary of their local union that they don't want five cents a month to go for political purposes. They do not have to give any reason, as has been suggested by both the original mover of the resolution and the member who has moved the amendment, or they don't have to state their political affiliation. The information is strictly confidential; they merely go to the financial secretary of their local union and tell him that they don't want their union dues used for any political purpose. There is no stigma or no difficulty attached to opting-out.

And here, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to a statement made the other day in debate by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Page 771 of Hansard, and I'm quoting: "Didn't your" - and he was referring to the Conservative Government - "Didn't your government when it put in the Medicare plan have all the doctors in to begin with and then allowed those who wished to opt-out to opt-out. In other words the procedure was exactly the same, everybody's in unless you opt-out." When the Honourable Member for Riel - and he's not here today - was in the government this was all right for doctors but he's not prepared to allow the trade unions affiliating with a political party, or even the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, he's not prepared to allow trade unions affiliating with a political party to follow the same procedure.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, members in the trade union movement in Canada, as elsewhere, have demonstrated that they are responsible citizens, capable of making decisions affecting their welfare with no need of resolutions or amendments such as those proposed by the Honourable Member for Riel and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. During debate it was also implied that the decision for unions to affiliate with a political party was an executive decision. The Honourable Member for Riel stated in his opening remarks on Page 596 of Hansard, and I quote: "As we know, the unions who come under the aegis of the Canadian Labour Congress can by executive decision require the members of a local union to check off a certain amount of their salary to a fund for a political party."

Mr. Speaker, this statement is incorrect. The decision to affiliate with a political party is the prerogative of union membership by democratic process at union local level and is not dictated by the Canadian Labour Congress, the Manitoba Federation of Labour or Grand Lodge Headquarters of local unions involved. Union executives can recommend certain courses of action but decisions can only be made by a majority vote of the local union membership in open meetings. Union executives do not decide the policy of local unions at any time. The democratic process is founded upon the will of the majority and the trade unions adhere to this in all things. The union executive is a servant, not the master of the membership, and Mr. Speaker, I speak from experience.

The Canadian Labour Congress is made up of international, national and C. L. C. chartered unions, each of which have their own constitution setting out the democratic procedures under which the obligations on each local union must operate. Some constitutions allow local membership to contribute to a political party of their choice, and this is decided by a majority

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) vote of the membership. Members who do not wish to contribute to a political party can opt-out. Incidentally, the five cent a month contribution does not come from the member's salary, wage or remuneration but from his monthly dues only.

Speaking of union affiliation in moving the amendment, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia said, and I quote Page 775 of Hansard: "My biggest concern is that the small percentage at the meeting when a meeting is called, the small percentage of that union makes a decision for everybody in that unit." Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, union meetings are open to all union members to attend and to cast their ballots for or against any particular motion. If union members are as concerned about political affiliation as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia claims, and if I know trade unions and I know my membership in my union, they will surely turn out in full force to defeat a motion with which he suggests they do not agree. Whatever the case, the majority vote will carry the motion and I would say that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia's concern for the average trade unionist is misplaced. The onus is on the individual union member, as it is upon the voter in every election, to express his choice by the democratic procedure.

During debate, Mr. Speaker, mention was made of shareholders in corporations having no voice in how or to whom political contributions are made. In making his amendment the Honourable Member for Assiniboia said, and I quote Page 774 of Hansard. "That same individual," (the union member) "is depending on his bread and butter at that place where he's working, which is a little different than a man in a corporation, because a decision is made on his behalf because he has shares in a certain corporation."

Earlier on, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and I am glad to see him in attendance this afternoon, saw nothing wrong in this practice, and according to the honourable member's statement on Page 708 of Hansard, he says it doesn't matter if a shareholder is not aware in detail of the disposition of his funds for political contributions. In other words, what he doesn't know doesn't hurt him.

The trade union movement does not operate on this premise. All members have full knowledge of where their money is going and why. They also have accorded the privilege, in the case of political contribution, of making up their own minds. Shareholders, Mr. Chairman, are not the only members of the public that are being hoodwinked into believing that they are not making political contributions to political parties. How much is the cost to the consumer of goods and services being affected by secret contributions made to political parties? And some contributions don't always remain secret, and I would say at least two members of this present House will remember the beer probe of 1956 -- and where is my friend from Souris-Killarney because this might interest him?

