

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grades 5 to 9 standing of the Walter White School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Borden Hasnik and Frank Lodawyks. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli.

We also have 45 students of Grade 11 standing of the Riverton School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Frank Gustaw and Mrs. Luprypa. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

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

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Mennonite Hospital Society Concordia praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Mennonite Hospital Society Concordia.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending March 1972 and the Annual Report of the Resource Conservation Commission for the year ended March 31, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Department of Labour for the year 1972, and I may say there are mimeographed copies for the members which will be distributed but we haven't been able to receive the normal printed copies and they will be sent to members in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following reports pursuant to the Controvert Elections Act, a report from the Court of Appeal and the Court of Queen's Bench -- they are nil reports; a report from the Provincial Auditor covering the Auditor's Report; and the financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1972 of the Liquor Control Commission; and the 49th Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year January 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972, and there are additional copies.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following reports; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation, and Auditor's Report for the year ended March 31, 1972; Manitoba Arts Council Annual Report, the Auditor's Report for the year ending on that same date; and also the Seventh Annual Report of the Horse Racing Commission for this year; and I am enclosing ten copies of each report.

I also have a statement to make, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba's tourist industry enjoyed another boon year in 1972 when an estimated 3.5 million out-of-province visitors came to the province. This is an increase of about 225,000 over the number of tourist visitors recorded in 1971. I would like you to know that an important part of this overall rise in the tourist figure comes from the increase in the number of direct entries over the international boundary from the United States. According to year-end figures for 1972 released recently by Statistics Canada, about 1.1 million persons entered Manitoba from the south. This reflects a 19.4 percent increase over the 1971 figure for direct border entries. Of this number about half were in the long term category -- that is, those who stayed one or more nights in the province -- up 20.4 percent from 1971. This is even more significant when the same

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . report indicated the non-resident visitor total for Canada showed a decline of 3.6 percent in 1972 as compared to the previous year. There were also more non-resident vehicles coming into Manitoba from the south. Total traffic entries at U.S. border crossings into the province in 1972 were 378,853 -- up 23.4 percent. The long term traffic entries totalled 161,470 -- up 22.8 percent.

It is evident that Manitoba promotions in the U.S. tourist market, particularly in the near market areas of the American Midwest, are having a beneficial effect on our tourist industry. More Americans are choosing Manitoba as a vacation destination and more of them are staying longer. The remaining 2.4 million non-resident visitors came mainly from other Canadian provinces.

Tourist spending in Manitoba also reached a new peak. According to Canadian Government formula, used for the first time in 1972, total tourist spending in Manitoba was estimated at about \$192 million. Of this figure roughly \$48 million was spent here by American visitors and the balance, \$144 million, came from other Canadian visitors and from Manitobans vacationing more than 25 miles from home in their own province.

I wonder if the page boy could distribute these. The "Visit Friendly Manitoba" has taken on a new significance with the launching this week of a comprehensive new package tour program that offers a wide variety of Manitoba's recreation spots and activities as attractive destinations for vacationers. The program has been coordinated and developed by the Tourist Branch in response to recommendations from the travel industry and that pre-planned package tours are the kind of saleable attraction that will bring vacationers and tourists to Manitoba. In support of the program our department has published a 36-page 4-colour brochure containing an initial listing of 20 tour and vacation packages designed to appeal to a wide range of vacationer requirements.

The brochure offers all-purpose indoor and outdoor family vacation packages, year round and seasonable excursions, independent and guided tours and cruises, honeymoon and anniversary vacations, wilderness fishing and hunting, wildlife photography, golfing, etc., to list but a few of the options offered. For example, Lake Winnipeg cruises are included in season for weekends or a full five days; weekly tours to remote fishing and hunting resorts, rail tours to Churchill or air tours to Rankin Inlet, bus tours to various parts of Manitoba, some as far as Thompson. There are hotel and sight-seeing packages of a year round variety for Winnipeg with optional sports and cultural attractions added. The tours are designed for the most part to originate from Winnipeg. A prepaid package would include accommodation and transportation and its cost would be according to the type of tour, method of transportation and length of stay involved. The assembly of the package tours and negotiation of contracts with the various participating tour facilities and transportation services has been carried out by the Manitoba Tourist Branch. Thunderbird Travel Limited of Winnipeg has been designated as the central booking agency for the package tour plan and will be responsible for future promotion of the program. All recognized travel agents are commissionable on vacation packages they sell to their customers based on the plan. The first printing of 150,000 copies of the brochure is now being distributed to travel agents and transportation companies in Canada, United States and Europe, and the Canadian Government travel offices around the world. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister on behalf of our party for his announcement this afternoon indicating the various tours that are going to be arranged for visitors to our great province. I find this is most interesting. If my memory serves me correctly we discussed this matter at some length in a debate of the Minister's Estimates last year that these type of tours would create a lot of interest to those people who choose to visit our great province. I would also, Mr. Speaker, indicate that our policy in matters such as this would be to see that part of the "Make Work Programs" of this government for our unemployed people would be in the tourist industry to help encourage more permanent jobs and assist this great growth that we are indicating or finding again today in the tourist attraction of our province. It's most encouraging and I welcome the announcement by the Minister.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party also welcomes

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . the improvement in the figures and the increase over last year. I'm sure that the Minister will agree with me when I say that we have still a long way to go and that Manitoba has yet to achieve its national share of the tourism potential, and that in the last year or so that he has introduced some improvement to the program, Mr. Speaker, it's still our position and I'm sure his too, and the Minister of Finance's position, that one of the most exciting, one of the most tantalizing tax revenue prospects for the Province of Manitoba is the continued expansion of the tourist potential. I believe the Minister's department issued figures recently indicating that as much as 40 percent of the tourist dollar winds up directly or indirectly as tax revenue through income tax, sales tax and so on, so that obviously it's an area of endeavour and promotion that we would support the continued expansion of.

As well we regret, though, that the government Tourist Promotion Division has not yet helped us to achieve what the Royal Commission Report of over four years ago said we could look forward to in Manitoba. I'm referring to the report that indicated that we had a potential of approximately \$400 million of tourists' spending -- we've only reach \$192 million. We'd like more information and we hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the report or in the Estimates of his department we'll be able to find out just how much of the 150 million--odd spending referred to in his statement was by Canadians outside of Manitobans and how much was really Manitobans just travelling around the province.

We again, Mr. Speaker, encourage the Minister in his job. We know it's a difficult job; we would encourage the government to make greater sums available to him for the attaining of the objectives that the TED Commission set out and I would draw to his attention that only this morning, or yesterday rather, the Province of Ontario, which already has a massive tourist industry, announced a, I believe, 50 million or 50 percent increase -- I'm not sure which -- but a major 50 percent increase in tourist promotion spending which enables the Minister of that province to produce some staggeringly impressive results and we would wish the Minister well in that kind of endeavour in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement unless the Honourable Member for Rhineland was wishing to comment on the previous one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. No one else except recognized parties may comment on a Minister's statement. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement concerning the burning issue of the location of the washroom in Memorial Park.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the Honourable Minister have a written statement for the members of the House?

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not.

MR. SPEAKER: Our rules call for it as the Honourable Minister is aware. Shall we proceed by leave? (Agreed) Very well.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that some comment is necessary with regard to the regrettable situation which has arisen as a result of this government's desire to install washroom facilities in the park adjacent to the Legislature, commonly referred to as Memorial Park. Construction of this facility was proceeded with by the government in good faith on the assumption, perhaps premature, that the desirability of this facility was generally acknowledged by all levels of government. These assumptions have perhaps been aborted by misunderstandings which have arisen between various representatives of the municipal and provincial governments.

It should be made plain that the Province of Manitoba was amongst the first, and perhaps "the" first government to willingly submit itself to municipal zoning in the City of Winnipeg Act. To our knowledge none of the City of Winnipeg's zoning restrictions have been violated. It should also be noted that although the province does not wish to become engaged in discussions as to the legality of the position of either the city or the province, the legal position is certainly not one which the province admits any sensitivity to insofar as its actions are concerned.

The Committee on Environment informed us today that they have not approved the application of Robisko Construction Limited, our contractors, for permission to construct

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . washroom facilities in Memorial Park. The Committee further "requests the Provincial Government to locate this facility in the immediate vicinity but not in Memorial Park." Consequently I have issued instructions to my department to inform the contractors that after their normal working day today that he is to cease construction until such time as he is notified.

The Department of Public Works proceeded with the project after discussing the matter with Environment Committee Chairman Abe Yanofsky and Councillors of Midland Community Committee. On Monday February 19th, Chairman Yanofsky indicated to us that if there were no objections from Midland Community Committee Councillors, Environment Committee would immediately give approval to such a routine matter. The councillors were informally canvassed and informed the Department of Public Works and Mr. Yanofsky that there was no fundamental objection. The following day we issued instructions to the contractor to commence construction, which he did. On Wednesday, February 21st, a councillor or councillors objected to the location and the matter was referred back to Environment Committee for further discussion. A week later on March 5th, Environment Committee met and due to objections by some Legionaires denied the province a building permit.

