

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8 o'clock, Thursday, January 19, 1967

MR. LYON: Because of the interruption that we had by leave of the House just before the dinner hour I would suggest now that we go back to the second item on the Order paper after the Orders of the Day, the order for return in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before you refer to the matter alluded to by the Honourable the Attorney-General, I have a question of privilege which I would like to raise, and I understand -- and if the Honourable Minister of Education tells me that the information that I have received is not correct, well I withdraw it. But my understanding is that the Honourable Minister of Education released to the Press at 5 o'clock this evening a white paper on education. I would like to know whether that is of such a nature that the House should be informed of its contents before the Press.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I'm not aware of this, Mr. Speaker -- what the honourable member is referring to -- unless one of the other Ministers ...

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps I should say a few words. I've already had some conversations about this with leaders of the House. The government has made preliminary arrangements to start working on the educational campaign for the large single districts division on the assumption that the Minister's statement covering the matter will be made in the House tomorrow, tomorrow morning, Friday. I believe that there is no reason why that should not take place as I've made soundings which indicate to me that there's no reason why we can't proceed into the Committee of Supply right away, have the Minister's statement, and then as far as the government is concerned we are willing to adjourn the committee and get on with other business and let members have over the weekend to consider the matter -- (Interjection) -- Yes. If for any reason of course this does not take place, then we'll have to cancel the arrangements that have been made to commence the campaign. But as far as I am aware the white paper itself has not yet been released and it is not our intention to release it until such time it is given in the House.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if certain discussions have been held in this connection I would like to be informed just what -- of the matter, of the discussions, what they are pertaining about and to what degree.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, it's merely this, that tonight I hope we'll get to the stage where we move the Committee of Supply and by agreement we hold it over or it gets adjourned until tomorrow because nobody wants to proceed with it tonight. Tomorrow we would like to call the Committee of Supply early in the proceedings and enable the Minister of Education to make his statement on the white paper. This is the usual procedure and I just want to make sure there is no likelihood of an extended debate on the resolution to go into Committee of Supply tomorrow morning which would preempt the time and thus prevent the Minister from making his statement. My understanding is that there's no reason to expect a protracted debate and therefore the Minister can make his statement tomorrow morning. If for any reason that's not the case, then we will have to alter our plans about releasing the information and starting the campaign, but it would be, I think, desirable if we could proceed as planned.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding, am I correct in assuming that what the First Minister said was that the statement had not been released to the Press?

MR. ROBLIN: As far as I am aware no authority has been given to release that to the Press at all. If it has been released it must be some -- I know nothing of it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I think it's a different thing to say that no authority has been given. Could the First Minister ascertain whether or no that statement has been released whether there was any authority given or not for its release.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend will tell me the source of his information I'll check into it, but this is a complete surprise to me. I know nothing of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information concerning the northern forest development announced by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this House on Tuesday, March 8th, 1966. No. 1. Which of the following companies the Manitoba Government or any of its Boards, Commissions, Agencies or Funds dealt with or discussed with or signed agreements with (a) Monoca A. G., St. Moritz, Switzerland; (b) Technopulp A. G., Char, Switzerland; (c) Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Ltd.;

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . (d) Churchill Forest Industries Ltd.; (e) Technopulp Corporation Ltd.

2. The capital structure of those companies. I might say here, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to those companies with whom the government has dealt, obviously none if the government has not been dealing with them or has signed agreements with them.

3. The names of the officers and directors of the above companies.

4. The names and addresses of any other companies associated with the above companies in the northern forest development in Manitoba.

5. The capital structure of such other companies.

6. The names of the officers and directors of such other companies.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information concerning the northern forest development announced by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this House on Tuesday, March 8, 1966:

1. How many employees are presently employed in Manitoba by the company or companies with whom the government signed the agreement.

