

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, September 25, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Fourth Report. Your Committee has considered Bill No. 30, an Act to incorporate The Brandon University Students' Union, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas) introduced Bill No. 43, an Act to incorporate St. Anthony's General Hospital. (Second reading Monday next.)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 23 students of Lord Selkirk School of Grade 5 and 6 standing. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Barton. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

We also have with us 25 students of the Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts, the Journalism Class. These students are under the direction of Mr. O. E. Sprunt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Bajayu zwrnuty uwahu shanownych posliw do galerii. Widwiduut nas 38 chleniw i chlenkyn Selkirk Day Centre. Wony ye pid prowodom pana Storoschuka. Tsey oseredok ye w wyborchi okruzi shanownoho posla z Point Douglas.

Wimeni wsich shanownych posliw legislatury Manitoby wytayu was nyini.

(Translation): I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 38 senior citizens from the Selkirk Avenue Day Centre, under the direction of Mr. Storoschuk. The centre is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I will direct this question, in the absence of the Minister of Recreation and Tourism, to the Minister of Culture. While I gave the original Minister notice on his desk, I didn't have time to give it to you, Sir, - to that Minister.

The question is regarding two roadside parks on No. 1 highway in my constituency in the Municipality of Wallis, of who the Reeve is in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Edgar. And the question is this: over the many years there's been many tourists stop there overnight - and I'm in no way, Mr. Speaker, blaming the present administration, this ruling came out I believe possibly through the civil servant - and the question is this - as Mr. Edgar lives very close to this area these people that pass - tourists in Manitoba, out of Manitoba, out of the country, are badgering him as to why they can't stop there at night. And the question is this, would the Minister consider any further investigation to adjust the rulings because I think we all are aware it's our big industry and I certainly would like to see a little bit of that tourist money left in my constituency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I hate to be a kill-joy, Sir, but I must rise in this House to show my friends the members of the Conservative Party that I'm well, healthy and raring to go. I'm quite touched with the action of my good

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . friend the Member from Lakeside and the other pallbearers, but I must tell them, I must tell them that their action in rejoicing over the - in dedicating this memorium to me is a bit premature but I appreciate it nevertheless.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like an answer - or if not an immediate answer in the very near future as this is a fairly important question for my area.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister, I can assure my honourable friend that we shall take his representation and look at it very closely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, in regards to an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press in regards to beef prices being probed by Mr. Jim Wilfley, and to give an answer - at least part of an answer - to the honourable member that questioned me in the House on September 23rd regarding beef prices, I now have in my possession a study that has been made by Doctor M. A. Loyns of the University of Manitoba on beef prices. It is far from being complete. I've added one page to the report that dates September 23rd, 1969. Copies of this brief are available to all MLAs interested, and you could be in touch with my office to have a copy of these.

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Official Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would agree to distribute a copy to all members of the House, because I think most members would probably be interested in that report.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I have now six copies. I will beg 57 copies made and have them available to all MLAs.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Reil): . . . Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can he advise the House if he intends to reconstitute and call the Lake Winnipeg Action Committee regarding the flood levels on Lake Winnipeg?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Brandon East): Could you explain to me what the Lake Winnipeg Action Committee is?

MR. CRAIK: The Lake Winnipeg Action Committee that was formed several years ago when the crisis occurred on Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Could the honourable member indicate if that's the same committee that recommended the placing of dikes in the wrong places?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on this question I have some information for the House, in a reply to a question or questions asked of me last day regarding lake levels in Lake Winnipeg. I might say first of all, for the honourable members who are interested, in the annual reports of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources are found charts illustrating lake levels throughout Manitoba, the major lakes of Manitoba, including Lake Winnipeg, and it gives you a very good graphic picture of the fluctuation of lake levels; I might add that the 50 year mean of lake levels is - this is for the period 1918 to 1967 - is 713 approximately - 713.

The lake level, and this is the mean of the week ending September 20th, and this is measured at Gimli - the lake level, this is the past week ending September 20th is 715.33. Last year at this time it was 714.28. In 1967 it was 714.40. However, in 1966 the year in which some crisis existed, it was 716.54. In other words, we are more than a foot below the high level of 1966.

Now I have consulted with the experts in the Water Control and Conservation Branch and it is their opinion that an emergency situation does not exist at this time. No money is set aside for the construction of temporary dikes therefore, similar to those built by the previous government.

Mention was made of a strong north wind. If there was a three-day strong north wind at these levels some flooding could be expected. However, a record level of flooding is not expected; in fact it's quite unlikely. However, if such a situation arose, the government and the people in my Water Control and Conservation Branch would at that time take appropriate action.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Department of Mines and Natural Resources does not consider the situation to be an emergency situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's very

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... obvious that we're having difficulty in impressing the government and the Minister responsible for any real concern about Lake Winnipeg, but I assure him there is. I'm just suggesting to him that at the time it was in our jurisdiction we did have the Winnipeg Action Committee. It met with the government on a ministerial level and we assured them on that.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order interject at this time. I do not recall any establishment of a committee called the Lake Winnipeg Action Committee that was established by this Assembly. -- (Interjection) -- I was with it, and I was here with it a long time before you ever came here and I expect to be here a lot longer than you will be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PAULLEY: So, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On a point of order I question whether or not my honourable friend is in order in raising this matter of a committee that is non-existent, and as far as I am aware, was never ever established. And if my honourable friend has a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources let him put his question and not make a speech.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. There was a committee called the Lake Winnipeg Action Committee that did meet with the provincial cabinet. It was not formed by government. I think this is where the misunderstanding is.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, that's my point.

MR. SPIVAK: No that's very important.

MR. PAULLEY: Another secret committee.

MR. SPIVAK: No, no. They were present. As a matter of fact if I'm correct the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm wondering if there may not be a more opportune moment to conduct an investigation as to whether or not in fact this committee ever was in being, when the Honourable Ministers estimates are proceeded with.

If the honourable member has a question he may put his question now.

MR. ENNS: Right. My question is simple and direct. Will those persons who have met before on this same subject have an opportunity where they can either get assurances or otherwise, or be informed of the current situation by the current government?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if such a committee is active I for one will be most ready and willing to meet with them. But I would inform my honourable friends on the other side of the House that no letters, no telephone calls, no delegations, no one to my knowledge has made any representation to my department on lake flooding - except the honourable members on the other side. No one has made any noise about it whatsoever.

MR. CRAIK: ... Mr. Speaker, if the speeches are finished across the way, could the Honourable Minister tell me the figures that he has given us, if these are just time figures or do they take into account average lake levels, because as you know we talked of fluctuations of two feet or so depending on winds -- (Interjection) -- If my little pomeranian friend from Transcona here will quit yapping we can get the right answers.

MR. EVANS: I believe the honourable member is referring to whether we're talking about an average lake level per se. The point is, of course, that the lake water levels have to be recorded at some specific geographical location. Readings are normally taken at Gimli, or at least Gimli and Winnipeg Beach are two common places that they're taken.

I just might add further, I mentioned that the average for the week ending September 20th was 715.33 at Gimli. Today - this very day - the water level is down to 714.63.

With respect to measurements at other areas I would only say that the other zones or points along the lake are not - the water levels are not recorded as frequently. There is a recording I know made at Grand Beach but this is only recorded monthly, but this is a procedure that's been in effect for some time.

So in effect what I'm saying in the way of supplementary information is that while the lake level was at 715.33 for the week ending September 20th, the average; today's reading is lower - it's 714.63.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. He has said that in 1966 the lake level was 716.54. In the news and information service bulletin that came out last week - perhaps he could tell me whether my memory is correct - didn't it say in that bulletin that the level would be maintained

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)... at 716 if the lake was used?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there is no device to control the level of Lake Winnipeg at the present time. This government has no authority. The level of the Lake Winnipeg at the moment, as my good friend Reverend Petursson would remind me, is an act of God, not an act of the Manitoba Government.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I meant if and when it is controlled as is being considered.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the honourable member, this is the purpose of the feasibility study which is outlined in the Cass-Beggs report and at the moment we're working very hard I can assure you, the people of my department are working day and night to prepare for this feasibility study, and the point of the feasibility study is to ascertain the adequate parameters, adequate for purposes of tourism, recreation, fishing, navigation as well as hydro-electric flood purposes, and I can assure you the advance information I have is that the lake level can be controlled substantially below record flooding level, substantially below that, and I'm quite optimistic as to the outcome.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if the battle of Lake Winnipeg is over I was going to ask another question. My question is to the Honourable the First Minister. Members of the Legislature have received an enquiry from the University of Lethbridge who are considering sponsoring a conference on one prairie province. So my question is: would this government send a delegation to that conference if it is held?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have not seen that letter. Until I have had time to read it with some care I'd hesitate to make any comment except to venture the personal opinion that if such a conference is being held at the academic plane that it might well be in the interests of future planning to at least send someone down. Possibly even my honourable friend could accompany the group.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. A few days ago I asked him a question about a grievance by layoff or firing of some employees at Sprague by the Columbia Forest Products and he promised to give an answer. I wonder if he has one?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I'm speaking as the pomeranian or the Minister of Labour but I have looked into the matter raised by my honourable friend and may I inform him that there is no violation of any legislation in regard of this dispute. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations are going on at the present time in order to resolve the matter. It is a matter that is of concern of the government.