I might point out for the edification of honourable members that today, after the Session, the Honourable H. R. Pawley and myself will meet with representatives of the Canadian Legion to discuss their objections, and on Friday, March 9th at 11:00 a.m. members of the Environment Committee will meet with the Honourable Ben Hanuschak and I to discuss their objections to the location of the washroom as well. I think it is essential that the various levels of government have a good working relationship and it is in that interest that we meet with members of the Environment Committee in an attempt to iron out the problems. Both members of the Midland Community Committee and members of the Environment Committee recognize the need for washroom facilities for users of the park. At issue is the location. Since some members of the Legion have objected to the location we are also prepared to meet with them to discuss their objections and present our plans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has retreated from the position that he took initially in this particular case. He retreated in the face of the outflanking movement that was created by the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and members of the Environmental Committee, unlike my friend the Minister of Mines and Resources, who proceeds unabated with any plans that he originally starts. The Minister may use this opportunity when he has created this hiatus to perhaps hold public hearings to determine the level at which it may be desirable to flood Memorial Park, and failing that, failing any agreement on what may happen in Memorial Park in that instance, perhaps it might be possible to build a monorail to the nearest biffy. The Minister now has created an opportunity for himself to take several alternatives that are open to him, and I hope that his next step will be such as to note create the problem that he created for himself in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a regrettable matter in this House that the most powerful elected representative of the City of Greater Winnipeg had to come into this House . . . -- (Interjections) -- My honourable friends can hardly wait. Perhaps later on we'd care to talk about this. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that it's a sorry state of affairs in this Legislature when the Mayor of this City has to take the action that he did in order to be heard, in order to be able to have the Minister to pull in his horns. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it certainly is a disgrace. When a Minister of the Crown can break the law and then stand up and back track and get away with it, it's a disgrace. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that the Member for Portage la Prairie has just said that the Minister can break the law. When he says that with such confidence, is he referring to Section 654 or is he referring to Section 607 of the City of Winnipeg Act? There is no admission whatsoever that any law has been broken, and

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . therefore the honourable member should withdraw that statement unless he is acting in the role of a judge here. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has given his opinion, and we appreciate his opinion, but in the opinion of many in this House and many outside, the Minister has broken the law. Now perhaps if the Minister will be able to respond again, I would like to know who is going to pay the extra costs caused by his hasty action. If there is going to be extra costs attached to this and it was a mistake within the department, are the taxpayers going to pay that bill? Obviously, my friends say opposite, obviously the taxpayers are going to pay the bill. But all I can say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . Mr. Speaker, is that I hope the Minister has learned a lesson, and I hope that when he speaks to the Veterans, whenever it is during the week, that he will not only listen to them but he will take their advice and keep that objectionable thing off Memorial Park.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements or tabling of reports? Order please. Order please. The order of business now calls for ministerial statements, tabling of reports. Notices of motions. The Honourable House Leader.

TABLING OF REPORTS (cont'd)

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, excuse me, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 33 dated May 11, 1972 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Charleswood.

Mr. Speaker, just while I'm on my feet, I have asked periodically about reports from the Federal-Provincial Study Board, and I believe that I have indicated that I did not receive reports from that Board. I'd like to now say, Mr. Speaker, that I did receive the report for the termination of 1972 yesterday, that I intend to file it in the House, I am merely awaiting confirmation by the other partner to the Study Board, the Honourable Minister of Fisheries. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that I think I advised the House that I had not received previous reports from the Study Board. There was a report which I had forgotten about, which was received for the period ending December 31, 1971. It was very preliminary in nature, Mr. Speaker; there was no intention to mislead the House; I had forgotten that I had received it. It too will be tabled with the concurrence of my federal counterpart on the Study Board, and I regret any inconvenience that I would have caused anybody by the inadvertent statement, Mr. Speaker, that I thought I had not received a previous report.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to amend The Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs Act.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 12, an Act to amend the Brandon Charter.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to a question arising out of the Estimates that were tabled last night. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether there will be any additional unconditional grants or additional amounts be given to the City of Winnipeg or other municipalities in Manitoba this year other than in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of policy to be determined. My honourable friend will appreciate the fact that during the course of preparation on the

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . Estimates as presented last night, that the federal budget was brought down, we received a notification of additional revenues to be made available to Manitoba by transfer from federal source, and accordingly we do have to make some adjustments. We have not completed that exercise yet; we hope to be in a position to report to the House relatively soon.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the First Minister can indicate whether this will be done by supplementary Estimates to be presented to the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, yes. By definition the Estimates that will have to be brought forward as a result of revisions due to the changes in the federal budget will be brought here by way of supplementary Estimates.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then on the basis of the answer given by the First Minister, the municipalities and the City of Winnipeg can assume that there will be more money available from the province.

MR. SCHREYER: That would be a correct assumption.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Mines Minister in connection with the contract that was referred to as being terminated yesterday in the question period. Did the government simply not exercise an option to renew, or did they in effect terminate a two-year contract and in effect fire the research group.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't read the material. My understanding is that the contract provided for two phases, with the first phase being completed on March 30, 1973 giving us an option to take the second phase, which we didn't take. That's my understanding but I haven't read the document.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister then examine the document and answer the question after he has examined the document?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the answer that I gave is as I understand it at the present time. May I say that if there are different interpretations that can be read by any person with respect to it, it will not change the action of the government with respect to doing this work in House.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, did the Minister decide to cancel because he became aware that the studies that were being conducted were leading the researchers, particularly Dr. Newbury . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is repetitive even though it has been altered slightly. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that innuendo was left on the floor without an answer being permitted. I indicated in the House that I had no knowledge whatsoever of what reports were coming, I have no knowledge whatsoever, and as a matter of fact my only verbal communications with the Study director indicate nothing untoward. The sole reasons for dealing with the matter as it was dealt with were given to the House; there were no other reasons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct three questions to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could the Minister inform me and my constituents when the next phase of The Pas special area agreement will be signed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARROW: Well, could the Minister tell me what's the matter?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I could answer that question very simply. There is some hold-up or delay on the part of the Federal Government. The negotiations between the provincial officials and the federal officials have been going on for over a year now. My understanding is that an agreement was reached at the civil service level last fall, early in the fall, and the normal procedure would be for the Federal Government then to pass the agreement to its Treasury Board and through Cabinet and then it would come to the Provincial Government to go through our Cabinet. My understanding is the agreement has gone through the Treasury Board in Ottawa; I am not aware if it has passed through Cabinet in Ottawa. To ensure that there was no delay on the part of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Cabinet

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . passed the agreement a number of weeks ago and are holding it now waiting on the Federal Government decision. So, Mr. Speaker, we're just waiting at this point on the Federal Government.

MR. BARROW: Will the agreement provide for assistance to the community of Cranberry Portage to obtain a water system?

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the nature of the agreement is that the provincial minister responsible and the federal minister responsible are not allowed to announce any matters contained within the agreement until there's a joint announcement. However, I could assure the Member for Flin Flon that his constituents in Cranberry Portage will not be forgotten.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he will undertake to see that his Cabinet Ministers are made accessible to the members of his caucus.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question, so perhaps my honourable friend could rephrase it. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I thought that my honourable friend would do the courtesy of making the question intelligible.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, he can't . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is not going to make the question intelligible, then I will not dignify it with an answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will put the question again. Will the First Minister undertake to make the members of his Cabinet accessible to the members of his caucus.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what my honourable friend is referring to, but I do know that a former Conservative Leader, John Diefenbaker, was stabbed in the back by his own caucus, so if my honourable friend is referring to that -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. In view of the findings of Chief Justice Tritschler, how long is the government going to defer clarifying its position on proceeding with criminal charges against Kasser and Reiser?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any findings of Chief Justice Tritschler, but I have made it clear and Crown counsel in court made it clear that proceedings will be brought against certain named individuals, namely Messrs. Kasser and Reiser and others, in accordance with the advice of counsel and in accordance with the administration of justice with which I am charged and this government is charged, and it is not a matter for the prosecution by the courts, and I want to make it very clear that I don't think that further fishing expeditions on the part of the Opposition is in the interest of the administration of justice.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has just made reference to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member ask a question?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's a supplementary question with regards to his counsel which he has made several references to. Was it not his counsel who yesterday said in court that the evidence was in upon which to proceed?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not going to make any further comment about what proceeded in court. The honourable member can read about it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to direct to the Attorney-General. Can he advise how many meetings were held by one or more members of the Inquiry Commission and one or more members of the present Cabinet in private at other than a public hearing?

MR. MACKLING: The honourable member is concerned to try and cast a smear on the Commission of Inquiry or others and I'm not about to respond to his smear tactics.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question is in reference to a statement made by the Attorney-General that meetings had been held. My question today is simply to ask him to advise the House when the meetings were held that were referred to by him in his answer yesterday.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, when the Commission of Inquiry reports, all of the details of all and any procedural meetings that were necessary will be divulged, and I don't intend to engage my honourable friend in a worthless exercise at this time.

MR. CRAIK: One further question. Why did neither the government nor the

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . Commission voluntarily disclose that private discussions did take place between the government and certain members of the Commission?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, response is made to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. -- (Interjection) -- Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if you could restrain the braying of the Whip of the NDP we could get through the question period. My question to the Attorney-General is: how many others which he has just referred to -- and I'm certainly not seeking the names -- how many others other than Reiser and Kasser are about to have proceedings taken against them?

MR. MACKLING: The Crown never advertises its shopping list for prosecutions and will not do so at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Honourable the Attorney-General. With respect to the meetings which were indicated did take place between one or more members of the CFI Inquiry Commission and the government members, can he tell the House if there was a minute kept of any of the private meetings between one or more members of the Inquiry Commission and one or more members of the government?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, that question has already been answered.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister indicate when the information or the proceedings of such meetings will be made public as are other affairs of the Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been answered. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Can he advise who Mr. Scott Wright represents before the Commission of Inquiry?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the honourable member was a resident in Winnipeg and in Manitoba during the course of hearings and read the newspapers from time to time and was aware of the answer to the question he asks.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Morris state his point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes. Sir, you have frequently cautioned members of this side of the House not to preface their questions with statements which are not to the point. I think the same applies to the answers that are given. If the Minister does not have an answer he knows his alternative, but to permit him to make statements such as he has been making in reply to the questions that have been asked him is a violation of our rules, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on the same point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order raised by my honourable friend the Member for Morris, while I'm not one who has ever pretended to be expert on the rules nevertheless I have sat in a legislative body about as long as my honourable friend, and in two different parliamentary bodies at that. My honourable friend knows very well that when putting questions before Orders of the Day that the questions must be put in the interrogative without preface and without being argumentative. The nature of the reply, the answers, if my honourable friend will just cast his mind back to the years when he spent . . .

A MEMBER: What mind?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . over in parliament, he will know whether the format was correct or not, used by my colleague the Attorney-General.

MR. PAULLEY: It's only half there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us proceed with the Oral Question Period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I should like to direct my question to the Attorney-General. On a couple of occasions he said meetings were held in the presence of solicitor. I wonder if he'd care to name that solicitor.

MR. MACKLING: The Attorney-General's Department has a number of solicitors and we engaged counsel, and I'm not about to indicate which counsel were at what meetings and all



## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . of that will be reported when the Commission of Inquiry makes its report.

MR. JORGENSEN: A further question -- I wonder if the Attorney-General would advise the House whether it was a solicitor from the Attorney-General's Department or someone from outside.