I have here, and I will quote from it, a copy of a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune dated April 4, 1956, and for the benefit of the honourable members I will read it into the record. The headline, as you can see: "Brewery Gifts are Revealed." A sub-head: "Say \$27,500 total in the past six years." The report then reads, and I shall read into the record: "Three Manitoba breweries today revealed that since 1950 they have made political contributions of \$27,500, nearly 60 percent of it to the government of that day, the Liberal Party. . . The CCF was the only party that emerged unscathed from the revelation. Made by the breweries on their own initiative, the surprise move made by D. A. Thompson, counsel for the breweries, upset the agenda of the Legislature's beer probe committee. At the last session of the committee, the whole question was labelled as a side issue and pushed to the bottom of the agenda by the then government majority. The figures tabled by Mr. Thompson show that contributions had been made to the Liberals, Conservatives and . . ." - where's my friend from Rhineland? ". . . the Social Creditors . . ." and also my friend from Churchill as an Independent. The Independents of that day also shared in the largesse - "and the Independents, by Sheas, Drewrys and Grants Breweries. He did not" - and this is referring to the counsel Mr. D. A. Thompson - "He did not reveal the names of the individual candidates who had benefitted from the donations. In his statement, Mr. Thompson said that the breweries had made political donations in the belief that it was beneficial to our system of government by party, and that they offer no apology."

And "The Breweries' challenge," a sub-head here: "The breweries we represent deny emphatically that they received favoured treatment from any political party or candidate as a result of any contribution they have made, and they challenge any person to prove the contrary."

(MR. JENKINS cont'd)

However, I think the next item is quite interesting: "The contributions made, he said, were the result of requests for such donations. The breweries did not volunteer the cash." And I think we've heard references to political bagmen and perhaps they had political bagmen in those days. "The contributions from 1950 to 1955 were shown as follows: Sheas Brewery Ltd., Winnipeg Brewery Ltd., Liberals \$8,100; Conservatives \$7,200; Social Credit" - my honourable friend from Rhineland - "Social Credit \$300.00. Drewrys Manitoba Division, Western Canada Breweries Limited - Liberals \$6,750; Conservatives \$3,500; Social Credit \$200.00; Independents \$200.00."

A MEMBER: Will the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JENKINS: When I am finished I will. "Grants Brewery Limited, Liberals received \$550; Conservatives \$200; Independents \$500.00. In addition, Mr. Thompson reported that Grants Brewery Limited, of which he is the president and also the counsel for all the breweries evidently, had made contributions from 1945 to 1949 as follows: Liberals \$650; Conservatives \$600; Social Credit \$25.00 and Independents \$50.00. In the same 1950-55 period, said Mr. Thompson, the same breweries paid out in community welfare and charitable contributions just under \$400,000. The figures were tabled, Mr. Thompson said, to dispel a widespread impression that breweries had spent very large sums in political contributions and these in turn had influenced brewery prices.

"The breweries feel that they are caught in the crossfire of political strategy and that a thorough impartial hearing of their position on the main issues of prices and profits cannot be in this aura of suspicion and political rivalry. Few people could be so naive as to deny that all political parties obtained a substantial part of their funds by requesting contributions from corporations, unions and individuals. It is a well established and recognized practice which no one can fail to acknowledge. The contributions" -- I am quoting Mr. Thompson. This is what he said. "The contributions, he said, were usually made to different parties in some relation to their size, house membership and the number of their candidates. The Breweries could not state that the contributions were for the use for political purpose in an election, as prohibited in the Manitoba Election Act, and did not know if the funds were actually received by the intended donee. The breweries do not believe that the Act prohibits contributions such as those made, Mr. Thompson said. They made no claim for legal privilege or protection in respect to the disclosure.