I have a notation that the information we have pertaining to the above company re the lay-off of eleven employees referred to by my honourable friend is as follows: There probably were eleven employees whose services were terminated. The basis for this termination was the company went on a four-shift operation after training people over a considerable length of time and it involves workers having to work on Sunday, in accordance with the agreement. However, all people working on Sunday shifts still have a day of rest. The employees work a 48 hour week. If required to work any time over and above this they are paid overtime rates. The chief problem is, of course, and this is understandable, that the employees objected to working on Sunday shift. There is a union involved. It is a question of negotiation between the union and the employees and it's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations are going forward insofar as this matter is concerned. May I again say that the facilities of the department are available to both sides upon request.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for the information to me and to the House. I have another question to him. It's on a different matter. Has the Minister offered, or his department offered any assistance in settling the dispute between the Society for Crippled Children and the bus drivers? I think the ones that suffer here are the children.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, that's right, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to my honourable friend and the members of the Assembly that myself as Minister of Labour and my department are deeply concerned with the situation prevailing at the present time in respect of the bus strike between the Teamsters Union and the Society of Crippled Children.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that as long ago as April, the Teamsters Union had the right

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... under the legislation of Manitoba to strike. They withheld doing so up until the day before yesterday or yesterday morning. I have been informed by the Union that -- and of course may I preface this remark by saying that the strike is strictly in accordance with the laws of the Province of Manitoba. There is the question of those concerned, that is the crippled children, and we are concerned with them likewise. I have a notation from the President of the - by telegram - of the teamsters local which reads as follows. It was just directed to me: "Re legal strike the Society of Crippled Children and Adults. The Union is prepared to meet and discuss this problem at any time day or night, Saturday or Sunday included." I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with the laws of the Province of Manitoba this is an internal matter in the first instance but the officials of the Department of Labour, including the Minister, will be prepared to meet if desired by the two parties in the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him now that a week has gone by, whether he has received any reaction from Falconbridge or Boeing or any other corporation with an ardor for Manitoba, to the budget that was brought down a week ago by his honourable colleague.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend knows, all of the information that could possibly be of use to the Boeing Corporation has been provided by officials of my department. We have given them an offer to stand ready to supply them with whatever additional information they might require. It now remains only for the Boeing Corporation to meet in Board of Directors to make their decision as to where they will locate. I could also tell my honourable friend, Sir, that there are two places that they are looking at; one being some place near St-Jerome, Quebec, the other somewhere in this part of Manitoba.

Inasmuch as the Province of Quebec has taxation that equals or exceeds in fact taxation levels in the Province of Manitoba, corporation tax may be one point lower, sales tax is three points higher, and all that taken into account, Mr. Speaker, we have still reason to be optimistic that the Boeing Corporation may decide to locate here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if he has answers to the questions that were asked yesterday in connection with the Order for Return No. 5 and in connection with the Medicare program.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Not as yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Well a supplementary question then dealing directly with Order No. 5. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate whether the figures of the arrears are cumulative or not.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the last part of the question.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate whether the figures contained in the Order for Return of the amount of arrears owing to the Hospital Commission for Medicare payments are cumulative or not. They are given monthly but are they accumulative figures or not.

MR. GREEN: No, the arrears figure is the arrears as at the date mentioned. It's not a cumulative arrears figure.

MR. SPIVAK: Well again, are those arrears for that specific month or are they the cumulative arrears for the total owing on the Medicare program since March 31st?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the last figure that is shown is the total amount of arrears that is outstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. In view of the announcement yesterday that the Province of Ontario will ban the general use of insecticide DDT, January 1st I believe it is, is this government also considering taking action in the same direction?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government is always looking into the area of the possible danger with the use of insecticides. We are naturally going to find out from the Government of Ontario what the reasons were which led them to take what appears to be a decision which will be made some time in the future, January 1st, 1970; which legislation will not, to my understanding, ban the use but will restrict it considerably in different areas. When

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . we get those reasons and if they indicate that there is some outstanding danger to the Province of Manitoba or to any facet of our provincial life then we'll certainly accept whatever responsibility that information would lead us to.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. In any event I presume that this decision could be made before next spring?

MR. GREEN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that we would have the information very quickly and that the decision if necessary - and I don't want to imply that it is necessary - could be made before next spring.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is really supplementary to the other questions in connection with the request to the Minister. I wonder if he can undertake to try and get the information that was requested as soon as possible because it is germane to the present budget debate now taking place.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I can't give the honourable member that assurance. I would like to remind him that his question relates to whether or not the figures indicate consistency with the department's projections, whether their opinion would be that there is a consistency, and I would ask the honourable member to appreciate that some people would say that it might be consistent, some people would say that it might not be consistent and I think that his views on that would not be inhibited in debate by taking whatever position he wishes to.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there were two questions that were asked that have not been answered. The Honourable Minister has only referred to one. The other was whether the amount of monies that are shown as paid out under Order No. 5 really are the only monies that were owing as of that month or were partial payment, and I think this information is important as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think most of us have become aware particularly of late that the Federal Department of Fisheries has a pretty important part to play in the administration of the regulations within our own fishing industry. A question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - is he aware of any -- and I'm not worried about the cutback in the federal civil service -- but is he aware of any specific functions that the province may have to take on as a result of this reduction in federal civil service staff?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, offhand I am not aware. I will look into the matter. I would hope and I'm rather certain that there would be no detrimental implications; I can't say positively but I will look into the matter and if there is anything adversely about to occur we will endeavour to take appropriate action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. Can he indicate in light of the tabling of the report yesterday with respect to short term plans for hydro power development, can he indicate any further decision with regard to calling of the Public Utilities Committee?

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say to my pompous not pomeranian friend that I have answered this question on numerous occasions. The committee will be called when it is deemed advisable for it to be called.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate whether the consultants who were hired by the previous administration in connection with the uranium enrichment development have still been retained by the present government?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice. I might add by way of explanation to my honourable friend that they are not actively engaged in any work at the moment.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder would the Honourable First Minister indicate whether the proposed change in the hydro development was ever discussed with them prior to the announcement in the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I told my honourable friend the other day that the proposed changes in the sequence of development of the Nelson have nothing at all to do with the ultimate matter as to whether or not we shall have a uranium enrichment plant established here

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.),... in Manitoba, for the simple reason that the total output of hydro-electric energy on the Nelson is in no way affected whether we decide to go by way of a high level diversion on South Indian Lake or whether we decide to go for the Lake Winnipeg controlled flood - a simple or dual diversion of the Churchill River.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Would the First Minister indicate that the rate, the hydro rate is not affected by this decision at all. Is he in a position to really say that?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to say that but I am in a position to say that if there is any cost differential on a per kilowatt hour basis it is so marginal that it hardly bears notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my department is quite concerned with this problem and I notice that during the last week or two there were certain questions asked, one in particular by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in regard to the Whiteshell Provincial Park, and I'd like to state at this time that hearings will be held this fall to examine the possible changes in the policy of issuing permits for permanent trailer sites in the Whiteshell Provincial Park. Mr. Peter Thlessen, 39, a teacher and university researcher living in North Kildonan has been appointed Chairman of the hearings. For the benefit of summer residents using or wishing to use the permanent trailer sites, the hearings will be held in both Winnipeg and in the Whiteshell. Dates and locations of the hearings are to be announced later. A total of 343 permanent trailer sites are located in the West Hawk, Falcon and Dorothy Lake trailer camps. For many years it has been possible for summer residents to lease permanent trailer sites in consecutive years. This has had the effect of limiting the accessibility of many trailer sites to others. Changes in the method of issuing trailer site permits are contemplated and any change in the present leasing policy will not be instituted until the fall of 1970. The results of the hearings may indicate need for a new leasing policy and these results will have to be assessed before any change in the method of issuing trailer site permits is made.

The other announcement I'd like to make at this time is a grant of up to \$58,000 in support of the Winnipeg portion of the 1970 World Hockey Tournament. The grant fulfills a \$75,000 pledge made by the provincial government in 1968 in supporting a bid for Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation to bring the second round of the tournament schedule to Manitoba, March 22 to 29. Last year a grant of \$17,000 was made to Winnipeg Enterprise Corporation to cover salaries and expenses for advance ticket sale and promotion office.

The current grant includes a further \$17,000 for promotion and ticket sales, \$31,500 to provide accommodation for six hockey teams and officials of the International Ice Hockey Federation and \$9,500 for hospitality to be extended by the Province to the hockey players, tournament officials, the news media representatives covering the tournament.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM, (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Tourism and Recreation for his very informative speech. He has given us the policy of the provincial government here with regard to the Whiteshell area, but he has not given us any indication that he will make representation to Ottawa with regard to the policy in Riding Mountain and this is a question that is very important to most people in Manitoba.

MR. BURTNIAK: I made it quite clear in my answers to the questions that have been asked before, that we have contacted Ottawa to find out what the policy of the Federal Government is with respect to National Parks and so far we have not received any answer from them yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Some time ago there was considerable concern about the health and welfare of our chickens in this province as a result of possible harmful affects by the microwave towers that we have crisscrossing through this province. The question directly, if the Minister is listening, is does he concur with the findings of the report that was evidently released just recently by the University of Manitoba that in fact these same radio waves seem to spur on greater production and in general seem to be in no way injurious to their health.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): What was the question?

MR. ENNS: Do you concur, Mr. Minister, in the report issued by the University?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen the report.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister, in the interests of all chickens in this province, undertake to find that report?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend ought to know that in due course I will be looking at many reports, that being one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could inform the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that if he persists with that line of questioning, he may very well lay an egg or two.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker.... going to happen in this House. I won't say on which side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question if I may to the First Minister. Does he not agree that this is the line of questioning that he did actually participate in Ottawa on this same subject, and does he agree with the statement over TV last night?

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable gentleman that's an argumentative question.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind admitting that it was a matter which I did treat seriously while a Member of Parliament for Selkirk, for the simple reason that the farm operator in question suffered substantial loss, reasons for which could never be precisely determined by any veterinarians that were brought in from as far away as Des Moines, Iowa, Toronto.

I want to say to my honourable friend also that upon speaking to one or two physicists in Ottawa in the National Research Council and Defense Production Council that it is felt that it is within the realm of theoretical possibility that stray strobe energy from microwave towers could theoretically cause damage.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day - some weeks ago I directed a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in regard to the construction of the Patterson Dam in southwest Manitoba. At that time he took the question as notice and I wonder if he has any report that he might give to the House now in regards to commencement or any progress in the construction of the Patterson Dam.

MR. EVANS: I will endeavour to make a report tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Leader of the House. Is it correct that executive assistants of the Ministers will be available to members of the government caucus specifically for speech writing and research work, particularly for caucus members?

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a question that is within the orbit of decision by cabinet and decision by the government and not subject to answer on Questions of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker,

MR. PAULLEY: Unless I misunderstood my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I hope my honourable friend,

MR. PAULLEY: If the rabble would just keep quiet, I could listen to what my honourable friend says.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MOLGAT: because I was referring to people who are employed by government. These are people who are not civil servants I understand in the regular term, but they are employed by government, by the minister. My question was, are the executive assistants or special assistants, whatever the terms are, available to private members on the government side, members of the government caucus, for work like speech writing, special research work and that type of work for caucus members of the government?