MR. MACKLING: The Commission, Mr. Speaker, the Commission of Inquiry will be making a report and all of the information that is necessary about Commission meetings and the presence of counsel will be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of his answer to a question last session, where he said he would meet with the people of a Unicity Bank, has he met with the directors of Unicity Bank -- Unity Bank, to see if it can be located in Manitoba? Unity Bank.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. I don't recall the exact statement or commitment that I made.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I am sure that the Minister must remember if he's met with the directors of Unity Bank or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Attorney-General. Can he advise whether Mr. Scott Wright played a part in screening the documents pertaining to the present government's participation with the CFI project before forwarding them to the Inquiry Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record the honourable member continues to fish. All of this will be disclosed by the Commission of Inquiry report, but I want to indicate to him, I want to indicate to him that counsel for the Crown communicated immediately after the appointment of the Commission of Inquiry and invited them to see all documentation that was in any one of the files that we had in respect to this matter, complete and full disclosure was given to the Commission of Inquiry.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a further question to the Attorney-General. Since Mr. Frank Meighan has been denied access to any government documents that have been filed with the Commission, when will these be given an opportunity for inspection, the documents that have been withheld as well?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Commission of Inquiry conducts the Commission, and I don't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Mines Minister. Was the decision that he took to not renew, as he would say, the contract of Dr. Newbury . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I believe that question has been repeated before.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the point you're making the Minister answered a question that I had not asked. He presumed the question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will not have a debate with the Chair. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I realize that the Premier is the Minister in charge of dominion-provincial relations and, of course, the Minister of Finance. In view of the many heavy responsibilities likely to come up this month with the Dominion-Provincial Relations Conference, does the Premier expect to appoint a separate Minister of Finance?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course I look forward to the day when that will be possible and I continue to hope that it will be possible relatively soon, but in the meantime I continue to carry this burden of office. It is one which I cannot complain about since all my colleagues and I have asked for it in a sense.

MR. BARKMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Premier tell us when he intends to bring down his budget?

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the budget can be brought in soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, the farmers from Manitoba are busy cleaning and preparing seeds for spring planting. Is the Minister of Agriculture charging the farmers a cent a bushel for the wheat seeds and the cleanout of this grain being sold to feed mills?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the position of the Commission is with respect to by-products of grain that is cleaned through the various seed cleaning plants and subsequently sold, but I can take that question as notice and inform my honourable friend at a later date.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question put to me the other day by the Member for Rhineland and that is, what penalties are farmers going to be suffering under the new protein grading system, that is the new grading system for wheat, and presumably it's an anticipation of decisions yet to be made and therefore, Mr. Speaker, it's hypothetical at this stage. We are watching the situation to determine whether or not the government at the provincial level should make some determination with respect to that policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. Oh, sorry. Did the Honourable Member for Arthur have a supplementary?

MR. WATT: Well I had a supplementary, or first question in regard to the question that's just been asked. Could I ask the Minister if the Department or his Department have been studying -- what procedure they have taken in the United States in regard to protein grading?

MR. USKIW: I didn't quite get the question, Mr. Speaker. I think it has to do with what systems are applied in the U.S. I'm not aware of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the First Minister, and ask him if all of the documents which pertain to the present government's involvement in Churchill Forest Industries have been forwarded to the Commission.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, all of the documents that are relevant have been made available to the Commission. It is my understanding that the Commission did follow the procedure of having its staff and counsel come to this building in order to make a full and systematic review and analysis of all relevant documentation, and accordingly those documents were taken. I might add also that I did send letters of request to two predecessor premiers asking them for concurrence in the rather extraordinary step of making all cabinet documents available, and received a reply which was forwarded to the Commission.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Would he be prepared to say who made the determination as to which were relevant documents?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Commission of Inquiry, and I quote more specifically the Commissioners themselves on their own judgment and on the advice of the Commission counsel. It is my very distinct impression, Sir, that the Chief Justice, E. Rhodes Smith, the chairman of the Commission, is satisfied that all relevant documentation is either in their possession or available and has been reviewed and seen by them.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the First Minister could advise whether or not Mr. Scott Wright was present at the first perusing of the documents.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I could not say with finality that he was or was not. It's my impression that the Commissioners themselves and their counsel made the judgment and decisions as to documents required by the Commission, and in any case the reference to Scott Wright, Queen's Counsel, is one which -- I'm not sure what my honourable friend is trying to get at, but I feel quite comfortable whatever my honourable friend is trying to get at.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is to the Mines Minister. Is it correct that the second phase of the Nelson-Churchill River study that he has announced will be taken over by his own department? Is it true that the second phase is the part which was designed to give an independent estimate of the environmental damage that the project would cause?

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GREEN: The entire study which was reported to the members of this House and funds for which were voted by members of this House for the last two years, had the purpose of dealing with the two projects, Lake Winnipeg regulation, the Churchill River diversion, and in as broad a generality as I can put it, were designed to examine how the projects could be handled so as to maximize their benefits and minimize their problems insofar as problems are created by any change in the ecology. Phase I and Phase II of the study -- I don't know the terms of reference offhand but I'm saying that that was the purpose of the total study and certainly changes in ecological matters would be part of the study but within that context, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: . . . Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister. Will the now estimate of environmental damage arising from this project be in effect made, not by the independent contractor, but by the very department that's creating the damage?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there isn't a single person, whether I've had arguments with them or not, whether it's been Mr. Booy, or Mr. Newbury, whether it's any person on this staff during the four years of office, who will have made a charge that I have told him what should be his judgment. The staff people in my department are as independent, or more so, than the staff people who happen to be working for the University. They are giving me their professional opinion, they are advised to give me their professional opinion, they are advised not to base that professional opinion on any political favour or fear, and that is what we have expected from all people whether they have been working within the staff or whether they have been working without the staff, and it's significant, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Newbury and Mr. Booy, both of whom were working as members of the Water Commission, never ever breathed a word of charge that while they were on the Commission that they were encouraged, induced, or in any other way expected to say things to favour the administration. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they were told specifically that we want their independent professional judgment without fear or favour as to how that could affect this government politically, and they have done that, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly what our own staff people are told. I have every confidence in the professional integrity of the staff who works for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, they are as pure or purer a staff who are responsible to nobody and who don't have any consequence to fulfill the recommendations that they make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. A supplementary. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Did the fact that internal studies in the Minister's department have an aura of confidentiality about them, influence or cause the decision to take the study back into the department where it could be kept confidential?

MR. GREEN: I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that there was a problem between the government and the independent contractor that my honourable friend is referring to, as to trying to separate their responsibilities to the project, that is the contract, and their willingness and freedom to engage in an attack of the project, that that was a problem, and we felt, Mr. Speaker, that there would be no constraints whatsoever and that they needn't have a problem in their own mind and that there need be no question of professional ethics because now, Mr. Speaker, without any constraint at all they can attack the project until Hell freezes over and they have no problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is tantamount to the following situation; I really don't see what the fuss is about. The International Nickel Company hires McGill University to do a study on mineral resources, and during the course of the study Mr. Kierans says that the International Nickel should be expropriated and taken over by the government and taxed out of existence, and Mr. Kierans' contract terminates at the end of March 30; and the honourable member is suggesting that International Nickel would be doing a terrible thing interfering with the academic freedom of Mr. Kierans unless they renew his contract. No, Mr. Speaker, we expect no different treatment from Underwood McLellan, from the University of Manitoba, from any other consultants that we have hired, than would be afforded to private enterprise. The public is asking for exactly the same . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister has made his point. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has had two supplementaries on the same question.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister and it arises out of the statements of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the fact that tomorrow I gather we'll be dealing with the Estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. First in view of the fact that a precedent has been set with the Kierans Report being tabled in the House, I wonder if the First Minister would undertake to table the Planning and Priorities Analysis of the policies of the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management and I wonder if he'd undertake to table that so that we could deal with that when we deal with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition can't have it both ways. If he is suggesting that he would have wanted to object to the tabling of the Kierans Report he should have indicated so. I believed, I sincerely believed at the time of the tabling of the report that we were making available information to honourable members that they would find whether they agreed with it or not, that they would find informative and interesting, and accordingly it was tabled.

Now my honourable friend is asking for internal working documents and, Mr. Speaker, a review of Hansards of the last fourteen years will show the attitude of the previous Conservative administration when it came to the tabling of reports, let alone internal documents. I can remember ad nauseum the former Attorney-General of this province making the point, correctly, under the rules that interdepartmental memorandums and working papers, documents, etc., were not matters subject to being tabled in this House. Now if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition suggests that the procedure that has been followed for many years is one which is to be -- is repugnant and should be repudiated, let him say so clearly and we may just do that, but let him repudiate his past practices first.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the answer from the First Minister is no, he's not prepared to table the Planning and Priorities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member ask a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, well, I would like to get the same preamble that the First Minister undertook with his answer, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be given the same rights. Mr. Speaker, my question then to the First Minister is, why in view of the planning and research capacity already existing in the department, why this analysis commissioned and done by Planning and Priorities?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet is one that has existed I believe since 1967 or '68. I believe it certainly was established not later than 1968. We found that with the existence of such a mechanism, which by the way exists in other provinces such as Ontario for example, that if such an entity exists it had better be made use of, and made use of in a way that will be helpful in reviewing the policy and policy direction of any given department. Accordingly the staff of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, staff members were assigned according to their varying background and training, etc., to make a systematic analysis and review of the major policy directions in the various departments, and to come forward with such proposals or recommendations as they felt they could defend and justify to Cabinet in the ordinary course of policy decision-making. All in all, Mr. Speaker, and in short, it's a very normal process indeed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. My question refers to the Veterinary Clinic at Cypress River and I would like to ask the Minister could he inform the House as to whether the Commission has given a decision as to whether or not they're going to build in Cypress River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll have to take that question as notice and answer my honourable friend at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has his department, or is the government giving support to a proposal put forward by Mr. Runciman, President of United Grain Growers, the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . farm income security through a price compensation plan?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not been involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will incorporated community clubs be able to make use of the loan money that is now being made available to municipalities under this new program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I would first like to thank the honourable member for providing me with notice of the question. The fact is that the Manitoba Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund is available to provide loans to municipalities, and to that extent the loans would not be available to incorporated community clubs. The only way that an arena for instance would be able to obtain a loan would be if it in fact was part of the assets of the municipality.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Mines referring to the general subject of tabling of documents referred to by the First Minister. Since the Minister's Estimates are first on the list for examination, and since his responsibilities include that of the operations of the MDC, would he now table the Annual Report of the MDC which he now has in his possession?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will table the report before we get to our Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In view of the sharp increase reported in juvenile crime, as reported in today's Tribune, is the Minister considering setting up some program to deal with it similar to the one he's set up for the dealing with the abuse of alcohol?