2. How many of these employees were residents of Manitoba prior to being employed.

3. How many of these employees were residents of Northern Manitoba prior to being employed.

4. How many of these employees are now located in Northern Manitoba.

5. Where company offices have so far been opened and their addresses.

6. How many acres of land have been purchased by the company in Manitoba and the legal description of such land.

7. How many acres of land have so far been cleared for construction sites and the legal description of such land.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. What borrowing by bond, debenture or otherwise has been done in the past year by the Manitoba Government or any of its Boards, Commissions, Agencies or Funds, showing the amounts, date, interest rate, discount if any, commission if any.

2. What the real cost was to the government in borrowing this money, taking into consideration all costs and discounts, in (a) dollars, (b) interest percentage per annum.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question or so for clarification. I want to give my honourable friend the information he's looking for and I'm not quite sure of certain points. In the first place when it says the last year, can I take it to refer to the last fiscal year?

MR. MOLGAT: No, really I'm interested in the last period, say the beginning of January -- in other words, the latest calendar year figures.

MR. EVANS: I can give my honourable friend up to the 30th of November last, in the form in which that is -- at the present time I can provide him with that information. If possible I will give him a full calendar year, but I would undertake to give twelve months ended November 30th or if possible twelve months ended the 31st of December. If that is correct. If I understand my honourable friend, he would be satisfied with the following requirements, that is the net of borrowing less retirements -- that is to say the net increase, if it is an increase or decrease if it is a decrease, of borrowings in the period -- that the net increase or decrease of treasury bills, because my honourable friend will understand so many of them are issued for even as short as ten or fifteen days, some of them for two or three months, and others -- and these are coming constantly in and out -- and I would interpret his requirements to be the net change, increase or decrease, in the volume of treasury bills in the period. The same description would apply to savings bonds. There would be the net of new savings bonds issued less those redeemed in the period. If that is satisfactory to my honourable friend, I would be glad to supply it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I just may clarify my question. What I'm really interested here in knowing is what specific issues did the government sell in the course of the past

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . year, and long term issues particularly. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, this is really what I'm interested in, the long term cost of borrowing to the government; and what were the terms of those issues, what the government got -- in short what was the cost of the long term borrowing to the government on each specific issue. I'm not trying to get here the flows, I'm trying to get each issue to find out exactly what it is costing us to borrow money.

MR. EVANS: With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to accept the Order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member from Gladstone I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. How many cabinet meetings were held away from the Legislative Building in the year 1966.
2. Where these were held.
3. What the costs of such meetings were, including transportation, accommodation and all other costs which were paid for by the Manitoba Government or any of its Boards, Commissions, Agencies or Funds.

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

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information for each year since the change in the Federal-Provincial tax formula, in 1962:

1. The proper name of each tax collected by the Federal Government on behalf of the Provincial Government.
2. The rate of each such tax.
3. The additional rate imposed by the province.
4. The amount produced by each tax showing the portion which is Federal abatement and the portion which is extra Provincial tax.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information as of June 1, 1966:

1. How many automobiles owned, leased or operated by the Manitoba Government are equipped with two-way telephones or radios.
2. The department and the person to whom these automobiles are allocated.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information for each year since 1962:

1. The number of conservation officers on staff at the beginning of each year.
2. The number of conservation officers who have left the government service in each year.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, again in the absence of the Honourable Member from Gladstone, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Total number of applications received by the Government of Manitoba for school tax rebate in 1966.
2. The total amount of rebate paid by the province.
3. The largest amount paid to any single applicant and the number of parcels of land represented by it.
4. The number of parcels of land appearing on the Assessment Roll for which no application for rebate was made.
5. The amount of money due taxpayers for tax refunds as of December 1st, 1966, and not

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . processed or paid.

6. How many taxpayers are represented in the amount in question 5.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information concerning the northern forest development announced by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this House on Tuesday, March 8th, 1966.

1. What expenditures the Manitoba Government has so far incurred relative to this project on roads, bridges, land clearing, forest protection, forest inventory, including aerial photography, photo interpretation and field cruising.