MR. PAULLEY: I would say, Mr. Speaker, in past practice the executive assistants have been executive assistants to the Minister and they are under the general control of the Minister. I would suggest that that would be the answer to my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader could explain to me the reason for this document, which I found posted in the locker room yesterday. The heading is "The following list contains the names, telephone and office numbers of the executive assistants to the government ministers. Caucus members at large should feel free to call on that individual executive assistant whose departmental area includes or most approximates their own field of interest. The executive assistants will be available for consultation on specific matters of concern and as researchers, speech writers, etcetera, for all government MLA's."

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Would the honourable member give me a copy of that. I would like to....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, unless that particular document is signed by someone I don't know that we should accept it as being authentic or indicative of anything in particular. If my honourable friend can indicate who has authorized - I can assure him it wasn't anyone on the front bench here.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must confess it is not signed. It was on the locker room wall next to the telephone where the lists of office numbers are given for members and....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I make a request of my honourable friend that he forward a copy of that. It could conceivably have been concocted by a member of his caucus or a member of any other caucus, including my friends opposite, if it is not signed. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend would not hold me responsible as the House Leader or members of the government. Documents of any nature can be posted in the locker room. I would hate to disclose to this House, some of the contents of some of the documents that I have read in the locker room. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose would not wish to reveal some of the documents. But I would be more than happy if my honourable friend would forward to me a copy of the document. Again, I say to my friend, as I said a moment ago - as far as the executive assistants are concerned ostensibly they are under the jurisdiction of the Ministers - and I might say to my honourable friend one of the purposes of executive assistants, not only with this administration but the previous administration as well, was to forward and disseminate information required on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: In view of the fact that the Minister suggests that maybe members of my group prepared the list, I would like to assure him that no member of our group could possibly have prepared the list because we would neither know the names of the individuals concerned; even less would we know what room they operate in, which is also listed here; and even less would we know their telephone number. Now that information can obviously only come from the government side and not from this side.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt my honourable friend. The appointment of executive assistants are by Order-in-Council and Orders-in-Council are available to all members of the public including members of this Assembly. And if my honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose, or even, even my honourable friend from Lakeside, would take the time and the trouble to go to the recorder of the Orders-in-Council they could find out who has been appointed. We have a telephone exchange, Mr. Speaker, that would give the telephone numbers of the respective....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Along this line of questioning, I just want to make two points very clear: the first being that this was not authorized by me nor to my knowledge by any of my Ministers. The second point is that I shall endeavour to find out under whose authority this was done, if it was done by someone in our employ. The third point is, Mr. Speaker, that I shall check with Ottawa to find out what the practice is in the federal government. I rather suspect that even if this is true, that it may not be so unacceptable. I rather suspect it's being done in Ottawa every day.

MR. PAULLEY: And was done by the past administration.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister with respect to the subject that has been discussed. If upon enquiry it is found to be true and it has been found that executive assistants have been helping MLA's on the government side of the House, then will he make the same or similar type of services available to MLA's on this side of the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that would seem to be the logical conclusion to come to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): ... in silence for a long time to some of the statements made by the other side. I'm really shocked that the former leader of the Liberal Party should bring this in the House. It's a common known fact that executives are used for many things. As a matter of fact, during the last election, our Pepsi kid from River Heights has gone as far as using them during the campaign and nobody thinks this is terrible. And other members of the former government that were Ministers have done

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)... the same thing. I'm really shocked that somebody should come into this House and pretend that there is something terrible about having our executive, which is our business, to help somebody on the back bench. I have instructed...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: Just a minute, let me finish - you've been squawking long enough, let me have my.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. May I draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister that the First Minister has undertaken to enquire into this matter and report on it to the House and I am wondering if the matter could not be left at that point, at this time, until we hear a reply from the Honourable First Minister. I believe that we are going far beyond the purpose of the question period preceding the Orders of the Day. It's becoming a debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a question of personal privilege, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Transportation. The First Minister accepted my question and said that he would look into it, and I resent quite frankly the statement made by the Minister of Highways in these circumstances and I would ask that he be asked to withdraw the statement he has made.

MR. WEIR: We didn't raise it from this side, but I think the remarks by the House Leader were equally uncalled for in suggesting that it was quite possible, if not probable - he didn't say that, but he certainly left the impression that it could be, that it might have been drafted and put there by members of this side of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, was in the absence of any signature to the document it could have been done by anybody. And I do not impune motives to my honourable friends opposite. It is not my character so to do. And I know my honourable friends would not impune such motives to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: the members opposite doth protest too much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Before I direct my question, I can assure the House that it didn't come from the Social Credit Party.

I have a question to direct to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Some time ago I questioned the Minister whether the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba in connection with the Fisheries Act would be made available. I forget the exact answer that I got at that time, but if this information is available through an Order-in-Council, would the Honourable Minister give us the number of the Order-in-Council so that we could get it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe I personally gave a copy of this Order-in-Council to the Honourable Member from Rhineland many weeks ago; but if he has lost it, I will give him another copy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister, who I gather is leaving the Chamber. The other day when I was absent from the House he answered a question in connection with Northwest Orient Airlines and the air tunnel. I would like to simply ask him whether there has been further representations made to the Northwest Airlines in connection with this and whether it is likely that they will build an air tunnel before the winter season this year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem to be the likelihood. However, representation - communication will be made once again.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister would consider in the event they do not proceed with it, that representation be made to Ottawa, that it be part of the subject of the bilateral agreement we negotiated this year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can tell my honourable friend that there has been discussion on that very matter this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - BUDGET DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto; and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose which I have taken under advisement.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a point of order at this time. I note that yesterday you took this under advisement and I have made it a point again to review what might be the difficulty. I recognize that it could be the traditional problem of expenditure which could conceivably be involved, although in my first perusal I did not think there were expenditures involved. So if it was acceptable to the House, and by leave of the House, I would be prepared to alter my amendment by deleting the first line in both No. 1 and No. 2 and replacing them with the following - and I have copies for the House Leader and other members - and it would simply be in No. 1 deleting the first line and replacing "request the government to consider the advisability of referring the proposed increase in the provincial"; and in No. 2 "request the government to consider the advisability of immediately undertaking an overall review of." Now I think that if that were acceptable, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, that it would certainly cover any possibilities of the motion being out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose made a request to me directly of the advisability of accepting this. I defer to my colleague the Minister of Finance who would possibly, Mr. Speaker, if you would permit, make a comment as to the acceptance or rejection of this particular thing. Not in connection with what your ruling may be, Mr. Speaker, but rather the context of the amendment of my honourable friend.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Speaker, I might only indicate that certainly we have no objection to the request of the Member for Ste. Rose for leave to have his amendment changed. That has nothing of course to do with any decision that you make unless he has corrected what might be an obstacle in his path. In other words, we agree to his being allowed to make that change at this stage.

MR. PAULLEY: If the honourable member has leave to make the amendment he proposes to change the amendment, Mr. Speaker, we concur with that request.

MR. SPEAKER:..... show that on March 22nd, 1926, an amendment was moved that the question be referred to a Select Standing Committee for consideration, study and report to the House. A point of order was then raised on the ground that the proposition was not an amendment at all. It was at that time stated that it is not an amendment to a motion to move that the motion go to a committee. The Honourable Rudolph Lemieux, Speaker, ruled the point of order well taken and accordingly declared the proposed amendment out of order. This ruling appears in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition 1958, citation 202 (6), in the following words: "It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee." Accordingly I must rule the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is that the first one or the second one? I was under the impression that we had leave.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: I must be mixed up. I was under the impression that the member had leave to change this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member had leave to make change in a proposed sub-amendment which he wished to put before the House.

MR. MOLGAT: And that's out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: That leave was granted. The sub-amendment, this is my ruling on the sub-amendment, that in my opinion the proposed change would have had no effect on my ruling.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on your ruling that the amendment was out of order in any case.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, may I say something on the point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: No, unless challenge it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Speaker's ruling isn't debatable. I'm not sure whether.....

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I must regretfully challenge your ruling without explaining why I do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that is what the rule says, that that is the only recourse that the honourable member has.

Shall the Speaker's ruling be sustained?.....

Shall the Speaker's ruling be denied?.....

MR. MOLGAT: No.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right. Shall the Speaker's ruling be sustained.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the ruling sustained.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is shall the ruling be sustained.

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Stur. Cr.), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Watt and Weir, and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Froese, Johnston (P. la P.) Molgat and Patrick.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 46; Nays, 5.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried and the Speaker's ruling sustained. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time, I too wish to compliment the Minister of Finance on his appointment. Certainly his first budget has appeared to be well received by the public and the business world in general. This speaks well for our government's approach to the fiscal responsibilities of the Province of Manitoba.

I have enjoyed my position as the newly elected member of Flin Flon, and certainly the challenge of the north, while nothing new to me, has brought me and my constituency renewed faith with our First Minister's reaction to the emphasis of development of our last frontier.

Since I represent the constituency of Flin Flon, I wish to make sure that all members of this House are aware of just where Flin Flon is. I might add that this area lies within the confines of the promised land. It is a constituency in which the people and electorate are well attuned to the task to shape the destiny of northern Manitoba. I am conscious of the fact that my riding emphasized the first real development of our mining potential. When one considers however the challenge, the opportunity and the type of people who live in northern Manitoba, perhaps the description of the north as being the promised land might well apply.

When one considers the lack of many social aspects of life, one might ask why do people go to the north, or what draws people to this new way of life? Some of the primary challenges facing people of the north, in my mind, are inadequate lack of housing; fear of pollution of air and water; industrial accidents and death; lack of adequate communication systems - I might just add that the people of the north note with great satisfaction they have at last a Minister of Transportation who realizes that all the cars in Manitoba are not located in the southern part of this province - the high rent structure facing new arrivals in the north; the long-standing lack of a resident Mine Inspector and Workmen's Compensation Inspector in northern Manitoba; the long-standing practice of grant and tax incentives to companies in the north with no complementary incentives offered to the people who, in the long run, make the wheels of industry turn.