MR. MACKLING: The short answer is yes, Mr. Speaker; the Manitoba Police Commission has embarked on a wide range of activities and I'll be filing a report likely during the course of my Estimates' review which will indicate the concerns of the Police Commission in various areas which includes public relations and the relationships between police and others in the community, including young people.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Point Douglas that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of public importance, namely that the recommendation of the Executive Policy Committee of the City of Winnipeg to contract out work now done by employees of the city may result in costs rising to \$30 million and unemployment of hundreds of people, and that these results will effect the economic well-being of the people of Manitoba and the fiscal policies of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. According to our rules I will now entertain five minutes by the parties to debate the issue of urgency, only the issue of urgency. The Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I would like to make clear the point that the government party will have an opportunity of dealing with this motion in the same way as any other party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

A MEMBER: That's right, any member . . . any member can make it

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has risen on a point of order and notwithstanding the inane interjections of the Minister of Labour, I want to speak on the point of order as well. Government does have the opportunity to respond to the point of order and that opportunity's provided when the Member for Osborne speaks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm told now he's not a member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Chair recognizes parties and members representing the leader or anyone else only when I've had notification, otherwise I recognize individuals first and then parties, and that's the precedence that shall take place today.

The Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you, Sir, for rising to the same point of order raised by both my colleague the House Leader and the Member for Morris, but I would like to if it's possible, Sir, clear assurance that there will be an opportunity for myself, or someone designated from the Treasury Bench, to respond to whatever that motion is and to the comments made by the honourable member who is proposing it.

MR. PAULLEY: That's correct. That's in accordance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I indicated, that unless I am informed by a party that someone is representing it, then I have to assume that the individual is standing on his own feet and the party has the opportunity to explain its position.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I asked, Mr. Speaker, if we may have a copy of that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's entitled to a copy of the motion.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on the same point of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order, and I'm offering a word of caution to all sides of the House that if the government has a spokesman as well as the member who's introducing the motion from the same party well then that precedent will stand so that in the future any member plus any member of his party may speak on behalf of the party and we haven't been doing that up until this time.

A MEMBER: Yes we have.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No we have not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party state his point of order.

MR. ASPER: We have not received a copy of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the pages hand the Honourable Member for Wolseley a copy of the resolution. --(Interjections)--

The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that my motion caused such concern among the members present and I suggest the Rules Committee regard the change in the rule as an urgent matter as well as my motion.

(MR. ASPER cont'd.)

Sir, I refer you to Section 103 of Beuchesne which does point out that urgency is when the ordinary opportunities provided by the Rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

Sir, I can think of no matter before this Legislature today that is of greater urgency than the decision that may be taken by the City of Winnipeg Council this evening. I think that it is clear that as that decision will occur this evening there will be no other opportunity for a member of this House to raise the subject matter, namely the proposal to contract out the work now done by the City Engineering Department. By the time any member here has an opportunity to discuss this matter our good civic government and orderly administration in the City of Winnipeg could be laid off and these men, Sir, to be put on welfare, for two reasons. One that the wages paid by the private contractors are generally lower than wages paid by the City of Winnipeg and that contractors . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I must caution the honourable member that he is debating the substance of the motion and not the urgency.

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, Sir. And that contractors will in fact require that some of these individuals who are working for private contractors will have to acquire social assistance. Sir, by the time another opportunity arises for members of this House to discuss this proposal, the economy of the City could be affected detrimentally. By the time any member of this Legislative Assembly has an opportunity to discuss this matter the assets of the City of Winnipeg may be sold off. These assets are now worth, I'm told, a book value of 1.7 million but the cost may be as high as 30 million.

Sir, the decision of the City Council is based on a report the cost studies of which are now in dispute, and I think it is clear that the City of Winnipeg as is its wont will be on the steps of the Legislature soon not with the type of publicity stunt that occurred yesterday but with a petition asking the Government of Manitoba to provide to them additional tax sources. That, Sir, I think is a foregone conclusion. And if the costs of this proposal to contract out rise to the \$30 million, the City of Winnipeg will be here very quickly asking that the members of this Legislature provide them with additional moneys. They have only recently come here, Sir, to ask for 25 percent, 25 percent of the provincial tax paid.

Sir, I think that this report, this decision of the City of Winnipeg is one that requires discussion by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Surely the existing system of 80 percent done by private contractors and 20 percent by the public sector is sufficient for the public sector has a big enough share; surely the wages paid to the men of the City Engineering Department need not be turned into profits for contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to indicate very clearly that notwithstanding the subject matter of the honourable member's motion, and notwithstanding the conviction that the honourable member has in the matter, or my own, the fact remains that the subject matter referred to - my honourable friend's motion - is something which comes within the purview of decision-making of the City of Winnipeg under the authority vested in it by an act of this Legislature, the Province of Manitoba.

Having said that I make no secret of the fact that in my own personal opinion that there is much in what the Honourable Member for Osborne has said that one can agree with, but that is not how the relationship between two levels of government, each operating within their own proper spheres is to be carried out. One always continues to hope that there can be a maximization of harmonious relations between two levels of government whether it be provincial and federal, or whether it be provincial-municipal, and so whether it be in the case of this particular policy dispute, or whether it be in the case of any administrative dispute, there must always be a genuine effort to seek the most harmonious relations and solutions possible.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that fact, in addition to the fact that there is no urgency at all involved here in the sense that the matter is not something that is to be decided properly by this Legislature, I do not see how urgency of debate in this Legislature is attached to the subject matter in question.

I would, of course, like to indicate that the province feels that in all of its dealings with the City of Winnipeg to date, that apart from disagreements of policy questions we have tried to be scrupulously fair in our relationships with City administration. I know there are some who would argue that we have not followed certain sections of the City of Winnipeg Act in our

MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . own procedures. Well Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of interpretation, a matter of some difference of legal opinion. Earlier in response to the Member for Portage la Prairie today I indicated that there were differing legal opinions with respect to two different sections of the City of Winnipeg Act, but clearly in this case, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter coming within the City of Winnipeg purview, under the City of Winnipeg Act; urgency of debate in this Legislature does not exist as such, although the policy matter is important.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the last words of the Premier I will agree that the rule very clearly provides that the subject matter for debate must come under the purview of the government in question. This one obviously does not. Sir, the First Minister was given wide latitude in dealing with the question of urgency and it now becomes obvious as to the reasons why they insisted upon the right to speak in order to silence one of their own members. All I can say, Sir, to honourable gentlemen opposite is for heaven's sake, pull yourself together and try and get along without bringing your family disputes into this Chamber time after time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete agreement with the Premier but I wonder whether he would have been so temperate in his turndown of the motion had it been a member from this side who proposed such an asinine motion in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member is imputing motives. I wish he would retract . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well then I withdraw the word asinine -- I say stupid.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . observation. Would the honourable member permit an observation. I can assure him most readily that if it were my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie, I would be equally gracious and kind and friendly.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder how members of this House would feel if an MP in Ottawa stood up and asked for an Emergency Debate on matters that were to do with this Legislature. —(Interjection)— My friend says it's been done; well I doubt it very much that anybody that had the brains to become an MP and go to Ottawa would insert his nose into the business of a provincial legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: So I can't help but make the observation, Mr. Speaker, that the motion, the motion that we are considering whether or not to debate, I don't think has done any good at all for the cause of friendly co-operation between the City of Winnipeg and this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I thank all the honourable members for their contribution in respect to urgency. I have to concur with those who indicated that there is no urgency and that it doesn't fall within the purview of this House. Beauchesne's citation 100 subsection (1) says, "that the matter must involve the administrative responsibility of the government". It clearly does not. Therefore I must refuse the motion.

I should also like to indicate that not only today, but yesterday as well, those who are making motions should sign their motions when they forward them to the Chair. Thank you. Any other oral questions? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions before Orders of the Day I have condolence motions.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have a question that I would like to direct to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Could he inform the House as to who is the present legal counsel for the Manitoba Development Corporation?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is one staff counsel, who I believe is Mr. M. Freedman, and, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that maybe one-third of the rest of the lawyers in Winnipeg are making a living now from the Manitoba Development Corporation.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was asked a question by the Honourable



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . Member for Riel. The question was: is the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs engaged in expropriating land in West Hawk Lake. Now I gave the answer to the honourable member who is not here, but in view of the fact that this was asked in the House the answer is no.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

#### MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to notice given in this Chamber on Friday, and then again yesterday, I would like with honourable members' permission, to proceed with the dealing, treating of four motions of condolence.

The first has to do with the late Gordon Beard, MLA, former member for the Constituency of Churchill.

Mr. Beard passed away a matter of three months ago or so at the age of 51, a relatively young man. He was a native Manitoban, born in Neepawa back in the 1920's, served in the Canadian Army during the Second World War, and moved to the Dauphin district sometime soon after the end of World War II to establish a business there. He moved, as many honourable members know so well, to the Thompson area in the late 1950's to establish a business there. Subsequently he was elected to this Assembly in the early 1960's. He served as a member of the Assembly for a period of six years, I believe, four of which were with the party of the Official Opposition, now, the government then. He resigned in 1968 for reasons having to do with the northland and northern development and returned to this House in 1969 as an Independent member.

I think that every one in this Chamber would be able to agree with alacrity, that Mr. Beard was one who spoke with feeling, who spoke with understanding, who spoke with practical commonsense about the north and the problems associated with the small and remote communities, and with northern mining towns, and the problems of economics and economic development, transportation costs, etc., etc., insofar as northern communities were concerned.

He had a particular and very continuing surveillance on many programs that were being evolved with application and relevance to the north, the use of the Port of Churchill; and in more recent years, his interest broadened to include an interest in the high Arctic.

It is a matter of intense personal satisfaction to me that I spent with the late Gordon Beard a number of days in northern Manitoba together, he and I, and also in the Arctic district of Keewatin this last late, this last July, and had opportunity to discuss many, many aspects of government responsibility and northern development with him.

