

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, June 9, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 49 students, Grade 11 standing, of the Sisler High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Shaw. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

We also have 31 students, Grade 5 and 6 standing, of the Sanford and Mafeking Schools. (Sanford is the host, Mafeking is the guest.) These students are under the direction of Miss Brooks, who is the host. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris, the host school, and the Honourable Member for Swan River, the guest.

There are 75 students, Grade 9 standing, of the John Pritchard Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Fershau, Mr. Gurney and Miss Plowman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the First Minister.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 62, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3); and Bill No. 71, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (4).

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 60, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act; and Bill No. 69, The Co-operative Association Loans and Loans Guarantee Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson) introduced Bill No. 64, an Act to validate By-laws Nos. 70-22 and 71-15 of The Rural Municipality of East St. Paul. (Second reading Friday next)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the contract for the construction and control of Lake Winnipeg has been awarded by Manitoba Hydro?

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the House a week to ten days ago, when the bids were received the lowest bid was singled out of course and a check was made as to the suitability of the equipment, machinery belonging to the lowest bidder. The technical officers of Manitoba Hydro satisfied themselves as to the adequacy of the machinery and letter of intent was proceeded with, purchase orders were placed and the contract has been awarded.

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask whether the First Minister can indicate when the next meeting of Public Utilities Committee will be held?

MR. SCHREYER: Some time next week, I suppose, Mr. Speaker - the earliest possible next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I should like to direct my question to the House Leader and ask him if he could advise the House how many more bills we can expect to receive before the Session ends?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I know that there are still some to come. I'll have to take the question as notice to give my honourable friend a better estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder would the transcripts of the Public Utility Committee debate be available to members of the House before we debate it on third reading?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Member for Roblin for

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) clarification as to what is to be read on third reading; it's not clear to me.

MR. McKENZIE: For the information of the First Minister, I'm not a member of the committee and I'm wondering, could we have the transcript of the debates that are in there before we get into third reading in the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, third reading of what?

MR. McKENZIE: Before the report is brought into the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh well, yes, of course, Mr. Speaker, before there's a motion moved in this House for the adoption of the report, I rather suspect that all of the transcript will be available; in fact I think that assurance can be given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. Some time ago I asked him if he would make his decision public or disclose in the House the position that the government would be taking or proposing or putting forward at the constitutional conference; will the Minister table the position that the government will be taking at the constitutional conference?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's been a request by the Federal Government which I understand all provinces have agreed with, that the documentation relative to the conference be kept confidential and released subsequent to the conference, I presume.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. He mentioned the other day it's his desire to make the MDC loans public information, and would he undertake to make this current instead of one year; because when we do get the report it's almost one year late. Would he make it current or would he undertake to make it, say, on a quarterly basis?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Chairman, I will be making a statement on this matter during my estimates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTION FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter referred to Private Members' Day? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill 36, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might say that I was very sorry that I could not be here last week when the Minister of Urban Affairs presented Bill No. 36, but I have had the opportunity to read his comments; I have also had the opportunity to read the comments of my colleagues. Certainly I will not try to repeat them, but I may have to emphasize some of the remarks that they have made.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance in his close to opening remarks said: "This is a proud day for Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, if this bill is rammed through as the government wishes it to be, -- (Interjection) -- and it will, that's the attitude of the government -- it will be the darkest day in probably the history of this province and for the people of the province.

The Minister is running true to form by creating tax shifts again that will shift people out of this province and I am sure when this bill has gone through he will be bragging as he has over the other tax shifts that he made the greatest change in the Winnipeg area, but I am sure that history will prove that his change will be disastrous for all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 36 should not even be introduced at this time, and the reasons for that -- there has been no counsel with any people in the Greater Winnipeg area -- and when I say no counsel, I have made checks, Mr. Speaker, and find that in most local municipalities and cities, the treasurers, engineers, city clerks, recreation directors, police chiefs, fire chiefs and many others, have never had the opportunity to sit down and discuss how this bill would work or how it would be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there are intelligent people in civic affairs in the City of Winnipeg and in the Province of Manitoba, and I am sure they are much more knowledgeable than the people

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) that have written the principle of this bill or the government's proposals in the White Paper; but it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of this bill was written, I suggest, by people from outside of this province who have had no experience in civic affairs in this area. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as one person told me who had read this bill, with the set-up of community committees and councils, it's not unlike the City of Moscow. -- (Interjection) -- Right - only they call themselves that.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister at this time when he speaks out as he has in Hansard that he's had letters from the Netherlands, and he's had comments from people from all over the country, what a marvellous thing he's doing, I suggest, Sir, that his answer should be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hate to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but I think the undertones are having a war with the overtones and I can't hear what the honourable member is saying. Would everyone kindly observe our rule? Thank you.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure they want to hear me, Sir.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Sir, the answer to these people by the Minister should have been that because of weather, geographic, economic conditions and people in general, that no two areas are alike, and those who want to have knowledge of how to have people participate more in the governing of their city should get the information from their own city. I don't say that he shouldn't tell them the plan, but I assure you no two areas are alike. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that those people in this area who have a far greater knowledge than anybody on that side in civic affairs in this province have been completely ignored by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister keeps clouding the issue of Bill 36. He keeps referring to the urban problems that are in southern areas; he keeps referring to the transportation problems that we will have; he keeps referring to the urban sprawl - and I agree there are problems; and I also agree with the Minister that we must build for the future. He has tried to cloud the issue by creating the impression that Greater Winnipeg is in terrible condition, which it is not. He refers to bickering between Metro and the area of municipalities - and that has been 90 per cent between the Mayor of Winnipeg and Metro. If the City Council of the City of Winnipeg had spoken for the City of Winnipeg I assure you there would have been much more harmony. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is also forgetting that it is a fact that when a local council represents the people of that city before a senior government on their behalf it is a healthy situation. There is nothing wrong with the Mayor and councillors coming before a senior government as elected members of those people; those people have usually come before the council asking to be heard and asking to be represented, and it is the council's duty to represent the people before senior governments, and that, Sir, as I said, is a healthy situation.

He leaves the impression that local councillors are ineffective and not giving good service. Mr. Speaker, the Minister says "not true", but certainly when he has talked about the services in different areas not being good, he leaves that impression. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, services in most areas in the Greater Winnipeg area are good. Services from the aldermen and elected members in that area are good and certainly from the administration people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if a person desires to live in an area, that's his own business; if he desires to have gravel roads or ditches, that's his own business; if he desires to pay taxes for better services, here again that's his own business. Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that when this bill is put into effect - and I certainly hope it isn't - everybody will have to pay the same and certainly they will expect the same services, and I'd like to say, pay the same whether they like it or not, Mr. Speaker.

All this . . . to pass a bill that will not create a good way of life in this city or help the future of its growth! In fact, Mr. Speaker, Bill 36 will be like scrambling 12 eggs and it will take many years to straighten the situation out. The Minister obviously doesn't realize that the implementation of this bill, as fast as they are trying to ram it through, that there are problems in many cities. One problem, I would say, is the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. James-Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, are the only two that have a general levy. Every other city has local improvement levies that will certainly have to be straightened. And they have to be straightened out, Mr. Speaker; the Minister is only kidding himself if he thinks they don't have to be. I know. I've been through two amalgamations and so has the Attorney-General.

The problems that arose from amalgamation between St. James and Assiniboia to create the City of St. James-Assiniboia seemed few but I assure you they kept coming up for two years

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) after. The implementation of this bill by the end of December 1971 is next to impossible. It can't be done because the elections will only be over in September and although the Minister stated in his report that he is working out the financial problems because he has the budgets, again this is false. There's no way, there is absolutely no way, Mr. Speaker, you can budget for 1972 on an amalgamated city using the budgets for 1971; unless the salaries of the people in the area all remain the same, and that, Sir, I will mention later, is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister with his CTC which was "Cherniack's Travelling Circus", went about the city trying to sell the proposal or a bill of goods but the people weren't fooled. He tried to say that it would cost less, and it won't; it'll be more. And he would say during those meetings you know, "if you're in Chicago, where do you say you live?" Real whale of a selling point, Mr. Speaker! That little ditty of a selling point is not enough to say to the man who is visiting in West Kildonan when he says, I live in St. Vital. I like living there. I like my government there. I like my recreation there, and it's my business and my choice that I live there. And if the Minister has any conception - or I should say, if the MLA that was elected in the St. Vital by-election, has any conception whatsoever that the people of St. Vital want amalgamation, he's only talked to one-third of the people. Because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I canvassed in that area and everybody, 66 percent said we don't want to be amalgamated. That's the way they voted, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) - Nonsense? -- (Interjection) -- That's right. The nonsense, rubbish, statements, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden are spreading from that political hack, Cass-Beggs, who was brought in.

Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- That's right. What about this person who is in West Kildonan and St. Vital? He has his rights. Are we now going to get rid of the competitive spirit we've always had in this city? Are we going to take a city that grew over 100 years' time the way it did? I will grant you, Mr. Speaker, if this was Calgary or Edmonton - and I say no two districts are alike - but they pretty well grew as one city, and you can accomplish that, but to take this city, with all the charges involved in local levies, tree planting, taxes, anything you want to put forth, and do it in one fell swoop, is sheer lunacy.

The Minister spent, according to Hansard, what I would say close to three pages to create the impression that this bill is not total amalgamation. Mr. Speaker, he can't sell that either. It is total amalgamation. He spent a lot of time saying the community committees would give the people more active role in the local government, and this is wrong, Mr. Speaker. He can't sell that either. I will go into that a little better in a very short time.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 36 will introduce party politics into the civic scene and this is wrong. It's already happening, Sir. There are meetings going on all over the city. I would say that I'll get the usual type of chatter about CEC but only the NDP party caucuses before meetings of city council. When I was on the local council - and I still am in St. James-Assiniboia - I assure you when the Minister of Municipal Affairs' father, Mr. Pawley voted one way, the Attorney-General voted with him and vice versa. The party politics in our cities have not been there between the other two parties and shouldn't be, but this will create it. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that I would challenge the Attorney-General to say there were party politics in the St. James-Assiniboia Council.