I ran for public office and for this Party, Mr. Speaker, because I felt, and I still feel, that the former government had not met the needs of northern Manitoba. I come to this House with one basic desire, to press for and enact legislation which will help wipe out many of the problems facing the people of the north. We are shortly going to enter into our second century of life as a province, and as a member of this provincial Legislature I earnestly hope, Mr. Speaker, that this New Democratic Party as our government body will enact proper, progressive legislation which will benefit all the people of Manitoba. I further hope that with such co-operation this province will double or triple the gain it has made in the last one hundred years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And once again it is my hope that with the leadership of our First Minister and the astute guidance of our Minister of Finance, we'll bring prosperity and good fortune to the whole Province of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Are you agin me or for me?

I'd like to on the offset, Mr. Speaker, relate what I have to say this afternoon to what apparently somebody feels in Winnipeg, a Mr. George A. Russell, who wrote a letter to the Winnipeg Free Press, Saturday, September 20th, 1969. And in relation to the headline I suppose this should be called "The Case of the Cross-eyed Golden Boy." And he refers it to -- reference to this fact. He says: "About 1850 an Englishman visited Canada and went home with a cold, blue, dripping nose and spoke despairingly about the barren, sterile wasteland in

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... northern Canada. About a hundred years later I landed in Winnipeg, fully cognizant of the fact that this barren, sterile wasteland, through its production in metal and timber, had made the only really significant contribution to Canada's position in the world of trade.

"When I arrived in Winnipeg, friends towed me proudly past the Legislative Building with strict admonition to look at the Golden Boy because see, he was looking to the north; that is where the future lies. Well it took a very short time to realize that the Golden Boy might be oriented north but his eyes were playing tricks, being either demurely averted to the northeast, to the financial and mercantile centre of the city and province, or looking straight west to the now glutted wheat fields. In other words, he was cross-eyed.

"No one can know for sure where the present emphasis on the north is going, but Messrs. Schreyer, Borowski and Burtiak are at least deserving of a compliment for uncrossing the Golden Boy's eyes. When one thinks of the contributions made by INCO, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and the pulp, timber and fish operators to the province, the glutted wheat fields and the parasitic welfare society to the south become pretty appalling." This is G. A. Russell, Winnipeg, and I wished I had his fortitude, Mr. Speaker, to get up and say the same thing.

But we'll try and say it in another manner probably and not quite so bluntly. It appears that we in general agree that government must be prepared to pause periodically and review the needs of government and the paths that Manitobans must follow. I would ask the Minister to direct his attention to the need - to the budget - for costs of government services to support the northern development we talk so much about. We know that the north is opening, but has this government been able to properly assess its fiscal responsibilities both now and in the immediate future. I do not think so but I think this is one of the challenges that they are going to have to meet up with.

My comments therefore will be directed to the needs of the north, the northern half of this province and the half that has the future. This budget policy has in fact taken away the large companies responsibilities, incidentally which were won through hard-nosed union negotiations, in respect to the companies paying the employees' medical and hospital premiums. And on the other hand....

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the honourable member permit a question? Which company are you referring to who would not have to pay the premiums?

MR. BEARD: Well, the Canadian National Railroad, the C. P. R., the INCO, etc.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member not aware that both last year and this year legislation is being introduced which would require the company, those that are under provincial jurisdiction in any event, to pass on any savings in premium directly to the employee? Is the honourable member not aware of that?

MR. BEARD: It is also a fact that the Canadian National Railway or the C. P. R. are not going to pass those on to their employees.

MR. GREEN: But, Mr. Speaker, those companies are under federal jurisdiction. But surely with regard to companies that are under provincial jurisdiction, if he's speaking of the steelworkers in INCO, the legislation is before the member right now indicating that any saving would have to be paid in cash to the employee, and I just wonder whether he is aware of that.

MR. BEARD: Yes, but...

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the reason I ask this question is that the notion that he is now presenting somehow has got around and surely it was heavily publicized last year that this would not take place. It's in the legislation before him which was given second reading to yesterday, and I just wonder why anybody would want to continue to perpetuate that kind of notion when it's not so.

MR. BEARD: If the Minister will sit down, I will continue on with this debate. If he is correct this is fine and dandy, I will accept it. But he has agreed also that this does not affect the federal employees, or those that are employed by companies outside the jurisdiction of this province. But if in fact it is being passed on to the employees - and the assurance is there this is fine, and I have not done my homework or I have not been listening at the proper time - but I think that we must - and I want to look into it further because I have not had the assurance that this was in fact the case. But I will leave it, and if the Minister will let me carry on I'm passing over that part anyway.

The Minister said that he had hoped to change the attitude towards flat rate taxation policy in respect to taxes in general. And I join him with his thinking, but wish to point out that the

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... income tax is not an equitable tax when related to the worker on a fixed income and a high cost of living area. Costs of living are not being considered in respect to income tax purposes, and I would hope that the Minister would follow this as we go through what I hope to be able to present today. It appears that Manitoba business and industrial corporations have accepted the new proposed budget so I will not concern myself with that portion, and I will be supporting government at this time while asking them to bring about equitable policies for northern Manitoba.

In the north, high wages are paid for obvious reasons. One is the higher cost of living, including government services; second is to encourage northern migration and labour pools; and the third is to develop northern resource industries of course. It sounds good to campaign for larger federal income tax exemptions for northern residents, which all parties and all candidates, including myself, have used in respect to northern campaigning. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not providing an answer through our government leadership but rather sloughing it off on other government shoulders.

The Federal Government policy will not react to this type of approach until this province initiates their own incentives. Why can't the Finance Minister rebate that portion of the income tax collected by the province to those in the north if they are really concerned about the position of northern labour and northern industry. And why can't the Minister consider rebate of a further portion of the federal tax which is levied on tax-paying northern people who are saddled on the other side with living costs which are higher than in any other part of this province. Why wait for a federal formula when the Minister has the funds in his hot little hands and he can do the job and he can take the political credit for the initiative to equalize the inequalities within this province.

This sort of rebate hits right at the heart of the labour-industrial problem and supports provincial incentives for further northern development. If he presents policies respecting income tax collections which have not taken into consideration the changes in costs of living, or the difference in cost of living in the large regional areas of Canada, then he is really not following through with his philosophy. Is it right to pay the same percentage of income tax when you do not share the same advantages offered through government services in the north? This is what is happening in many cases. The northern people deserve a kickback in this respect and -- (Interjection) -- 30 percent.

If the Minister wishes to project an image of a just society, then I say let him consider the position of northern industry, northern people and northern living conditions, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister cannot equalize living costs, then let him stimulate higher take-home pay. Mr. Speaker, this is not for the benefit of industry as much as for the relief to those of all areas of northern employment. It would relieve northern inflation to a great extent. Higher wages paid by companies never reach the employee as it is snatched away by unrealistic government income tax policies that have gone on in the past. Northern allowances, northern cost of living bonuses, northern expense allowances are all taxed. What good is accomplished if we continue a policy of extracting what's supposed to be the remedy invented by government to look after the incentives for people to go north, because we're taking back 40 percent before they even get it. Now government is proposing to take away even larger and increasing amounts of its own brainchild.

How can we expect to encourage good civil servants, nurses, doctors, dentists, school teachers, if we continue to grab back the incentive through taxation. How can we expect to compete for the labour pool or establish stable labour forces in the north? At present, incentives are tied so close to high living costs that taxation often places that person that is moving into the north in the hole in respect to the position that he was when he left the lower living cost areas. I think unilateral income tax policy leaves no room for equality of living when you compare southern urban and rural living to those in the northern communities. Are the poor only the ones earning under \$3,000.00? Certainly this is not the formula for social justice in respect to northern Manitoba and in respect to northern Canada.

In reviewing the northern peoples' case, the impression is far too often left that our demands for equality in development will drain the public's purse and take money from southern-oriented projects. This is not really the case. I am sure a true picture would prove to government that this - and this House in fact - that it is the exact opposite. The north is not only self-supporting but it prepays and provides tax revenues to finance other areas of this country. Let us take as an example Lynn Lake mines and the Sherritt-Gordon Mining.

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... Sherritt-Gordon spends millions of dollars on exploration before a mine is found. In fact, many millions are wasted on investments in non-paying claims. The Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company spends millions on a building site before one cent of profit or turnover is received. In fact, Japan has been encouraged to invest millions of dollars in the Fox Lake area on the basis of a prepayment of anticipated delivery of resource materials. Here is a wonderful example of foreign investment in Canada without foreign control. The mining company provides valuable assistance to national economy through the foreign money paid for their export material. The company re-invests large portions of its revenue in plant expansion and programming to keep up with the demand for its product. Many more millions are spent on exploration programs to find more resource material to replace what is being extracted.

Since northern industry has not publicly protested against higher corporation taxation policies, I must presume that they are accepting this approach as part of their collective responsibilities in contributing toward the growing demands on the public purse. And I compliment them for this decision. But I feel, as other Manitobans must feel, that industry must stand prepared to accept a greater share of the cost of industrial townsites and the opening of new frontiers within our province. New communities always increase the profit of the industrial world throughout the province, and rather than confining the profit to the area such as Thompson or Lynn Lake it spreads itself out throughout the whole community, and industry must face up to the needs of government at all levels to provide and extend government services to all of northern Manitoba. I would point out the problem that The Pas is experiencing in the expansion of their area, where they say they cannot keep up with the needs of the policing services. Their cost is growing and it's growing before the service actually gets there and they get the benefit of this, and I think these are some of the positions which we must iron out and I'm glad the Attorney-General has indicated that the province is doing something about it. But I believe it's a good example.

Roads, communication services and medical, education, hydro programs, welfare services and medical, education, hydro programs, welfare services, must all be upgraded in developing this new area. The money must come from those who share in the greatest profit, and that of course is the government and the industrial and business world of this province. However, I too warn government not to kill that northern goose that lays the golden egg. Let's make sure that our Golden Boy doesn't become cross-eyed from watching northern mining industries move out of the province or even out of this country. Our resources only become of value to this generation if they are processed. If they remain underground there is no further value than if the Minister buried his money in the ground and left it to accumulate without using it. Let's make sure that the government does not lose sight of the need to develop our raw materials into integrated industries complementary to our northern resources, and I would point out that I was happy to see Ontario take the lead a couple of years ago and say that there must be integration of the raw resource rather than let it go holus bolus out of the province. We at present could, in fact, and should be criticized for selling our resources too cheap and having to import them back at too high a price in another form.