2. The location of the road construction work.

3. What work has been done on the road from Wabowden and Thicket Portage to Lake Sipiwesk.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the dates when the services of the three former cabinet ministers terminated in their official capacity. I am referring to the three that served in the 27th Legislature at the time the election was called but are no longer serving. I am correcting the wording -- there are two words omitted.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, to be clearer about my honourable friend's request, I presume he is referring to Messrs. Hutton, Steinkopf and Smellie. Is that right?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. ROBLIN: Hutton, Steinkopf and Smellie.

MR. FROESE: No, not Mr. Hutton, Mr. Harrison, Harrison, Steinkopf and Smellie.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you very much. I wanted to be sure because I hadn't -- I thought it was Mr. Hutton.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debated on second reading. The Honourable Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, in Bill 10 the change from the present section 3 of schedule B to the proposed section - this proposal -- (Interjection) -- it intends to permit a local authority to prepare a planning scheme in order to reserve new land for new roads and streets in addition to the present provisions for main thoroughfares that it desires to keep free from buildings and to reserve land for these purposes while giving the freedom to property owners to object to the planning scheme first to a responsible authority which could be the local authority and as a final recourse to the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs, who in turn may refer these objections to the Municipal Board for a hearing, in place of the present requirement which states that such lands may be reserved by agreement with the owner or the owners of the land.

Now the reasons for this proposed amendment are as follows: There is an increasing number of municipalities who wish to reserve lands for the public right of way in those areas in which there is a sporadic or haphazard development -- usually this development is by leaps and bounds. This has taken place and even in some areas that are already presently subdivided but this subdivision in the opinion of maybe the local authority or perhaps in the opinion of the Planning Commission is no longer suitable or is it desirable in the public interest. And while the present legislation permits this to be accomplished in various ways it doesn't take into account the time element and herein lies one of the problems. But the commonest problem arises where there are blocks of land where buildings have been erected around the periphery of a block and a considerable amount of the land in the interior of the block becomes land blocked. Now in the past the Planning Branch has been called upon to suggest how such situations could be improved but in many instances a solution is impossible because of inadequate public access and one cannot be established due to possibly an existing building which has been erected with really no thought to the interior of the property. Now before this situation is reached it is often possible to show how an access to the interior of the property could be established, but since present methods of accomplishment, that is of presenting alternate plans of subdivisions at meetings with property owners to get their approval, can from the experience we have had take

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) . . . . a long time and in many cases up to as much as three years to work out it is highly possible this could happen and has happened so that in the meantime a building could be erected in such a way as to prohibit access to the property. So the intent here is not only should the public interest be protected but also that of the property owner directly involved.

Now in areas which are presently subdivided, the local authority may wish to work towards a better plan, one probably with less streets to build or maintain and shorter lengths of services to provide, probably more lots per acre, fewer intersections; and here also the time element is a factor as cancellation of an existing plan - getting approval of all the property owners to a new plan can take longer than in those areas that are not subdivided. But the greatest use of this section, Mr. Speaker, would be made for new streets and roads and only to a lesser extent for thoroughfares.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Rhineland and I believe the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain too, expressed considerable concern here as to insuring the property rights of individuals, and to make sure that they are adequately protected. I would like to refer them to section 26 of the Planning Act which makes provision for compensation to persons injuriously affected by the adoption of any planning scheme. Section 26, subsections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 12 of section 27 of the Planning Act provides for compensation -- if they look at this section you will see where it provides for injurious affection. Section 28, subsection 1 of the Planning Act provides for expropriation. Section 29 deals with compensation for persons whose property is injuriously affected by the use of section 29, subsection 1.

Now in going back - and it seems quite a long time now to December 12th - the Honourable Member for Lakeside asked some questions there on pages 119 and 120 of Hansard. He asked the number of municipalities who were employing planning services and the number is 51. Breaking this down, there are two cities, 21 towns, 14 villages, 13 rural municipalities and one local government who are employing planning services; and there is also special agreement covering assistance to the L. G. D. of Pinawa.