Mr. Speaker I could go on and on but at this point I would like to move the sending of a Motion of Condolence to his surviving wife and two children, and to leave other words of expression in his memory to a person who is also well known to him and who shares responsibility for the same part of the province.

So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Thompson, that this House convey to the family of the late Gordon Wilbert Beard who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Premier for giving me the opportunity to say a few words about my departed colleague and my constituent. I was always concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the day would come when I would have to say something about a departed member because I have felt that in politics there's often people that are, you know, less than exemplary and it would be very difficult for me to get up and say something nice about a rogue. I am happy to say that I do not have such a problem. I think everybody in this House, and outside of the House, will agree with me that Mr. Beard was probably as fine a politician as sat in this Legislature since its inception a hundred years ago

I have had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of sharing an office with him since about 18 months ago, and sharing our geographical position in this House, and sharing our Independence together,

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . and on many occasions voting together on various issues in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Beard, like myself was one of the original pioneers into Thompson. We are often referred to by our friends as the Founding Fathers of Thompson. When we arrived there, there was nothing but muskeg and swamp and black flies and mosquitoes and a headframe. I worked on the headframe and Mr. Beard was a little more fortunate he had a coffee shop and a dining room in a local hotel, which we used to frequent very often and when we got tired of eating the camp food we would go to his hotel.

As I continued to work underground and work with the union Mr. Beard was elected to the Legislature and attempted to represent all of us in this newest community in Canada and after many years of frustration, understandable frustration, he resigned in '68 and as a result of that an election was called and I ran and got elected, so I suppose if one can be ever grateful for getting into politics that I should be grateful for him launching me into politics because certainly had he not resigned it is difficult to say what would have happened. The probability is that I would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in Thompson had respected Mr. Beard, certainly since '68. I don't think it's any secret we were just as disillusioned with him prior to '68 as he was with the inability to get anything for the north. After his resignation I think he became perhaps one of the most popular people in the north, and since his election in '69 he worked tirelessly for all of the north, which included my own constituency. He will be missed by all of us there, as I am sure he will be missed by the members.

I would like to close in expressing my appreciation again to the Premier, and to Mrs. Beard we offer our condolences and our prayers and we pray for her spiritual strength to carry on with her children on her own. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the Motion of Condolence for someone who was our colleague and someone who was a friend to all of us, a man of the north, as we knew, whose vision and concern, and whose diligence and human warmth really truly knew no bounds.

Gordon Beard was a man who made an indelible impression on all who met and came to know him as a man from the north. Gordon was a big man, we knew that, but even his size could not contain the size of his heart. No sense of urgency would stop Gordon from passing the time of day with another person; and his supreme character was his ever abiding interest in people. Gordon Beard staked out his place in this Legislative Chamber. It didn't take him long to make his concerns known to everyone in this House, yet in remembering his speeches here in this Legislature, they were characterized, as the First Minister indicated, by common sense and by wisdom. He was a man not to be ignored when he pleaded for the north, for Manitoba, and for Western Canada, and for the country of which he was so much a part. Gordon was a progressive person in his outlook. His vision of the north was far ahead of the rest of us as he outlined the character of the north, its physical presence and the place it had in the mosaic of our province.

I and all of us knew Gordon Beard well and we all considered him a true friend. I recall last year almost to the day, when I was recuperating in the hospital, on a Friday at the conclusion of the first week of the session Gordon visited me in the hospital and spent time -- he visited me after hours so that he could spend time, and he spent a lot of time in the course of the evening with a discussion of the events of the week as he summarized them, as he saw the political intrigue, as he dealt with what he considered the cut and thrust of debate.

Although he was an Independent in the true sense of the word, Gordon had an interest in the political process and in all political parties. He was a member of the House from 1962 as the First Minister indicated until his death, with a brief recess from 1968 until the 1969 election

Now he began as a member of the Progressive Conservative caucus and when he died he was sitting as an Independent, but in no way, Mr. Speaker, did that reduce the admiration we held for him; it only served to emphasize his independent spirit and his irritation for getting things done.

Today in many circles, Mr. Speaker, the name of a politician is viewed with certain skepticism.

Gordon Beard's contribution to the esteem of public service will go down in the annals of our province's history. Politics and the north were his life. Gordon believed that the political

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . service was the highest goal for man. He sought politics as a means for accomplishing his goals for the north. For him politics was the highest profession and he served himself and our province in a way that sets an example for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, no words can truly express the emotional impact which I, and I am sure all our colleagues in this Chamber, feel on this motion of condolence. I can only hope that my few words can do some justice to a man who served well and for whom we have a total respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will also try hard not to make my remarks too personal because so many of us knew him personally and knew him well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we would all agree that Gordon's passing away was rather untimely, if we can use that word, at a relatively youthful age. However, all of us would agree perhaps if Gordon Beard had not personally applied himself so unselfishly and applied himself so diligently with problems of the north and as a member of this House, I say perhaps this might have extended his life. However, now that he is gone, all of us in this House will remember him for years to come as a likeable, constructive and a peaceable man. I believe much more could be said.

I know that many members here today would like to say some of the things that are on top of their minds, of the many things that we shared with Gordon while a member of this House. But as has been said, we all knew him personally, and I know we agree that he has left a great void in this House and even a greater void in northern Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, our group is happy to associate ourselves with this motion of condolence to be sent to his wife, Mabel, his son Billy and of course his daughter and son-in-law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the Condolence Motion that's before us. Gordon Beard was a very close friend of mine, indeed I enjoyed his support, especially during this last Legislature very very much; and it just so happened that probably I was the only member of the House except for the Ministers of the Crown that attended the conference in Churchill last summer, where we had some pleasant times together and also where we discussed a number of matters that were so close to his heart.

He was a great champion of the Hudson Bay Route Association and to which meeting he went even last spring to address them. He honestly did his level best for his constituency and for northern Manitoba.

I know all members of the House will miss him -- probably I will miss him more than any of the others -- and I certainly want to pay my respects and express my condolences to the Beard family, to Mrs. Beard and her children.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may be permitted to add a word of sympathy to the family of the late Gordon Beard. I do this, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that Gordon and I were sworn in together as members of this Legislature in 1962, and from this meeting, Mr. Speaker, a lasting friendship developed. I having lived and worked and served in the Northwest Territories, this somehow drew Gordon and myself together in the bringing together of minds. I, Sir, shall miss him.

During the Throne Speech debate, Mr. Speaker, almost without exception during those eight days, members have prefixed their remarks with words of respect and admiration to the memory of Gordon Beard. We served together, Mr. Speaker, on the Northern Task Force; we travelled into the far reaches of the North. He contributed much and, Sir, in my opinion the report, the outcome of that work, is part of his memorial.

Mr. Beard, Mr. Speaker, had an unique dialogue with the people of Indian, Metis and Eskimo blood; he was a priceless gentleman and respected by them. Sir, we have too few of his breed in this day and age. He gave every substance, oft times beyond endurance, Mr. Speaker, many times to the expense of his personal family, sometimes at the expense of his health. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, Gordon Beard has been successful in placing before the people of Canada the problems, the trials, and tribulations of white and Indian and Eskimo alike in northern Manitoba.

Sir, northern Manitoba is the better for Gordon Beard having passed that way. And again, Sir, I extend my condolences to Mrs. Beard and her family.

MR. SPEAKER: In accepting and concurring with the Motion of Condolence, would the members please rise for a moment of silence. The Honourable First Minister.

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is obviously not possible for one to speak with as much personal feeling in the case of a former member of this Assembly who was here at a time before the memory involvement of anyone that is here today. That is the case with the late Oddur Olafson who was MLA for the constituency of Rupertsland in the period of 1936 to 1940.

Mr. Olafson passed on last December 16th at the age of 84 years. He was born in Riverton and lived there for all, or if not all, for most of his life. He was involved with a number of business enterprises in the Province of Manitoba, including Falcon Construction, Monarch Construction, Lake Winnipeg Fur Farms. He was also active in the Masonic Order and in the activities that surround the Masonic Order.

The late Mr. Olafson, if one could just turn one's, try at least to turn one's mind back to the years of his service here in this Legislature, 1936 to 1940, serving a constituency that even today is one of the more difficult to serve. In those days it must have been difficult indeed. The constituency of Rupertsland in the late 1930's, it was an area of the province in which there was a virtual absence of the most basic kind of transportation access except by water on the eastern shore of Lake Winnipeg and by the most primitive kind of bush airplanes. Communities like Little Grand Rapids, Berens River, and communities between Lake Winnipeg and the Ontario border further north must have been like making a great adventure journey into some far distant place. It must have had that kind of relative distance and time factor in those days. So we assume that the late Mr. Olafson therefore was in a way representing very much a frontier region in the province in that time.

I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland, that to his surviving wife, two daughters and three sons, that this House convey to the family of the late Oddur Olafson its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, the life of Mr. Oddur Olafson spanned almost a total existence of the Icelandic settlement in this province, having been born and lived all his life in Riverton, as the Premier stated. He was also the founder, which the Premier did not state, of Olafson Transportation Company and as such travelled the length and breadth of the lake on business, as well as in his occupation as a politician, and had friends from one end of the lake to the other. He was a great sportsman. He was interested, especially in boys and in hockey, and a very community-minded person. Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to second this motion of condolence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege on behalf of the Conservative Party to express condolences to the family of Oddur Olafson. While I did not know Mr. Olafson, I think it should be said, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who chooses to seek public office is giving a service to his community and to his country, and by the description the First Minister has made of his life he is no exception in this case. He was a busy man in his own community and he still found time to offer his services to his community. And it is my privilege, Mr. Speaker to express on behalf of our Party condolences to the family of Oddur Olafson.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to associate the Liberal Party with the motion before the House, to express our condolence and last respects to the memory of Oddur Olafson. As the First Minister said, it is somewhat unfortunate that no-one is here to speak on his behalf who knew him but it is a matter of some poetic justice perhaps, symmetry, that one member of this Chamber Reverend Petursson did officiate at the final ceremonies, I believe, for the burial of Mr. Olafson. From what we know of him he was a man of many parts. He had a phenomenal enthusiasm for life and all of its challenges. He was an entrepreneur in the true Manitoba pioneer sense; he founded several companies, engaged in experimental innovative transportation technique in one of the most difficult areas of the province. He tried ranching; he experimented with ranching, and many people in the area today remember him as having introduced a way of life and an economic viability to fur ranching in particular.