What is the economic future of northern Manitoba? I would hope to prove that in fact we are not being too greedy or living off southern subsidies. Generally speaking, Manitoba appears to be faced with jet age expenses, and as it is often called, Model T income. We do pride ourselves in being able to turn out trained professional and vocational personnel, while on the other hand, through the lack of southern industry and northern development sufficient to demand these peoples' services, they are leaving our province. Indeed if it were not for northern Manitoba's astronomical growth the population of this province would be decreasing rather than increasing.

We are not satisfied to see northern revenues used to bolster the sagging economy of the south as an answer to Manitoba's problems. Rather, we suggest that this economic practice should stop. I believe it would be to all Manitobans advantage to stop exploiting northern Manitoba and to use the northern revenues to re-invest in northern services so as to create a balanced budget for future governments, and be prepared for the influx of northern industries and private investors' injections of corporate money. Let's be prepared to face a strong northern development. Up to now, government philosophies have closely followed those of the fur trade era, when you took as much out and put as least back as was necessary.

It has been the indifference of government which has produced the present neglect and our backward position. Governments have fallen into the trap of making decisions to southern

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... bureaucratic advice rather than communicating with the people who make up the north. The government still wishes to tell rather than to advise. I only have to turn to them on the federal Indian policies and of course the Churchill decisions that were made in the past in respect to incorporation etc., and without regard for what the people thought about it in the north. Most of all, though, is the fact that the decisions are made and we are never even advised about the decisions in the north. Let us invest in the northern services and create an atmosphere, I say, that will encourage families to move to labour-oriented resource areas. It is far easier than trying to bring a resource to a burnt-out area. Let's assist the people in the north through tax incentives that will equalize the living costs and encourage people to linger longer in northern Manitoba.

This can be done through northern revenues at no hardship to other parts of the province and certainly not taking money away from other parts of the province. Let's be sure that neither government nor industry plunder our resources without fulfilling their fiscal obligation to those who must come later. The constituency of Churchill pays more in the long run for hydro and telephone services than any other part of the province of Manitoba. It can be said that northern Manitoba produces revenues of up to \$250,000 per day in tax revenue for the two senior governments. Taken another way, over \$70-80 million in tax revenue is going to the treasury benches both to the province and to the federal government. The government services are not being introduced at this rate. Northern roads, etc., are not built at the expense of southern cutbacks. Northern revenues repay government expenses and, in fact, they prepay them in most cases. If government services, though, today are curtailed, so will the private industrial dollars be curtailed, and it is up to this government to make the decision as to where they are going to go. If they are going to compete for the industrial dollar, then we as Manitobans must be prepared to give that same government service that has been withheld for so many years and which has withheld the development of the north. If the problem of housing in this province or in this nation is a public concern, then I say in northern Manitoba that it has reached a tragic proportion, both from the level of industrial development areas and of course in the Indian semi-isolated communities.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba can no longer afford either a cross-eyed Golden Boy or a cross-eyed Finance Minister, and I would hope that this will not happen. I am going to support the Finance Minister at this time and I will tell him that we will be looking forward to new injections and new philosophy in respect to northern development from his department and from other departments, and we'll struggle along with you as long as you will support us - and I think you're started in the right direction, but too often, too often we have been courted by leaders of government in respect to northern development, only to have been let down and find that this is really not to be the case right now but later, and later is "now". Now. I would hope that the Minister in the next few months will be able to come up with the budget and take some of my advice under consideration and I hope that the Minister of Transport and the rest of the New Democratic colleagues in Northern Manitoba will make it abundantly clear to him that really, I am not too far off when I make these comments in public. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

. . . . continued on next page

(MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the problems that has been too long neglected with this House, something that I wish to draw attention to, is the need for more concentration on the part of the Legislature, on urban problems. When I listened not too long ago, only a day or so ago, to the debate on the agricultural estimates, I realized very forcefully how active the members from the rural parts of the province participate in debates and make their views known. It's now a different kind of a Legislature. I think for the first time in Manitoba's history we can actually feel that the urban areas have a proper recognition. Some of us perhaps would think that a few more seats were still in order but nevertheless, no matter how one counts, whether 27 Metro MLAs and 2 from Brandon and possibly one from Thompson, it does seem that there is in fact a majority, so I think it's a new ball game and I think it's time to recognize the problems of the Metro area and other towns and cities in the province, time to identify them, to emphasize them and to, in particular, allocate resources to them, because the urban problem is growing and it's pressing as well.

We consider that the overwhelming amount of our economy is based on the non-rural sector, some 80 or 85 percent. We consider that some 54 percent of the population in this province resides in the metropolitan area. When we look at some of the massive programs which have gone into revitalizing the rural sector of our economy, the programs like FRED and ARDA, massive efforts in the Interlake area, some \$85 million recently announced on the part of the federal government and other millions in other programs, and we compare this to the amount of money that has been spent in urban renewal in the entire history of this province, then we see that there is indeed a striking imbalance. Compared to a multi-million dollar project dealing with agricultural problems, we find that only a few million have been spent in tackling urban problems. There are massive efforts. For instance, some of the extension programs carried out provincially and federally with men, money and material to assist rural Manitobans. There is really nothing comparable in the urban field. Mr. Speaker, the record of previous administrations in this area I think has been poor, and I think it is up to this administration to, in effect, break new ground and to work in new directions. The big question is of course what is needed, and I can only suggest in general terms some of the solutions to some of the problems, because it's a very big -- they are of a very big order indeed.

First, the municipal government structure undoubtedly has to be altered. We are now going through a long overdue updating of the Municipal Act which is, by various counts, 30 or 50 or maybe 100 years out of date. We are still waiting for the report of the Boundaries Commission. Almost every day we are reminded of some of the problems in Manitoba in regard to the Metropolitan Winnipeg area, continual fighting, name calling and wasting of time going on between Metropolitan Council and the City Council. I think there is no doubt that in the short run or in the long run we will have to move towards one government in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. I think it is time that some of the duplication was cut out and that we move into the field of effective planning.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent some time looking at some of the problems in downtown Winnipeg and these are the problems that this government must tackle immediately and is starting to tackle and should put even more emphasis on it than they do at present. The problems of the downtown area, with a rotting core, a downtown area that consists of parking lots, that consists of low revenue areas that hold an aging and declining population, calls for some drastic action. There is a need to look at the plans, such as the Metro Corporation has proposed, the Metropolitan Downtown Winnipeg plan, and to wherever possible give them support. This particular plan that I mention apparently, according to Metro planners, is self-liquidating and the Corporation could, in fact, go it alone and would not require provincial money.

Mr. Speaker, I think another thing that is needed that has been talked about but I think there is a need for action on the part of our government in the immediate future, is to create a Department of Urban Affairs. We need some agency or instrument to specifically deal with urban problems, and the problems of urban centers in Manitoba are really twofold. There is first of all the unique situation of the very big city of Metropolitan Winnipeg, and then there are the problems of the smaller centers which are really very different, qualitatively. I think there is a need for some experimentation here and there is certainly a variety, including the frontier community and the growing and the declining towns and cities of the province. When I read the TED Report some months ago, I recall very vividly some of the shocking statistics of the number of rural towns and cities which increased, which I was very happy about, but also of the large list of those that were declining, and this is something that we have to tackle.

Fiscal relationship is a third area that we must deal with. There appears to be no system and no planning in these relationships. Sort of a patchwork of financial arrangements on an ad hoc basis is the present system. The cities and towns, and in particular the Metropolitan government and the Winnipeg government, are unable to meet their requirements in building roads and sewers, transportation and recreation facilities. There is a need here for new arrangements and powers so that these governments will be able to raise the monies required and spend them in the manner in which they see fit. I think there is general agreement that the province should deal with things or areas that concern people, in general education and health and welfare, whereas the local governments should deal with such things as streets, roads, possibly housing and so on. And a fourth point is that there is a need for statutory changes, as I mentioned before, to update the Municipal Act and to cut through some of the legal straitjacket that hampers in particular urban centers from carrying out their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, all of this would go down the drain if we didn't also concern ourselves with the people who are charged with this responsibility, and I am thinking in particular of the politician, the elected representative, because these are the people, in effect, who make the decisions. I remember my honourable friend for Birtle-Russell the other day was talking on the need for getting legal counsel in terms of the voting age, but our responsibility is even greater than that of the lawyers and that is that we make the laws, and we are charged with tremendous responsibilities as are elected representatives on any level. I think it's time we got into a real talent search for people in government. I am talking first of all about the civic representatives. I think it's time for a longer term of office; a four-year term, I think, would be best. I think it's time we paid higher salaries, time we considered full-time representation, time we allowed that more support and research would be given to these people.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of those comments I also think of the men of this Legislature, and I think somewhere in the future - in the next year or two - we will have to re-examine the method -- in fact, we are going to do this in one particular committee in this House, the committee which will attempt to strengthen the committee structure, attempt to see whether MLAs can be made more effective and so on. Mr. Speaker, this whole concept of MLAs as being sort of part-time people who work in the off season and so on, I think has to be changed. It is my contention that men in public life are always underpaid; that if you consider the responsibilities that they have, if you consider that, for example, a person in public life is charged with the responsibility, as in this Legislature, of voting on expenditures and incomes approaching some \$400 million per year, that's a very heavy responsibility indeed. If you consider the salaries paid to people in this Chamber and compare them with private industry, then the result is rather, well, it's pretty poor in comparison; that the job is as great in terms of responsibility and, I would contend, even more significant, and the kind of salaries paid and so on I think are inadequate.

Also, you have to add a final factor and that is the question of risk. There are no guarantees in this business. I look at some of my honourable friends opposite, the former Minister of Education, who for a year or two was given an important portfolio and a salary that was reasonable if not excessive, and today in effect his salary is cut to one-third. This is the fate of men in public office and to many of our other friends opposite, some of them no longer present, who were completely wiped out in terms of their income and their livelihood and now must scramble for a living.