The municipalities who are no longer employing planning services number 7. Of those there are 3 towns, 2 villages, and 2 rural municipalities. And municipalities that have requested the planning service number 9. Breaking these down there are 4 towns, 2 villages and 3 rural municipalities. And municipalities that have expressed an interest in the planning service, there are 2 towns, 2 villages, 4 rural municipalities and 3 local government districts. Now the cost is based on per capita of 30 cents.

The question was also asked what assistance they are giving to other branches and departments in the Provincial Government and in the Provincial Government the Planning Branch has been working with and on a co-ordination basis too with the local government districts, the Urban Renewal and Housing Branch, the Municipal Board, the Assessment Branch, the Highways Planning Branch, Water Control and Conservation Branch, Soils and Crops Branch, Extension Service, Environmental Sanitation Branch, the Regional Development Branch, Parks, Lands Branch, Surveys, The Manitoba Hydro, The Manitoba Telephone System, the Community Development Services, Elderly Persons Housing, Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board. And of these that I have mentioned planning assistance has been given on request to 9 of them and contact with the others is on a co-ordinating basis.

Assistance to the departments of the Government of Canada -- this was asked for -- direct assistance has been given to the Atomic Energy of Canada at Pinawa by agreement, and herein most of the work with the Federal Government is in the field of co-ordination with Indian Branch Affairs, with the Department of Public Works, with Central Mortgage and Housing and the Parks Branch.

The question was also asked, do we have a Director of Planning and who is he? Our Director of Planning is Mr. John Whiting. To give you a little rundown on him, he was born in Jamaica, 1932; he received his secondary education there and worked in an oil refinery in Trinidad for some three years. He graduated from the University of Toronto in 1957; post graduate diploma in Town and Regional Planning at the University of Toronto was received in 1958. In 59 and 60 he was the research assistant with the Metro Toronto Planning Area Board; and 60-61 he was the assistant planner at Hamilton. In '61 he came to the Municipal Planning Branch in the Province of Manitoba; in '61 he was made the assistant planner. In '64 he was the planner in charge of the Souris Field Office. In '65 he was our chief planner and in '66 he was made Director of Planning.

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.)

Now we do have a chief planner too in the person of Gerald Tencha who was born in the City of Winnipeg and received his secondary education here graduating with a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the University of Manitoba in 1961. In '62 he was employed by the Surveys Branch of Mines and Natural Resources and in '63 he graduated with his Master of Science City Planning at the University of Manitoba. In '62 to '65 he was employed with the Winnipeg Engineering, he was an Engineering Consultant in the capacity of an Engineer Planner. In '65 he came to the Municipal Planning Branch here. He was a Planner III and in '66 he was our chief planner.

Now the Planning Branch staff, you asked me for the make-up of it, we have 25 positions in there; 9 planners, 3 planning assistants, 9 draftsmen, 3 clerk-stenos and 1 clerk. Now we have some positions vacant here: 4 planners, 2 draftsmen, and 2 clerk-stenos.

I have tried to give the information asked by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and Rhineland and if I have missed any of those its some time, but I would be quite happy to give you any more information I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of bills. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I follow the proceedings aright, I think probably we should put the question, should we not, on Bill No. 10, the Minister having closed the debate?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bills. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if this item could be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave?

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment to this Act is to raise the maximum annual earnings for compensation purposes to \$6,600 from \$6,000; to introduce a new section that will permit a youngster of a deceased workman to continue education to the point where he has successfully completed a first degree at University or a technical course with an allowance of \$50.00 a month.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill increasing the wage ceilings on which compensation is based and also an increase in pensions to dependents, but the question that I'd like to ask the Minister now is if the increase to dependents is the same as to the orphans, because I feel that if a dependent has no parents the compensation should be higher in this case so that a child or the person, the dependent, can go on and have a better opportunity to get his education.