He was a man of great figure. Those who remember him in the district as a young man

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

(MR. ASPER cont'd.) . . . . describe him as a man who couldn't resist a challenge and couldn't resist the commitment to help others, and as he chose at one short period of his life, four years, to serve in public office I think demonstrates this. If it's true that each of us through our lifetime is really building a mosaic, a pattern, of what our lives were, then looking back on the life of Oddur Olafson one must say that it is a very impressive pattern, so for that reason we are proud to join in the Condolence Motion and express our sympathy to his very large family whose, I am sure, memory of him is enriched by the length of life and the accomplishment he had.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not having known the honourable member, the late Mr. Olafson, however anyone seeking and serving public office in this Legislature I think is deserving of public recognition. Therefore, I would like to associate myself with the Motion of Condolence.

MR. SPEAKER: In accepting and concurring with the motion of condolence would the honourable members please rise for a moment of silence.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like now to present to the House and to you, Sir, the Motion of Condolence relating to the late Alexander Keith - I'm sorry, Sir -- the late Arnold Keith Alexander who was a member of this Assembly from the period 1958 to 1969. The late Mr. Alexander was one born in Manitoba also, educated in the Russell-Roblin area of the province. He served in the Canadian Armed Forces for quite a number of years in the early 1940s through until the period of 1954.

He became a member of this Assembly with the formation of the new government in 1958 and served for the next 11 years. I, Sir, am not aware of the circumstances of the passing of the late Mr. Alexander and would only wish to add that to his family this Legislature wishes to send the following motion: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that this House convey to the family of the late Keith Alexander who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the First Minister for extending me the privilege to speak to the motion that is before the House in condolences to the family of the late Keith Alexander who passed away at a very young age of 51 years, December 1972.

He was a very active person in the Russell-Roblin area, as the First Minister has stated, having served in the Air Force as a pilot. He attended the University of Manitoba, Arts Degree, and studied theology, and in 1970 he became a full-time Lay Minister for the United Church of Canada, and until shortly before his death he served the Benito-Kenville pastoral charge in our province. He was a member of the Masonic fraternity, a member of the Legion and, as the First Minister said, served the Members of the Roblin constituency in this House with great distinction, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the record will show this man contributed a great deal to the debates of those days and to the progress of our great province.

Surviving besides his wife are his sister, Mrs. Sprung of Manitou and his mother, who resides in Roblin. His father predeceased him in 1968.

He was a very interesting man, Mr. Speaker. He's one of the few people in life who because of his feelings and his deep concern for his fellow-man he left a very lucrative occupation to enter the Ministry and served as a Lay Minister until the time of his death. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all here today sincerely regret that this man was unable to finish the work in which he had become so vitally interested.

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the members of our Party and the people of Roblin constituency, which I am most honoured to represent, I join the First Minister in extending our sympathy and condolences to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal group we join in sending our condolences to the Keith Alexander family. I believe three of us had the pleasure of sitting with Mr. Alexander for several years in the early sixties and I can say without fear that we found him to be extremely witty and intelligent and he made a contribution to this Chamber and

## MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . he made a contribution to the progress of this province. We are proud to be associated with the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, and speaking to the Condolence Motion of Keith Alexander those of us who were in the House when he sat with us will remember him as a dear friend. And I can recall when he spoke, he spoke with enthusiasm and he really enjoyed a spirited debate. I'm sure that he will be remembered by all of us who knew him, and we would like to express our condolences to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: In accepting and concurring with the motion of condolence would all members please rise for a moment of silence.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I come now to a former member of this Assembly who passed on most recently and therefore is the last of the Condolence Motions to be presented to the House. I refer to the late Evelyn Foster Shannon, Esq., MLA, for the constituency, I think, as it was then called, Transcona-Springfield. The late Ev Shannon as he was known apparently to those who knew him, to his friends and neighbours in Transcona, was also a native Manitoban having been born in Rapid City, Manitoba and educated at Kelvin High School here in Winnipeg, and who lived in Transcona from early on in the 1920s. He served in the Royal Flying Corps and on his return from the war went into the lumber dealership business in the Town of Transcona; and of course we do have, Sir, in this Chamber one who without reflecting on his years in a way that he may not be pleased with, nevertheless I must say that anything that has happened in Transcona since 1925 or 30 he will be well aware of and in a much better position to speak to than I.

Let me add, Mr. Speaker, that the late Mr. Shannon at one time represented an area, a constituency part of the area of which included the Beausejour district which in turn touches on my own life, my own lifetime. I had no personal acquaintanceship with Mr. Shannon but I do recall in the election campaign of 1940 or 45 when I was perhaps just a boy of 5 or 8 years old that as often happens there were election slogans being used. Mr. Shannon was a sitting member, was running for re-election, one of his opponents was a Mr. Pulfer -- Mr. Pulfer's name was spelled P-U-L-F-E-R. Someone in jest changed the "E" to an "O" and the slogan was, "Pull for Shannon" - The third candidate in that constituency was a gentleman by the name of Barefoot and so someone in jest added to the commercial sticker or slogan, the words - "Pull for Shannon and go Barefoot", -- and of course one has to have a sense of humour in politics or else it would become intolerable.

I don't know if the late Ev Shannon ever remarked or commented to my honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, about that particular experience but it is one little anecdote of life that I do happen to recall from boyhood days.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is I believe a very good tradition and practice that this Legislative Assembly has maintained over all these years to send a resolution of condolence to the surviving family and accordingly in this case, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the House convey to the family of the late Evelyn Foster Shannon, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm an old traditionalist and one of the reasons that I appreciate so much the conduct of this House is that each year when there has been the passing of a former member of the House that a Motion of Condolence is presented by the presiding officer, normally the Premier. And the motion, Mr. Speaker, is always the same. There is no difference made in the formal motion between the persons concerned; no mention is made in the formal motion as to what party the individual happened to have served; but it is a general recognition of devotion to duty by former members. This year, Mr. Speaker, I have listened, as indeed the members of the House have, to these Motions of Condolence. I have had the honour of sitting in this House with seven of the departed members. I have had the honour and the privilege of being associated with Evelyn Shannon and his family over the years. The only one that I did not have the honour of knowing was Mr. Olafson. Mr. Speaker, one of these day

## MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . someone is going to stand up in this House and express a Motion of Condolence for all of us that are here today. And I think that we're among an honoured group of people in Manitoba.

I've had the opportunity of being here for some 20 years and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether I would need the fingers of one hand to count those that were not real devoted citizens of this great province of ours. Such was Evelyn Shannon. He was a fraternal brother of mine and on a number of occasions we sat within a Lodge room. He was a man that was honored and respected in the community; he was the Mayor of Transcona for a number of years; and he was a Liberal, but had the real affection of all of the people of the then Town of Transcona.

In his political career as representative of the Constituency of Springfield he acquitted himself admirably in this House and it was most unfortunate that really his term of office ended as the result of an accident that he had. But he did, as I indicate, Mr. Speaker, represent Transcona and the Community of Springfield well.

He had three sons who were very very closely connected with my family, grew up together and knew each other very well. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, somewhere down along the line there is a remote relationship between Evelyn Shannon and one of my daughters. I attended his last rites. The funeral home was filled to capacity an indication of the affection with which he was held, not only with his lodge members but with the community as a whole. And while sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that eventually we all must pass to the great beyond, we cannot help but regret the passing of those whom we respected and were associated with.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the First Minister for giving me the opportunity this afternoon of expressing to Mrs. Shannon and the three boys, and Evelyn's descendants, the appreciation of a life well spent in not only devotion to his native province but also to his community of Transcona and to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members of this Assembly wish to associate themselves with the message of condolences which is to be addressed to the family of Mr. Evelyn Foster Shannon.

Few people have such an opportunity to serve their fellow citizens as did Mr. Shannon. He served as Mayor of Transcona, as a Member of this Legislature; he served his country in the Royal Flying Corps in 1918; his business career encompassed a lumber dealership, real estate and insurance; and after his service as an MLA had been completed he continued to serve the public as a civil servant in the Manitoba Highways Department until 1968. He was also active in a number of service clubs. Although none of us who are members now had the privilege of knowing Mr. Shannon, we wish to extend to his family and his friends our sincere sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the members of our party on this condolence motion. It was not my pleasure nor it was not my privilege to know Mr. Shannon personally but the record speaks for itself. He was a good public servant, he was a mayor, he was an MLA, and I have tried to get some information from the people that knew him and I was advised that he was a real good public servant. So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate the Liberal members with this condolence motion to the family, to the late Mr. Shannon and to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not having known the late Mr. Shannon, however I would like to associate myself with what has already been said by other members of this Legislature here today and give my condolence to the Shannon family.

MR. SPEAKER: In accepting and concurring with the motion of condolence, would all the members please rise for a moment of silence.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe we are now in Private Members' Hour and since there are no Orders for Return which have been received I would think there is no debating of Orders for Return and that the next item would be Private Members' Resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. The Honourable House Leader is correct in his assumption.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, calling of the Orders for Return is normally done on regular time. I have no objection to it being done now. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of all of the members of the House, I would ask that we call the Orders for Return then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that arrangement is perfectly agreeable to us except that I notice that the Member for Assiniboia has the first Private Members' Resolution and I would suggest that I would defer to him to determine whether or not he's prepared to go ahead with his resolution. If not, then we'll deal with the Orders for Return.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the only difficulty with that course of action is that each person following the Member for Assiniboia would then have the same choice; whereas if we all agree by unanimous consent that we want the Orders for Return called, we can do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Then we agree that we go on Orders for Return first - Agreed? Very well. The Honourable Member for Riel, the first Order for Return.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River THAT an Order of the House do issue providing information on the amount of money paid by or on behalf of The Pas Forestry Complex to Stothert and Company, including:

1. the amount paid to Mr. Stothert or his firm in respect of consulting services;
2. the amount paid to Mr. Stothert in his capacity as General-Manager of the Complex.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government has no objection to this Order.