I recall only too well how, when we did vote on the question of indemnity, there was a little bit of jockeying on the opposition side of the House, and I think some of it was deplorable. There should be, I believe, a new system. The old system calls for the government to stick its neck out in terms of raising the salaries. This is now being considered in Ottawa, and any government that dares raise its own salaries is subject to all kinds of criticism. This can only be done intelligently, I suppose, or safely if there is agreement from all sides of the House, but even then the public condemns the politician because it always comes down to the same principle of "you raised your own salary." And as the ultimate authority, that I suppose is perhaps -- perhaps it's true, but it has a bad connotation. I think we should consider a new system perhaps, to avoid further jockeying and political hay being made, scoring points off one another, and too often keeping salaries down at inadequate levels - inadequate to attract the kind of men who should be in government, many of whom are in government.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Legislature is considering a proposal - I'm not sure I have it entirely correct, but I understand the system will be that the salaries will be set, probably by an independent group, and then once set will be fixed and related to the civil service. Our

(MR. DOERN cont'd) system seems to me to be the reverse. We wait for the civil service salaries to creep up and put intense pressure on the government in the following way, that since the deputies and other higher civil servants are getting annual increments and demanding annual increments, you soon reach a point when the Minister's salary is almost lower than, or is in danger of being passed by, the people beneath him. And so usually when that point is reached, then the government decides to in fact make a change in the salary structure. I think this was done, as I understand it, three years ago when the Conservative Government of that day was pressured by that circumstance to in effect take some action.

I think a better system would be to have an independent commission examine the whole question of salaries and the roles of MLAs and people in other levels as well, to set a fair amount, and then, after that, to tie the MLAs' and Cabinet Ministers' salaries to the increments of the civil servants. Because to simply fix a salary and wait for eight or ten years to go by with no annual increments, there's a relative loss.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's time to break with certain traditions that are carried on in this House. As I say, I am calling in effect for more say on the part of the members who represent urban constituencies. I think it is incumbent on us to see that this Legislature tackles some of the problems that have been neglected too long.

I also think it's time we broke what I might describe as the rural psychology of the House, and by that I mean this. Too often this House seems to be determined out of consideration for the seeding and the harvesting of crops. Mr. Speaker, I think that a case can be made for that, but I think a case can also be made that if that is to be taken into consideration - and there are only a small number of farmers in this House; many of the rural members hold occupations other than farming - I think if a case can be made to take into consideration the plight of the farmer in regard to his annual income, I think a case can equally be made for teachers, that special consideration should be given when exams are near that the House stop; that when the teaching profession is starting to go into a certain phase of the year that the House should never start at that time, or that if another phase is developing, that the House should stop at that time. We have lawyers and accountants and we should maybe consider their plight, that when the tax season is up we should stop the House and make sure it doesn't interfere with their livelihood either. I think a case can be made there too. I say to my friends from every part of the province, let us meet as equals. Special considerations should either be equally distributed or not given to any part.

Mr. Speaker, my comments are not directed against the people who come from parts of the province other than the metro area. My remarks are addressed to those of us who are in the metropolitan area and who do represent the cities and towns of Manitoba, that it's time we got on the ball; it's time that we made our voices heard, and it's time that this Legislature started to deal with these problems.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the honourable member suggesting that in his view the members of this Assembly are underpaid and that their annual stipend should be increased?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question of indemnity and the question of the duties of the MLA should be thoroughly examined. It would not surprise me if the conclusion came about that they were in fact underpaid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could call second readings, but possibly, Mr. Speaker, if you could call Bill No. 37 on second readings, we can make an effort to find the persons who are holding Bills 38 and 36.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I've had very short notice on calling this particular item; there were many other items ahead of it, and it would appear to me that I have lost my bill for the time being . . .

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, perhaps there's another member who wishes to speak . . . Oh, you've got it.

MR. FROESE: I just wanted to refresh my memory as to why I adjourned the bill and what I wanted to discuss.

This particular bill deals with the Social Allowances Act and the matter that is contained in here and clarified has come up several times during my term in the Legislature when people call on me with a particular problem, and on numerous occasions this very matter has come up where the total assets of a person are of such a nature that prevents them from getting assistance. It involves older people who probably have some life savings and have very little assets but who do not want to part with these and therefore they just try and get along. If they were spendthrifts or would just use up that money, then they would be entitled to this assistance, which they otherwise I am sure would have been entitled to, but just because they had a little assets there and a small bank account with which they would not want to part because they felt that they had to have a little reserve - they wanted a small reserve - and as a result they had to forfeit the assistance. I'm not so sure whether this legislation should not be changed and should be amended so that in cases of this type that persons would be allowed to have a little more in assets in that way. It would not have to deplete their reserves, however meagre they might be, completely before they are entitled to assistance under the Social Allowances Act. This is my reason for adjourning the bill at that time. I feel that there should be amendments made and this particular matter should be examined more fully and, I think, corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you reading for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate on this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland and I would like to advise him that it was not the government's intention at this time to change policy. The reason this particular piece of legislation was being brought forward was merely so that the policy which had been in existence and of which he complains, and which frankly has puzzled me many times, would be at least consistent; the department would know that there is no question about it.

I might indicate that the amount of assets that a person could hold would be, in my opinion, governed by regulation and that could be changed. I would ask my honourable friend to consider the dilemma that sometimes society is in. Many many people object to giving welfare payments to people who they say should be able to go out and work. I think that a great number of people would be objecting to giving social assistance to sustain people with a large sum of money in the bank. Now the question is, what does "large" mean? And . . .

MR. FROESE: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt him. They have a little reserve but their income is very low - it is next to nothing - and yet because of the assets that they might hold they are in . . .

MR. GREEN: I appreciate my honourable friend's question but nevertheless, is society prepared, and again I'm throwing this out as a question and not trying to define a policy. Right now society says that it will not feel that a person who has \$3,000 in the bank needs public assistance. They don't feel that a person should be able to keep that money to give as an estate to their children who may be very well-to-do. My honourable friend indicates that that \$3,000 may be the only source of dignity that a person has and he likes to feel that he's got it, and therefore he needs assistance because digging into that amount removes his life savings. I appreciate the problem but I want to indicate to my honourable friend that the problem is not simply solved and we at this stage, we're not intending to bring in any policy changes with regard to the Social Assistance. We did bring in, as my honourable friends knows, some revisions to bring the amounts to a level which is more consistent with the existing cost of living, but this bill merely clarifies the existing policy.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . now call Bill No. 36?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in regard to Bill No. 36 there are some questions I have on this particular item, but in deference to the government and in an effort to speed up the action in this House, I feel that I will not speak on it at this time but rather deal with it in the estimates of the department, and I have no objection to the bill now.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Bill No. 38, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the adjournment that I made was on behalf of the Member from St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's remarkable, Mr. Speaker, when you're absent for a day how popular you are. Maybe I should stay away a little more often. -- (Interjection) -- I can see that. So I heard.

Mr. Speaker, I paid attention whenever this bill was debated, this bill on The Election Act and especially, as we know, on the lowering of the voting age to 18, and I might say that I was all ready to listen to the words of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek, because I feel that he is one of the new members that is usually quite sound, but I was disappointed after I'd been listening to his speech for awhile. He started quite well. He started in saying that he felt that the people, the young people of this generation, probably were more prepared to go on in the world and take their responsibility than we were when we were at that age. But then he made the statement that he would not support this bill, and the main reason that he had, the reason why he was not supporting this bill . . . it was all in the sake of uniformity. And if this is the only reason why he can't support the bill, I think that it is certainly a very weak reason.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, uniformity doesn't interest me too much. I feel that -- I can't see for instance why we're talking about uniformity when many of the different provinces now permit the vote before 21, some at 18, and some at 19 and so on. And he said -- the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek felt that this was a little too soon. He was in favour of this but it was a little too soon. We should make a lot of studies, and if we were giving the responsibility, the privilege or the right to these young people, they should also have certain responsibilities that go with it. Well I certainly agree with him in the instance if you want rights and privileges, you have to have the responsibility that goes with it, and the honourable member can rest assured that this is the opinion, I am sure, of all the members of this House, but you have to make a start somewhere and this is the important thing.

What disappointed me, what I certainly disagree with, in his speech was the statement that he made, he was suggesting that we should have a referendum -- and that to me made no sense at all. Made no sense at all because you are asking these people, you are saying that they are the people, they are smart now; one of the statements he made was that they wanted to take a more active part and then we are going to have a referendum, and in view of the fact they can't vote, they will not have a word to say in it. We will ask somebody else if they want to vote. They will have no say at all.

A MEMBER: Their parents.

MR. DESJARDINS: I beg your pardon? Their parents? Well, their parents -- some of them have no parents and some of them want to think for themselves. I can't see where the parents should decide. Maybe the parents should decide a lot of other things but they don't. In ordinary circumstances or in two or three generations ago, maybe this would have sufficed, Mr. Speaker. We would have asked their parents. But now the young people want to take part in the management of their affairs and this is what politics is, the management of their affairs, and they want their own opinion. They are not going to just automatically go with what their parents say. But nevertheless, I think that a referendum in this would be wrong. I am sure that the honourable member, when he made that speech last week, did not realize how much has been said in this House over the period of years on this particular topic of the voting age and reducing the voting age to 18, because I am sure if he had, if he'd had the knowledge of what had been said, he wouldn't have made this kind of speech, and I say to him that it's time that his party decided once and for all, do they -- are they just paying (and I'm not suggesting they are, I'm asking a question) -- is the Conservative Party just paying lip service because politically it would be suicide to say that the young people are not intelligent enough to vote. Do they really think that they should vote, that they should have the right to vote, because if they don't they should say so and vote against this bill, and if they do, they should quit trying to find excuses. And it's not good enough for a member of this House to say, "Yes, for the sake of uniformity, don't do it now," and it's not good enough to say, "We need more study. We are not ready." And it's not good enough -- why? Because this is nothing new. We have been asking -- well, the last was in '68, there was a resolution, an amendment on this. In '67 -- I

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) remember the one in '67 because I proposed the formal amendment at this time. Before that, the Honourable Member from Assiniboia had a resolution, and before that I think there was a Mr. Wright who was a member of this House, but there have been all kinds of resolutions, and if there is any sincerity in this, well we should be ready by now at least. I will tell you why. I will tell you why I say this. Because in 1967, 1967 there was a resolution. I'll read the resolution that I proposed at that time.