"On motion of F. E. Birch, Liberal, Norfolk - Beautiful Plains, the committee asked H. B. Monk, counsel for the Fort Garry Brewery, to table a list of contributions on behalf of his client. The Fort Garry Brewery was the only one omitted from Mr. Thompson's statement. The two other breweries, Kiewels, Pelissiers, and Brewery Products Limited, a beer distribution agency, were listed as making no political contributions since 1945. Mr. Monk told the committee the details were not immediately available but they would be compiled and submitted. He said that the firm had made contributions which were small in comparison with those revealed by the other breweries. These contributions might be considered part of the breweries' operating costs, one of the subjects being studied by the committee, Mr. Monk suggested. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Monk told the committee that the brewery they represent had also made contributions to political parties in the municipal and federal field. These donations, Mr. Thompson said, were small and had been shared by a larger number of political parties or groups. The breweries could not give complete information for the whole ten-year period, as requested by CCF leader Lloyd Stinson, because of the death of two persons having sole personal knowledge of the facts, the brewery counsel said.

"The committee deferred action for discussion on the disclosure until figures were received from Fort Garry Breweries Limited. Mr. Thompson said he did not disclose names because, in asking the information last week, Mr. Stinson said he had no desire to embarrass any particular candidate or MLA. He quoted opposition leader Duff Roblin as having said in a recent speech that government, not the breweries, is on trial. 'We are afraid that Mr. Roblin's attempt to place the government on trial may result in those breweries being injured without trial,' he said. Last week in Committee, Mr. Roblin said he had no knowledge of any brewery contribution to the Conservative Party since he became Leader in 1954. Mr. Thompson's statement listed a contribution of \$500.00 last year from each of Sheas and Drewrys.

"Now, just to give you a sum up of what the political beer pot was worth for this period,

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) here is the breakdown by parties of monies distributed by breweries as outlined to a Legislative committee today" and that was April 4, 1956 - "the Liberals received \$16,050; the Conservatives \$11,500; The Socreds \$525; The Independents \$750; the CCF nil, and the LPP nil, for a grand total of \$28,825.00."

A similar report, Mr. Speaker, appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of the same date and under the headline "Breweries bare gifts to three parties." It is significant to note that the then CCF party was not one of them. That's the end of the quote, Mr. Speaker.

The man in the beer parlour certainly was not aware that the price of his suds was being tapped for political purposes. This apparently is legal, although trade unions are frowned upon for making financial contributions, 5 cents a month per member, made freely and openly by a democratic process. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members of this House, let us look seriously at the election procedures in Sweden and in West Germany where the cost of elections are covered by the public treasury, and in an editorial by Bruce Hutchison in the Winnipeg Free Press dated Sept. 5, 1969, he quotes a statement - and I believe it was quoted here the other day but I'll reiterate it for you - quoted a statement made by Sir. Clifford Sifton, and I think he was a prominent Liberal politician of his day - made over 50 years ago, but, Mr. Speaker, it is just as relevant today. Sir Clifford said, and I quote: "If democracy is worth its price, then its first charge surely should be levied by a known and authorized formula on its beneficiary, the people as a whole. Campaign expenses for legitimate parties of all stripes should be paid out of taxes and should be taken from no other sources, and those who break the law and get money from other sources should be put in jail."

Mr. Speaker, I am against the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and I think I stated by reasons why. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and honourable members.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member a question? Is he against provisions of an anonymous opt-out or opt-in basis? I don't care which procedure is used, if it's opt-in or opt-out, but are you against anonymous procedure?

MR. JENKINS: If I could answer that question I would, but I don't know by what procedure, whether it be by law or any other, that you can have an anonymous opt-out. Perhaps the honourable member could explain what he -- I don't know and I doubt if anyone else in this House knows either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable member, could we have the articles that he read from tabled?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

A MEMBER: There's a request here.

MR. JENKINS: Is it a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): I didn't have a question. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the honourable members for Rhineland and Churchill be allowed to state their questions?

MR. FROESE: . . . request that the articles that he read from be tabled under the rules of the House.

A MEMBER: He read the whole speech.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the Member is required to table an article from a newspaper which he has identified. It is not a document which is not available to all of the members, and the member, if he wishes to see it, can get it from the library in the House. I doubt whether the rules would require the tabling of that document.