Mr. Speaker, the committee chairman and members of the committee will form a Cabinet in the new government and I assure you that the commissioners under this bill will rule the City of Winnipeg or the Greater Winnipeg area. There is no way that the power of the commissioners is not ultimate. We haven't gone as long as we have, Mr. Speaker, in the Greater Winnipeg area to now be controlled by a management committee instead of elected peoples and that's what will happen in this bill. In fact they're already jockeying for the job. The communities committees, Mr. Speaker, will have no power. They are an unstructured organization with no clear terms of reference and can serve no purpose so in time they will be dropped because of lack of interest. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. All financial decisions will be made, Sir, at the 50-man council level and as the Minister took two pages after the Member for Rhineland asked a question to explain how the budgets would be made up and they would be made up at the local level by the elected community members on the advice and concert of the community committees and then it would go up to the big 50-man council, be looked at, sent back and that was the budget you would live with. --(Interjection) -- Complicated? Mr. Speaker, you could take a car apart piece by piece easier.

Sir, let me tell you what'll happen in community councils. The people will come forward

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) into the meetings with many requests at first. Let me tell you what the request from the community clubs council in St. James-Assiniboia was, where there's 14 clubs, and there are absolutely no elected members on that. It was \$265,000. We had 170,000 to spend. And when this happens it goes down and the people will want, I assure you, when the community committee comes in they will say, We want a new arena - which they would have had in West Kildonan if the Minister hadn't cut it off. We would have had more recreation in St. James-Assiniboia if the Minister hadn't cut it off. We will want all of these things. They will say bridges, new roads, more baseball diamonds, hockey rinks and swimming pools, and you'll get that budget up in the 50-man council and you'll cut it. You'll have to cut it or the mill rate the first year will go to 100. There's no way around it. -- (Interjection) -- That is correct. That is correct. But when the community council gets this budget back and this goes on, year after year, or time after time, the first year, they won't come back; they will lose interest. -- (Interjection) -- That's right; they did in St. James. They will lose interest. They will also find that their elected members will be part of a political organization and unless they are on the right side they won't have much of a hope, and to represent themselves, they'll have to be standing in front of a 50-man council. And I'm really, really impressed when the Minister insinuates or says this 50-man council - in fact, I don't think he said it, that's why I say "insinuates" - but the 50-man council will have to be worried about tree planting; he'll have to be worried about the tree pruners from Saskatchewan, I guess; he'll have to be worried about chips out of curbs, that didn't get done or cut out of the budget, Mr. Speaker, and I assure you they will not have these hearings. They may have them but they will take a month at least to get anything done.

These things are the things that are close to people. They pay their taxes. They don't owe us anything and the city shouldn't owe them anything, they should have the return for their money. And that's all a local alderman is there to do, is give service and administrate the people's money.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has often said, the greatest benefit to local government is they can act when a situation arises for the benefit of the people. They won't be able to act for the benefit of the people when you have to be responsible to a 50-man council if you get your budget cut, and I assure you, you will.

If there has to be changes from one budget to another to help the people, this won't happen overnight. In fact, you can't even do it now, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 9 doesn't allow you. -- (Interjection) -- No. No.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how he, especially him, the Attorney-General could change his mind. For six years on council I was with him, hearing him preach the benefits of local council, the benefits of being able to make decisions and the benefits to do things for people and against total amalgamation. I suggest he hasn't got the guts of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to give his opinions to the First Minister. In fact, the people of his constituency are wondering if he's the same man.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education got sold a bill of goods during the election time while sharing headquarters with the Minister of Urban Affairs. That's the only place I can say he did a selling job. He did a good one, because the Minister of Education was firmly convinced that total amalgamation of this city was wrong. The Minister of Labour, although he's not here, well knows the services civic election people give to an area. The Premier has changed his mind and his original thinking. We had the bulletin read by the Member from Assiniboia, and I have read the bulletin where he says that the Ottawa proposed plan is probably one of the best, and that's basically what the Boundaries Report works to. But of course we're getting very used to the First Minister changing his mind. It's a thing of fact around this Legislature at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, there will be increased costs. There will be increased costs in the elected members' income. The job that is placed before them in Bill 36 is such that they will have to work at it full time. -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not against it; if the man is doing the job, pay him. But I suggest to you that he will become more of a political animal than the man who is an alderman at the present time. He will be worried about elections every time because it's his living. He'll be simply worried that he is always doing the right thing in the ward that he's in for the people that would vote for him. You hit the table for a reason; you didn't want to hear the last part - for the people that vote for him. No local alderman or no ward man should take the responsibility upon himself to just be responsible to a ward of the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) people that vote for him; all cities should be like St. James-Assiniboia and a man should run at large because those are the problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Logan is making some comments and part of his constituency was never better off until they joined us. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. That's right. Mr. Speaker, there will be subsidies to the areas that have to have their taxes raised. Now isn't that just dandy? Here we are, we're needing money for education; here we are needing money for welfare - although the Minister spends it like water; here we are needing money in just about every area of this province and the Minister of Urban Affairs is suggesting subsidies to communities who don't want any damn part of it. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the subsidies on the basis that this bill is unnecessary and shouldn't go through.

Mr. Speaker, in this little Hansard we have here, the Minister suggests that the big council and its committees will take over December 1, 1972 and they will decide about the salaries. They may put people in categories or place them in different areas. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, I don't mean that. I mean that what she has said is you will have categories, you will have, maybe the firemen making less in Fort Garry than St. James-Assiniboia or Winnipeg. This will be up to the decision-making of the big council.

Mr. Speaker, I remember being on television with the Honourable Minister when he suggested or approached the same type of an answer as saying it would be left the same and I started to say to him before they cut the program off - you're kidding. Do you mean to tell me we're going to have one assessment? We're going to have one financial control. We're going to have one great big large council and you're going to pay them differently December 1st, 1972? I assure you, you don't know what you're saying. You're being unfair. I don't like the bill, I don't like your idea, but if you do it you're being downright unfair not to bring those people up. Are you going to pay the elected members different, because the elected man from Fort Garry should get less if the fireman from Fort Garry gets less. Let's be fair to the people if you're going to push them into it. Qualifications, I can speak on that. So can the Attorney-General. -- (Interjection) -- I couldn't speak on yours, you're not qualified. You've never been part of any civic government in your life and if I were to read back to you what you said in 1967 regarding Metro you'd be shocked. I don't have it with me but I assure you I'll get it.

Mr. Speaker, you can't amalgamate this city without bringing the salaries in line and I assure you when that happens, the project of Mr. Elswood Bole, who I would say has more knowledge in civic government in this area than anybody, certainly more than the people that the Minister has brought in to work on this thing, says that it will cost 17 to 18 million dollars, and he is right. I have the figures from Mr. Bole, they were printed in the paper. The paper clipping? I'll see that you get it, Sir. I said \$17 million; I'll get it from the paper. You probably have it. He doesn't like to admit it. -- (Interjection) -- He can't prove that it won't. -- (Interjection) -- Now we're going to throw this great big city. 500,000 people into a mess that you can't even prove. Oh by the way, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Minister to ask Mr. Elswood Bole to come with his charts and explain it to their caucus. -- (Interjection) -- Did he come? I will ask him myself. I will do. Maybe he'll take the grin off the Honourable Member from St. Matthews face. Mr. Speaker, I, -- (Interjection) -- That's not a very nice statement at the present time, Sir. In fact it's a lousy statement. I consider where it came from. I would like to say, Sir, that amalgamation, centralization is proving in the southern cities to be ineffective and inefficient. Bigness is costing more money in the North American continent than anything else we have. It is costing a lack of closeness with local people which is probably the most important.

Mr. Speaker, the Boundaries Commission Report - and I call it a report, I don't call it a suggestion - deserves better treatment than it got. It was presented to the government I believe around September of 1970; the local area municipalities received it around the first part of November. The members of Legislature on the Opposition got it the end of December, and in the meantime we had a White Paper proposal come from the government. They said the Boundaries Commission Report was a political document made up by Conservatives so they threw it over their shoulder. They said it said nine cities and it didn't. It was a report that suggested nine cities was the most economical, and it was just a report. It was passed off as expediency to make way for this White Paper on the basis that they tore it down that it was nine cities, but it was made up by a group of people who researched and studied. But the significant part of it is, Sir, is this government doesn't like having hearings of any kind, as

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.)we find on Lake Winnipeg and Hydro. In fact they even go so far as to break the law not to have them.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read from the Statutes of 1966 Page 368, "An Act to establish a Commission to recommend the reorganization of Boundaries in Local Government Units" and Section 13 says " Hold hearings. Subject to Section 15 after preparing the provisional plan and making the provisional report the Commission shall hold public hearings at such places and time as it may determine, and the Commission shall hear any person desiring to make representations to it with respect to the territory to be included in the boundaries of the proposed local government unit." And that, Sir, is still in force, it has never been repealed and not everybody in the Boundaries Commission has resigned and the Boundaries Commission is still in effect. Mr. Speaker, that is just flouting the law of this province.