The resolution was this: That Whereas the young people of the country constitute a most important human resource, and Whereas young people at age 18 are considered fit for military service in times of war, and Whereas young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are considered mature enough to participate in the economic, social and athletic life of our country, and Whereas it is in the interests of good government that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 participate in the political life of our country, Therefore Be It Resolved that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens 18 years and over, the right to vote in provincial elections."

And Sir, do you remember - I think you should because you brought in an amendment at the time, and your amendment read, the proposed motion of Mr. Hanuschak in amendment, that the resolution be amended by deleting the word "provincial" in the last line and adding the following after the word "elections" in the last line: "over which the provincial Legislature has control" and by adding the following "Be It Further Resolved that this government institute a more intensive program of instruction dealing with the structure, function and operation of all levels of government in Canada," and by adding the following: "Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Canada be requested to consider the enactment of legislation to reduce the age of qualification of federal electors to 18 years."

I am pleased to see the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek back in the House now because I think that he should know this. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? I remember explaining at the time that I certainly would have no objection to supporting your amendment. I felt that this should be done automatically if you are going to ask for a vote, that we should have the proper course in the school, but we agreed; and Sir, may I say that your amendment passed unanimously - unanimously. This was passed in 1967, and I refer the member, who seems puzzled because you will see why you were puzzled - I was puzzled too - that was on page 168 of the Journals of 1967, 21st of February, but then when this was passed, the vote came on the main motion as amended, and at this time there was an amendment. After everybody in the House accepting this there was an amendment when it became the main motion as amended, and the amendment was made by no less than the leader of the government of the day, Mr. Roblin, and this was the amendment that he proposed.

Mr. Roblin moved an amendment: In the preamble delete all the words after the first Whereas in the resolution and substitute the following: "the status of youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House, and Whereas the legal voting age at the federal, provincial and local levels should be reviewed before the next provincial election, and Whereas a common electoral franchise is desirable, and Whereas an improvement in education for democracy should be sought. Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 16 years, or such other age under 21 as may be deemed appropriate; And Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise; And Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights."

So you see, Mr. Speaker -- what's that? I'm not quoting this correctly? Oh, well I heard something when you were waving your head. Well Mr. Speaker, as you see, let's try to follow this and I don't blame the honourable member for being puzzled, but the government voted for my motion as amended by you, Mr. Speaker, but then amended it and threw everything out, all the words after the first Whereas, and inserted this.

And to complicate it a little further - you can see this is not the only Session that things get complicated or mixed up - Mr. Hillhouse made another amendment: that the Roblin amendment - this is a sub-amendment - be amended by inserting after the word "appropriate" in the 4th line of the first operative paragraph therefor the following, namely, "but that in the meantime, and as evidence of sincerity and good faith, the Government of Manitoba take immediate steps to lower the voting age, within the aforesaid limits, for the election of members to the Assembly." So we had, on one hand, a government that was saying yes to a motion, agreeing

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) to vote to lower the age, recognizing that the young people should have the vote, and then after accepting this, amending this and saying, "Yes, but let's study this," and then they voted against this amendment, a simple amendment that was asking the government of the day to show the evidence of sincerity. And this is the way it stood and the members of the government at the time were the only ones that voted against the motion. All the rest of the votes were the same.

So you see -- I should say that there was another. Maybe I'd better quit now because I'll get everybody confused, but there was another amendment after that. There was an amendment by Mr. Johnston that the amendment be further amended by deleting everything after the word "sought" after the 7th Whereas in the resolution, and adding thereto the following - this of course is after the Hillhouse sub-amendment was defeated. "Whereas this being Canada's Centennial Year, with much emphasis being placed upon the young people of our country to assume their increasingly important place in Canadian affairs, And Whereas most legislators of Manitoba have advocated the assuming of a more active part in the political scheme of things; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba be urged to take immediate steps to institute the voting age at 18 in time for the next provincial election in Manitoba."

Now I am sure that, as I said, the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek wouldn't have made the speech that he did if he had known all this. -- (Interjection) -- Well I know, but this is why he wasn't here and this is why I'm giving him this information. As you know, as former Speaker you must remember that I was always in a spirit of cooperating with all the members in this House and this is what I'm doing at this time. I would like to pass on this information to him, that at this time the members of the government said yes, we agree, but then they said, "but we will see," and then they were asked for evidence of sincerity, of wanting to do something, and they said no, and then they were asked to do it immediately and they said no. And then the member stood in his seat the other day and said, well, for the sake of uniformity don't do it now, and it's very good but let's wait; this is premature. And I am saying to him it isn't premature.

Now probably I left out the most important thing was the amendment, and this is some of the excerpt of the leader of the government at the time in his speech, Mr. Roblin, who said - and I'm quoting here from Hansard on page 1373 - "I would like to say, that although I have not always held this opinion, that in my opinion the question of the voting age in provincial elections and other elections is now a matter that is ripe for serious consideration and study." Now, in '67 - in '67 he said this, and now the member is saying no, it's not ready, we shouldn't go ahead with it at this time. And I ask a question of the honourable members across from us also - and I wish that the Minister of Education was here, the former Minister of Education, because the motion read is such - this is the motion of Mr. Roblin; "Whereas the legal voting age at the provincial, federal and local levels should be reviewed before the next provincial election" and that wasn't done, and if we listen to our friend it won't be done before the next election again. And this is why I ask, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends: "Are you for or against granting a vote to 18-year-olds? This is what I want to know. I'm talking to you. Because I'm . . .

A MEMBER: You'll find out - when we vote.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it might be. I hope so, because not the way you speak I can't find out. -- (Interjection) -- Oh now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said don't listen to what we're saying. Oh well, this is fine. I'm too honest and sincere and I always feel that they are doing the same thing, and I believed, like a fool I believed everything they were saying. I am very sorry.

And then also, and I follow for my honourable friend because I am sure he enjoys this - it says here Mr. Roblin said: "Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise." And if the former Minister of Education was here, I'd ask him, "What did you do?" What did you do, because the Honourable Member from Fort Garry stood up and said, "We are not ready," and he blamed the teachers and he blamed the teaching profession, and I'm asking to the former government, the former Minister of Education, what did you do?

A MEMBER: Nothing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Nothing. This is exactly it, and this is why, Sir, we must go ahead with this motion. We must go ahead and give this vote because we will be waiting forever and ever.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

And then the last point in this amendment was, again by Mr. Roblin, "of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba with particular reference to legal rights and responsibilities," and again I say to them, what is the report? Has this been done? You know, Sir, I think we have a very good and clear example of people who do not mean what they are saying, and this has to stop, and I challenge my honourable friends now - and it might be that you're right. It might be that the people at 18 years old are not ready to vote, but surely if you think so, have enough guts to stand up and say, "No, they are not ready. It is bad for Manitoba," but don't say yes because you are afraid that they might get the vote and then try to queer this resolution or do anything else to retard it, to say, well, it's going to be done later on, we are not ready for it.

And I also object -- there's another, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Fort Garry who said a few things that I objected to. Now this honourable member seemed to place "apparently there's utter chaos here; it's a bad world; Society is sick;" and so on, and he blames all this on the teaching profession. Mind you, he's very careful how he does it, but it's very clear that he has no confidence in the teaching profession in Manitoba, and he blames them because they are not teaching respect for government and for politicians, and I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that it is up to us to teach the young generation - all of us, not only the teachers. It is up to us as parents and it is up to us as legislators, and if we want to be respected we have to earn this respect. And by taking an attitude that this is too soon, that we don't want this because this will not work for uniformity, and that we are not ready, and after accepting a resolution, as the government did in 1967, and then doing nothing about it, is it any wonder that the young people are saying "Are these people sincere?" "Are those politicians sincere?" Isn't that the reason why they don't believe in politicians?

There is nothing wrong in the words "politics" or "politicians"; it is only the managing of our affairs. There is nothing wrong. It's a very good and honourable profession. But that doesn't automatically say that all politicians are angels or saints. That certainly doesn't say this, and it is up to us to show, as I say, that we deserve respect from the young people and if we say to you -- just imagine this young person that feels that maybe he should exercise this right to vote when he's 18, and he was told in 1964, "Well we're studying it; not now;" and he was told the same thing in '65, and in '66, and in '67 when Mr. Roblin, of course, would not come out and say "no" because I guess he was interested in running federally at the time. He said "Yes, but." In the resolution that we passed.

Mind you, there were some members that didn't vote for that. It didn't pass unanimously. It was a very good resolution, all kinds of survey, but the members of the Liberal Party at the time refused to vote for it and I voted against it because I did not believe in the sincerity of the government - and I was proven right unfortunately, because this government was not sincere, could not be sincere, because nothing that was passed was ever carried out. No study, no change in the education policies or curriculum to prepare these young people for this. Oh, the Minister is back. Now I'm not going to start all my speech again but I hope that he -- (Interjection) -- Don't tempt me. Don't tempt me because I might and then you'll have to stay a little longer. But I'm sure that you -- I've noticed how attentive you have been during my speech and I'm sure you can repeat word for word and I hope that you will tell your friend and that he can answer it because there is no reason he can't take part in this debate. -- (Interjection) -- You don't care if he tells. Well that's fine. He doesn't carry tales. Well Diefenbaker has made a joke, or the second Diefenbaker has made a joke, Mr. Speaker, and if he calls this obscene I wonder if he'd like to read some of his speeches. I wonder if he'd like to see some of his speech where he's showing us so much leadership that he's saying, "I place all my trust in the people of the front bench." Would you like to repeat that speech now? If you think this is obscene would you tell us what you think democracy is or what you thought democracy is when you were on this side of the House. I think that was obscene. I think that certainly was obscene.