MOTION CARRIED

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

A MEMBER: He's absent.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh! The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. The amount of office or other space purchased, rented, or leased by the Provincial Government or its agencies since the compilation of the information provided in Sessional Paper No. 81 of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature.
2. The date of each particular purchase, lease, or rental transaction.
3. The persons or companies with which each transaction occurred.
4. The amount of building space involved in each particular transaction.
5. The amount of money paid out in respect to each particular transaction.
6. The department or agency of the Provincial Government on whose behalf each particular transaction was made.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the honourable member is moving this on behalf of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the government has no objection to filing this return. I would warn the House that the compilation of the information will be an onerous job but it will be attempted. There is no objection in principle to filing the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return providing the following information concerning the Executive Assistants to every one of the Ministers:



ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

1. the number of such Executive Assistants;
2. the name of each;
3. the contractual terms of employment of each;
4. the salary of each;
5. the date of the appointment of each;
6. the nature of the appointment of each (whether by competition, bulletin, etc.);
7. the professional qualifications of each.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the government is prepared to fulfill the terms of this Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, so ordered. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. the number of doctors performing abortions in Manitoba;
2. the amount paid to doctors per each abortion;
3. the cost of post-abortion visits to doctors' offices;
4. the names of doctors performing abortions;
5. the names of the members of the Abortion Committee;
6. the number of abortions paid for by Medicare performed in other Canadian hospitals;
7. the number of abortions paid for by Medicare performed in the U. S. A. ;
8. the number of abortions paid for by Medicare performed in other countries;
9. total Medicare payment for abortions outside of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again the terms of this Order are particularly onerous to fulfill but the Government will attempt to do so, subject to us supplying that information which is within Government competence, information of which we are aware.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered. The proposed Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia THAT an order of the House do issue for a return with respect to the employment of Messrs. Dr. Peter Briant former M. D. C. President.

Mr. Robert Carr former assistant Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development.

Dr. Weldon former secretary of Planning and Priorities and Priorities Committee.

Mr. André Oulette, former Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development.

Mr. Cass-Beggs former chairman of Manitoba Hydro, answering the following questions in each case:

1. Were these jobs filled by the above-mentioned advertised, if so, in what publications.
2. How many people were interviewed for each position and by whom was the interview conducted.
3. In the case of interviews how many interviews were held with each of the above-mentioned and what was the duration of each interview.
4. What were the qualifications of each of the above that convinced the government to hire the individuals in each case, state the period of employment and salaries and expenses for each of the above-named for the period employed.
5. What were the financial terms of settlement when they left government service, where a financial settlement was made.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government has no objection to filing a return on this Order. I would warn the honourable member that some of the information not be as precise as is implied by the answers, such as the number of interviews and the exact length of time, but to the extent that we can provide the honourable member with answers to the questions we will do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye THAT an

## ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. GORDON JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . order of the House do issue for a return showing with respect to the name, qualifications, position and salary of each person hired by Order-in-Council since July, 1968 to the present time.

2. The name, qualifications, position and salary of each person earning over \$10,000 per annum hired through the Civil Service Commission since July 1968 to the present time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Orders-in-Council are of course, a matter of public record and are available without the government filing a return. If the honourable member wants someone to do this type of paper work which is normally not required, we would prefer the paper work to debating as to whether this should be done but it is not normally the case that persons hired by Order-in-Council become a matter of an Order for Return because it is already public. With respect to the balance, we are perfectly agreeable to providing the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I accept the totality of it, I would like to indicate that the Chair was remiss in not indicating that the first part is public information and should not have been included in the question. So therefore, if that is agreeable the remainder of the question will be accepted. Agreed? So ordered. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, THAT an order of the House do issue for a return showing with respect to each member of the government civil service who made trips outside of Canada on government business in the years 1968 to the present time give the following:

Names and positions held of every individual on each trip, the places visited, by each individual;

The cost of each trip;

The purpose of each trip;

What was accomplished by each trip; and

Who authorized the trip.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again this is a difficulty only in terms of the onerous job of compiling it. The Government has no objection to providing the information. Some of the questions are rather subjective - what was accomplished by each trip? I assume that the answers could be equally subjective.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is - when he says "the cost of each trip", I assume that he's talking about the cost to the Government of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: Not individual cost. That's fine. Not the individual . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, THAT an order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

The total cost of the Judge Hewak's Commission Inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: The Order is perfectly agreeable Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. So ordered. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to move this Order for Return on behalf of my colleague, the Member for Lakeside. And I wonder at the same time if I may, in order to get it off the Order Paper or dealt with, move the other one that was stood just a few moments ago, if there is no objection to the House. On the top of page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed to? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake THAT a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence and contractual agreements among the Manitoba Government and the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board and Burns Foods Limited relating to the sale of pork to Japan.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure as to the intent in the Resolution so I have to at

## ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . this point refuse the Order. It's not clear enough.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case it will be transferred for debate. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is not sure then perhaps there are one or two courses open to us - either we can move it for debate or we can ask the Minister and leave it standing on the Order Paper until we find out just what the Minister - what is confusing about this particular Order for Return. So if it's agreeable with the government I would ask this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: May I suggest that it could stand on the Order Paper. That in the meantime the member who wants the information and the Minister of Agriculture could possibly talk to one another and by that time, if it's not . . .

MR. PAULLEY: If it's presented and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed, that we leave the matter in abeyance.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Labour is indicating that the motion was presented and has been declined. Could we perhaps have unanimous consent of the House to regard the motion as not having been presented, so that there is no breach of the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Agreed? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, then I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake THAT an Order of the House do issue providing information concerning any pension arrangements made on behalf of Mr. David Cass-Beggs.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cass-Beggs was also appointed by Order-in-Council. I wonder if it would satisfy the honourable member if we did file a return but gave only such information as is not already in an Order-in-Council, if such exists.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered. Now we reach a resolution proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, no, I wish to move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, sorry that would be government business . . . Yes it is government business . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . unless there is a private member who wishes to speak on any of the resolutions which take precedence then the next item on the Order Paper is anything that has not been discussed.

A MEMBER: Leave has already been granted . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed past Private Members'?

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the Report of the Special Committee of the Legislature appointed to consider the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and allied subjects received by this House on Monday, February 26, 1973 be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration and thence reported to the House for concurrence.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, is the Minister not going to speak and to elaborate on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just by explanation, there will be all kinds of time during committee for members to talk, not once, twice, but three times. I assume that will give full scope of debate to all of the honourable members and therefore I have no intention of making any remarks. That doesn't preclude other members.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I really had thought that we would get a generalization or some further comment in addition to the report that is on the Order Paper and the motion

## GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . before us, because we are dealing with a report here that brings in something new and there was also a presentation made to the committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member address himself to the motion. The motion asked that the House go into Committee of the Whole to discuss the report. That is the motion before the House. So would the honourable member address himself to that motion.

MR. FROESE: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, when the motion is being put that we can discuss the matter of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe our rules indicate that a member has to make his debate in respect to the motion before the House. I'm just asking the member to conform to our rules. The motion is that the House go into Committee of the Whole to study the question of the report. That is the motion before us. That's the debate the honourable gentleman can participate in right now.

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

MR. GREEN: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker: I move that, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the aforementioned rules of the House.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. GREEN: I intend to say as little as I possibly can; people accuse me often of doing the opposite. The report of the Rules Committee is very brief, I would hope that we could pass it expeditiously. It deals with permission being given to the media to record both by television and by radio matters that are taking place in the House, on the understanding that it will be done at media expense and that there will be no governmental costs. There are two substantial amendments to the rules, and only two, both of which I understand really have been requested by opposition members. One is that on the Estimates, that instead of breaking down the time into departments as we did last year we would go back to the position prior to last year's rule and that the Estimates will take 90 hours and will be called by the government at their discretion and will be debated by the House until they are concluded and that the termination will take place at the end of 90 hours.

The rule, Mr. Speaker, -- Mr. Chairman, one matter was the subject of some minor controversy is whether speeches be limited to 30 minutes. The Rules Committee recommends that speeches be limited to 30 minutes, including Cabinet Ministers. We've accepted this, Mr. Chairman, on the good faith, which I think is important in the House, that a Minister presenting his Estimates would almost certainly be allowed beyond 30 minutes if he was dealing with the introduction of his Estimates. The committee will have that in their control at the present time. We are prepared to proceed that way in the hope that that works out. If it doesn't work out as we hope it would then of course that will be for those who disagree with it to try to make another change.

Last year the Honourable the Minister of Labour pointed out that on third reading of a bill which is reported from a Committee of the Whole House, there was no debate and most members agreed that this was probably an inadvertence, so the suggested rule is that when a bill is reported from the Whole House it will come to the House for third reading in the same way as any other bill comes for third reading. Those are the only two rule changes.

The other matters contained in the report are really matters which affect practice and taste and are recommended by the committee to the House to be dealt with but do not involve changes to the rules. Such as the House recommending that if we do get to what some members like to call the "speed-up motion" that it will be dealt with in such a way as to make sure that a bill doesn't come back less than 24 hours after it has been reported from committee. Secondly, that it would be understood that Hansard would ignore members if their microphones are off. Thirdly, that in the format of Hansard there would be attempts to make them a little more stylish and therefore make Hansard a little more readable. And lastly, that concurrence resolutions would be read by the Speaker rather than by the Clerk.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't pretend that we've covered everything but the Rules Committee did do a job on those items that members were uncomfortable about or where they felt that

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . rules had to be changed. I presume that certain members could argue that there are many other things that are wrong, and I presume that I couldn't inhibit that kind of debate, but I would urge members to adopt what has been a consensus of the Rules Committee to the changes that have been put.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm not a member of the committee but I must say that it has long been my opinion that broadcasters should be allowed access to the Chamber in as complete way as is possible, and I mean by that, have TV, have access for TV cameras, either closed circuit or broadcast and access for radio programs as well as taping of all kind. I think that the incident that we saw here last night, or yesterday afternoon rather - and last night - would be a revelation for many citizens of Manitoba to see and they would presumably express their opinions to other members and reprimand some of them perhaps on their behavior.

I think that this afternoon, Sir, when I rose to move adjournment for debate on a matter of urgent public importance, we did come across a difference in interpretation in Rule 27 (2). Now I realize this is not part of the committee report, Sir, but as we are in committee to discuss the Rules Committee Report, I think what I am going to mention would be in order. 27 (2) does indicate that one member from each of the other parties in the House may state the position of his party. Now it was clear this afternoon, Sir, that there was a different interpretation as to what that would mean. Some members obviously thought that if any member of a party in the House rose that that member ipso facto was expressing the opinion of the party that he was in.