The Boundaries Commission Report is probably Utopia compared to the White Paper. If it were implemented, as I say it would be Utopia, at a low cost instead of a mess that we have before us today at a high cost. The Minister talks about history. I would like to talk about history and say to him and this government, that you will move this province back to the postage stamp province it was years ago. The City of Winnipeg will have many more than half of the people of this province in it in time and I assure you the years that have gone by to build up the good relations with the rural area and give them the feeling that they weren't left out, will be gone. You will be sitting with a Legislature in the City of Winnipeg that can lean heavily on the Golden Boy at any time and I assure you, Sir, it will happen and the people in the rural areas of Manitoba will suffer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Sir. With everything that is wrong with this bill, Sir, and as much as I dislike it, if the government would set a Legislative Committee to hear the good and the bad and study it, study the best way to implement it without doing it in three months by putting it in scrambled eggs - and I'm sure the Minister is now saying I'm asking to wait another year. But I assure you, Sir, that the Treasurer, the people in the largest city of this area are saying it can't be done, it can't be implemented. They're wondering how it's going to be done, but it'll be done the way the Minister says because you got to do it his way in this province. Mr. Speaker, the bill is of a size that should take a year. The people I have talked to that are knowledgeable about Federal affairs, when a bill this size is presented, it usually goes to a committee of the Legislature set up to study it and hear people, to work on its implementation and what have you. But I know what we'll have, we'll have the same as 56, we'll have a bunch of amendments thrown at us when we walk in and when we finish clause by clause we'll say now we've got two hours to study them.

Mr. Speaker, this government is ramming this bill down. The only reason for pursuing it, the only reason I can think of for pursuing it with all its faults is to take absolute control and more control over the people of this province. And they will try. And they laugh. They laugh because they try to throw people off with their laughter but it's happening every day. I assure you, Sir, that the City of Winnipeg at the present time, after ten years of Metro and the studies that have been made, we know our mistakes, we can sit down and iron them out properly, we can look at all the proposals that have been brought before us, and we can by making some small changes to the Metro Act, because the two-tier system is the best, and also Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Minister's idea about urban sprawl is completely backwards. To work with the planners of Metro, or the head planner of Metro who is trying to put everybody in a small area and even as it grows, keep putting them in that area is a concept that is wrong. It's a concept that's being thrown out. As long as there is zoning, we may even take over another five or six miles of this big city but you still have to have your local government and your local representation. You must have your zoning, you must have your planning, you must have your assessments, etc., you must have all of these things, Sir, in two-tier government or regional government. And I assure you, once you iron out the responsibilities of both - which can be done after ten years experience - you will have a situation in this city if it's properly studied and done right, better than the damned mess this bill is putting it into. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Would the honourable member submit to a few questions? Firstly, has he had the benefit to have of any of the background calculation figures that may have added up to the estimated 17 or 18 million dollar figure stated by Mr. Bole?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I have seen his charts, I have gone over his charts and everything with him. I've seen his presentation, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat again, I have more confidence in Elswood Bole regarding civic affairs in this province than I have in the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The honourable member has not seen any of the calculations that support that figure; is that correct?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if he's asking me if I've seen the book where they added it up and divided it backwards and forwards, no. But the Minister likes to get a yes or a no; it's his legal training.

MR. CHERNIACK: Another question, Mr. Speaker. Does the honourable member accept the principle that regardless of which employer, which municipal employer a man has he should receive equal pay for equal qualifications and equal responsibilities?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If you amalgamate the city, yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the corollary then would be that if you don't amalgamate the city, unify the services, then he does not believe that there should be equal pay for equal work with equal qualifications?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, I agree with the Attorney-General on that when he was Chairman of the Police Commission in St. James-Assiniboia, he didn't agree either; but if you amalgamate the whole city, yes. Let's talk about your argument . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C., (Attorney-General) (St. James): I wonder if the honourable member will answer my question now. Do you recall in your remarks indicating the operation of the community committee and its operation in respect to a proposed budget and you gave an example of a recreation budget. Is it not a fact that the Recreation Board for which you are now Chairman, and when you were then a member, presented an extensive budget to the City Council of St. James-Assiniboia and had that budget arbitrarily reduced by a substantial percentage and then the Recreation Board had to go back to the various community councils involved and rationalize that budget? Now that's the very process which you attacked. Is that not so?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General has a short memory. On the Recreation Commission in St. James-Assiniboia, to answer him, as he well knows there are four citizen members and four elected councillors and the deciding vote will be by an elected member. Certainly let's not play around with words, budgets are cut even in this government, but you will depress the people in the community committees this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit another question. Does he consider Mr. Jim McInnis to be a man knowledgeable in Municipal Affairs in Greater Winnipeg?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, very knowledgeable I assure you but there is more than one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a comment in the debate. I think it's clear that there's going to be a number of people speaking from the Opposition, if not indeed every one, and there are a number of points that have been raised by Opposition members that I think bear commenting on. I know my colleague, the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs, will indeed comment on them but I want to put a few personal views on the record.

The Member for Lakeside spoke I think last week, I believe last Friday, and was quite concerned about what he regarded as a growing trend towards bigness and he didn't really appear to offer any solutions for it. He simply emphasized the fact that the urban area was growing and emphasized the fact that there was a greater population and an ultimate shift in political power and he was concerned that this might upset the concern of the Provincial Government with some of the rural problems. Mr. Speaker, I think that the fact that the urban areas are growing throughout Canada and throughout North America and throughout the world in fact is an irreversible trend and that there is no way in which any government can reverse that tendency even if a government believed that that were a desirable tendency; I think that the only method that one could consider would simply be ruled out automatically. It's simply impossible to build a wall around a growth centre or to adopt a policy that would in effect harm

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . a growing centre, to provide it, for example, with a few financial resources, to make certain that the services and transportation and recreation were inadequate to see to it that the financial base necessary for a city to deal with the problems of welfare, unemployment, crime, jobs and so on, would simply in effect be too cruel a policy to even think about. So when my honourable friend expresses his concern for the fact that people are moving to Winnipeg he offers us no solution, because I suppose one of the solutions would have been to stop the process of mechanization that has gone on in the farming areas of the province; I think this is one of the reasons why the people who are outside of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area have been coming into the Winnipeg areas, partly because of the use of machinery and the fact that fewer people are required in some of the occupations which were able to support a larger number of people in terms of employment. The food production has gone up and some of the labour needs have gone down, and the result is that people have left parts of Manitoba and gone to the growth centres and in particular have come into the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. I think this is quite different than our sister Province of Saskatchewan which has smaller cities and I think an accelerated population loss where people have gone from Saskatchewan and often have gone to other larger cities.

I ask the Member for Lakeside whether he believes that - he was the one actually who claimed that the urban programs were at rural expense, and I really think that that statement does not hold water, that he contended that in the past or in the future that the rest of the province would subsidize the Metropolitan Winnipeg area, and I think if one were to look at the statistics, at least in terms of the past, and I know that the people in the Metropolitan government have made the case that a good portion of the tax dollar that is collected in the capital is sent out throughout the province. I don't argue against that; I think that you take from the stronger areas and you try to help support some of the services, some of industry throughout the province; but I certainly don't think that the reverse is true.

The Member for Roblin made the same statement in saying that we were attempting to make urban life more attractive, and again what is the alternative? Are we to deliberately attempt in a policy to make the urban area less attractive? That seems to follow from his statement. He advised the rural members to vote against the bill, and by his own logic I suppose he should have encouraged people in his own party who represent urban seats to vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the other comment that I wanted to deal with was the Member for Sturgeon Creek's, who seemed to suggest to us that he believed that the old system was the best and it would not be possible for a member of the new 50-man council to come forward and to bring small problems before the large elected body. Well I think that it is true that the responsibility of an individual member on a new urban council will be to deal with small problems that he suggested like chips on the curb, or garbage collection, but this is obviously not a topic to be brought before a large assembly. It is the kind of topic that one deals with and it is the responsibility of the elected member to bring that problem before the proper authority, the people perhaps in the Civil Service, and to deal with perhaps members of his own community committee, but it is not the responsibility of council to deal with each individual problem before the larger body. All of us in this Assembly have problems brought to us and all of us attempt to deal with them in our own way, but we do not bring forward the minute detail and the individual problems of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few points that I wanted to speak on in this debate and I look forward to hearing some more comments from the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on the resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour now standing in the name of the Member for Rhineland.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us deals with

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) the changes in the House rules, and when we take a look at the motion on the Order Paper, it says: "That the report of the Special Committee on the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, received by the House on May 27, 1971, be concurred in."

First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the motion before us and the rules that were distributed the other day certainly are not one and the same. When we discussed the rules and the report of the committee that was brought into this Chamber on an earlier occasion - and it's recorded in Votes and Proceedings No. 4 - it's completely different than what we have actually brought in by way of changes in the rules as they are now supposed to be inserted in our Rule Book; and I certainly will comment more on that as I go along.

I think the proposal before us is a colossal sell-out of parliament here in Manitoba. It is that in no uncertain terms, Mr. Speaker, and this leads actually to dictatorship here in this House. And it's no fun neither, because if you take a careful look, many of the members of this House who are not appointed to special committees will have no way of bringing about amendments to bills. There is no way open for them to do so. This is what the new rules propose, and you'd better take a second look for those members that haven't considered it very carefully. On top of that, Rule 68 as is now printed was never brought into this House before, we didn't consider it in committee and now we are faced with Rule 68 which has some 14 clauses in it to be accepted by this motion of concurrence. Mr. Speaker, surely enough the House Leader should know more than to bring a proposal of this forward at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. The honourable member is suggesting that I am bringing things in that were not approved of in committee.

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all the motion is made by the Minister of Labour but that doesn't make it any less reprehensible for him to be attacked than me to be attacked. I want to assure the honourable member that the committee report was referred to staff, as was promised by the House; the document that is before you, if it doesn't represent committee decisions, we'd be pleased to know where it doesn't; but to suggest that we deliberately took the committee decisions and changed them . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating the point. I agree that he had a point of order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has stated his privilege.