And also the other point that I wanted to raise - and the Honourable Minister knows that I cannot make any amendment for increased expenditures of money, so I'd like to urge the Honourable Minister now to increase the level of pensions to the widows of husbands and men killed in industrial accidents. I have mentioned this on first reading of the bill and I urge the Minister again that since he had reviewed this bill, that he may take a look at this phase of it again, because for example at \$100 a month I feel that the widow is in a distressing position. Suppose the husband instead of being killed is injured with permanent disability and suppose he is making \$400.00 a month, with a permanent disability he would be getting \$300.00 a month, and if he is killed a widow would only be receiving \$100.00 a month, so it seems to me that it appears it's cheaper to have people killed in industrial accidents than to have them injured. In this instance I feel that I would like to see the Minister do something and increase the widows' pensions as well.

The other point I'd like to raise, Mr. Speaker, I feel is quite a serious one, and that is to increase the existing disability pensions to people that are receiving pensions for the reason of the shrinking of the dollar. I feel that recognition must be given to the fact the dollar has depreciated since the days that many of these employees have been injured and are on compensation. So once again I feel that the pension to the widows should be increased and the second point that there should be an increase in existing permanent disability pensions to the people who are on it now.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, may I have this item stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This debate is now several weeks back from us and to possibly refresh our minds it was a continuation possibly of the Throne Speech debate and it was suggested by certain members who spoke that the message should not be delivered unless there were probably some other matters brought up and included in the message to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and my friend, the Member for Rhineland spoke at length on matters that he thought should be included. I too have some suggestions that should be included, in my opinion. Perhaps if I mention for a moment something that had been ...

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . if the honourable member meant what he said, that it was his thinking that his debate was to be a continuation of the Throne Speech. . . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: No, it wasn't my thinking, Your Honour, but I just go by what I read in the Hansard. Would you like me to quote? On Page 263, towards the end of the Throne Speech debate, Mr. Roblin speaks, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind - the gentleman asked whether he could continue the debate. The debate is that the Address be presented to His Honour, so I presume he has to confine himself to that subject." Now this is the Honourable the First Minister referring to the Honourable Member from Rhineland. Then next Mr. Molgat says and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an open debate because it is very questionable whether an Address should be presented to His Honour in view of the behaviour of this government and I think my honourable friend can speak as long as he wants on the behaviour of the government. Then yourself, Mr. Speaker, said this: "I'm prepared to receive a little direction from the floor in this connection." And then the Honourable Member from Rhineland was given the right to speak so I took that to mean that we could continue on in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope, I had hoped that the Honourable Member for Portage would not use this motion before the House to revive the Throne Speech. This I suggest, in all sincerity, is contrary to the rules, namely Rule 31 which states in part "No member shall revive a debate already concluded during the session." It might be well to quote Rule 30 also where it's stated in part that: "Speeches shall be directed to the question under consideration or to the motion."

I would ask the co-operation of the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie and others who may wish to take part in this debate to confine their remarks to the principle of the motion as set forth on Page 5 of our Orders, that is that the Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented by such members of the House as are of Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the Address. I would appeal to the honourable member to abide by the rules in view of the circumstances on that occasion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not wish to question your ruling or your judgment but I had hoped to receive the same treatment as the Honourable Member from Rhineland had received when he made his contribution.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to continue to speak to the principle of the motion as indicated a few moments ago?