I think that the rule should be changed, Sir, either to allow three speakers from each party, or, changed in some other way that we can enable any member to move an urgency motion if he deems it necessary and at the same time allow a representative of the party that he comes from to express what may be the party or may be the government's position on the same motion. I think that the suggestion I make would avoid the procedural wrangle that we were in earlier this afternoon when I did move adjournment of the House for a debate of urgent public importance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in other years when the Rules Committee met I generally attended some of the meetings so that I was conversant with what had gone on, and also was informed as to the discussion that had taken place on the different changes that were brought in in the report. This year the opportunity didn't lend itself so that I could attend and therefore I have not witnessed any of the discussions that went on in the committee that brought in this report.

I was interested to know when they discussed the report made by a certain Mr. Ted Smith on behalf of the Broadcasting Association just how thoroughly the thing was discussed and what implications there are. According to the report it mentions that Alberta has some way of recording and also putting some of the speeches and the matters pertaining to the operation of the House over TV, and I would certainly be interested to hear from members on the committee that participated in the discussion as to how the thing worked out. I notice also from the report that what is agreed to at the present time is more or less radio only, and not TV, because the report of Mr. Smith makes mention that the matter of TV be delayed to a further date. Whether this has been discussed at a later date I don't know because the report doesn't mention any further discussion on this matter at a later point.

The cost - - that there's supposed to be no cost to the public. Well, we all know that the CBC is a definite cost to the public and I think we shouldn't be too concerned of those costs that will be involved with the CBC because it is heavily subsidized already and I see no reason why we should be concerned when the CBC is in consideration.

There's also mention made in that particular report of the cost of installing the system and there's mention made that a new cable system is presently being installed. I would like to hear from the Minister just what are we doing, what changes are being made in this connection, and what are the expenses because the additional expenses that are mentioned in that report are very minor. I think the total of it is around \$1,150.00. This certainly doesn't sound very large. Then, too, are we not opening the door when we make this open to the media in the building, do not radio stations across the province have the same right and should they

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . not have access to what is happening here when we open the doors to the people that are locally in the building. I think I would like to hear from representatives of the members of the committee in their discussions whether there is reason for concern in this area.

And, too, what about wire-tapping - - (Interjection) - - well if we're opening it up, if we're letting the people of the news media have access to it in other rooms, surely enough there could be tapping somewhere once we put in a system of this type - - (Interjections) - - the Member for Thompson said there's no speech made in the House that's worth it. Well, I wouldn't go that far, certainly I think as members of the Legislature we should be interested enough in what members of the Crown have to say, what the Ministers of the Crown have to say in the running of this government because we're spending over half a million, or over \$500 million, and surely enough this should be important enough for the people to know and that we should be concerned enough too. So that speeches made by members in this House are important and especially so when it comes to policy matters. Certainly I would like to have a little more said about Alberta's experience because this is mentioned in the report and no doubt the members of the committee did discuss it otherwise they wouldn't come forth with their recommendation. And I would certainly think that opening up the doors and opening up to this type of reporting we should hear from them as to what we can expect.

On the various points contained in the report I have a number of questions to raise, and what about the timing. Are members going to be given equal time when it comes to TV or even radio? Is it completely up to the press as to what and how much coverage will be given? Have these matters been discussed by the committee? I certainly would like to have a little more information in agreeing to such a report before I would give concurrence to it.

I notice that already some of these recommendations have been implemented. Did the Committee have authority to have these recommendations implemented before we gave concurrence to these recommendations in the House? What about the Minister of Public Works; what are the Minister's views - - and he's not in his seat today - - what are his views on the matter as he was not a member of the committee and yet these renovations, or whatever it is, are taking place under his jurisdiction. And I certainly think that the Minister should be in on the discussion here when we discuss this whole matter because he is directly involved.

Then we come to the particular rule changes and Rule 65 is being changed. This is the one where we're deleting certain sections dealing with the discussion and the time involved per department on the Estimates. I really have no quarrel at all with deleting those sections, in fact I welcome them because I felt that last year so often we were probably in the middle of a discussion of an item in a department and then the time lapsed and we could not continue. So that I felt that members should be free to discuss the items of interest to them of a certain department without tying ourselves to some hourly limit as to the amount of time that we could spend on a given department's estimate. I certainly go along with that. But I have some - - well I shouldn't say misgivings - - but at least I feel that at the same time when we're deleting that that we should make very sure that ample time is given to devoting and discussing capital estimates. There is nothing mentioned in the rules that capital estimates have to be brought in while we're discussing the estimates of government or the supply estimates and I think this should be covered by the rules that capital estimates be brought in while we're discussing or sometime during the time that we are discussing supply estimates, and that ample time be provided for the discussion of capital estimates. Here again I even feel that there should be provision in the rules that there could be one adjournment of the Committee of the Whole when discussing capital supply so that when the information that is given by the Minister on capital supply, so that we could mull it over in our minds and so that we wouldn't have to conclude the discussion in the one session; so that we could discuss capital estimates and some way adjourn it or go on to some supply estimates, and then come back at a later date to discuss capital supply. Because I've certainly had this trouble and I'm sure this is something that other members of this House no doubt have experienced as well, that we are given a sheet with the amounts on it for capital supply for the various items and at that time it's all cold and we've had no information. Then the Minister comes in and he provides us with certain information; but I think we should then have the opportunity of going back and at a later date come back to discuss these very estimates that have been presented earlier. I think the rules should provide for this and there is nothing in the rules that would do this at the present time.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

As mentioned I have no serious objection to deleting Subsections 2, 3, and 4 dealing with the allotment of time to the different departments. Clause 10 of that same rule -- and I'll just briefly check with the rule book -- Clause 10 deals with concurrence motion section -- and here again I am not quite sure whether this motion should not be defined a little better. In my opinion, it's not definite. The reference just combining all resolutions of the department into one when making a concurrence motion, does this pertain to only one member dealing with it, because it is not clearly spelled out and I would like the House Leader to take a look at that particular subsection 10 because I think we should have a better and a clearer definition of that sub-clause.

I would like to at the same time discuss the Rule 70. Earlier at this session I brought in some amendments to another report that we should add two more committees, two more standing committees to Rule 70, and I will at a later time submit an amendment to this particular report so that to provide for a Committee on Education and also one on Health and Social Development. I spoke on this on February 26th and outlined my reasons for making this request. Since then we've had the 1973 Estimates tabled and we find that further increases in expenditures in both these departments have taken place. Education has increased from 129,451,000 to 134,727,000; Colleges and Universities, the Estimates have increased from 67 million to 75 million; the combined total increases is from 197 to 210 million, and this does not include the capital that is separate from the operational expenditures. And I feel that we could have a committee that could have these various boards brought before it so that we could make more full inquiries into these various expenditures. Last year according to the Journal, Page 193, there was capital voted of 18,244,000 -- this is on Education; we had the school capital financing of \$10 million provided as well. So that when we discuss the operational this is not the total amount, and that we should be considering the total amount when discussing Education. The same holds true for Health and Social Development. We again have an increase in this Department from 190 million to 196 million. So these are very important items and certainly they should receive full scrutiny and that we should have standing committees to which matters could be referred so that we could discuss them in committee and examine the work done by them.

Coming now to a further change in the rules, and this is Rule 88, sub-clause 4, which is to delete the words "or debate" in the last line; and the rule presently reads -- sub-clause 4 reads: "A bill reported from a Committee of the Whole House shall be received and forthwith disposed of without amendment or debate." Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot agree with this recommendation. It used to be that before a bill, a government bill was introduced calling for the expenditure of moneys, was preceded with by a resolution to discuss the bill and its purpose, its objectives, before it was introduced to the House. This is a number of years ago and I am sure that the previous House Leader is fully aware of it, and I think there was a lot of merit in having such a resolution preceding a bill, and I want to give my reasoning for it. The reason for that is that the government would then have the benefit of views of members of the House on the question contained in the bill before it, and if the opposition members felt very strongly on certain points they could still change the bill before it was introduced, because once a bill is introduced the changes are coming forth very seldom and the government has taken a position. This is why I have always figured that the resolution stage was a very good one to have a bill preceded by a resolution. -- (Interjection) -- No this was standard practice for years, and the Honourable Minister of Labour knows that fully well. Once a government bill is introduced the government has taken a stand and is not likely or easily persuaded to change that stand.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, or the resolution.

MR. FROESE: Secondly, it was also the practice that all bills would be or were subject to discussion and amendment in Committee of the Whole. This is more recent. This also has been changed and they will now be denied unless prior notice is given. You cannot amend, far less even debate the bill and its contents in Committee of the Whole. These changes were brought in just a few years ago that unless you give notice a bill will not be dealt with in Committee of the Whole, and now we're even going as far that the opportunity to debate the bill on Third Reading will also be denied. This sure means that the opposition is being muzzled in debate, especially now with this amendment that is being proposed here that there should be

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . no debate on Third Reading. This in my opinion is the height of callous irresponsibility of the government. What were we elected for to this House? What was the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I implore the honourable member to let me ask him a question.

MR. FROESE: Oh, after I'm finished. I certainly don't want to give you my time . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Then I rise on a point of order. On a point of order on the debate, the honourable member is arguing that we should not do the reverse of what we are doing. He is saying that we should - - he is saying that the Rule change is eliminating debate. The rule change is permitting debate because it is crossing out the words "or debate", so that it is no longer true that on Third Reading there will be no debate. We are changing it from our present rule which says "no debate" to a rule which says that there will be debate, and therefore the honourable member is arguing the reverse of what is occurring.

MR. PAULLEY: Maybe we should accept what he is arguing for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken if the honourable member will read that section again it says, and they read, the words before, "without amendment or debate", and debate is . . .

A MEMBER: . . . crossed that out.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps you could call it 5:30 and give the member an opportunity to read the report.

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

IN SESSION

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature appointed to consider the rules, orders and procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and has instructed me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30 the house is now adjourned and stands adjourned . . . The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if I may direct a question to the House Leader and ask him if it is his intention to continue with the consideration of this report before going into the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wasn't here yesterday - - indicated that we would like to get the Rules Report passed, but if we don't we'll move into Estimates and we will figure out a way of getting by. I am certain that with the good faith of all concerned we will do so. I am also going to ask the Ministers who have introduced bills to speak on those bills so that we can get them progressing as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: the hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.