MR. GREEN: I will state my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I'm permitted to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I heard the point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Matter of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Right. I heard the point of privilege. Order, please. I would like to inform the Honourable Member that I heard the matter of privilege, and I'm suggesting to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the matter of privilege is correct. The Honourable Member for Rhineland may proceed, but he should not implicate or make assumptions which are not correct. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Rule 68 as it is proposed in the rules that were distributed, were never considered by this committee, were not contained in the report that was discussed on previous occasions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may just clarify the situation and correct my honourable friend if he doesn't mind the interjection, that the First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm afraid if I allow this, then the Honourable Minister of Labour shall be closing debate. If he has a point of privilege or a matter of privilege or a point of order, I should like to hear it. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I raise the matter as a matter of privilege, because my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland refers to, in his opinion, that this was not discussed in Committee of the Whole. I want to point out to my honourable friend in order that the situation is clear that it was the Honourable First Minister who raised the points contained in the Rule 68 I believe, referred to by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and it's my understanding, and this is comparable to Rule 75 I believe in the House of Commons, and he mentioned it specifically and there was agreement in my understanding in the Committee of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the Whole. I believe it was supported by the Honourable Member for Morris, or at least there was no objection, let me put it that way; but it was raised in the Committee of the Whole House. Now if my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland is referring back to the matter being raised in the Special Committee on Rules that met during the recess, he is correct, but I do with due respect, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating the question. Order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that Rule 68 was not in the previous report that was accepted. We never received copies of Rule 68 during the time that we were discussing the report that was tabled; there was nothing in the report of Votes and Proceedings No. 4 of Tuesday, April 13th, and then to have it inserted now is completely unacceptable to me. Certainly I don't want to be considered a fool who will accept something that we didn't discuss, we didn't consider and we didn't decide on, and then to have this brought forward at this time and to have it concurred in. I reject it completely.

There are other things that I wish to mention in connection with the document that was tabled the other day. For instance, Rule 19, there is mention made of ministerial statements, it says: "That a member presenting a report to the House shall do so by stating that he is tabling a document." I take it that these are reports tabled by Ministers and not by Standing Committees, because if they are reports by Standing Committees, certainly there should be a motion following so that they could be debated. I take it that this is one where the Minister will be tabling reports where a motion is not involved and as a result there will be no debate.

We proceed to Rule 21, and here again in connection with Private Members' Resolutions, I hope this doesn't also apply to private bills; it doesn't indicate so, but surely enough we should make very sure that private bills' discussion may be adjourned, even if resolutions can't be, but that private members' bills at least will be able to be adjourned so that discussion can take place further at a later date.

We move on to Rule 26, No. 3 and here we're dealing with the matter of debating matters of urgent importance and we find under this particular rule now that the decision whether it will be debated will no longer be in the hands of the Speaker. The Speaker will no longer be able to make the decision; government will be deciding, because it says here in subsection (3): The Speaker is then to put the question, "shall the debate proceed" and there first will be a vote by this House whether the government will allow the debate to proceed or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. FROESE: . . . and we're removing a certain amount . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that we can't confuse two things here, one is a debate on the substance of the rules which has already been held in the Committee of the Whole House at which all the members were present. That debate has been held and the very point that the honourable member is now debating was raised and decided upon. The question now is whether the report of the Committee of the Whole House shall be received as a report and I don't know whether that opens up a debate on every rule that was already agreed to by the Whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in the immediate subsection, subsection (4) it says: "If the House determines by its vote to set aside the normal business of the House," so this indicates that there will be a vote and that the government will decide whether we will be able to debate matters of urgent public importance. I feel that we're taking away a certain right that was there in the rules before which we are now removing and which we are now turning over to the hands of government, and I certainly don't approve of that either. Before the rules said: "If three members were in favour, we would automatically be heard." This meant that the smaller groups in the House would have more say and could make a decision of this type. This authority will now be removed from us as well as the Speaker and handed over to the members of the government, and I certainly reject it. The Minister of Labour says "the House". Well we know what that means, that the governing party has the majority and they make the decisions for us even though we may object to it.

We find that Rule 60 is completely eliminated. Certainly there was no mention in the report that this would be done. I feel that Rule 60, subsection (1) could remain, which is the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) definition of "Resolution".

And then I proceed to the new Rule 68. Mr. Speaker, and as I have already mentioned, copies of these were never distributed. They were not part of the report that was tabled in the House and they are completely unacceptable to me. We, as members of this House, or members who are not members of Standing Committees will have no opportunity to put forward amendments and as has been pointed out on previous occasions where they have removed me from more committees, this means that I, as a member representing the people of my riding, will have no way of amending legislation coming before this House referred to these particular committees. I think this is a very very severe blow to members of this House and certainly this is one that should be rejected completely. I certainly can't see how other members on the Opposition will accept such an amendment and such a proposition.

We also find that the amendments will now only be made in Standing Committees and we will not be able to do so in the Committee of the Whole. This means that there will be no record of amendments placed before committees in Hansard; we will have no way of going back to find out what the arguments were about. We have no way in the future of checking on these things and how should this thing be acceptable to me. I reject it outright and certainly very strongly. Certainly this report should be referred back to Committee of the Whole to be reconsidered and to be amended. I, for one, will not accept it on its present basis.

I would briefly like to refer to some particular sections of Rule 68, and as I mentioned before, we have 14 clauses in here. In the first clause it says that, In considering a bill in any Standing or Special Committee of the House, the title, the preamble and the first clause, if it contains only a short title are postponed and then every clause is considered by the committee in its proper order. So this means that the Standing Committees of the House will be considering the bills clause by clause.

In Section 4 we read, "The consideration of the report stage of a bill from the Committee of the Whole shall be received and forthwith disposed of." There will be no debate in Committee of the Whole on this. We will not be able to make amendments. And it goes on to say in another section that "where debate is permitted on an amendment". So this indicates that this is not a right to us, that we will be able to debate them. This is only where it will be permitted and when the government will agree to have these amendments debated.

Certainly when we take a look at 68 subsection (10) it says that "Mr. Speaker may select or combine amendments". Well, Mr. Chairman, this is another area that I object very strongly to. The Speaker should be impartial and if amendments are going to be made by certain members of this House and other members will be making amendments and the Speaker will determine whose amendment will be accepted, there no longer is the impartiality and I feel that this likewise is very unacceptable to me.

We go on about recorded divisions. Again that we cannot call for a division on an individual item if we desire so. They can be combined. This is what Rule 68 (11) says: "The Speaker may defer the calling of members for "Yeas and Nays" until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to the bill have been considered." So, Mr. Speaker, here again I take very strong objection to this, because if you combine a whole lot of amendments, it's just like an omnibus bill. There may be some amendments that will be acceptable and other not and then you're supposed to vote in favour of it because you would like to support some amendments whereas you're very strongly opposed to others. Mr. Speaker, this is outright and completely unacceptable to me as a Member of this House and I very strongly oppose the acceptance of such a measure here today.

Then, too, in the last item it says "When a bill hasn't been reported from a Standing or Special Committee and no amendment has been proposed thereto at the report stage and in the case of a bill reported from a Committee of the Whole, with or without amendment, a motion that the bill be now read a third time and passed may be made in the same sitting". So that it can be passed and that's the end of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have registered a number of objections that I have to the rules that have been distributed: I would like to see some more debate but certainly at some time before the debate is concluded, I certainly would like to move that the matter be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration, because in my opinion this leads directly to dictatorship. The House, the government will dictate to us what we can do and certain members will be ruled out from their say that they have now and that is rightfully theirs. When I was elected as a member for the constituency that I represent, I was elected to come

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) out here and to do the best thing possible. If bills are coming before this House that contain objectionable amendments, I should have the right to make amendments to delete these or to have them changed. These rules will deny this very fact to me and I take very great objection to this.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I certainly will move at a later point that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no obligation for me to advise my honourable friend but I'd like to remind him that we are in the House and that if he makes a motion he'd have to make it now and have it seconded.

MR. FROESE: Oh, certainly if that is the wish. I will then move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that the report be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

. Continued on next page

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to clarify what has occurred up until now so that there are no great fears about cancelling Parliament or trampling on the rights of honourable members or something sinister having occurred with respect to the passing of these rules. I think that everybody on all sides of the House attempted to have, as far as is possible, and with almost unanimity agreement as to what these rules would contain, and that all of the rules as published are taken directly from the report, or were not done so, then the direction of the committee to legislative counsel to translate what the committee asked for into language which would be acceptable to the rules was done by legislative counsel, and what you have here is a composite of that agreement. So when it's suggested that the government is trying to trample on the rights of members or on Parliament, I would assure the honourable members that nothing of the kind is intended.

With regard to the suggestion that Rule 68 is something which the honourable member says was not dealt with in committee, was not dealt with by Committee of the Whole House, was not in the report, I can only say that my honourable friend may not have been here when it was discussed - if I wish to be generous to my honourable friend, that he may not have been here when it was discussed, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion is recorded in Hansard. The First Minister got up first of all and explained the practice that had been followed, indicated what rule, the specific rule, I believe it was 75 of the House of Commons which is also a Parliament, the Canadian Parliament, was asked to be transcribed to our rules and as far as I know - I haven't looked at 75, I haven't compared it word for word with what is here - but as far as I know that is what has occurred.