MR. JOHNSTON: In my opinion I'm speaking to the principle of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is your intention to revive the debate from the Speech from the Throne -- or refer to it?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to abide by your ruling and if you . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't ruled as yet.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well then I'd like to continue, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. JOHNSTON: This afternoon there was some mention made by my honourable leader as to the credibility gap that has seemed to come about in Manitoba since the . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order if my honourable friend wishes to continue in the way that he has. I think you have made a perfectly reasonable proposition to the House that we should not revive previous debate. If my honourable friend wants to talk about the credibility gap he can do so tomorrow when the motion that is under adjournment now comes up for debate. I suggest that it would not be proper to, in effect, revive the Throne Speech debate as my honourable friend appears to be intending to do and I would say that on a point of order, though you have not made a ruling I certainly support the line of logic that you presented to us tonight, Sir, and I think that members should without any fuss in my opinion, accept that guidance. We're really not being stifled in any way. There is plenty of opportunity to

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . talk about these subjects but this is not the motion to do it on.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. If the honourable member feels that such an Address should not be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor he certainly must give his reasons, and I think this is what he is trying to do. He is not talking about the Throne Speech at all.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order, it seems to me that the question before us at this time is whether or not the precedent that was established some four weeks ago now, is applicable or not, because what happened on that instance is that the Honourable Member for Rhineland, speaking on this very question, spoke on a number of assorted subjects and my colleague, the Member for Portage - I'm not sure exactly what subjects he wishes to cover but I would think that he ought to be entitled to the same latitude that was extended then. So I think it's a question of knowing whether the precedent at that time - and in this matter I'd like to refer to the Honourable the Attorney-General who has indicated to us on previous points of order that any precedent established in this House is the determining factor. I submit there was a precedent established on the 15th of December, that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was allowed to speak on the subject, to speak on a number of items, explaining why in his opinion the Address should not be presented to His Honour, and I assume that my honourable friend from Portage intends to do the same. I don't think he wants to revive the whole debate, but I think he wants to state his position.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for the opinions they've given and I appreciate the position most sincerely of the Honourable Member for Portage. However, I must point out that at the time the motion now under consideration was made on December 15th proper consideration I think you will agree with me was hampered by a number of opinions being put forward simultaneously at all points throughout the House, all of which made it most difficult for the Chair to rule in the interests of all concerned. It is unfortunate that at that time the Chair did not guide the House in accordance with the rules that has been referred to a few moments ago.

I appeal to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to accept those circumstances of that day and respect the rule that was agreed to by the whole House when it was printed and included in that book. It is my opinion that the motion before the House should not be used as a vehicle to reopen the Throne Speech which has run its course, a full eight days in accordance with the rules, 34, sub-paragraph 4. And accordingly it seemed to me that the Honourable Member for Portage intends to persist, no matter how slightly in his remarks to make some reference to things that were included in the Throne Speech, leaving me no other alternative -- I must rule the honourable member out of order in carrying out what appears to be a continuation, no matter how slight, of the Throne Speech.

MR. PETURSSON: In as much as I feel that I was one of the members involved in the predicament, call it, that arose at that earlier time and was voted out as speaker on that occasion, I am accepting the ruling of the House at that time, I'm not insisting on continuing what was started on that occasion. I was recognized by the Speaker I believe according to the records in Hansard, there was a motion made that the Member for Rhineland be recognized, and by vote of the House he was, and I understood that that was to bring that particular part of the House ritual to a close and I was accepting that as part of the ruling of the House and I'm not proposing to pursue that any further; I doubt whether anybody else should.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think the honourable member means well but he's talking about a previous debate, he's not talking about this motion at all. He was recognized in a previous debate. It has nothing to do with this at all.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not my intention to allow the House to get into the condition it got into on the 15th of December. I'm asking co-operation in order that we can continue with the business. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, what is the ruling exactly? That the precedence that was established on the 15th of December when the Honourable the Member for Rhineland spoke on whatever subject he chose, that that is not a precedent of the House. Is this the ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. MOLGAT: But your ruling is that there was no precedence established on the 15th of December by the speech of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Is that correct. I'd just like to know whether or not we operate here on precedence or not?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not been advised of any such precedence.