MR. FROESE: I think we are entitled to that under the rules.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I repeat. The Member would certainly be entitled to a document which was not available to him, but the member is reading from a newspaper article which is his own, which he has identified, which is available to every member in this House on the same basis as it was available to the member who spoke, and on that basis I submit that it need not be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill. Has the Honourable Member for Churchill a question?

MR. BEARD: I would just like to ask the member if he would advise the breweries that

(MR. BEARD cont'd) they are behind on their contributions to the Independent Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to dissociate myself from the remarks made by the former speaker in that I was not associated with Social Credit when those donations were made. Never during the time that I have been associated with it have we accepted contributions from the brewery.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. JENKINS: Might I reply, just to clear up a point, Mr. Speaker? If I inferred -- and I apologize -- if I inferred that the present Member for Rhineland was one of those who received political contributions, I am sorry if I created that impression. I said there were only two members in this present House who would recall. There are -- to my knowledge, the Honourable the Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose are the only two members who were present in the House as it was constituted in 1956 who are in the House today in 1969.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Could he give us the name of the author of the article and the newspaper that he quoted from?

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, newspapers in Winnipeg have all their past copy filed on microfilm. If any member wishes -- there is no author on here; I would imagine it was one of the staff writers of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Could the honourable member provide us with the name of the newspaper and the date?

MR. JENKINS: The name of the paper is the Winnipeg Tribune and the date of it, Wednesday, April 4th, 1956, also the Winnipeg Free Press dated Winnipeg, Wednesday, April 4th, 1956.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a member has made a request for the document to be tabled and according to the rules of our House, this is required on request. -- (Interjection) -- Well it has just been stated that there's only two members in this House when that newspaper article was written and I would think that after a member has made a speech and used quotations, and by the rules he's required to table on request, that he should comply with the request rather than put 30 or 40 members to the trouble of digging back ten years in the files of the paper. The request has been made, Mr. Speaker, and I leave it to you as to whether or not you rule that it should be complied with by the rules.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, the member -- I'm not quite sure whether he has quoted the rule but I would like to know what rule he is referring to which says that on request any document must be tabled.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker . . . I would suggest that the honourable member was out of order in quoting from the newspaper to the extent that he did, particularly that he could not give us the editor's name, and I think the request being asked for a paper that's sixteen years old is reasonable.

SOME MEMBERS: Right.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . by the Honourable Member the Leader of the Liberal Party could be reserved by you and we can go on with the business of the House and if, in due course, you decide that it should be filed, then the honourable member can be requested to do so when you arrive at your decision. I don't think that the time of the House need be delayed to debate whether or not he'll do it when you can arrive at your decision in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: I will reserve decision on the request for the tabling of the documents referred to and offer my decision when I have arrived at it.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got a long speech and thank goodness, I haven't got a bunch of statistics because I think this just gets you into a lot of trouble. But what I do think I have is some common sense, and I think that's really all that's necessary to decide this thing. It's all that's necessary to decide this thing. A man should not have to identify himself whether he's for or not. This thing of bringing it up, "why didn't the other person change it when they were in power," that's all nonsense. You just need to answer the question. If you're aboveboard and want to act this way, surely there's nothing wrong with this. All you need to do is not to compare to Sweden or to West Germany or do anything else like that, just use a little soul-searching on your own part and see if you wouldn't be better to pass this thing. If you people take donations from people without their consent or making them opt out, this will haunt you the rest of the days you're in power, and you wait and see.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on one occasion prior to the amendment being made to the resolution. I rise only in the hopes that there are a few sensitive souls on the members opposite that will appreciate the difference between opting out of the Book of the Month Club, or indeed even opting out of a professional organization, to the difference of declaring oneself in those very few areas -- and there are a few areas -- where the preservation of privacy are in fact fundamental and important, and I suggest politics is one of them. I suggest, as I suggested in my speech before, that the area of one's personal means is very important to members opposite when you're talking about the pros and cons of a means test, the demeaning act that that puts a person through. I suggest that perhaps the person of one's religious background, or indeed ethnic background, when it refers to employment opportunities and so forth. I suggest there are only two or three important areas where the matter of personal privacy is of fundamental importance to personal liberty and freedom, as members opposite often like to expound on. And to have an otherwise reasonably literate gentleman like the Member from Elmwood tell us on this side of the House that there is little or no difference between opting out of a Book of the Month Club or declaring one's politics, gentlemen that begs a question and I remind your consciences of it every once in a while and I would expect a response from some of you on that. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is before us has to do with opting out rather than with opting in as the original motion proposes, and I certainly was quite in favour of the original motion and I do not subscribe to the opting-out feature that is being proposed here. I feel that the onus should not be put on the member who does not want to participate, to opt out. I think it should be the other way around, as the original motion proposes, that he opt in if he so desires. I find that we have opting-out provisions in too much of our legislation at the present time. I know of various organizations that are chartered under provincial law who have this provision and yet I do not like it because in so many instances it requires a great detail, dates have to be remembered, notices have to be given by registered mail and so on, otherwise they are not recognized, and I don't think that this is proper. I feel that I cannot support the amendment, that I will support the original motion if the amendment is lost.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. FOX: In the absence of the honourable Minister could we have the matter stand -- the next resolution too?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The following resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in the name of the Attorney-General. Stand? (Agreed.)