The suggestion that this rule would prevent amendments is not correct. What the First Minister said I find repeated in these rules, that amendments can be moved at committee but that there would be no Committee of the Whole House to reconsider a bill which had previously gone through a Standing Committee; that a bill went either to a Standing Committee or to a Committee of the Whole House. If it went to a Standing Committee, or indeed if it went to the Committee of the Whole House, when it was reported to the House any member could move that the report be changed to include an amendment of any section. As a matter of fact the 68A says: Where the Order of the Day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with sub-rule (5) is open to debate - an amendment. - (Interjection) - Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no notice at the committee stage but there has to be notice at the stage where it comes into the House, but any member could give notice of that amendment and any such amendment would be considered.

The honourable member says that they would necessarily be considered omnibus. That is not our intention nor is it my understanding of the reading of the rules. What I understand the reading of the rules to be is that the Speaker could hold all the amendments and then have them voted on as amendments, one at a time, when he desires the divisions to be called on those amendments. But it's not my understanding from the rule that he must treat them as an omnibus amendment. So 68, as referred to, has not been "snuck" into the report; 68 as referred to was agreed to by most members of the House. I respect my honourable friend saying that perhaps he didn't agree to it, but the fact is it is not something that has been attempted to "put over" on any honourable member; it directly followed the discussion on the rules which took place in the House when the honourable member may or may not have been present. - (Interjection) - Well, if you were here, if you were here all the time then perhaps I have been more generous than I should have been, because it was mentioned by the First Minister. He had the Rule Book of the House of Commons in his hand when he was reading the rule and explaining just how it would work. With regard to Rule 26 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I said that the rule had not been - I can read - had never been tabled in this House; it was not contained in the report; . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The honourable member is debating the matter. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that may be true, but the honourable member was here when it was being read by the First Minister at that time. I don't recall - it may be his recollection - I don't recall him saying that the rules should be tabled. The Honourable First Minister read from the Rule Book -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member said we should receive copies of it and indeed that is what we have now received, but the fact is that the rule, the substance of it and what is intended by it was fully described to members of the House.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

The honourable member says that 26 takes away the right of the Speaker to decide on the urgency of a debate. May I suggest to the honourable member - and I'm not going through all the arguments again - that 26 as it now stands gives more rights to members in the House than 26 as it previously stood. Mr. Speaker, this rule does not in any way extend what is now open to this side. If the Speaker rules on an emergency debate now and members of the majority choose to appeal his ruling and rule against it, it would still be the government who had control as to whether an urgency debate took place.

Mr. Speaker, the question of whether it has been or has not been a practice is not what my honourable friend is referring to. My honourable friend says that 26 gives more rights to the government than it now has and that is just not so; 26 gives more rights to individual members than they previously had because they are now permitted to debate on the question of urgency whereas they couldn't debate on it before, and the fact is that the question as to whether the debate will proceed is still ultimately in the hands of the House where every question ultimately lies.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate to the House that we have a motion before us to refer a matter to a committee and the debate should be about that. Unfortunately, I have allowed a certain amount of latitude for the Honourable Minister to get into the debate which we had previously when we were to concur in this report, and I would like to have him confine his remarks to committing or not committing this bill or referring it to the committee. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, when I did indicate that the honourable member's remarks should be confined that there was no ruling from yourself that that should in fact be done, and you recognized the honourable member which I thought meant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do not wish to debate the matter with the Honourable Minister of Mines but we have a new motion before us which is to refer back to the committee, so it's not the same motion which we were debating before. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that the Member for Rhineland moved that we refer back to committee on the basis of certain arguments that he gave, and I know no rule of Parliament which would prevent me from answering why he wants it to be referred back to committee and that is exactly what I am intending to do. I am trying to indicate that the reference that we now have is exactly what the committee had decided on before, and I question whether on that basis it should be referred back to committee. I'm now trying to demonstrate that what is before us is not, as the honourable member has said, something new, but what in fact the committee decided upon. This is so with respect of Rule No. 26; it's so with respect of Rule No. 68 and it's so, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can make out, with everything that is now contained and for which we are asking concurrence in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): As a member of the committee and with regard to the stand of our party, I think there's something very interesting that's being overlooked in these discussions. It's unfortunate we're meeting with the problem we're meeting with just now, but I think it will be recalled that in the development of these amendments, which are two years' work really, that my colleague and I had reservations, but you'll recall in the discussions in committee and elsewhere that we're so late in the session that we would adopt these rules on a trial basis with a view to possibly amending them after a reasonable space of time. So it's not finalized, if that is still the feeling of the House, that we are going to adopt them for the balance of the session and then possibly review them. Well, we can always review them, but review them toward amendment to accommodate the honourable gentleman. It's a trial basis really.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering whether we're really wasting time on this. The matters raised by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland were raised during the consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the proposals emanating from the Special Committee on the Rules of the House and then, if I recall correctly, the Honourable the First Minister made a suggestion in respect of the possibility of adopting the general Rule 75 of the House of Commons in respect of treatment of reports regarding bills. But, Mr. Speaker, if you recall and if honourable members of the House will recall, when I presented the report

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) from the Committee of the Whole I indicated that there was a suggested change for clarification purposes regarding Rule 21 (4), and at that particular time I asked for the unanimous consent of the House on concurrence of the report to include in Rule 21 that there will be no more adjournments of a debate on Private Members' Resolutions, and that failing to obtain that unanimous consent it was necessary that the report be referred back to Committee of the Whole.

Now what actually is the situation before us at the present time is the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not giving consent to the adoption of the report as amended at my request for the inclusion of the reference to no more further adjournments on debate. So therefore we don't really need the motion of my honourable friend, although, Mr. Speaker, you have accepted it, because we had to have unanimous consent to that adoption. We haven't got that unanimous consent, thanks to the interest of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, so of necessity the report has to go back to the Committee of the Whole House in any case.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to pursue the debate any more. I made a request for unanimous consent on the adoption or of concurrence; it has not been given; the report of the Committee then goes back to the Committee of the Whole House and I'm sure at that particular stage we can rehash some of these ideas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume now that the debate centres on the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland so that gives me the opportunity to say a few words at this time. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I must say that I regret very much the attitude taken by the Member for Rhineland, and I understand in all the years that I have been associated with Parliament, any effort to change the rules is always regarded by the Opposition as an infringement upon their rights and an abrogation of their liberties in the Chamber. It hasn't always worked out that way. I have lived through changes in the rules on several occasions and I think rule changes are necessary from time to time if we are to meet our increasing obligations and if we are to enable ourselves to cope with the ever-increasing workload of a Legislature. I honestly felt that the recommendations that had been made by the Committee were designed to achieve that without in any way attempting to take away the rights of members.

I want to point out that at the time that suggestions were made for the changes in our Rule 68, the First Minister did read at length from the sections of the House of Commons Standing Orders in order to indicate the type of rule that he would like to see adopted for this Chamber. Now I must confess that I had no experience with that new rule because it was changed after I left the House of Commons. The First Minister has, and he assured us - and I took that assurance at its face value - that it would result in no infringement upon members' rights, and if I recall my remarks correctly, I stated that although I had some reservations about how these rules would affect us and that I would have preferred to have the amendments and the consideration of the clause by clause bills dealt with in the Committee of the Whole rather than in the Law Amendments Committee, I was prepared to accept the suggestion of the First Minister in incorporating those rules into our procedures for the remainder of this session, because it would be a relevantly short period of time, and we would gain the experience necessary to enable us to review the rules at the end of this session and then make recommendations that we thought might be necessary in order to meet the difference in circumstances that you find in a provincial Legislature as opposed to the House of Commons. And I believe that it will be necessary to make some adjustments.

But assuming that in a Chamber of this sort there are reasonable men, I reasoned that it would be possible to work out any difficulties that may arise and that by the end of this session we would have a fairly good understanding of how this rule would apply and how it would work, either for our benefit or to our detriment, and I was prepared to accept it on that basis. But I want it clearly understood that the Member for Rhineland has implied that we accepted it without any consideration. Well that, Sir, is just not true. The member in my view has misread practically every recommendation that we've made - and that's not uncharacteristic of the honourable member; he does that on most things he reads - and I regret very much that he's taken this position because it now is going to deny us the opportunity of experimenting with new rules in this House that I think would expedite the business of this Chamber and enable us to carry on our responsibility in a much better way, and I think much more satisfactory way than we're dealing with at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, because this will be referred back to the committee, I'd like to offer by way of a contribution some additional thinking to the -- (Interjection) -- Unfortunately, my contribution has to be made now if I'm to make a contribution. It may very well mean a delay before this matter's discussed again.

This will not work, Mr. Speaker, unless we are prepared to accept certain ground rules for the manner in which the Standing Committees are to operate, because the practice has been in the past for amendments introduced in the Standing Committee, particularly amendments introduced by the government, to be introduced at the time of discussion on the particular item with not too much notice, with not too much notice, and some of them can be a very substantive nature and require some notice to be seriously considered within the committee. Mr. Speaker, if we take in example the uni-city bill, which is the largest bill in front of us and possibly the largest one we'll see in terms of the number of sections for the next period of time, we have to understand that on the basis of what is being proposed, the amendments to the uni-city bill will be discussed in the Standing Committee; it will not be discussed in the Committee of the Whole if the new rules are adopted. The truth of the matter is that what is required is sufficient notice for any proposed amendments to be seriously considered.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to adopt this -- and I have no quarrel with the effort of those who try to make this into a better -- or work as a better system than it has in the past -- there should be some basis in which there is notice, sufficient notice and sufficient time for amendments to be considered, or at least be presented to the committee both by the government and by Opposition so that they can be dealt with properly and in turn can be dealt with more effectively in the committee.