MR. LYON: On the question of precedence, if I may say so, precedence that my honourable friend refers to is -- as the honourable the Chairman of the House has said there was no intervention by him at that time. Precedent comes about by virtue of a ruling of the Speaker and because certain debates take place at a certain time and when the Speaker subsequently in the same debate or subsequently in the same House makes a ruling which may or may not be in accordance with the precedent, with the previous action, the ruling then becomes the rule and the order of the House. And I think it's quite clear to my honourable friend as it is to all of us here the Speaker is saying his ruling is that you cannot revive the Throne Speech on this secondary motion, which is a formalized motion, which in my brief experience of some nine years in the House has never been debated before.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie wishes to speak to the motion, to the principle of the motion sent forward on our Order paper he is quite in order to do so. I am merely questioning the thought that he may bring into his remarks or make reference in his remarks to the discussion that's already gone on and been completed insofar as the Throne Speech debate is concerned, that's all, The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That was the point, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to have cleared up. I understood you to say that he could not use this motion as a vehicle for reopening the Throne Speech debate, but what I wanted to find out -- you've given me the answer now, that if he wished to speak to this motion, he could speak to this motion, provided he did not revive the Throne Speech.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, while the point of order is under discussion I would just like to comment on the remarks of the Honourable the Attorney-General because he has on diverse occasions educated me on the rules of the House and I have taken his suggestions very much to heart and what he has said -- and I can quote the chapter and verse given a little time to look it up -- should be emblazoned I would think in the rule books in large letters, because he has said, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker doesn't make mistakes, he makes precedents. So would the Honourable the Attorney-General explain to us how the fact that the Speaker, who never makes mistakes, and allowed the Honourable Member for Rhineland to proceed on the general debate on this motion, didn't establish a precedent. If my honourable friend would with his customary clarity elucidate that point I'll have been more than interested.

MR. LYON: I would be quite happy to, Mr. Speaker, although I would hate to .....

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . member of this House, may I ask what question is under discussion in the House. It is my understanding that you suggested the rule of order for us to abide by and there's been considerable discussion by the Honourable the Attorney-General and the former Premier, which I think is totally out of order. You've made a ruling that the debate on this particular question must pertain to this particular question. I see no purpose at all in any argument between the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Member for Lakeside. Let's get on with the business of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Portage would care to continue as I suggested a moment ago.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I said I did not wish to challenge your ruling, although there had not been one, and I am certainly willing to accept your ruling without challenge at this time. I must say that I had intended to continue on in the vein of the throne speech but in view of your remarks I am willing to accept your ruling without challenge and make my remarks at another time. However, I would like to remind members of this House that it was the Honourable the First Minister himself who brought this upon us when he undertook to give the time and it was implied - he can say otherwise in this House if he wishes - but he implied that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was going to have time to speak and so there was an opening and we took the opening but we did not mean to take it to obstruct or use the time of this House unduly. So, Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling and I will make my remarks at another time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a word or two in connection with the Motion that we have before us . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please . . . . just a moment. I'd like to accept the remarks of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie with sincere appreciation. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: The motion before the House at the present time, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented by such members of the House as are of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the address. I think it is a time honoured custom that such an Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor following debate normally called the debate from the speech from the throne. I think it would be in order for me to make a suggestion however as to the type of paper and the printing that should be used in the presentation to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and how the engrossing should be done.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker in view of the conduct of the government since the election which was held last June 23rd and the puny proposals that the government has presented to this House for consideration that the paper that is going to be used for the engrossing of the message to His Honour be a very very pale pale pink or yellow embordered by a wide band of black, indicating that Manitoba is in mourning because of the type of government which we have in the province at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party meant that as a suggestion, not a motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I am interested in this matter -- as the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has said it's a time honoured tradition. He is correct in saying that it is a time honoured tradition that this motion is passed. I asked in all seriousness the other day is it carried through, is the speech engrossed and presented to His Honour by the members of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder. My honourable friend the First Minister said yes, that is done.