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't like a resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill to go by without some note from the government. This would be a pretty grave situation, especially when he's seated so close to us here. Mr. Speaker, the resolution, I feel, has admirable intention and I see no reason that the government would not be in a position to support this resolution. It expresses a genuine concern about what I would gather to be a lack of communication in the past, which I would gather would be under the regime of the previous government, with the representatives of the people of the Port of Churchill, Townsite of Churchill. I think that this has been only typical of a general problem of a lack of communication in many of the northern areas with peoples who have attempted to work out their own affairs and yet they do feel that they have not been successful in obtaining the type of communication that they feel they deserve from the central government, and since, Mr. Speaker, it is our expressed view that open government is a principle of an advanced and a progressive government, and since we feel that in communication the final decisions will be more meaningful and more effective insofar as everybody is concerned, I see no reason that we are unable to develop consultation with the people of Churchill.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

I think that there has been an area of consultation in the past. I think officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs have attempted at various times to bring in different people in the Town of Churchill into their discussions. I gather from the Honourable Member for Churchill that, although they have introduced them into discussions, that too often it has been after decisions and plans have been already arrived at and certainly this is not the proper way of doing it. So, though this does involve the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in negotiations, I see no reason why we should certainly not welcome a consideration of the problem expressed by the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BEARD: . . . and I think the honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member be closing debate?

MR. BEARD: I'm sorry.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the page boy could bring the resolution back I'd be pleased to . . .

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia,

WHEREAS all aspects of northern development calls for air transportation, and

WHEREAS regional air transportation responsibilities are not firmly established and,

WHEREAS many local isolated communities with thousands of people depend entirely on air transportation for community development, health, freight and passenger services.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this government consider the advisability of:

- (a) The review of present policies and responsibilities of Manitoba regional air carriers,
- (b) The review of charter air carrier policies and services relating to northern isolated communities,
- (c) Consider the advisability of provincial governments requesting voting representation on the Department of Transport's board issuing licences within the province,
- (d) An annual public review of northern air services to be held in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out that probably entering this debate I will lose the opportunity of flying home this weekend, but that's my contribution to northern transportation.

Since I will be touching on air transportation in respect to the north and since I will be touching on and naming many of the companies that are providing this transportation, I would like to make two or three things abundantly clear before we get into the real heart of this problem. First of all, I am not going to condemn private enterprise or a company which cannot defend itself in this House just for the sake of taking advantage of publicity, because fortunately we have nobody up in the gallery so this is a discussion between you and I and members of this Legislature.

I think that we must also take into consideration the fact that when we are discussing private enterprise in respect to northern transportation, that we must remember that those companies have the monopoly, in fact have a franchise on public services, and I believe this is the important point that we must keep in mind. It's a private enterprise with a monopoly on a public service and I believe this puts them in the position where they should be, have their services debated within this House, because I make it abundantly clear right now that what I have to say is the feeling that has come out of the north because of the problems that Northerners have been involved with in respect to air transportation. On the other hand, northern Manitoba was opened by air transportation and we, as people in the north, pay our respects to those who pioneered in the air transportation business, but we also say to you

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . today, in this modern age of 1969, that air transportation should get out of the pioneer stage and get into modern facilities.