Now the argument is it can be advanced, that it can be changed in the report stage, but the truth of the matter is that if we're going to utilize the committee system -- which is really what this is all about -- in a way in which they will be dealing in more direct manner with the substantive amendments to be discussed and passed or approved altering the various sections of the Act in a committee. In other words, it would seem that there would be much greater wisdom to at least have some basis on which notice would be given at least within a reasonable period of time so that the committee is not going to be deluged, as we could very well be with amendments to a very large Act such as the uni-city Act, which will make it almost impossible to deal with effectively, and either have to accept the government's explanation without any attempt to be able to caucus, without any attempt to be able to examine the drafting itself.

I bring in the uni-city bill as an example because I think this is the best example of what could happen, because the likelihood is that we will be dealing with this under the new rules and surely we should possibly consider some procedure within the committee that would not be left up to the committee's will but would be determined in advance.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I beg to move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Spivak, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAY: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johanson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Sherman, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nay, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it and I declare the motion lost. The motion before the House.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the First Minister otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The motion before the House is to refer the report back to

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) the Committee of the Whole.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the concurrence of the report of the Special Committee on Rules and Orders adopted by this House on May 27th.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the other day I moved the motion of concurrence in the report of the Committee of the House that did have under consideration the report of the Rules Committee which was adopted at the previous session of the Legislature, and contained within the report from the Committee of the Whole were certain recommendations for change and adoption of rules dealing with the conduct of the proceedings of this House. These rules that I asked concurrence of had been adopted by the Committee of the Whole after considerable debate and consideration in the Committee of the Whole House.

However, there was one very important rule that I had suggested on my motion of concurrence that should be considered by the Assembly, and that had unanimous consent been given at that particular time by amendment to the report it would not have been necessary for us to revert back into the Committee of the Whole House, and that particular suggestion or proposed amendment that I made was in reference to Rule 21 (4) and (5) dealing with procedure insofar as Private Members' Resolutions were concerned. If you recall, Mr. Chairman, contained within the report from the Committee of the Whole House dealing with the rules of the House there was a provision that under Rule 21, which read as follows: That during Private Members' hour no request shall be made by a member to allow a matter to stand with respect of Private Members' Resolutions. I indicated, according to Hansard of May 27th, that after further consideration and consultation by myself as sponsor of the resolution, that consultation with the representative of the Conservative Party, the Member for Morris, and also I consulted with the Member for Rhineland and the Member for Portage la Prairie, that this particular rule should be extended to include a provision when dealing with Private Members' Resolutions, that there be no adjournment of the debate save that, Mr. Chairman, as to the expiration of the hour-period devoted to Private Members' Resolutions. I had thought that I had concurrence in the proposition, but the Honourable Member for Rhineland raised objections, and of course in the absence of concurrence and unanimity we could not proceed further.

So, Mr. Chairman, the situation that we have that we're confronted with at the present time, may I say in all due respect, is only a consideration of the report of the Committee in respect of Rule 21. The balance of the report that I moved concurrence with had been adopted by Committee of the Whole House. So now then, the only proposition in my opinion, subject to correction - and there are occasions when I am wrong and my honourable friend the former Premier, the Member for Minnedosa will agree - that the only real matter before the committee at the present time for consideration, after due deliberation, is as to whether or not provision should be made under Rule 21 that there be no adjournments on debates in regards to Private Members' Resolutions save that of course, as I indicated, the expiration of the hour devoted daily to Private Members' Resolutions. So I say, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the Committee, that not having that consent on the motion of concurrence it was necessary that we go back to Committee of the Whole House where we are at the present time.

I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that the report of the committee be amended in respect of Rule 21 that during Private Members' hour no request shall be made by a member to allow a matter to stand with respect of Private Members' Resolutions and no motion will be entertained to adjourn the debate with respect to Private Members' Resolutions. And I would like to point out that this specifically refers to Private Members' Resolutions and not to Private Members' Bills. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, indicates that this is to replace provision No. 5 in the report - 21, subsection (5) in the report that I introduced for concurrence.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could you please inform us as to whether we are debating the report that was submitted to the House on Tuesday, April 13th, 1971 or is it the rules that were distributed the other day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are debating the amendment that has been placed before you just at this moment and that is all that is before the committee. The rest of the report has been concurred in and reported to the House, so the only question that is before this committee is this particular amendment.

MR. FROESE: This question I asked because I don't think by adopting this report that this really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I don't intend to debate with the member. That is the ruling of the Chair. The matter before the committee is this amendment. The Chair will entertain arguments to the amendment.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Rule 68A be deleted from the report.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if on a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order, may I raise the advisability of entertaining the motion as proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear your mumble. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition which was before the House was a motion that the report be concurred in, and Committee of the Whole House has agreed now with the particular amendment that was suggested. Now if my honourable friend, may I say in all respect, does not agree with the concurrence of the report from the Committee, it's at that stage that his motion should be entertained because all I did, as the sponsor of the motion for concurrence, was report to the House that what transpired in Committee of the Whole was agreed upon and from then on it's in the hands of the House and not the Committee because we've already had, may I say in all due respect, a decision made in the Committee of the Whole House on all of the report with the exception of the suggested change for which we came back into Committee of the Whole House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland to the point of order.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I moved a motion to have this referred back to Committee to give it further consideration, with the very intent that I would proposing this amendment and certainly the amendment is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair is still in a quandary with all due deference to all honourable friends. I am wondering about the propriety of the motion in light of -- is it not negating something which has already been decided? Well, if it is the wish of the Committee then I will put the motion, that Rule 68A be deleted from the report. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I am now speaking on the motion. I am now speaking on the motion on 68, on the removal. Well, Mr. Chairman, I've had an opportunity of talking to the House Leader and he has some idea of my proposal, and this may be part of the answer, it may not be entirely the whole answer.

It would seem to me that what is required if the committee system is to work and if this section is to work effectively, is some way in which notice is provided of the amendments to be introduced in committee by the government with respect to the various pieces of legislation that will be brought forward. There has to be some manner or some mechanism in which the notice of the amendments would be given in time for the members of the committee to be able to deal with this, to be in a position to caucus it if necessary prior to the actual committee meeting, and being in a position to deal with it effectively within the committee because there will not be this second opportunity in Committee of the Whole. However, there would be the second opportunity with respect to the report of the committee if there are matters that have not been fully dealt with or fully understood by the members of the committee.

Now I brought the uni-city bill up as an example in the prior debate because I think this is the best example that I could bring forward. With the number of sections in that bill, the likelihood is that there'll be substantial amendments by the time we reach the committee stage

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) and we will probably be operating within these rules by that time. It's only fit and proper that we be given sufficient opportunity for those amendments to be considered by the committee, certainly by the Opposition parties who would have no advance knowledge of it, and be in a position to deal with it effectively in the committee if we're going to basically eliminate one step of the procedures we've had in the past with the committee dealing with it and then the Committee of the Whole following afterwards.

I think that there's sort of a general agreement between the House Leader and myself that somehow or other this could be understood and agreed to and possibly provided in the rules, with an understanding that when we do get into the speed-up, the time limit may change and vary and it may not be possible to give sufficient notice, and there would have to be some kind of general understanding that there would be at least reasonable opportunity given if it can happen. But certainly if we're not in the speed-up motion there should be some provision for at least a 24-hour notice before the meeting of a committee in which the amendments that will be introduced will be known so that they can properly be dealt with, examined in caucus by the Opposition parties to be able to effectively deal with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just contribute something to the discussion. There are occasions when government or Opposition has had an opportunity to speak to the Legislative Counsel and arrange for him indeed to prepare amendments. There have been occasions where in Opposition we prepared our own amendments, and certainly it is reasonable. I would agree that if they're available they should be handed to the committee; and as members know, very frequently on the closing of debate on second reading indications are given of the nature of amendments to be brought. But I don't think that the Leader of the Opposition would want to hamstring the committee from dealing with amendments that arise because as a result of representations that are made, very often right on the spot the Legislative Counsel is requested to prepare an amendment, or indeed members themselves can produce an amendment right on the spot.

Now I think there is an understanding of a desirability to accommodate the problem that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition proposes, but I don't think it would be desirable to make it so hard and fast that the committee's work will be frustrated by the failure to produce an amendment which nobody has thought of yet, and then the meeting may have to stand for, say, 24 or 48 hours. I think that an understanding is always a healthier situation than to try to hamstring the operations.

I do understand that from the proposed rules - and I unfortunately didn't participate in debate at all at the last committee meeting on this precise rule - that after the amendments are made at the committee stage and they are reported back to the House, then there must be 48 hours provided for that purpose, and that any further proposed amendments have to be brought in I believe within 24 hours, so there's quite a bit of notice provided there. But I think that the desirability expressed by the Leader of the Opposition is one that I would support, that I would be afraid to tie down too hard, because it could prevent an orderly process, and I don't think any of us would want that to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I just want to make reference to Bill 9 which is a bill that's already passed, as the best example of the way in which this will probably work. There were substantive amendments, and substantial amendments actually introduced by the government, and under the procedures that we will be working under in the future if there is agreement with the suggestion, we would have had notice of them. Notwithstanding that, there was still amendments that were arrived at in the committee, and were bound to be arrived at in the committee as a result of the presentation and as a result of debate. That I agree with. But there certainly should be, I think, an obligation on the part of both the government and Opposition to give notice and without in any way tying it down because I don't know how we can do this. I would hope that there would be some understanding on this and some degree of co-operation in the weeks ahead to put this in order, and if this happens, it's my impression that part of the objections that the Honourable Member from Rhineland has can be answered, because the notice would be indicative of what is going to take place and the opportunity for debate would occur as a result of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I don't know why in the past it hasn't been that much of a problem, but I

(MR. GREEN cont'd) think it's reasonable for all members of the committee to have a reasonable time to look at amendments that are being proposed by anybody. If they don't want the time - in other words, if an amendment is introduced which everybody sees is not of consequence and is willing to pass it, that's fine, but I think that it's reasonable that people should have time to look at amendments that are being proposed and I can't see circumstances under which any side would act unreasonably in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my motion is to delete Section 68A which includes the various subsections, certainly which deals with the matter of changing about our whole structure of dealing with legislation in this House. If this passes, from here on many of the members will not have an opportunity to amend legislation as they have been heretofore. We will be denied certain rights in proposing amendments. And this is quite common. We know the situation today when you're not a member of the committee you cannot propose motions in the Standing Committees, you have no vote and certainly you don't have the rights, but then the bill comes back to the Committee of the Whole and you then have an opportunity to put your motions forward and to have them acted on and to debate them, which will be denied with the passing of these rules. We will no longer have that opportunity and this is very very basic to our whole structure of government, to our whole structure of Parliament, and this is a very sad day indeed. It strikes right at the root of our parliamentary system, and to have it brought in so early by this government, after two sessions, and here they're striking this death blow to us.