But my honourable friend will have a chance because they'll have to stand up and be counted. Do they have faith in the young generation of the people of Manitoba? Are they going to give them the right? Are they going to do something except giving them beautiful words, telling them how wonderful they are. Are they going to do anything for the young generation? Are they going to try to assist them to accept their responsibilities or are they going to vote against this again? But this time, Mr. Speaker, they can rest assured that it will become law.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) It has been clear that the Liberals would not change their mind before, and the Independent here from Churchill, myself and the members of the government certainly will not go backwards again; we feel that this has to be done; and I hope that my honourable friend will have enough guts to stand up now and show us who is obscene and who's right -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Is that -- the . . . about parliamentarians, when they have their mouth full of toffee I can't hear what they're saying. I wish to heck they'd stop their chewing.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be any longer in this debate. There are other points. I want to restrict myself to talking about reducing the voting age. There are a lot of things and that could come in in this committee -- this committee will change anything. We don't think for a minute that this is all that has to be changed. I have a lot of other points myself that I want to bring in this Election Act and I certainly will find a way to do it, but at the time, the main thing, the principle of this Act, the main principle is that the young people of 18 years old and over should vote, so now let's have the vote and see what's going to happen.

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

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

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Bill 39.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this Bill stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . there is no question on this occasion but I want to appeal to my honourable friend that this is a very important matter. We'd like to process it as quickly as possible. But no objections that it stand.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the House Leader. Does he intend to have this Bill passed before the budget speech is finished?

MR. PAULLEY: The budget speech really has nothing to do with this. The budget will finish on Monday. May I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the budget -- the motion of my honourable friend, the motion of my honourable friend will pass the House but this Bill has to, of course, after it has been given second reading, be considered in the Committee of the Whole which will be following most likely the termination of the debate on the budget in any case.

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: No more point of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it not proper that this bill really arises out of the budget and hence should really not be discussed, in my view, until such time as the budget is accepted by the House. Otherwise the House is proceeding with a bill prior to having had the government proposals leading up to the bill accepted by the House. It seems to me that the proper course of action would be to complete the budget debate and then, arising out of that debate, this bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker . . . the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked for the motion to stand. It's been agreed upon. The budget debate will cease as of Monday evening. We only want to progress the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to have the matter stand? (Agreed.)

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, if you would be kind enough to call the motion standing in my head -- in my name, dealing with the . . . I appreciate the laughter of my honourable friends and I understand it. I have a few other things in my head as well and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would kindly call the motion and adjournment standing in my name on Page 3.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in further amendment thereto.

I have taken the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Rhineland under consideration, and with reference to his sub-amendment I find that no legislation nor rules

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) having any bearing on the sittings of our Legislative Assembly speaks of anything other than a Session or Sessions. I appreciate that the word "regular" and other words have been used in debate for the purpose of describing, identifying or stating the main objectives or highlights of a given Session, but insofar as the formal, legal description of this Session is concerned, it is the First Session of the 29th Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. That is the only acceptable and proper style of identifying this Session. It is my humble opinion that I can accept no variation of it and therefore rule the sub-amendment out of order.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I --- on the point of order, I have to object to this ruling because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member know it's a matter in which he may object? The question on the amendment has been called.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question on the motion as amended. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would now call the next resolution on Page 4 standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs,

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable from time to time to consider and review the Rules and Standing Orders of this Assembly;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of this House, composed of the Honourable Mr. Speaker, Honourable Mr. Paulley, Messrs. Bilton, Doern, Fox, Gonick, Graham, Johnston (Portage), Turnbull, and Weir, be appointed to examine and review the Rules, Standing Orders, practices and procedures of the Assembly, with special reference to improving the functioning of the Committee system, expanding the role of the private member, bringing about a closer relationship between the Legislature and the general public, and generally strengthening the role of the Legislature in regard to the executive arm of government;

AND THAT the Committee be empowered to consider matters relating to the decorum of the House and allied subjects, and to report its findings and recommendations of these matters to this Assembly during the second session of this Legislature;

AND THAT the Committee have authority to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation and have power to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said Special Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this occasion to make known my protest on this resolution before us because, as the mover, the House Leader, well knows, that any committee considering the rules are bound to bring in changes which affect parties in this House. This has been the case from time to time when changes in the rules were made, and probably because I'm an only member of our party that the changes affect me probably more so than any other members of the House. I know this to be the occasion in previous times when we had committees set up for this purpose. I am not named in the committee and therefore I will not be allowed to take part in the committee as far as proposing any motions and as far as voting on any of the items that changes that will be made. I, as a member of this House, represent some 16,000 voters in my riding. This is supposed to be the case of most of the people in the House here, yet my people will be deprived of representation on the committees that are being appointed by this House on most occasions, whereas the members of the New Democratic Party, their members, their people are being represented on most or all the committees and to much greater degree because --- I may give you some of the figures the previous . . . Out of 14 members that I checked, 7 of them, 7 of the NDP members were represented on all the committees, the very same members. And surely enough when they claim that this is justice, it is far

(MR. FROESE cont'd) from it. I feel that the people in my riding are deprived of proper representation in many matters in this House. I haven't checked the honourable members -- or the Minister of Transportation; I haven't checked him out. I can do so if he prefers or wants me to do, I can do that for him if necessary, but I just want to point out that if they think that this is justice, that is just not the case, and that I will have no say in the matter until such time as the committee has completed its report, that the report is brought back into the House. And, Mr. Speaker, you're fully aware that to amend any decision at that time is much much more difficult than to originate or formulate changes when they are being formulated and to bring in changes at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I register my protest on this very committee that is being established at this time and for this purpose because I feel that my party or group should be represented on this particular committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please say "aye." The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken, I wonder if accommodation could not be made in fact for the Member for Rhineland on this occasion. I recognize that the rules as they presently read do not provide for his group to be considered as a party in the House, and yet within the province at election time they do operate as a party. In other provinces they do form the government. And I think I share with him the feeling that the rules are not really a party question. The rules are here for all of the members of the House regardless of which party they belong to. And yet we sit here as members of a party, and I think it might be well for the government to reconsider whether my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland could not be included. I don't think it would really change the voting structure of the committee. If the government felt that -- and as I read the composition of the committee now it has six members from the government side, three from the Conservative group and one from the Liberal group. That is assuming, Mr. Speaker, that I am recognizing your impartial position now but nevertheless you did come from the government side of the House. This would leave, in any case, a majority if that were so but I don't think that we look at the rules really from a partisan standpoint in any case, and I think it would be a desirable thing to include the honourable member if he feels that he should be there. I think it's a reasonable proposition and I would appeal to the government to give this consideration.

The question of the rules, I think at times takes up maybe too much debate here in the House, I suppose, and yet without the rules a private member has no real protection in the House. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I would be agreeable to have the Member for Churchill as well on the committee. I would have no objections to that. -- (Interjection) -- Well if he were to make an appeal, Mr. Speaker, I would consider that as well. The question of the rules has come up at this session and -- (Interjection) -- Oh I'm quite happy to be represented by the member for our group who's there. The rules are very important if you look at the protection of the individual in this House and before we make a change -- and I'm all in favour of making changes and modernizing our rules, I think there are a lot of antiquated procedures and forms that can be put completely out.

And, Mr. Speaker, I add that I share very much the sentiments of certain members in the House on the question of dress. To me, dress is a most inconsequential matter. I'm not concerned. I think we're foolish in this country, in the summer time in particular, to run around with a tie around our necks making sure that we stay hot instead of being dressed reasonably for the type of climate that we have. These aren't the important things to me. But what is important to me, Mr. Speaker, is for example when you make a decision -- and as you did on this matter of dress, and this is why I was concerned about it -- because having made a decision, and if then your decision is not respected, then what protection do private members have on other decisions that you might make and which might not be respected. This is my concern in the matter, not whether or not a tie is right or a tie is wrong. I couldn't care less, but I do care that once you have made a decision and the House approves of that decision, then that decision be respected whether I agree with it or whether I don't.

And so I only point that out, Mr. Speaker, to urge the government in this one to be broadminded. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland feels that he should be on this committee, and if other honourable members do so, then increase the number of members on the committee; if need be, increase the numbers from your group. I have no objections to that, but I would rather that this be done so that when the rules are completed no honourable member

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) of this House feels that the changes were made without his having the right in that committee to have a voice and a vote.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, we could on this motion get so that we would consider this a Committee of the Whole, at which we could all be represented I suppose and sort it out. I happened to be a member of the committee that attempted to put the committee structure together and I recognize how difficult it is when there are a variety of people whose interests need to be looked after. One of the things that happens when one person representing one constituency forms a part of a committee like this, he removes from another group who is maybe, like our group, representing 22 constituencies, and it gets so that there is absolutely no relationship at all to the procedure within the House and the procedure by which we govern ourselves at all other times.

Now, as I say this I recognize the difference in this resolution, and I have no real objection to the Honourable Member for Rhineland being put on the committee if some way can be found of doing it. But I do say that insofar as our group is concerned, I certainly wouldn't want to do it at the expense of losing one of our three representatives representing 22 seats in the House, and moving it in that way. If there's a way that it can be sorted out I would have no objection to it, Mr. Speaker. Although I must say that if you move to the point where you get two or three others on as individuals you get to the snowball area where maybe, and maybe it isn't all that bad, the suggestion of the Committee of the Whole, although you'd end up with a convention rather than a committee to participate in the work of the committee.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the position that the Member for Rhineland finds himself in, I sympathize with it, and if the government can find some way to meet his appeal and that of the Member for Ste. Rose, I would have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, since this in some respects I suppose affects me, I would be willing to stand down and allow the member to be placed on this committee without demanding the same right for myself. I realize I ran as an independent and I realize that this House cannot give me all the amenities I suppose that are enjoyed by parties. I recognize that the Member for Rhineland is in fact a member of a group, and possibly inasmuch as he has risen today and spoken on this, and is in fact saying I want to be on this committee, that maybe proves to us that he really feels that he would like to become involved in this part of the duties of the House. And if he really feels that, then maybe the House Leader should reconsider the position and perhaps one of the members of his party would have the same feelings, and maybe the Member for St. Boniface would like to be on that committee. I note that it is quite a good committee up to now because really it doesn't involve any lawyers, and I'm sure that what they'll bring in is something that we'll be able to understand. So I leave it at that, but I would waive my rights to this committee and — (Interjection) — to ask to be on this committee — pardon me — and I'll leave this

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

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon — (Interjection) — oh, excuse me, 10:00 o'clock.

But I do want to remind the honourable members that I think that there was agreement this morning that we would go into Law Amendments this evening at 8:00 o'clock, and respectfully I ask all members of the Law Amendments Committee to be there at that time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.