I have moved this resolution on northern air transportation to not only emphasize its importance but to bring to light its present weakness, along with an honest attempt to try and initiate changes by private enterprise . . . the Federal Government agencies and their obsolete policies. If I am irresponsible for introducing this open discussion, as it has been indicated, then I would have to admit to this House that I am not in tune with the wishes or the thinking of the people of northern Manitoba. My personal qualifications are, first, I live in northern Manitoba; secondly, I have spent my share - in fact a few thousand dollars - on air transportation in northern Manitoba, and I have looked very closely to the brief presented to the air transportation here in Thompson a year or so ago. At this time I will start to mention a few names, and it was at this transportation hearing that first of all got me really involved in what does come about, because we have had problems with TransAir just as Gillam had problems with Midwest, and at that time TransAir decided that they would want to include Gillam in their Churchill run, and to offset this, apparently, Midwest said, "This is fine and dandy. We want a service to Thompson." And at that time, the president of Midwest had approached the Chamber of Commerce and a number of us in Thompson, and said that if they could get our support - and this includes the unions, the people in Thompson - that they were prepared to come to Thompson and pick up the people, take them back via Gillam to Winnipeg and compete - and I think this must be kept in mind - and compete with TransAir on a direct route to Winnipeg. And this is the first time that I have ever heard any air transportation company talking about competing on prices. That, Mr. Speaker, would have been a wonderful point in as far as Thompson and northern Manitoba and Gillam were concerned, because they would have had competitive regional service.

But this is not to be brought about, because the lawyers argued all that day, and the next day, lo and behold, they both came back to the hearing and said, "We have come to an agreement in our hotel room overnight and we have decided that we will both withdraw our applications for service," so that Midwest withdrew an application to service Thompson and, in return, TransAir decided to withdraw their application to Gillam. And why? Why, Mr. Speaker? It has been indicated to me that at that time a company by the name of Preswich in New York was financing both of the regional air carrier services and it would indicate that the finance company was making the decision - and this is my own premise, I don't know whether it's right, but I am pretty sure it is because they are a fairly large company and the brother -- there are two brothers; one's president of the finance company and the other brother is president of one of the largest air services in the United States.

I have read a study prepared by the Air Transport Board, by K. V. Stedicki Ginsberg called the Regional Air Carrier's Problem, and this is one of the documents which I obtained from the Queen's Printer - and rather than having to table this, I would suggest that if any members want it they can go down and pay \$1.50 the same as I did.

I understand it is 5:30. If we could call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I could probably still catch TransAir before I really say what I think about it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for Churchill has a point, that maybe we can get him up to the north by catching TransAir. We have no objection, but if you would permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that it would be the intention, and it will be on Votes and Proceedings, to call the Committee on Law Amendments for Tuesday morning at 9:30, at which time we will continue hearing deliberations with respect to the Fisheries Act and other related bills, and I want to say, to apologize to some degree for my ignorance in not recalling that Monday is Yom Kippur, one of the most important religious days insofar as the Jewish fraternity is concerned. I am sure that members of the House may have received representations from some of the members of the Jewish fraternity. I have assured them as much as it is possible for me to do so that the bill itself will not be progressed to a degree that their representations will not be heard, so if any member has this drawn to their attention over the weekend, I would appreciate it if they would say to them there is no endeavour on the part of myself as House Leader, or the government, finalizing the bill on Monday, Law Amendments will be called for 9:30 on Tuesday, at which time they will have the opportunity of making representations.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . off the hook.

MR. PAULLEY: You don't have to take me off the hook at all, Mr. Speaker - the fish

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) hook. May I suggest that as far as fish hooks are concerned, that my friend the Member for Souris-Killarney gets out with his fish hook and enjoy the weekend.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the House Leader a question. Are we still having Law Amendments as listed in the Votes and Proceedings? It's still on at 9:30 on Monday morning?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. Law Amendments will still go on at 9:30 in the morning, Mr. Speaker. I move the House now adjourn, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House was adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.