Surely enough, this is the beginning and this is worse than some of the other legislation that is being brought forward such as uni-city or the insurance bill. This is directly hitting the Legislature, the members of this House, and I for one will never agree to such a proposal as this one. I want to retain my rights as a member of this House to bring in amendments if they're not in accordance with what I believe in, what I strive for, and what my constituency would like me to do, and certainly I think these are matters that are very important and that should not be trampled on. And yet this is exactly what this government does, this is trampling on the rights of the individual members of this House and I certainly will not support or stand by idly and allow this to happen.

It is certainly, as I said, this is the beginning of a dictatorship here in this province. This government now decides who will be having the right to make amendments because they're the ones that decide on the committees. So often I've asked to be on a certain committee, the government denies it, and now they'll not only deny my right to be on a committee, but by denying that they also deny me to make amendments to bills that may be coming before this House. And that is a fact, Mr. Chairman. This is exactly what is happening. We know that on so many occasions committee meetings are held in which only members of the committee get notice. How do you know what's happening and when it's happening if you don't know of the particular meeting being in session? As a result, you then cannot participate even in the debate and you don't know what's going on. How can you then be ready when the report comes back to the House, and we know that when reports come back to the House that you cannot make amendments to individual sections. Reports of committees are not amendable and you know that as well as I do. You should know it better than I do, that you cannot make amendments to particular sections of legislation when a report is tabled in the House and comes back to committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I most strongly object to this particular section and to this particular way of amending the rules of this House. This is indeed a black day for Manitoba and for the Legislature of Manitoba. This will go down in history as one of the black days.

Mention is being made that this is being done on a trial basis. There's no such thing as a trial basis. Once these rules are accepted they are the rules of the House, and members who talk about trial basis, that is nonsense. It is nonsense indeed, because once these rules are changed and the government has obtained these rights, they will never agree to come back and restore the rights to us later on. This is wishful thinking. We have seen it every time when the rules are amended, it's always in favour of the government; it's not in favour of the Private Members. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think members on the Opposition side certainly should take heed of this and should make their views known in connection with the amendment before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it was my inclination just to let the question be put if no one else wanted to speak and defeat the proposal and let it go that way, because I have a feeling that the majority of the committee do not see that which the Honourable Member for Rhineland sees. This talk about "black day" is to me complete nonsense. We can name black days, and there are black days that do occur, at least pretty grey days that may occur in Parliament, but I'm not aware that the black day which is rather well known in the House of Commons was ever related to the rule which apparently is used all the time in the House of Commons. I don't know if the Honourable Member for Rhineland wants to hear me try to explain again what I know other members have explained to him, because it's up to him to try to understand with an open mind.

May I start out by saying that I understand his personal frustration because he is dependent on some other member of the House to support a motion that he may want to bring for adjournment or indeed a substantive motion, and to my recollection he has never been denied a seconder to adjourn debates. I know that when we were in Opposition we always gave him that courtesy and I notice that that is continuing, that he has never been denied a seconder to adjourn. I even recollect occasions when he was given a seconder to make a substantive amendment and then didn't receive support of his seconder when the amendment came to a vote. As a matter of fact, today I gather a peculiar situation occurred when it seems to me that there was no real support for his desire to adjourn debates on a previous issue, which I am not of course debating, but that somebody accommodated him by actually moving on his behalf for his benefit and adjournment.

So I know his problem and I think he has been accommodated tremendously by all members of the House when he has requested adjournment, because he does carry a heavy load of trying to monitor all resolutions, all bills, and he stands very much alone. So although I can sympathize with him with his personal problems, I do feel that he has received more consideration as an individual than any other person in this House or committee, and if indeed he talked about a black day or a desire to frustrate him, the easiest thing for government to do would be just to deny him any adjournment that he wishes to make, and I don't recall that having been done.

Let's get back to the exact discussion before us. As I read this, the desire has been expressed, and I believe by the vast majority of the members of this House, that there should not be repetitious debates first at the committee level and then back in the Committee of the Whole, that it has proven in the past that there has been a great deal of unnecessary repetition when matters are discussed in committee stage and then come back to the House and then are referred to Committee of the Whole and then discussed all over again. But because there should be an opportunity for all members of the House to be able to bring in amendments, even to those bills which are dealt with in committees of which they are not members, the rule as I understand it provides that when a report is brought in from a committee then it cannot be dealt with for 48 hours and notice must be given of the report so that all members have an opportunity to review it, and if any member of the House can get one person to second his motion then he is able to at the report stage of the bill - I'm reading now from the proposed 68A - "at that stage, having given notice which appears in the Notice Paper of his intention to move an amendment, he can do so."

So the statement made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland that members of the House who are not members of committee are denied the opportunity to make an amendment is absolutely wrong, because I read it as being clearly the right of any member to make the amendment at the report stage. So although I think all other members of the House understand it, the Honourable Member from Rhineland didn't and maybe doesn't want to, but the mere suggestion that this is something being forced to deny any member any right, I think has to be rejected as does I think his motion.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I still have to put the first question, which is that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move by leave, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the report of the Special Committee on the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, received by the House this day, be concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is it in order to have it concurred in the same day that you get the report?

MR. GREEN: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. FROESE: You didn't ask for leave.

MR. GREEN: I asked for leave when I got on my feet. No leave?

MR. FROESE: No, I won't.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. FROESE: I propose not to give leave.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter before the committee is Resolution 104 and an amendment thereto by the Member for Rhineland that the Minister's Compensation - Salary and Representation Allowance, be reduced to \$1,00. The Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: The Minister of who?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Youth and Education. Excuse me.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was concerned my mike didn't go on, you see, until the word was given.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to start responding to some of the questions that were put and some of the statements made. Last night I did have an opportunity to make comments about the remarks put forward by honourable members with regard to the program for the hard of hearing in Manitoba, and I indicated that the department and the government were prepared to undertake an experimental program. I want to clarify; the clock had run out on me and I want to clarify something about the whole question of education for the hard of hearing.

Many members - and I don't suggest they acted on it - but many members, including myself, are under the mistaken impression that the School for the Deaf does not teach speech. In fact, it does. Every classroom at the School for the Deaf is equipped with loops, that is, electronic loops, and every child who can use one is equipped with a hearing aid, and an important part of the deaf is to teach him to speak and every teacher on the staff has part of the instruction. This is a major part of their program. So that, really, the truth is - and this has been the policy - that every child who enters the School for the Deaf would not be deprived of an opportunity to learn to speak. The problem, as expressed by the parents, is that they are in a silent atmosphere, and when children, young children are in a silent atmosphere, they then resort, as would every human being I suppose, to the easiest way to communicate and that is through the sign language because they are in a silent atmosphere. It must be recognized - and

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) I think this has to be said - that not every child can make it in an oral program. Their impairment may be of such degree that it would be impossible; there may be other reasons as well; and sometimes I think it's fair to say that one has to recognize that also a case can be made for the emotional problems which a child faces and the perhaps harm that can accrue to that child if he's trying to cope with a program which is beyond him and which is too difficult for him. So there's emotional problems that can certainly become aggravated and the child is not really helped.

We felt, after evaluating the various pros and cons, however, that it was worth trying, and for that reason we decided that we would concur in this experimental program to see whether it was going to work; and one of the conditions, and in evaluating it, will be that we will have testings going on all the time; that certainly the audiologist, the members of the medical profession who are most closely involved, will in the final analysis have to give us their professional opinion as to the effectiveness of the program, whether indeed the kind of program, the oral program - that is the o-r-a-l program - that is going to be tried has value, the extent to which it has value, and whether it can overcome some of the problems that the parents feel their children face, and that perhaps they can, by being in a vocal environment, be assisted, whereas today the School for the Deaf is, by and large, a silent environment, and it is this distinction that we are now trying to overcome.

Mr. Chairman, that's the only thing I wanted to add to what I said last night.

I want to deal with, perhaps starting with the last speaker, and since my salary is dependent really on his motion I should perhaps address myself to the amendment or to his motion, which was that my salary be reduced by -- to \$1.00 - I was going to say "by \$1.00" but it's "to \$1.00" - and I regret to say, and I've said it to him before and I know other Ministers before me who held this portfolio since 1959, I believe, have had occasion to differ with the Member from Rhineland, and I don't claim that I'm taking a different position, so when he accuses me of discrimination I assume he includes all the Ministers of Education that have preceded me in this portfolio since 1959, because the people of Manitoba in 1959, Mr. Chairman, indicated pretty strongly that they were no longer prepared to live with one-room schools and small schools. Manitoba was, I think, the last - I'm pretty sure it was the last of the western provinces to adopt the larger administration units, and I find it ironical that, I think it was Alberta, I think it was Alberta who started the movement in this direction under the Social Credit government of the day, and they didn't follow the path that was followed in Manitoba, which I think perhaps was a failure or a weakness on the part of the Government of Manitoba at that time. What Alberta did was simply recognize that the day of the one-room school was gone and they simply legislated it. They didn't ask; they didn't vote; they didn't hold referendums. They legislated it. And, as a result, they consolidated where they had to and they produced what we now call the unitary school divisions in Manitoba.