It's not time honoured as far as some administrations were concerned because even though the motion was passed it was not so done and I am interested to hear that it is actually carried forth, under these circumstances. And if it is, then I have no objection to voting for the motion. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the First Minister has not by answering the question exhausted his right to speak and if you feel that he has, or if he feels that he has then I would be definitely interested in hearing someone tell us exactly the procedure that is followed. I know that in some jurisdictions that this is done very formally. I know that the whole House or such members as are present on that particular day form up a procession and go over to the Government House in order to present to the Lieutenant-Governor the Address that has been adopted by the House. I didn't know that even the formality of going through with it was continued here and I would be interested in hearing exactly what is done.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to say a word on this fascinating topic, may I say how much I appreciate the observations of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party about the puny effort that we're making for the province. I thought, Sir, that -- I must be careful here, so perhaps I . . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, is the Honourable the Premier addressing himself to the Motion?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . is or he will be called to order as you were.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, you can't say it fairer than that. I think that I'll have to talk about the colour of the paper but it gets my point across, yes, I'm sorry that we can't do it. Now I don't think much of the taste displayed by my honourable friend in his choice of colour -- pale pink. After all surely a robust red coming from him would be a little more suitable; and of course the province would be bankrupt to support that kind of a colour. But the question of colour I must admit is something about which I'm afraid the government cannot do anything about, because there seems to be one failure, one omission in our procedure as we follow it here. I have reservations as to whether this Address is engrossed. I think perhaps it's typed. I hate to admit such a departure from precedent but that's the case. And I imagine that the constitutionalists would tell us that it is far more than a tradition that we should do this but a necessary part of our procedure to assure His Honour in the most direct possible way that those of us who occupy the Treasury benches have the confidence of the House and this is one way in which that is evidenced if he had any doubts about the matter.

The presentation does take place, and as the motion states, the mover and seconder have the honour of making the presentation and they are accompanied by some members of the Executive Council. We of course would be glad to have any member of the House join this procession but probably on the stipulation that they supported the Address, otherwise it would be a little hypocritical of them to turn up, would it not? So I presume that's one reason why the government is left to perform this task for itself. However it is I think, an interesting point raised by my honourable friend. I don't know what he did when he was in office but I can tell you that at the present time we do follow through the wording of this motion with the exception that instead of being engrossed it is very nicely typewritten in capital letters.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said I'd like to propose an amendment to this motion, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that the words "engrossed and " be struck out.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is intended to be a constructive suggestion but I think however that until we have taken advice with those who are in charge of our procedure around here we would not be apt to accept any amendments to the procedure at this time. Perhaps the next time this motion is brought in we might examine the wording of it but I'm one of those traditionalists who would not like at the snap of a finger to make any change in a method in procedure that has been followed through the years even though the wording may not be strictly modern.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . remarks made would they withdraw?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that you should put words in motion that you don't mean. I don't think that you should misrepresent . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure you that wasn't my intention.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I'm not referring to you. I'm talking about the motion of the First Minister. He stood up and said that it's not engrossed but he tells us to pass a motion that the thing is engrossed and I don't believe in that.

MR. ROBLIN: I think probably that some of us are out of order here because I rather had the impression that when I spoke, Mr. Speaker, that I closed the debate, having introduced this substantive motion, and therefore my honourable friend really has no right to introduce his interesting amendment. --(Interjection)-- Strictly to the point of order as I think my honourable friend will recognize.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think the time has come to put the question.

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

MR. LYON: Call the next item on the Order Paper please, the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that although the motion is carried, that if the House does go into Committee of Supply we would simply move the adjournment because we would like to proceed with the motion tomorrow as previously stated. So if we would perhaps just allow the item to stand on the Order Paper we could go into Supply first thing in the morning.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . Mr. Speaker, I think it is the practice that's been followed in past years so that it's merely by agreement in the House that the matter is left standing.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to consult with honourable members opposite. I understand there is no great disposition on the part of those with private resolutions standing in their name to proceed to those items tonight and if I could have some . . . indication if that is the fact I would then perhaps be disposed to move a motion of adjournment of the House. --(Interjection)-- I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and the House adjourned until 10 o'clock Friday morning.