So to argue, as the Member for Rhineland argues, that somehow we are discriminating is, I think, an exaggeration and not factual. These school divisions, the non-unitary school divisions or school districts, can come into the mainstream of the educational process in Manitoba. Last year there were six non-unitary divisions. As members are aware, that has now been cut in half and as of now there are only three left. The other three are now unitary divisions, effective as of January 1, 1971. And I'm not sure whether I really have to defend the position taken by former governments and this one, and by the members of this party when they sat in the Opposition as well as members of the Liberal Party and the government of the day, the Conservatives, that we just could not continue on with the one-room school and try to meet the demands of a dynamic, modern society that requires an educational system that's geared to the 20th Century.

I recognize that the multi-district divisions are in a poor position to recruit and to retain good teachers, because they are locked into their small units and they don't have the opportunities to operate as a system should have and provide for special education, for programs such as industrial arts, for programs such as vocational opportunities for the students; and to suggest that the trustee of today somehow isn't as good as the trustee of yesteryear - and this was the point he was making, that he had been attending trustee conventions for a number of years but he finds that the trustees at conventions aren't the same kind, or aren't as dedicated - I think the word was "are not as dedicated as the school trustees of yesteryear" - I reject completely. The personnel has changed, certainly, whereas at one time, and it wasn't too many years ago as members will recall, there were more school trustees in Manitoba than

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) there were teachers because there were schools with one teacher and five trustees and so you had the anomaly of more school trustees than you had teachers. Now maybe that is the direction that the honourable member wants to go. This government can't accompany him on that path and I don't think that the members opposite, generally, will agree that this is the path that Manitoba should travel.

Today in Manitoba 95.5 percent of all the students in Manitoba are in unitary divisions. In other words, less than five percent, 4 1/2 percent are still clinging to the old non-unitary school district type of system, and I am hoping - and I say this publicly - that before another year passes that the other school divisions and school districts will recognize that only through the unitary division system can the children who are in their care and are the children whose education we are all concerned about, that only by having a school board operating an entire system from kindergarten right through, can a proper - and I use the word "proper" - and the right kind of education be offered to the children.

We know, and statistics will show this, that the dropout rates in years gone by were very high and the answer to it was in the formation of the unitary divisions. We know that today the dropout rates are changing because students have more paths to follow; they have more flexibility; they have more choices; they have more programs. And to simply say, "Well, we have high schools at the divisional level even in the non-unitary; that's adequate," that isn't so because the problem of dropouts doesn't just start in Grade 10; it starts in the early years, in the early grades, and children who require special attention can't be coped with in a small district school. They can't be offered alternative courses if they're not academically bent, so unless they can fit into a very predetermined, fixed type of program, the children - and statistics, as I say, prove this from years gone by - just didn't have the opportunity when they went into high schools and a small percentage therefore went on to high school.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's all that I would want to say on the Member for Rhineland's presentation. He's made them before; I think most of us have heard them.

The Member for Riel did bring up an important question and that was the question of the recognition by this House unanimously last year, and generally by Canada as a whole, with regard to the fact that Canada is made up of two official languages, and he made reference to the fact that the Federal Government is participating with a special fund to help encourage and promote the teaching of the second language, which would be French in this case. A figure of \$300 million was used but the \$300 million referred to is an amount which is to be paid off or used over a period of years. I think it works out to about \$50 million a year to be paid across Canada, and there's a formula, a formula whereby the money is made available to the province. The member does take the position - and I can't quarrel with it - that it isn't only to make it possible for people whose mother tongue is French to develop their programs for their children only, but that rather the hope is - and I think I would agree with him here - that young children coming up, the next generation, should be exposed to French and at least have the ability to converse in French and to understand French. This isn't a matter of compulsion; it's a matter of desire; it's a matter of interest; and there's no doubt, if it could be achieved, it would be a desirable objective. I know, however, that the amount that the Federal Government is projecting into the program is not really sufficient to make this dream become a reality, and this year, when the first payment came through from the Federal Government, we had a decision to make. We had to decide whether the bulk of the money would be paid to school boards or school divisions in which French is taught as a subject, as it is in many school divisions, or whether the bulk of the money should be . . . to those school divisions which now have Français programs; and it was felt, particularly this year because the money was received quite late in the year - the agreement wasn't signed until, I think it was May or June - that the bulk of the money would be paid to those school divisions who, in the calendar year of 1970, had been offering the Français program in order to help them develop their programs, in order to help them to encourage the development of new programs within their area.

He brings up the question of using television instruction, and on this question he certainly has touched a very sensitive area as far as I'm concerned, because I am very disturbed about a development that has taken place in Canada with regard to the whole matter of television and the Federal Government's role in the field of television.

In 1968, there was a feeling, and it was pretty well agreed, that the CBC as the national instrument which would bind Canada together, if there is any rationale for having a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a Crown corporation, in the communication media, in television and

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) in broadcasting, that the CBC's role is to weld Canada into a nation, and that therefore its role, as I saw it and as others saw it, would be that it should be the instrument through which educational TV could best develop. And a bill was introduced into the House of Commons which would have made it possible for the CBC to become the vehicle by which this could be accomplished. Unfortunately, that bill was withdrawn in 1969 and, as a result, each province is pretty well on their own. And I would agree with the Member for Riel when he says that Manitoba cannot go it alone. Television is a very costly medium to operate, as other provinces are finding out. Ontario has moved into it through Cable TV and is using Channel 19 to serve the areas which Cable TV covers in Ontario, but we've got to look at their population in relation to ours and their Cable TV reaches millions of people whereas ours couldn't possibly do it.

I think we have to recognize that if we are going to use the medium of television, that we have to strive to do it on a regional basis if not on a national basis, because we are faced, as I say, with the CBC withdrawing from educational TV, and we are on notice from CBC that henceforth we can use their transmitting facilities but we'll have to pay for it the same as any commercial enterprise; that as far as the production of programs is concerned, we may use their facilities and their know-how and expertise, but we will have to pay for it, and the costs of production as compared to transmission are nine to one, so that we are talking in vast sums of money and so we have to go very carefully.

It could very well be that we are on the verge - and I think we are - of a technological breakthrough insofar as educational TV is concerned generally. The development of the new technical -- the breakthrough in TVR, that is the method whereby cassettes are being developed - I think that Manitoba has to be very cautious about what it's prepared to spend in both hardware and particularly in software. At the present time, the giants of the industry are competing and each one is putting forward what it considers as its answer and the best method for the cassettes. But there are, as I say, six large firms who are right now pushing their product, and before Manitoba locks itself into one or the other, I would have to be very sure that what we're doing is buying the right one, because the problem is that the various systems are not compatible and if we went the CBS route and found that that was not the one that in the final analysis won out, then we would have expended millions of dollars on what would end up in the final analysis as junk. So I am well aware that we have to resort and we have to use the media of television much better than we have, but we have to be very cautious of the rate at which we're going because of the uncertainty right now as to the best media, the best method of doing it, as to the advisability of investing into hardware and into techniques and technology which we may find two years from now are no longer valid, and I would remind members of the battle that took place many years ago when, in the recording industry, when the two giants of the industry, CBS and RCA, decided to battle it out as to whether 45 r.p.m. or 33 1/3 r.p.m. would be the standard, and at that time both firms did everything possible to convince the public on the virtues of their particular technique and their particular product. As we know, 33 1/3 won out and, as a result, those firms that opted for the 45 and the equipment to play the 45 r.p.m.'s took quite a beating. So that we are, in a sense, at that point now in looking at the whole question of television, whether and which route to travel.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): What about the North?

MR. MILLER: The North certainly is an area that has to be covered by television, and that's one of the problems that we face, that with the CBC taking the position that it is not the instrument through which educational TV will be made available, then Manitoba is faced with a problem of having to buy time as if we were a commercial enterprise, or build its own transmitting facilities to reach the North. And I think even the Honourable Member from Churchill will recognize that that is a very, very expensive and difficult proposition. -- (Interjection) -- He's not hard to get along with and I'm very glad to hear that.

The Member for Assiniboia mentioned the question of more recreation, more community use of schools, and of course, as he knows, I heartily concur with him and I know he'll be interested in hearing that, more than ever before, these schools are being used by the community for community use in the real sense, both for recreational, for physical activity, Phys. Ed. programs, for meetings, for courses, not just academic courses but for vocational courses, for handicraft courses, and we have, by action taken in this House and introduced by this government, eliminated at the last session the impediment which stood in the way of school boards cooperating with councils and vice versa. And councils and school boards are responding,

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.) The only way we could hurry up the process, and perhaps maybe that is what the Member from Assiniboia had in mind, was that perhaps the whole responsibility for recreation should be transferred to the school divisions and out of the hands of the municipal councils, so that school divisions would handle recreation commissions and community centres and so on. I'm not sure that this is what he meant and I don't think it's essential to go that route. I think it's simply a matter where two elected bodies have to realize that they are answerable to the same people and their concerns are mutual, and that therefore they have to cooperate with each other, and the indication I have is that they are cooperating and that there's more activity going on in that sphere than ever before. I believe -- do you want to call it 5:30, Mr. Chairman? Is this the sign you're making to me? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask the Minister if he would comment on the amounts of money that are being spent in the North, particularly the \$3 1/2 million, next time you speak.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday).