

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 p. m. , Tuesday, July 20, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

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 25 students of the University of Manitoba engaged in an Immersion Course of French and English. They are under the direction of Mr. Labross and Miss C. Jensen. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Oral questions; Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Could you call Bill No. 99, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Bill 99, really a person hardly knows exactly where to start. A bill of this size with the number of amendments that it contains has enough information or enough amendments which have far-reaching implications on the lives of the everyday motoring public in the province, that there are at least half a dozen areas in which a person could, I believe, make a 40-minute speech. It's impossible to cover everything in the Act. I don't intend to attempt to do that nor do I intend to make a 40-minute speech, Mr. Speaker. However, at this time I think it's only fair to try and attempt to lay out some general areas; these are areas of concern that I have and I'm sure there are many other members in the House have the similar concern.

One of the first concerns I have, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill can only be considered to be a further limitation on the rights of individuals. Throughout the bill in various sections we find restrictions and prohibitions are constantly appearing in the various sections of the bill. Limitations and definitions of what a person can do and what a person cannot do are apparent in numerous sections. Any legislation, Mr. Speaker, of this nature can only lead to the increased power which goes to the law enforcement people and brings us one step closer to the guardian angel type of legislation this government seems to prefer, and it's inherent police state enforcement practices.

Mr. Speaker, these are fairly strong words, but I believe that if you study the bill, you look at the various sections, you'll find that what I am saying is correct. Just to give an example, Mr. Speaker, suddenly we find not only speedometers but also odometers are appearing in the bill and the prohibitions that go with the tampering of odometers are quite apparent in the Act. This is just one small insignificant thing but we find throughout the act, on many many occasions, we find that there are restrictions on what a person can do and what a person cannot do and the rights of the State to enforce further restrictions on the rights of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, the second point that I find in here that is quite similar in fact to what I have already stated is the one dealing with penalty, penalty, fines and fees. Before I proceed in that, I want to at the outset congratulate the Minister where I find in two instances in the Act he has actually reduced the penalty section, he has taken out the jail sentence for failure to pay a fine and has imposed another form of penalty, where, in essence, he has said that a person's driver's license will be suspended for one day for every dollar of fine that has been assessed against him. I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker; I think the Minister is probably on the right track in this direction. I have never been one who believed in the debtor's jail and here we find the Minister is removing the jail sentence as an alternative to a fine and I commend him for it. But at the same time when you look through the Act and you find the various schedules and fees and fines being inserted in the various sections and you compare them to the schedule of fees and fines that existed in the Act previously, you come up with a startling similarity that exists throughout, that we have increased fees, increased fines and

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . increased penalties; and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's the intention of the government to use any legal means possible to extract from the motoring public as much money as it possibly can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've heard the Minister of Finance speaking on other occasions where he has said that he does not approve of the regressive fixed fee form of taxation and yet we find that we are seeing indications here in this Act of fixed fees, fines and what not in an effort to exert from the public another dollar in any way that they possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, another factor that becomes apparent when you're studying this bill seems to be the eagerness on the part of the Minister of Transportation to take on some of the responsibilities of other departments of government. We saw previously, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister had made his contributions in the field of censorship, and now we find the Minister is trying to erode some of the authority from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GRAHAM: In numerous sections, Mr. Speaker, in numerous sections throughout the Act we find that the Minister has introduced legislation which in my opinion, Sir, should probably more correctly be dealt with in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and come under the Consumer Protection Act. -- (Interjection) -- I refer specifically, Mr. Speaker, then, if the First Minister wants examples, where we find in the Act coming under the section of requiring odometers in every motor vehicle and the tampering with the odometers, that I believe that this could quite properly be in the field of Consumer Protection because the reason that the Minister has this in here is not for the use of the odometer but for the recording of the exact mileage for resale purposes.

There are other places, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Consumer Protection Act that appear in here, and they do, I think, constitute an infringement on the part of the Minister into the field of Consumer Protection which I think justly should be in the hands of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I refer here, Mr. Speaker, to the field where the Minister is requiring a qualified mechanic to attest to the roadworthiness and what not of a vehicle.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to refer the House to an article that appeared several years ago in the Reader's Digest -- unfortunately I haven't got it before me but I'm sure that many of the members remember reading it -- where a news reporter travelled across the United States and before he entered a town he would stop and make some minor adjustment to his car and then drive into a garage and ask the mechanic to fix the vehicle; and the reporting that was done on that left a person in utter amazement at the variety of excuses that a mechanic found to install anything from spark plugs to carburetors, to starters to what not, and all because the person had deliberately made one small change in the operation of his motor vehicle before he entered the town then asked the garage to fix it. And here we find, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is asking us to accept the word of a qualified mechanic; and I ask the Minister what he means by a qualified mechanic. I would refer him to The Public Schools Act where the Public Schools Act in their compulsory inspection of school vehicles do not require the services of a qualified mechanic, they specify a "certified" mechanic. I don't know what the difference is between a certified mechanic and a qualified mechanic, but I can see great difficulty arising when a person takes his car which he has just purchased from say, Dominion Motors, and he goes down the street to a qualified mechanic who has just been fired from Dominion Motors and I can imagine the type of report that that mechanic could possibly present to the motorist on what was wrong with his car. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that this properly falls under the jurisdiction of the Highway Traffic Act, I believe that it probably should be in the field of the Consumer and Protection Act; and this is my reason for raising it at this time. I think that it would probably be more appropriate if the Minister would leave the field of Consumer Protection to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and be a little more concerned with the activities of his own department.

Mr. Speaker, there's one particular subject . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): With all due respect to my colleague, I believe he deserves a little better consideration than he's been getting for the last ten minutes over there. If the honourable gentlemen are not interested in what he's saying, get out of the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest that the honourable member is being impertinent when he suggests members should get out of the Chamber. I think he should withdraw that. Secondly, before he does that, I would suggest that all members have been

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . interjecting and having their little caucus, that they should all participate in the decorum of the House. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that little outburst but I was really concerned. I think the honourable gentlemen know better.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. There's one more section, Mr. Speaker, in the Act that concerns me somewhat where I think that probably the government is placing a little more than what is required in the field of the reporting by a medical officer on the health condition of one of his patients. Mr. Speaker, I have always been under the impression that when a patient went to see a doctor that his medical condition became a confidential report which was strictly between the doctor and the patient, and here we find the Minister of Transportation is asking the doctor to betray that confidentiality and report to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles any occasion on which the doctor, in his opinion, feels that the driving ability of his patient may be endangered.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, we find that in other jurisdictions, and I refer to the Federal Government, when we're dealing with the licensing of pilots, we find that the Federal Government in the licensing of a pilot does not ask the person applying for a license to go to his family physician. They tell him specifically which doctor to go to, and that report then becomes the property of the Federal Government, and they keep very close check on the physical ability of a person who is registered as a pilot. The qualifications are different, depending on the class of pilot's license. I believe a private pilot has to take an annual medical check-up, a commercial pilot every six months, and I believe Air Canada requires one every three months. And, this, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is vastly different than what the Minister here is proposing and it causes some undue alarm to me, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure it does to many other people, that the Minister should be asking a doctor to betray the confidentiality that has been entrusted to him by his patient when he goes to him for medical advice.

And, if the Minister persists in this, Mr. Speaker, I can see a possible effect on the health of the people of this province because I know that I as an individual, would be a little bit hesitant to go to my family doctor if I felt I had some trouble which the doctor might divulge and I would lose my driver's license, and I might not receive the physical attention, or the medical attention that I probably require. This, to me, Mr. Speaker, I think leads to the possibility of a degeneration in the medical health of the people of this province. The danger is there. I don't say that it will occur but there is that possibility, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Minister to consider seriously the question of taking out the amendment which removes the word "may" and inserts the word "shall".

I know that the Minister has given the doctor protection under the Act which will, in effect, prevent any prosecution by the individual of the doctor for giving that medical evidence, but also, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this would not constitute a confrontation with the code of ethics of the medical profession. The medical profession, Mr. Speaker, have always had a very high code of ethics in the practice of their profession which has been admired by many people, and I would sincerely hope that that continues to be the case and we're not attempting to bring in legislation which will turn a highly professional person into an informer for government.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many general areas in this Bill for one person to cover at one particular time. The implications of the insurance portion in the Act - the various sections that refer to insurance - and the effect of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund changes leave many questions to be asked. I'm sure that there are other members in the Chamber who will pursue those avenues in some detail. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I only want to express my concern about some of the implications that appear in this Bill, and I have by no means covered them all - I've just mentioned one or two. Thank you very much.

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

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two remarks on the Bill 99. I think basically it is a Bill that creates more prohibition for the people in our province. It increases police powers. It makes the people within the province worry about how far the powers of the government are going to be, to what extent they're going to go. It makes the Registrar of Motor Vehicles the power with nobody save the Minister of Highways above him. It puts the man - the Registrar of Motor Vehicles - the one man, that has the powers to set the Motor Vehicles Branch and govern the Highway Traffic Act to no end.

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . .

There's areas in this Bill that make reference to qualified mechanics. There's one that I picked out. This mechanic decides - or at least this mechanic is qualified, he's the man that decides what motor vehicle is permissible to be sold and which isn't. This mechanic could have worked for a company and, through some, possibly an area where he wasn't fulfilling his job, could have been dismissed or he could have quit owing to the fact that he didn't like the work he was at; he could hold a grudge over the company that's selling cars; next door to the place that he worked at, he could be employed. He could be a qualified mechanic in that area. Somebody comes in there with a car and says they don't like the car they bought. He's the judge; he's the jury; he's the end word on whether that car was a good deal or not, regardless of what price he paid for it at the time of purchase. There's nothing in the Act that says who comes out against him as a mechanic and questions his ability. He says that car's no good. This could be something, maybe, that helps the small man - I question if it is.

I say that it doesn't help the small man, because if the small man goes in and buys a car for \$300 or \$400 from Dominion Motors, for instance, and the mechanic qualified in the next door neighbour's spot after the customer that bought the automobile knew this mechanic because he previously worked at said Dominion Motors, he goes over there to him at another - Consolidated Motors - and he says, "How's this car?" That mechanic can tell him that car's no good and sign a paper to say it isn't, and this car - he goes back to Dominion Motors with it and the only way he can prove his point is to take it to the County Court. All you're doing there to the small man is increasing the price of the used car. It's a widespread cover for the purchaser. I think that it's protection, but it's something that should be set out in the Consumer Protection Act and certainly not in the Department of Highways. I think that that will increase the cost of used cars to anybody who happens to be fortunate enough to have the money to purchase a second car or unfortunate enough to have to buy one of those \$300 or \$400 cars as a first car.

It mentions in another part of the Act, Sir, that the Registrar shall not issue a driver's license of any class to a person who is mentally disordered or one who is suffering from alcoholism and that condition is not under control. I have to question if the Registrar would be in the position he is today and be in the job he is today if he were smart enough and intelligent enough to question and know and suspect and detect somebody that has a mental disorder. And further to that, would he be in the position to say who was an alcoholic and who wasn't, and if they were in a condition that they couldn't better themselves.

I think that there's an area in that very section of the Act that was overlooked, and it's drugs. I think drugs today is far more of a problem in the Province of Manitoba than that of mental health or alcoholism. I think that the Minister, when he hit that portion of the Bill, or his Department did, I think they missed completely what they were aiming at.

There's a portion of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that aims at tires and the condition of them, the safety on the highway and of our streets. There's ways to check and measure the life expectancy of these tires. They look at bringing out a gauge that measures how much longer you can expect these tires to be safe while using them, and there's mention in the Bill something about taking three measures throughout the area of the tire and they should all come up with something in the area of one-sixteenth or three-sixteenths, I think it is, of an inch on three measures. Well, I have to suggest to you that one of the greatest tire users in the Province of Manitoba, particularly right in our urban build-up of Metro Winnipeg, is the Metro Transit and they specifically order their tires recapped without a tread on them. They come in with a smooth, slick recap and they do this for reasons of traction on icy streets as well as on pavement, and the more economical way to do it. So I think the Department and the Minister has to give some consideration to Metro Transit and make some provision to let them off the hook.

Another section of the Act mentions the odometer and it says that, the restrictions in there, that nobody, be it the owner of the car or the mechanic, or the seller of the car, the agency that sold the car, in no way can remove or tamper with the odometer. I think that this is the section of the Act that has to be looked at. I don't think it belongs in the Highway Traffic Act. I believe it belongs in the Consumer Protection.

In regard to bumpers and energy absorption bumpers, it will be compulsory by 1973. I think this is something that we've got to realize that the Province of Manitoba with a million people versus the North America Continent with some 200 million, we've got to take into consideration that we can't call the shot telling people how to produce automobiles. I think that

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . we've got to take into consideration that we're a small portion of the market for the American-produced automobile. The 'Big Three', Chrysler, Ford and G.M., they've agreed to have a bumper produced and available to us by 1973. But I'm concerned about the other manufacturers of the smaller cars - the cars that are imported, if we want to take into consideration that we respect the trade agreements that we have with Japan and with European countries that bring cars in here, and I'm sure that we let them in here simply because we agree with the other elements of the trade that we go along with. I think that it's something that we should take into consideration and not just say that the Big Three will be the suppliers of our cars.

I think that the Minister, particularly of this Department, goes along with it. It's not too long ago that he said that it's impossible to deal with the Big Three because they go on strike. You don't buy cars from the Big Three because they go on strike. Now I have to say to him, being a Minister on the Treasury Bench of a Labour government, I can't understand why he would suggest that you don't buy cars from the Big Three because they go on strike. And I suggest that today the Manitoba Telephone, several other departments of the province, are buying small cars. They seem to think they're a more reasonable thing to have; they're something that we should do rather than deal - buy a Toyoto, you know, anything except buy from the Big Three that are North American produced cars. So I suggest to him possibly another trip to Japan, along with some of his colleagues, and go over there and see if they can get a bumper that will absorb energy up to, I think, something in the nature, it was mentioned, of five miles per hour or something in that area.

Back, Mr. Speaker, to the Registrar and his powers. As I went through this Bill, there's mention made of a driver's license and its two parts. (I'll have to turn to the section of the Bill here - I've lost it.) The driver of a car will have a two-part license in the future. One portion of this license will have a picture of the driver of the automobile in the one section, and it seems to me that it says in the following section, fixed regulations of purposes of that particular section I was referring to, "a person holding a driver's license is requested to produce his driver's license by a peace officer, the registrar, a justice, or other person". The reason that I bring that to your attention, not so much that the Act is wrong, I realize that we go on two pages later, on Page 13, and suggest - I'm not quoting sections, I'm just quoting out of sections - and they go on to say that the driver shall carry his license in the other section - this is while he's driving an automobile - but it would make you think in the first instance that he could be stopped on the street, while he's walking down the street, and asked to produce his driver's license. And not only by a policeman, not only by the registrar, not only by a justice, but also by "or other person." So I question if that means that I could stop the man on the street and ask him if I can see his driver's license and his picture to identify him with.

I would question whether it means that this is for the protection of the police. I would also question if this is for the benefit of the Highways Minister. Maybe this means that the Highways Minister can stop and ask him about his license, whether he's driving or not. The reason I bring this up is because if we need it on Page 11 and Page 13 as well, and one says -- Page 13 might say that he's driving an automobile when he's stopped in an automobile. Page 11 doesn't. It just says that the registrar, magistrate, police, everybody can stop him, or another person can stop him right on the street and ask him for this two-part driver's license which one has a picture on it. And I say for that reason I think that it's a bill that's got a mile wide of latitude. I doubt very much that we're dealing this at the proper time.

I look at the section in the Act, Sir, that says that if you want to repaint your car and take it to a body shop, or if you have a farm truck or a construction truck, I know that a good many times in a slack season in the construction business that I'm in, be it winter, summer, a rainy day, we take a truck into the shop in the construction business and we'll paint it. We might decide to change colours. In the Act it says as soon as we do this, unless it's just the box on it, but if it's the body - which sounds interesting - if you're painting the body, you report it. If you're just painting the box, you don't. I would like sometime if one of our members could speak on that, the difference between painting the body and painting the box. Our Member from Lakeside could probably come out with something on that because he has trucks on the farm and knows more about that. Generally when we paint a truck in the construction business we paint it from one end to the other. But I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that reporting colours becomes pretty dictatorial in our Province of Manitoba; just changing the colour of your automobile or of truck. I think it goes back again to the Minister

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . that's in charge of the Department of Highways, I think this is something he's brought in on his own.

I say this for one reason. I have a letter here which I intend to read, Sir. It's dated April 19, it's addressed to one Henry Schindel, 522 Green Brier Street, he's a constituent of mine; last Friday night he brought it over to my house. He asked me to bring this into the House. This is on Minister of Highways and Public Works stationery, it says: "Dear Mr. Schindel: While travelling with my wife to Carman last Saturday, April 10, 1971, your car passed us doing well over the legal speed limit.

"Since you have a clear record I thought you would appreciate a friendly reminder, that is, that consistent speed attaches demerit points to your driver's license on which surcharges will be made to the driver." Signed by the Minister of Highways, Joseph P. Borowski.

A MEMBER: That's just a form letter.

MR. MOUG: No, this is not a form letter. This man, Mr. Schindel, answered the letter three days later and that took him to the area somewhere around the 23rd. So from April 23rd when he answered it and expected an answer back, on July 13th he got a letter from the Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Branch, 1075 Portage Avenue addressed Mr. Henry Schindel, 522 -- I haven't, Mr. Speaker, got an answer that the man sent to the Highways Minister because he didn't keep a carbon copy. At any rate he did not get a letter back from the Highways Minister but he got a letter back from 1075 Portage Avenue. "Dear Mr. Schindel. The Minister has referred to me your letter to him under date April 21st. I've endeavoured on a number of occasions to contact you by telephone but was unsuccessful in doing so. Your letter unfortunately became buried in an avalanche of other paper on my desk" - and believe me there must be an avalanche of paper on that desk if the Minister sends a letter to everybody that passes him on the highway.

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

MR. MOUG: . . . colored or uncolored, I would think that there would have to be a pile of papers on the Registrar of Motor Vehicles desk if the Minister of Highways is good enough to stop every car that passes him; because I've got a family of five and believe me I could give them all the computers and everything there is known for good office keeping and my five children, there's no way they could keep track of the cars that pass me.

He goes on to say, "Your letter unfortunately was buried in an avalanche of paper on my desk and my intention to write you shortly after receipt of your letter was frustrated."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOUG: "Your letter unfortunately became buried in an avalanche of other paper on my desk and my intention to write you shortly after receipt of your letter was frustrated" - as is the Minister. It goes on in the second paragraph to say, "The Minister recorded the license number of the vehicle which overtook him at a speed in excess of the legal limit" -- and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister's speedometer or odometer was correctly and truly recording the speed or the miles that his vehicle was doing because according to this bill it says, maybe not - check, you've got to check through, you've got to look through there and you find out that there's areas where your speedometer may not be classed as right, you would have to carry a certificate to say one way or the other. He neglected to record the color of the vehicle and that's why I bring this up, Sir, I wonder if because from time to time that the Minister of Highways can make mistakes on copying the small numbers, because has the great buffalo and the 100,000 lakes and then the tail - is there a tail end on the buffalo?

A MEMBER: No, no tail end.

MR. MOUG: Oh yeah, he's the Minister of Highways. But the head and the 100,000 lakes and then there's the small, you know, AG or BT -- let's use BT because that means Borowski Transport, and then the 100 and 101, this takes all the Treasury Bench in front there, you know -- but the Borowski Transport . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I have listened diligently to the Honourable Member but I'm sort of failing to see where he is attacking the bill or presenting his argument for Bill 99. I wish he would get with the topic instead of commenting on the Minister. I realize the Minister of Transportation is proposing the bill but the question before us is the bill and not the Minister. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I mentioned this, Sir, because I was looking at - would you ask my coach to go back to the front seat - I was mentioning this because -- I was making mention, Sir, as it says here because of the rapidity of which the passing manoeuvre was done it is entirely possible the Minister may have incorrectly interpreted. Now there's no way that that Minister

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . could incorrectly interpret anything. In my short time in this House for two years I've never seen him incorrectly interpret anything. Everything he's done right is right. -- (Interjection) -- He's been misquoted. Even on TV he's been misquoted, but everything so far really and truly as far as I'm concerned he's never been incorrect. It says, "incorrectly interpreted the licence plate number appearing on the offended vehicle. Since you say that you were not operating a vehicle on the day in question it would seem that my Minister" -- God help that poor Registrar to say 'my Minister' -- "must have incorrectly recorded the license number of the vehicle. It is regretted if the Minister's letter to you caused any concern. As to your assertion that the Minister is, as you put it, 'venturing out of his territory' by writing you a letter intended to be a reminder only, surely since the Minister has the final responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Transportation on a point of order.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with Bill 99. I really have no objection to the member reading letters, I could send a whole stack of the letters that I write to various people, but I really do think he should confine himself to the bill and if he can't perhaps he could yield the floor and I'll answer some of his silly questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Speaking to the point of order, I take exception, Sir, to the high regard I have for you, Sir, as Steward of this House to have somebody other than yourself getting up to suggest when somebody's in order or out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we get into a hassle over who can and who can't raise a point of order, all members are responsible for the decorum and for the procedure in this House.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I hate to interrupt the line of thought, Sir, of the Minister of Highways because it's pretty hard when you stare at a vacant desk to come up with much more than what he come up with right now; but I certainly do agree that this is one of his better times in the past two years since I've been in this House, he really come up with something. His language was good, he wasn't swearing, he wasn't mad at anybody . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest to the honourable member that we are not addressing ourselves to what the Honourable Minister was saying on a point of order but we are addressing ourselves to a bill before us. I've asked him once before, this is the second time. I don't think I'll -- Do you wish to argue with me? I don't think I want to rise again on the same subject. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: With reference, Sir, to a section of the Act that mentions about the period, in the two part license, and it says in the Act in the following section, I won't quote you the numbers of the section because I know that is against House rules but it mentions, I'll read one or two lines. "A person holding a driver's license is requested to produce his driver's licence by a peace officer, the registrar, a justice or other person entitled to its production under this Act." I'm trying to find out who is entitled to ask you to produce your license, because I think this is a part of a person's right, I think it's a part of my right, I think it's a part of your rights, I think it's a part of the Minister's rights, I think that if I have to drive down any highway, Sir, in this province and be stopped by any Minister of Highways that has a problem doing his job in this House, I say to him, he's wrong, and if you sit me down for saying it, I say you're wrong; but that's the only way I would say you were wrong.

I have to say that that Minister while he's lax in doing what he should be doing in his department, steps out all over, all and sundry he goes down into Toronto and says Spadina Expressway is not right. He'll tell you everything, he'll tell you that you're speeding and this man, this one Henry Schindel, this one Henry Schindel was at home cutting his grass on a Saturday morning and the Highways Minister said he was speeding going to Carman. Is this Highways Minister still in love? He was with his wife, he stated that in his letter, he was with his wife, I'll read it off the letter. "While travelling with my wife." Is this man in love? He can't keep track of his speedometer or the new licence plate he put out. For that reason I say that he's over -- they've taken Transportation where he's looking after everything in the province. They took the Air away from him, Air Transport went, he couldn't handle that; railroad went, he couldn't handle that. And I question, Mr. Speaker, if he can handle highways. I

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . question if he can handle highways.

I'll go back to 99 immediately because it's an Act of the Highways Minister, and it says on front "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act" and this is the Minister of Highways that I'm speaking to. And I'll finish reading this letter, Sir, because it came from one of his departments. I'll start again. "As your assertion that the Minister is as you put it venturing out of his territory by writing you a letter intended to be a reminder only, surely, since the Minister has the final responsibility of the administration of provisions of the Highway Traffic Act, he is not encroaching on somebody else's domain. I am sure that if it had been your vehicle, you would infinitely prefer to receive a friendly warning letter rather than an official summons from a police constable." I say, Mr. Speaker, this man would have been only too pleased if he had received a summons. That wouldn't have infringed on his rights to his home and his children. When his children knew that they were in the yard with him weeding the garden and transplanting the lettuce, that's one thing. But when this man is there with his children and he has to show them, he's got a 15-year-old boy who happens to be in the same grade as one of my children and he has to show him this letter and say, "look at that, son, there's what happens to you as a freedom, the freedom of your rights to be taken away from you as a Canadian" -- a Manitoban, a Charleswoodite which is even worse, a Charleswoodite, and they say to him, "No you weren't in your garden, you were speeding down No. 3 highway in Carman." I say that the Minister if he'd get and bear himself on rebuilding that road to Carman instead of checking how fast people are going and that is building highways, Sir. -- (Interjection) -- I want to finish this letter. "I am sure that if it had been your vehicle you would infinitely prefer to receive a friendly warning letter" -- and as I say that's not friendly -- "than an official summons from a police constable particularly since the Minister's letter suggested no punitive action was being contemplated." No punitive action. Just interfering with his rights in his own home, insinuating to his children that he's a kind of a guy that hides his car in the garage and also takes another car out and heads out No. 2 highway and doesn't tell the kids about it. Now is that impunitive or not? I say it is. I say that's absolutely impunitive, Sir, and the Minister should think about it. Final lesson that we get from the Registrar in this particular letter is, "Your statement that you were not driving a vehicle on that particular date and place closes this incident."

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is tabled or not, this particular copy; if it was, fine, if it wasn't it's here for the page to take. I think the Minister should have a look at that because No. 1 is, his Department doesn't answer this letter. He goes to a \$25,000 man, stacks his desk full of garbage, absolutely full of garbage -- let's see now, just a minute, just hold on, hold on, hold on, there's a -- I saw it here -- all right, I'll read it again. Okay. "Your letter unfortunately became buried in an avalanche of other papers on my desk." I say that there's got to be girls in the Highways Minister's department that could answer that letter without causing an avalanche on the desk of the Registrar and I say for that reason, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that surely even if some of the letters that were read onto the record this evening by the Member for Charleswood were in some way or another, which escaped me, but is apparent to you, Sir, in some way or another relevant and germane to the bill that is before us, surely the letter that the honourable member is reading now can in no way be construed as germane to the subject matter of the bill that's before us, so I rise on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken, I've already mentioned it twice to the Honourable Member for Charleswood. After this I shall have to ask him to cease and desist or else to stop debating. The Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If I'm correct, we are discussing Bill 99, substantial amendments to The Highway Act. The Highway Act is administered by the Minister of Transportation. The principle involved in the amendments is reflected in the manner in which that department is administered, and I think very seriously . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Minister is debating the same point that the Honourable Member for Charleswood was trying to make, and that's precisely what's wrong. That it's been repetitive, and he's been debating the character of



(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . the Honourable Minister and not the bill before us and I'm going to say it to the whole House once more, we have rules of procedure that we must carry out. I want the honourable members to conduct themselves accordingly and carry on as gentlemen in debate. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what you've brought to the attention of the several members in the House. Undoubtedly we were acting out of line there.

Now on that letter I had so many interferences with it, Sir, by members of the House that I would like to get it on the record verbatim and with leave and with your permission, I would like to start from letter A on the second letter and read it into the record. If I am going to be out of order doing that I would like to be informed now so there'd be no interruption in the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: I can inform the honourable member that I don't have extrasensory perception so therefore I can't tell what's in the letter, so how can I rule on it? I think he should use his prerogative and debate the point and if it is out of order then I'll have to interrupt him. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, Sir, owing to the fact that I had to read it twice now to get it on to the record, certainly I won't read it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If it's going to be repetitive it is out of order.

MR. MOUG: Well as I mentioned, as I already read it twice, there's no sense I read it again in order to get it on the record, but I would like to mention further that I think that the colours of vehicles regardless of if they're a help to the Minister of Highways or not in his inspection and his detective work up and down the Highway 3 and up and down the perimeter, I suggest that it's a little awkward and it's a little heavy for anybody to have to be reporting, particularly if they own a construction concern or a few vehicles, a transfer firm where they paint one or two trucks at a time on a changeover. I don't say where they take all their trucks and they can afford to do it, they take them in, they take them all in one day or all in a series and they paint them all the one colour. I would suggest to you that it's a little cumbersome, that part of the Act, for quite a few people to live with. It's a problem for the farmers because there are some mornings they start out with a white truck and after cleaning out the milk shed and the areas that they have their feeders, their cattle feeders in, they find themselves that night with a different colour truck. So I think for that reason, I think it's a nothing to start with. Why the department wants it on there I don't know. I would suggest that they give some consideration to looking into it deeper and giving it some concern.

There's an area in there where doctors and optometrists are being put into a position where they're asked that they report everybody that comes into their office. If a person is in there with a leg on their glasses, it's broken, and has to leave them for a day to get a new leg put on because it's a three-hinge instead of a two-hinge or some such thing, that man is without glasses, that optometrist is obligated to inform the registrar, and the registrar of course in a part of the bill is involved to restricting that man's licence until he gets his glasses back. What I'm saying is hypothetical and what I say is it wouldn't keep a man's licence away for more than — by the time the mail got out there, the man would have his licence back, but there is instances like this. It puts the doctor in the position that every time he looks at somebody he doesn't know whether he should phone up the registrar and tell him to cancel the man's licence or not, because he doesn't know how serious the man's medical problem is, and for that reason I say that that part of the Act is terrible.

There's many many parts of the Act, Sir, that should be looked at. We are all in favour, I think government and the Opposition side of the House as well right now is in favour of getting out of here. I think we've been in the House too long. We came in late; we've been delayed while we're in here, and we're looking at the late parts of July. I think everybody wants to get their family out for their summer holidays. Our children are out of school now and we want to take them for a holiday. We're being delayed by handfuls of bills coming out every day, handfuls of bills coming out every day, handfuls of amendments coming out every day, and I think it's about time that we look at taking — Bill 99 is the one that I refer to now and I think that the government — (Interjection) — Yes, Bill 99.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. MOUG: The government should take this opportunity, and I think it would be well advised if they took the opportunity to take this bill, pass the parts of it that are necessary in regard to insurance on tractors, semi-trailers and the likes of it, pass those several areas

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . of it, snowmobile if you wish, as one member mentioned, pass those areas and drop the rest. There's no panic on the balance of this. There's a lot of housekeeping on it and there's lots of legislation, Sir, that is very very important, and I think that they should take this, pass the necessary parts and keep the rest over to another session or till the next sitting of the Legislature. Thank you.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't quite finished perusing the bill and the Honourable Minister of Education says I could adjourn it. Well the experience in this House has been lately that whenever I make a motion to adjourn it is not agreed to, the government opposes it and they're exercising closure left and right when it comes to me. This afternoon I was ruled out by the government, yet immediately after that we had about four or five adjournments which the government agreed to quite readily, but when I make the motion to adjourn, it's a completely different thing; then the Minister of Mines and Resources or the House Leader takes very strong objection.

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

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of privilege. The honourable member has suggested that I prevented him from debating, and the fact is that a majority of the House voted in toto . . . -- (Interjection) -- That's not true? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that I rise on a legitimate point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Rhineland says that I prevented him from adjourning the debate. The fact is that the Speaker declared a vote carried by a majority of the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Procedures of this House are democratic. They are all carried out by votes of the majority of the members. There is no individual member except when a question of leave is under consideration that it can be presented, otherwise it's the majority that counts. So I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland the matter of privilege the Minister raised is correct. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will make some remarks on the bill to some of the provisions in it that I have considered, and also make some remarks on some of the matters that have been brought to my attention by my constituents in connection with the Highway Traffic Act. One of these is the matter of the wide trailers. This has been a real bad obstacle for some of my constituents. It's a 14 foot wide trailer. They're unable to move it and they're not getting a permit to do so, whereas in Alberta and Saskatchewan they are able to do that with escort, and my constituents who have this problem certainly don't object to this at all but they want to be able to move these wide trailers, 14 foot -- yes, and certainly these have been constructed; these are in existence today, and surely enough we should be sensible enough in this Chamber to see to it that whenever a new owner acquires such a trailer that he is allowed to move it or have it moved, even though there may be some restrictions, but certainly enough a permit should be issued so that if an escort is required, well let it be that way, but certainly let's not refrain from not having to move at all so that no dealings can be made. I think this is something that should not be in our statutes and I hope the Minister, when he gets up to reply in closing debate, will make a statement on that very part and in that very connection.

Some other provisions in the bill, one in connection with bumpers. I notice here that there is a provision that by 1973 a certain type of bumper, or at least a bumper that will carry a certain amount of resistance. They refer to it as an energy absorption system, I take it that just how much will be stated in the regulations or will come out in the regulations afterwards. Maybe the Minister could tell us just what he intends to do in this connection and what happens to all the automobiles that were built prior to 1973 that do not qualify and will not have the necessary bumpers that will be required in the new automobiles. Has the Minister made arrangements with the various automobile manufacturers that they will be complying with the bill before us? I think this is important to know because people will be wanting to buy new cars and if they don't meet the standards what are they supposed to do? Or will we be changing the Act next year to accommodate the new cars even though they do not meet those requirements? I think we should have some idea on this very matter whether this is going to happen or not.

There are other provisions in here; one deals with the matter of serial numbers when they're altered or removed. The provision says that no one is supposed to deal or nobody is allowed to sell such motors, and whether this applies to the total vehicle or whether it applies to the motor only, what can a person do when someone else mutilates a serial number on your vehicle? Just because this may happen and that the owner is not responsible, what can a

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . person do? I think if we are going to legislate against this, we should also have the answer for an alternative as to what is to take place. When the provision says not to be sold, the owner shall not even possess, own, operate, buy or sell, or even wreck. This is what the provision says and I think that goes pretty far.

Another matter has already been referred to by one other honourable member but I think it's worth repeating and I certainly want to enlarge on it. This has to do with people driving tractors. Younger people. The restriction is placed on those 16 years and under, and I feel when it comes to driving a tractor that we have many boys who are quite capable of driving a tractor at 14 or 15 and that this will cause a hardship to many of our farmers in rural Manitoba. Certainly during harvest and other periods in summer, younger boys will assist the farmer in his work, and if we are putting it into the bill that such people are unable to drive on a public road, that will cause a hardship because not all farmers have their land immediately to their home buildings. Many of them, especially in my constituency, farm several miles away from where their residence is, and they have to drive back and forth, and I certainly do not support this particular provision in the bill. This applies to other implements of husbandry that are self-propel driven, and I feel that a change should be made, that we should consider the people younger than 16, the 15 especially and probably go as low as 14 years of age, so that we would not be barring these younger people from helping on the farm. And if -- (Interjection) -- The suggestion has been made to make it twelve. I don't think we need go that far. I think 14, 15 will do, but certainly these are the young people that enjoy that type of work driving a tractor and at the same time they can perform a useful service.

I notice that there is also a relaxation in connection with the matter of hiring a truck for service, for hire, and I welcome this part. I certainly believe this is something that we should probably have done in the first place but, nevertheless, even now this is welcome and I certainly intend to support that part of the bill.

There are some other matters, the matter of penalties for speeding offences. Here again it's on the basis of so many dollars for each mile that you exceed in speed over the allowable limits, and I'm not so sure whether this should be the type of fine. Then also with that same provision or pertaining to that same matter, for those who are unable to pay the fine the provision mentions that no less than one day for each dollar of fine imposed or until the fine has been paid in case a person cannot pay the fine. I think that is too much to ask for - \$1.00 a day. I think there should be more allowed for each day that the fine is levied. Because on that basis even if the Minister had gone to jail under his recent trouble that he had, at a dollar a day this would have been 1,000 days and this would have been years for the fine that was imposed against him, and I feel that this would have been unjustified; he didn't deserve it; and I feel that we shouldn't put that kind of a thing in the legislation in connection with the Highway Traffic Act. This also applies to the matter of default of payment of fine when under suspension. The dollar a day applies in that connection and I feel a change should be made in that regard.

There are a number of other matters that I should probably touch on. The bill is far-reaching. It touches so many different aspects of the Highway Traffic Act, and I don't want to take all the time here tonight but I mention some of these points because I think they are very valid ones and some of the ones that I feel should be changed and that need a second look and also need consideration by this House and by the Minister, so that there could be some reconsideration given to some of the points in the bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek,

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, if the member would permit, I would like to speak on the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is open. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek,

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to start in to read Bill 99. I scanned it. When you take a look at a bill that says changes to the Highway Traffic Act, you really believe that it's probably housekeeping and something that should be done to the bill, especially when it has (2) after it. But after scanning the bill, one has to say that he should

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . thoroughly read it and dig into every section, which is what I started out to do, and frankly, Sir, got to about Page 28, 29, and wondered how in the hell a bill like this would get into this Legislature. There are obvious reasons why legislation is passed but unfortunately the Minister lies awake at night and decides when he's dreaming or thinking of something or, as the colleague from Fort Garry said the other day to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, puts his nightmares into a bill.

Mr. Speaker, on the section of bumpers alone, all of a sudden every car manufacturer that sells an automobile in the Province of Manitoba is going to be required to put a bumper on an automobile that comes into Manitoba and he doesn't really have to put it on an automobile anywhere else. This is either designed to build a fence around this province in some way, shape or form or we'll have to make our own bumpers or our own cars. It seems inconceivable that legislation like this could be passed.

The section of the lights having to be standardized in the Canadian Code is referred to on lights only. Where are the sections in this Act regarding the Canadian Code that might refer to springs, ball joints or anything else that might be on a car. I don't know the Canadian Code backwards, but he refers to lights, but then he doesn't put anything else in regarding the Canadian Code as far as I can see. As I said, I got to section 28.

But getting back again, I'm a salesman. I have to have a car for business, and now all of a sudden I have to have a car that is shipped into Manitoba without a bumper, that has one that's made here; it's got to be a special bumper and I've got to pay more money. Here we have standards that really, what are we saying when people cross our border, a man that's transferred here that has a car when he's transferred here - and again I will admit that it says from '73 on - but he's now in the position of having to have something special when he comes to Manitoba, and having something special when you come to be Manitobans at this particular time is getting to be a habit. Higher corporation taxes, higher everything else, and now you have to have a situation where you've got to have basic differences in automobiles, and the Minister stands up and he gets -- public opinion is what he looks for in this Highway Traffic Act, saying, "Here I am, the great saviour of Manitobans. I'm out to protect you." And all he does is sit back and think of these stupid things, not considering the fact that rules and regulations were made originally for some reason and he is prepared to wipe them out tomorrow on his whim. It almost reminds me of the letter that he got from a 17-year-old boy. I would say he got an answer from a 17-year-old Minister; that's the way the mind works.

Now we say that we have doctors. The doctors have to report my medical status if I'm a salesman. I earn my living driving a car, and many men do, and, Sir, I'll tell you what'll happen. I will tell you that the salesmen and the people that have to use their car in business will live in fear of going to a doctor. You will find that there will be quack people set up all over the place that'll give a written okay for examination. For an extra fifty bucks here and there you'll get your licence back. That's what he's setting up. I'm suggesting it happens in any profession. The lawyers -- it was said to me today, it was said in Law Amendments the other day, Sir, on Bill 36 by one man who is a lawyer: "I can't divulge the advice I gave my client," when he was questioned by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it was questioning by another but he said, "It's regarding St. James Assiniboia." It said, "I can't divulge the information that I gave a client." Why don't the lawyers have to divulge the facts on representatives banned three, four times on a case when he's had an accident or something like that?

Mr. Speaker, this big brother system is just going a little bit too far. We're not being treated like human beings in Manitoba when we find an Act like this coming across the desk. We're turning around and we're saying, "Look. You're not old enough to do what you think is right; I'm going to tell you to." And, Mr. Speaker, why? Because obviously the Highway Traffic Act (2) which is basically designed for legislation apparently because of Autopac, etc., and I would be quite willing to accept the sections in this bill that are definitely required for Autopac whether I agree with it or I don't, but it's there and it has to be done, but why take a bill when you're designing something to have legislation meld together and put hidden sections in it that will harm the people of Manitoba; and that's really what happens. The honourable member is right, control the people of Manitoba. Why? Why do Manitobans have to be controlled? Why do we have to be treated like children? Why do men have to have said to them if you go to your doctor you're in danger of losing your licence? Why do people have said to them, if you go to have your eyes tested you may be in danger of losing your licence?

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.)

You know, Sir, I'm not in any more favour than you would be, or the Minister or anybody else, of having people on the roads that are dangerous, and I think we presently weed these people out with our test programs, etc. Yes they are very conscientious people in this testing. You can call people in for a test. If I'm not mistaken, and I can't repeat word for word, there was a lady 83, 82 passed her driver's test; if she couldn't have passed it she wouldn't have been driving. But now we have a situation where you don't live in fear of going for a driver's test, you live in fear of going to see your doctor; and I assure you that this is a situation where - doctors don't want it. Why? Previously - and I'll give you the example, Sir, of my mother who was asked to take a form by her insurance company to her doctor to be filled out to see if she was capable of driving a car and when he signed it on that basis, of her own free will she went there to the doctor and got it signed. He signed it because he knew she would drive. Now you're not having people go there on their own free will to have licences reissued and what have you; you are saying to the doctor if somebody comes to you and you find something wrong, you can't have a licence. Now how many people who enjoy their car are going to do that? The Minister must have a heart as cold as this microphone. How many elderly people enjoy their car to go shopping? How many elderly people love their car in the winter rather than suffer when it's cold -- in winter when it's cold or summer when it's hot? How many people who just get some little pleasure out of life driving to the beach will live in fear of having a medical test and losing their licence? And this all comes from a nightmare -- and laugh, the Minister of Consumer Affairs will laugh, but by God he won't laugh if he does to his doctor and he'll say, "Look, there's nothing wrong with me," and all of a sudden he'd be told he can't drive his car. Why? Why? Because the Minister of Highways says, I don't want you to. He may have a murmur, stiff finger, I don't know what it is, maybe he woke up with sore feet, but all of a sudden he can't drive his car.

I, Sir, did never expect that Manitobans would be treated in this way; and as I said, Sir, I can't go past Page 28 in the bill because all of a sudden it started to disgust me and that's it. But in those sections there were bumpers, there's lights, painting of cars -- I'm glad you reminded me. They won't be glad you reminded me, but all of a sudden - a year and a half ago when I owned a white car with a black top and I changed it to a blue car with a black top - I have to run down and report it -- (Interjection) -- before I do it? You got to be kidding. You mean to tell me I've got to have a permit to have the colour of my car changed?

Mr. Speaker, it's humorous, there's no question about it, that it's humorous; that if I'm sitting in the house and my wife says, "I'd like to see the car painted green," I'd say, "Look Hazel, Muriel, for God's sake you go through the rigmarole, I don't want to do it." That's gotta be humorous; the fact that I want to have the colour of my car changed. You know, I've often mentioned my dog Jay-Jay and he wouldn't get in an argument like that. Sir, I've had some intelligent conversations with Jay-Jay but I doubt if I'll ever have one with the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I said I didn't go past 28; I would like to stand here and I'd like to go for 40 minutes and 40 minutes after that on this bill, but I have to admit to you, Sir, and to the Minister of Highways that I haven't read it all, but what I have read is childish, disgusting, big brotherish, dictatorial in many ways, which says Manitobans are not going to have the right to think for themselves any more. And you know, my honourable colleague from Fort Garry shocked the daylights out of the government when he said the "muffled sound of jackboots" a year ago, and I don't really like to accuse the government of that kind of thing but when you see legislation like this and you sit down and you have to wonder why, why? -- There's another reason maybe that the Minister of Highways is thinking about -- they've now taken over the insurance in this province; maybe they don't want as many cars on the road, and they asked the Minister of Highways to design an Act to get around it. I'm not suggesting that, I'm not completely suggesting that, but I have to say to myself, why, why do we get hidden sections in Bill 99 that is taking away the basic freedom of rights of Manitobans to think for themselves? It's beyond us. We see it and we get it in speed-up; we get it at a time when there's no more logic to pass a bill like this than fly to the moon. The logic of this bill is to combine the sections in this bill which is necessary for Autopac, but to stick these hidden clauses in at this particular time during the legislation is not only insulting but it's insulting to the intelligence of the people of Manitoba and the Minister of Highways turns around and says, I'm your great protector and he gets great publicity and great great things on the By-line by "I've done this, I've done this to protect you." But mind you, Mr. Speaker, he will come to his reckoning one day when people

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . will find out that they won't accept him. Sir, I'm in a business where I sell power tools and we have a power hammer that puts in anchors; it's a self-destructing thing because it keeps working all the time, a power hammer, and the Minister is a self-destructing person, and he will gradually find that out if he keeps passing this kind of nonsense legislation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation will be closing debate.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question was open, the vote had not been taken.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 107, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Brandon extension of boundary each year, I'd like to say a few words at this time. I'm sorry the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce isn't in his seat right at the present time because I'd like to say a few words to him -- I was hoping he would be -- (Interjection) -- I don't know, that isn't the same as looking in an eye . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I may suggest to the honourable member our rules call for the honourable member to address the Chair not any individual member.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'm just addressing you. I started to get around to my opening remarks on Bill 107 an Act which completely destroys the principle that's been established by all governments up to the present time, and what I mean is they changed the boundaries up till this year in the Province of Manitoba, have always been done by the negotiations and resolutions by all interested parties, and the first breakthrough in this principle, Mr. Speaker, was in the unicity bill, Bill 36, where no negotiations were entered in by all interested municipalities. And along comes Bill 107; same thing again, Mr. Speaker, forcing it down the municipalities' throats, legislating against the minority, and I don't care whether it's an individual or whether it's an individual municipality, Mr. Speaker, it's all the same as far as I'm concerned -- this is the government you know speaking for the people. I disagree wholeheartedly.

Why do I disagree? Because never at any time were the Municipality of Cornwallis considered in any negotiations. Do you not remember in the last session of the Legislature when the Honourable Member for Brandon West brought in a bill to extend the boundaries of Brandon; and how was that done? -- by negotiation and agreement by both parties. One only has to know the area around Brandon, Mr. Speaker, and I know that as well as anybody with the exception of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. But I know the Fotheringham farm on the west side of Brandon, I know all that area, because I represented that, Mr. Speaker, for eleven years here and I know it so well, and I know the agreements that went on between the City of Brandon, and everybody was happy, and everybody was happy, until the Minister of Industry and Commerce realized the election promise that he made to the people of Brandon, that he would extend their boundaries before the next campaign came along. So what happened, what happened, Mr. Speaker? The President of the University of Brandon was asked to be a commissioner -- one-man commissioner to look into the boundaries of Brandon, and he did bring in a report to extend the boundaries, and I know what the report is. So what do we have now, Mr. Speaker? A bill at the tail end of the session, as the Honourable Member for Brandon says, an important bill for the people of Cornwallis, an important bill for the people of Brandon, but shouldn't this have been dealt with sooner, or shouldn't this be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, by giving it to the municipal committee, refer it to committee and let them deal with this bill between sessions where they could go to Brandon and listen to the many people in the City of Brandon, the Municipality of Cornwallis, Souris, Wawanesa and all the other rural municipalities? Because they are all mixed -- the municipalities which I represent, Mr. Speaker, are in this bill and I only want to ask why. Why are they named in the very first page of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why. They are only there for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker, and while they mightn't be affected this year, it would be only quite easy next year to bring in another amendment, and I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to withdraw these municipalities, withdraw them from that bill, because if he doesn't I'll move an amendment, because they're no longer required in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I did represent the people for 11 years; I did represent the people of Cornwallis. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa represented the people for Elton for over 12 on 13 years and we do know something about the problems of the day. We do know something

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . . about the make up of this great area around Brandon because the development has taken place in the last 12 or 13 years. I would like to just say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs at the present time, this development did not come easy and it came for a very good reason, because Cornwallis had something to offer to these large industries and they offered them a deal, and the deal was good enough that Mr. Simplot was willing, along with a loan from the government, to invest \$30 million in the Municipality of Cornwallis. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the honourable members weren't here, so they haven't got a clue. He did invest some money. He did invest money. Mr. Speaker, if you can't keep these people shut up, over here I'll shut them up before I finish; because I got a story to tell, Mr. Speaker, I got a story to tell.

Mr. Speaker, if the reverse was true, I wonder if it would happen; I wonder if they'd expand Cornwallis' boundaries into Brandon, I wonder if that would ever happen? If you're so interested in minority rights, Mr. Speaker, if they are so interested in minority rights why didn't they push Brandon in a little bit? Maybe that would make some sense if you're dealing with minority rights. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. This would make some sense. Selkirk into Winnipeg. Let's take over all of Winnipeg, put it in the Town of Selkirk. But this only came about, Mr. Speaker, because there was a certain election in 1969, certain promises the Minister of Industry and Commerce made and he thought he better carry them through. And the only friend he had in Brandon I guess was Dr. Dulmage, the only friend he had in Brandon, so he put him to work. And Dr. Dulmage came out with a report. Dr. Dulmage came out with a report. I don't blame him if he came out with the report he came out with, that was his own views, that was the views as he saw fit.

But wouldn't it have been better, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it have been better if the government of the day had said to the City of Brandon, negotiate with the Municipality of Cornwallis, negotiate? We'll give you lots of time, there's no rush; Brandon isn't going to die for twelve months. They're not going to die even if -- so a lot of bad things did happen, they're not going to die. They're going to carry on. Brandon was here long before any of us, and be here a lot longer. So why not wait a few months, Mr. Speaker? Let the municipalities negotiate with the City of Brandon. Let them try to negotiate a deal that would be acceptable to both parties. But they didn't do that, Mr. Speaker, they didn't do it. They brought a bill in and that's the end result. And what's the Minister of Industry and Commerce concerned about? He's the principal of urban government for all urban areas. Well, let me tell the Minister of Industry and Commerce that there is more to Manitoba than urban areas; there's far more to Manitoba than urban areas and I tell you there's a lot of fine people in the rural parts of Manitoba. There's a lot of wonderful municipalities in rural Manitoba, too, and they deserve the same treatment. It's kind of unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, kind of unfortunate the policy of the first 100 years in the Province of Manitoba hadn't continued because I think the government of the day will live to regret it. What right or what security have any municipality in the Province of Manitoba -- what right have they to say that a year from now the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be in with a bill to take over about five municipalities and put them into one area -- without a vote, without a vote, Mr. Speaker, of the individual municipalities. The ratepayers don't even have a say. Did the ratepayers in the municipality of Elton have a say, the people that the Member for Minnedosa represents; did the people in the Member for Brandon West's constituency, did they have a say? I don't think they had a say. Even the constituents of the Member for Brandon East, did they have a say on this bill? Not very much, not very much. And I safely say here right now it's a sad day for the individual person. Where is this wonderful group of people that are always speaking for the common man -- and we have more common men in the western part of the province I would say than any other part of Manitoba. We have people that have made something out of themselves and are wanting to continue that great way. We have farmers that retired in my area, they've gone to the outskirts around Brandon thinking they had cheap taxes, thinking they had a fine home and a wonderful place to live the rest of their life, and now overnight the government is saying to them that they are a part of the City of Brandon and their taxes must go up three times as high as they presently are.

Mr. Speaker, they can talk all they like about all the wonderful things in urban government but there are still some wonderful things in our rural parts of Manitoba, in our rural municipalities, and I hope that they are not all taken in by this big wonderful idea involving everybody into a common denominator and stopping them from living as individuals.

Mr. Speaker, we heard all about the high debts that exist in Brandon. We all heard all

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . about the fortunes of Cornwallis, and I guess I know as much about these figures as anybody because I did inquire into these during the period of time that I was a member. It's difficult to assess a municipality in the position that Cornwallis was in in the past. I must say the Steam Plant was built under the Liberal Government, industry, large industry, Dryden Chemicals and Simplot constructed under our government. Motels were constructed up to North Hill; the refinery which has now been torn down was constructed during the day of the Liberal Government, and other industries all around Brandon, along with the provincial government and Federal Government to the North Hill. And these have been a valuable asset in the area around Brandon because Brandon could not have existed without these industries and government support both provincially and federally.

Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose you realize the income at the Mental Hospital that assists all the City of Brandon. This is wonderful. Along with all the other industries like the Federal Experimental Farm; but these, if this bill passes, are all part of the City of Brandon, all part of the City of Brandon. I don't suppose the Minister of Municipal Affairs ever contacted these large industries like Simplot, Pioneer Electric and Dryden Chemicals to see whether they were in favour of the formula he set out in this bill. If he did contact them I'd like to hear when he closes second reading on this bill because I think these people are important in our economy in western Manitoba and they should be considered. It's true they don't pay any taxes at the present time into the City of Brandon, that's true, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the salaries that these companies pay out mean a lot to the City of Brandon and they will continue to do so for many years to come, if they continue to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair to the people in the Cornwallis area who are so greatly affected by their loss of assessment; three-quarters assessment is going to be taken away. The Honourable Minister and the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce come along and say there is going to be a sharing of industrial and commercial taxes, on a per capita basis, on a per capita basis. Well, one only has to know the population that will exist in Cornwallis compared with what it will be in Brandon to know what it will mean to the Municipality of Cornwallis that remains after the boundaries have been changed. I would imagine there's 800 people. And in the Act it says that Shilo will not be a part because under the Unconditional Grants which means the people in Shilo are not classed as citizens in the Municipality of Cornwallis under the Unconditional Grants Act. So it would mean about 800 people, I would imagine, in the Municipality of Cornwallis compared with about 34,000 in the City of Brandon. You can see the proportion, Mr. Speaker, of the taxes the Municipality of Cornwallis will get.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's only right and proper to agree, all the members of the House, to agree with what the Honourable Member for Brandon West said, that the Committee of Municipal Affairs should go to Brandon and listen to these people. These people are busy now. Do you realize how busy the farmers are, Mr. Speaker, and many farmers will be affected? Do you realize how busy the people in industry are at this time of the year? Do you realize how many people are away on holidays, Mr. Speaker, and it's impossible for everybody to get into Winnipeg here to express themselves. I mean the interested parties, and all the people in the Municipality of Cornwallis are interested, and I mean interested, because their whole municipality is affected to the point where I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if this municipality will be able to continue. Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Yes, speak for the people in Brandon. I'll speak for the people in Brandon, sure. I'll speak for the people of Brandon and I say the people of Brandon should have negotiated with the Municipality of Cornwallis and it's only right they should have, but as they didn't and as this bill is in, the best thing the government can do to be fair to all the people in that area is to have the committee go out to Brandon and listen to the many briefs that will take place there.

What difference does it make, Mr. Speaker, if this bill doesn't pass this year? It's true there's supposed to be an election this fall on a ward system. But what difference does that make? Can anybody tell me what difference that makes? The aldermen are elected now, the aldermen can continue for twelve more months, just like they did in Winnipeg a year ago. And I can see no good reason, Mr. Speaker, why one year is going to make that much difference to either municipality. I hope that the people will — if they do have to come to Winnipeg, and I don't know what the government's decision is yet — but if they do have to come to Winnipeg, and I do hope many of them will come, both for and against this bill, both for and against, because if they don't come in, we'll never know whether this bill should have been passed or whether it shouldn't.



(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I could go on a lot longer about this bill but I know the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is anxious to get out to Room 254 to get us to work -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Transportation just opened up his mouth again, I'd be the last one to say to anyone else in this Chamber--and I saw a lot of members come and go -- but every member of this Legislature has spoke some common sense for as long as I've been in here, and it's an ill day for the Minister of Transportation to get up after what he called me during this past session, I don't mind him calling me anything -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's much else I'd like to say other than I hope that the government from now on don't decide to chop away at all the rural municipalities in the Province of Manitoba without letting the rural municipalities coming up with negotiations on their own. It's not right and proper, as I said at the start of my speech, for a government to step in, a big brother to step in and say to a small municipality that a large part of your municipality is going to be taken over and handed to a large city, adjoining city. I don't think this is right and proper and I would say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he better take this under consideration because I'm afraid that if he tries this about once more in the Province of Manitoba that he'll be hearing loud and clear from the interested parties, and I do hope, again, that the people come, express themselves, because it's only again, as I mentioned before, through that way will we know whether the change in boundaries for Brandon is right and proper.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. CRAIK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for Riel to adjourn debate.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Craik, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, Johnston (P. la Pr.), Johnston (Stur. Cr.), McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Patrick, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hauschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Uskiw, Uruski and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The question now is Bill 107. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I now have the opportunity to speak on this bill, and I don't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I have the point of order. The honourable member has spoken. When he adjourned he lost his right to speak. Order, please. I stated the rule, it's done. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, regarding Bill 107, the Brandon Bill, and I guess one would expect or wonder why a resident of the City of Winnipeg would be speaking on the Brandon Bill, but basically, Sir, my remarks tonight are going to be directed basically to the First Minister, through you, Sir.

Earlier today we heard from the Honourable Member from Brandon West who is a resident of Brandon who is making a plea to this Legislature asking them to please not push Bill No. 107 to the point of not having hearings or proper hearings from the people of Brandon. The bill was brought in approximately one o'clock last night, or this morning. Sir, the bill has repercussions to approximately 40,000 people, the second largest urban area in this province, and all of a sudden this Legislature is being asked to pass this bill and many of us not having an awful lot of what the bill states, and I'm sure, as usual the government not having

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . . caucused the bill properly. Later on we heard from the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member from Brandon East, and he went through a long detail of the Dulmage report. He went through details of the problems of health in the area, but he also mentioned one thing in the back of the bill - and I can't quote the letter, I haven't seen the letter that he tabled and it was regarding the DREE grant, Sir - and I believe the Federal Minister said he had hoped that the boundaries would be changed as soon as possible.

I am sure, Sir, that any Federal Minister who would receive representation from the Premier of the Province of Manitoba which said we are making moves to change the boundaries of the City of Brandon and we would ask you to consider the fact that we have DREE grants coming, but please consider the fact that we want to have some discussions with the people; I can't imagine any Federal Minister turning such a request down. I, Sir, fully realize that the Brandon situation is regarded by the government I guess similar to the Winnipeg situation, and although I deplore the handling of the Winnipeg unicity bill, or the Greater Winnipeg bill; although I deplore the fact that I don't think there's been as many hearings as there should be, I would say that the Minister of Urban Affairs did, in his opinion, do what was right. He presented a draft of the bill to us around the end of May or first part of June and then later on he presented the bill and gave time, Sir, gave a lot of time for discussion and debate on the bill which is what we are not seeing here tonight. We've seen what is close to being closure on a discussion of a bill that affects 40,000 people.

It may be all very well to say that the Brandon boundaries have to be changed, but the people of Cornwallis have made representation and have made their feelings felt. The people, Sir, of Cornwallis come under the Minister of Municipal Affairs and it is my understanding and my feeling towards the Minister of Municipal Affairs is that he is willing, I would say, I won't put words into his mouth, he would be willing to listen to them and possibly solve this problem in due course to the satisfaction of many people, and if it can't be solved then, fine, let the Legislature or the committee make recommendations.

But, Sir, what has happened? We have a new Ministry of Urban Affairs presently in this province, and when the Minister presented his estimates he was very proud to say that Winnipeg would be the first in the discussions that would come up regarding the changes in the urban area of Manitoba. And, Sir, I say to the Premier that when the Minister of Urban Affairs has settled the unicity bill, which will I'm sure pass this Legislature this session, he should have ample opportunity, or have ample time as the Minister of Municipal Affairs of this province to study the Dulmage report, to have hearings, or if necessary have hearings or meetings as he had in Greater Winnipeg, in Brandon. But we have disregarded the Minister of Municipal Affairs in my opinion; we have overlooked the opportunity for a new Department of Urban Affairs to look at the situation; and secondly, or thirdly, what has basically happened is the Member from Brandon East firmly believes in his own mind that this should go through and he's pushing this caucus; and I say to the First Minister, for God's sake make him stop pushing.

Sir, the Member from Brandon East mentioned wards. We are asked to vote on the changing of wards for the City of Brandon or go to the ward system and nowhere before us have we got the ward boundaries. In the unicity bill the government or the Minister of Urban Affairs set up an independent body to look at the new wards for the City of Winnipeg. He was criticized for the wards he brought in and he was fair enough, and whether I agree with the decision or I don't, he was fair enough to set up an independent body to set up wards; and now we're being asked, Sir, to vote on a bill where we don't even know what wards there will be in Brandon. I don't think this is fair to the people of Brandon, Sir. I don't think it would be fair to anybody. We are asked now to vote on a bill which basically says there will be a new tax arrangement for the situation of the people of Cornwallis versus Brandon in the takeover, etcetera. A new tax arrangement that doesn't say how much or how little; and we had an example, Sir, from the Member from Rhineland tonight who must have put a seed in the Minister of Municipal Affairs' mind when he said, "why does the people of Brandon have this kind of a concession when I as a resident of Winkler found my taxes go sky high, etcetera, because of reassessment and nobody came along and said to me will there be any five-year plan, will there be any savings or concessions to me?" Personally, Sir, the fact that we have now developed a Department of Urban Affairs or a Ministry of Urban Affairs in this province is the first thing should happen is the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . of Urban Affairs should have the chance to talk about it, and they should tell the Member from Brandon East, for God's sake sit down and be quiet and quit pushing because we have to investigate this thing. But no . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is casting aspersions upon the Minister. The bill is introduced by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I don't think it's fair of him to do that. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Sir, I'm sorry. But my feelings are that way and I will not refer to it again. The Dulmage report which was brought in had a recommendation on boundaries and the boundaries recommended in this bill are not the same. The boundaries that were recommended should be debated or at least there should be hearings on the report, or we should hear from the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Speaker, why then, why then would a report be tabled or shelved the same as the Boundaries Commission report has been shelved for Winnipeg and no hearings whatsoever? Why then shouldn't the people of Brandon be allowed to be heard on a report that definitely has a bearing on this community? Why then should not the people of the Cornwallis and the surrounding areas who have made statements and have made issue and brought to the attention of the Minister that they are not happy, why should they not have had hearings by the Minister of Urban Affairs? Sir, is the Minister of Urban Affairs in this province now a sham or was it set up just for unclicity of Greater Winnipeg?

Frankly, I don't know why, as I said earlier when I was speaking tonight, Sir, why these things happen with this government; why they don't take regard for the fact that when boundaries were changed or are changed in the rural part of Manitoba that there is usually some sort of agreement strived for between the two parties involved. You know, as much as I dislike the Winnipeg bill, Sir, at least we know the boundaries of Greater Winnipeg, but here we have a bill that is changing boundaries, and taking in rural areas, which is not unlike, as my colleague from Souris-Killarney said, why didn't Winnipeg take in Selkirk or Portage la Prairie? — (Interjection) — That's right. There, Sir, is the example of what you're having, "you better not." That's what the people of Cornwallis are saying and they're expecting from the Minister of Municipal Affairs some sort of protection as far as the decision is made as a desist for hearing.

Mr. Speaker, the Dulmage report suggested a regional planning for the Brandon area when the boundaries are changed, etcetera, and it would make sense that when we do pass the bill for the boundaries of Brandon that in it is a regional zoning or planning authority for the Brandon area. What is being passed in 107, tonight it looks like, or at least second reading because we are being forced — what is being passed tonight is basically saying maybe two or three years from now we'll have to do it all over again and I'm sure — and I'm not sure of many things when it comes to the Ministers over there getting in agreement — and I've got the laugh from Mickey Rooney again — but by the same point I'm not sure; but I am sure if the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Minister of Municipal Affairs are given the opportunity to take a look at the Brandon situation, which is the second largest urban area in this province, that it would become a situation that would be presented, and I'm sure you would have agreement from all sides.

Sir, I am getting comments, I know, and I've had the comment "hear, hear" or I've "said that before," and basically I would hope that the members on that side from Winnipeg would think a little bit more heavily upon what's happening in Brandon. It shows a "don't care" attitude for the rest of the province. In other words, because the bill is here, we'll ram it through, and as I said earlier, we have a government who is self-destructing, and I don't care if they wreck themselves and they get voted out of office, but I say through you, Sir, to the First Minister, don't start wrecking people's lives in Brandon or at least give them the opportunity to speak and be heard on this bill. And I say to the First Minister through you, Sir, why not — go ahead, give me all the answers or questions and what have you about the health and everything else like that — give me all of these circumstances, and I've heard them, but again I say why not, why can't the people of Brandon be heard and why does this have to be pushed through today or tomorrow or even the next day when the bill was presented at 1:30 last night. It's ridiculous, Sir. I said when speed-up was mentioned, I said when speed-up was mentioned that very strange things would happen in this Legislature when men are pushed to the limit and I assure you tonight is an example of it happening. And I would like to say that there should be a cooling off of minds at least until tomorrow morning after tonight. I would suggest, Sir, that we do need it but people in the backbench over there don't,

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . they just sit grinning. But by the same token, Sir, the Brandon bill should have more consideration. The people of Brandon should be heard - and the comment that I should sober up I don't mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate to the gallery that they are not entitled to participate in the debate. If they can't adhere to the Rules I shall have to clear them out. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: But if it has to be done, Sir, if things have to be said and I again, Sir, would preface my remarks or finish my remarks by saying to the First Minister, that he has the responsibility to see that all people in Manitoba have the right to be heard on things concerning their lives and the people of Brandon are no different. They have that right and they should have that respect. Thank you.

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

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear the honourable member, there's too much noise. Would he repeat what he said.

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

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

MR. SPIVAK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney on a point of order.

MR. McKELLAR: Any debate while the bells are ringing, it's always been the way during my period of time that I've been here, till the bells stop ringing then the Speaker takes over.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Is the Honourable Minister wishing to speak to a point of order? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not really a point of order because I recognize . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well, otherwise there's no question before the House. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I in all due respect suggest that there is no rule under our House, in our House Rules, that the division bells should ring forever and a day and I suggest that in the absence of such that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Is the Honourable Minister speaking to a point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Fine. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend from Emerson, as I indicated on a couple of debates, there's a lot to learn. I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with past precedences in this House that there is no necessity -- (Interjection) -- I am standing on a point of order, my honourable friend -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Riel that he should have the courtesy to let the Honourable Minister of Labour express his point of order. I'm trying to hear it too. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: What I am attempting to do, Sir, is to say that the process of democracy must continue and that it -- well my honourable friend from Emerson doesn't know of which I speak and I appreciate that. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that any member of this Assembly in the absence of any rule as to when the division bell should cease can -- (Interjection) -- well it's not even a bell, you're right - can, in essence, allow or provide for the continuance of the ringing of the horn or the bell forever and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of that in order that we may continue the process of the proper conduct of the Assembly, that you, Sir, in order to prevent such frivolity should order that the division bell cease and that the vote be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: May I refer yourself, Mr. Speaker, to Rule 10 of our own rule book.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I suggest first of all, my understanding of the rules

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . is that there is no point of order unless there is a matter before the House, and may I suggest that it might be wise for the Speaker to take the matter under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Rule 10 says that there shall be no debate, I don't rise in a debate, I rise on a point of order. I suggest that the conduct of the House is in the hands of the Speaker, that it is the usual custom for both sides to agree as to when division bells should stop ringing; but it is a matter of custom only, that the matter is in the last analysis in the hands of the Speaker and the Speaker should permit the bells to ring for a reasonable period of time, after which I suggest to you that it is incumbent on the Speaker to call the question.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, I should like to adjourn the House for five minutes and confer with the two House Leaders. The House is adjourned for five minutes.

House Resumed

MR. SPEAKER: I asked for the House Leaders to come and see me; only one appeared, apparently the other party wasn't interested. There is no point of order. I'm on my feet, I want to state the situation as it is. This House will either run with decorum or it won't run at all. I'll adjourn it. Would you please sit down till I get finished stating the situation. There were members in of all parties at the time when I made the request. I had no one come from any of the other parties as I requested.

The division bells have always been rung on the understanding that the Whips would control them. I'm not going to make a ruling in regard to how long they should ring but I'm going to ask once more that after this division is over I want to confer with the House Leaders, I want to arrive at an understanding of how this House is to operate, because it's the will of the House that concerns me and that's the way I want to operate. I am only the servant of this House but I do think that we all have to act responsibly if we are going to get concluded in this sitting.

Now the question before the House at the time of division was the Honourable Member for Gladstone, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, debate be adjourned on Bill 107.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, and I know you're acting with the best of intentions when you stated that you had asked co-operation from the House Leaders of the official parties of this House on deciding a matter where there is a great deal of contention tonight, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that five members of this House are being disenfranchised by that decision. Five members of this House have no say in an unofficial meeting, nor can they speak in this House on this matter and I think with all respect to your position, Sir, that there should be some consideration to those five members and perhaps one of them could be allowed to attend any unofficial meeting that you may see fit to call.

MR. SPEAKER: The rules in respect to the point of order are clear. The House rules recognize only people of four members or more as an official party to have representation in that regard. I believe I ruled on that earlier. I am not complete in stating on my point of order in respect— (Interjection) -- Did the member enter during . . . . out please.

Order, please. Order, please. As I stated to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie there was no point of order. I can recognize that there may be some concern in that regard and I'm certain that when we get to the rules committee meetings we'll have to devise some means of representation; I think this can be worked out by negotiations with the House Leaders and with the different members of the House. Now, as I said, all those in favour of the motion, please rise.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Craik, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Patrick, Spivak, Watt, Weir, and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paultey, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 18; Nays 25.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to indicate to all honourable members that when a division is taking place, and I wish they would mention this to their colleagues, there can be no one enter or leave during that division.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on Bill 107. I'm not opposed to the bill. I don't think that anybody on our side of the House is really and truly opposed to it; I think it's a matter that Brandon needs to have their voice heard as does the City of Winnipeg need their voice heard. I think that the government side of the House stands here and laughs tonight and says that I stand up and say that I'm not opposed to Bill 107 after voting twice, as we did in a division, and that's not the case. I think that Brandon should be heard, it's a principle. They're an urban centre, we have an urban Minister, they have 35,000 people in their city, they're going from one urban centre, they're adding in nine or ten municipal areas into it and all of a sudden the Minister of Municipal Affairs brings in a Bill 107 and sidelines the Minister of Urban Affairs. I say that if the Minister of Urban Affairs is good enough for the City of Winnipeg and it's 12 municipalities it's good enough for Brandon. That's all we want. We want Brandon represented by an urban Minister and not a Municipal Affairs Minister that's looking after hay patches and the far north and areas like that. I'm not trying to belittle any municipality when I say that, but I say if it's Urban Affairs Minister we have in this government, we'll use the Urban Affairs Minister. I think it's disgraceful to think that Brandon is belittled by that.

They have an area here in the bill, there's two full pages of description of what will comprise this new area, two full pages. There's not one person on that side of the House can explain to me where the boundaries are going to be. The people of Brandon don't know where they're going to be; the people of the seven municipalities, or nine, Daley, Cornwallis, Elton, Glenwood, Oakland, Whitehead, none of them know where it's going to be, they have no idea. They expect those people to sit down in Brandon, 35,000 of them, in that neighbourhood, and sit there and take it quietly. I say I can understand why they are dissatisfied in that city with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and they're dissatisfied. The Mayor of Brandon stated clearly the other day that there's no way that the people of Brandon are going to take over the responsibilities of this government by assessing two mills against their assessment for the next ten years. — (Interjection) — No, I won't, I won't, no. No, I won't.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOUG: I'll correct it to say 20 years. I was only taking it out of the newspaper and if it's 20 years I'll go along with the 20 years. That's worse. But I have to say at this time that the Mayor of Brandon was such a gentleman that he said he wouldn't question the Minister of Industry and Commerce because the Minister of Industry and Commerce is far smarter than he was and there's no way you question the Minister of Industry and Commerce's word. And this Minister sits here, Mr. Speaker, and he's not smart enough to recognize that he is being ridiculed, absolutely ridiculed by the Mayor of Brandon. He sits here smiling, he says did you see what the Mayor of Brandon said. I read what he said, believe me. That's why I got up here, that's why I got up here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, the honourable member is being dishonourable in the kind of remarks he's making about me, and furthermore his remarks are irrelevant to the bill at hand. They're absolutely irrelevant.

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

MR. MOUG: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's a point of order well then nobody can get up in this House and say anything. You know, that's where democracy just gets thrown right out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If the honourable member wants a point of order I should indicate to him that he should stick to debating the question before us. I did not make a ruling on the issue because I didn't feel that I should at the moment, but if the honourable member wishes to debate that point, I should indicate to him that it is not part of the procedure of what we have before us. We have a bill and I wish he would confine his remarks to Bill 107.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies for getting out of line. I wouldn't want to join the government side of the House in getting out of line every time I stood up, but I certainly would have to say to you that the people of Brandon are being short changed.

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . I don't want to credit the government with anything but when they brought in Bill 36; we had fair indication they were bringing it in, we had a bundle of paper the size of Eaton's catalogue previous to the bill being brought in. The only difference between that and Eaton's catalogue was there was no bargains in it; when they brought in the bill and two days later they brought in that many pages again explaining the sections of the bill. And I admire the government for that, I didn't admire what was in the bill but I admire the government for what they did.

And as I say, I do not oppose Bill 107 but I have to say to you today that I don't like the way the people of Brandon are being treated, and I'm speaking as an urban member, not of Brandon, urban member of Winnipeg because the representation they have from Brandon on this side of the House, he doesn't want to get up and speak for them. He won't do it. He gets up this afternoon and he reads letters to us much like I do about the Highways Minister. But I don't read them about my municipality. This man gets up and reads letters to us about what's going on out there. The only thing the Mayor of Brandon doesn't agree with him, The Mayor of Brandon said that if they have to pay their own money to get the complex finished he's going to quit. They go on and say they're going to - in this bill they estimate taxes. This is fine and I think they can, and I can't dispute it, but I say that if you have the people of Brandon here, the Mayor of Brandon, some of the councillors and some of the people that live there and from the different municipalities they can dispute it. -- (Interjection) -- and I'm sure they can. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. MOUG: They get into another area there, Sir - I'll try and ignore the static from the other side. I thought our thunder storm was over last Friday night but apparently it's still going. They get into the ward system and I don't object to ward systems. We're implementing that in Bill 36 in the city here and I agree with the ward system. But there's nothing in this Bill to say what they're going to do with the ward system. Does the man have to live in the ward he's being elected from? It doesn't mention it. It doesn't say the Mayor has to live in the city. It doesn't say how he's elected, how he's appointed, it doesn't say anything. All it says is they want ten. The boundaries they don't mention. They mention two pages in here and if everybody can figure that out without the help of a good stiff barrage of lawyers, you got me . . . There's nobody knows where the hearings are going to be held, when they're going to be held, if the people are going to get an opportunity to listen to the Municipal Affairs Committee if that's where it goes, in Law Amendments Committee if that's where it goes. Nobody knows. Yes, 2:30 in the morning you could be called in here. They've been called in Agricultural Committee, when the farmers are expected to be in the fields at 5:30 or 6:00 in the morning in Agriculture, there was a hearing in here at 1:30 in the morning, as was this bill introduced for second reading at 1:30 in the morning. And all of a sudden much like Bill 99 they bring it in here, they shoot it in front of you and they say we're putting it in closure, there's no way to amend it, there's no way do you amend it. They go to the point exactly, Mr. Speaker, as they did a few minutes ago by sending the House Leader of the government side of the House down there . . . knowing the rules as he does, and the man on our side of the House that knows the rules as he does didn't happen to be in the House.

I'm sorry I'm off track, questioning you, I won't, Sir. But I say that Brandon is being sold short, very very short. There's nobody knows where those hearings are going to be held. I say they should be held in Brandon. It's easier for us to send out a committee of 18 or 20 people out there for two days to listen to their briefs and listen to their discussion on this than send all those people in here and give them no notice. And the way I can see it coming up now with the length of this session as it should be, I can see no way that these people are going to have any 48 hour notice to prepare their briefs to bring them here, present them to that committee. I say this is the time that this government should be stopped and stopped now, and if they don't get the support of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, they're being sold real real short. I hope they get to know about it. He stands up and says everything in that bill is good. This is fine. Everything in there is good. As far as I'm concerned, there's one or two things that I condemn, one or two things; but as far as the people in Brandon are concerned I'll bet there's a million things in there that they're concerned about. They're concerned about the farms in these rural municipalities, the other nine other than the City of Brandon. The people of Cornwallis, what do they say about it. Let's get them in here, let's go out to them. Let's go out there to Brandon and let these ten

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . municipalities say their piece on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this government - mind you I'm glad to see it - I think they're shooting themselves down fast; they are not giving the people anything that they said they were going to. They're a people's government, they're proving today exactly what they are. For that reason, Sir, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the proposed motion be amended by removing therefrom all the words after the word "that" and substituting therefore the following words "that this bill be not read now but read six months hence."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to say a word or two, in connection with this bill, or the motion that is now proposed by the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to all of the debate that has taken place on Bill 107, and one of the main concerns of members opposite particularly is the guiding factor or premise that the citizens of Brandon and the Municipality of Cornwallis have not had an opportunity of appearing before a committee of this Assembly to make their representations - and my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie says, when,

I, in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, suggest to the members of this Assembly that the only time that representations can be made on a bill that has reached the stage that 107 has, is after the bill has been passed to a committee to hear representations. The mover of the motion for the six-month hoist, in effect is saying the absolute reverse - (Interjection) -- When I'm finished. The member who proposed a six-month hoist of Bill No. 107, in effect is saying that we don't want to hear representations from the people of Brandon or Cornwallis or any others who may be interested in the subject matter contained within Bill 107. Because it is historic, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, as you realize, and I trust that most of the other members of the Assembly should realize; if they don't may I respectfully suggest that they should consider an investigation into the net effects of a six-month hoist. That means that the bill is killed and killed completely; that notwithstanding the fact that there may be representations one way or the other in respect to the bill, they will not be heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the criticism that I have heard as a member of this Assembly, particularly from my honourable friend the member for one of the constituencies in Brandon, that he wants an opportunity for the people to be heard, and I think this is the base of the proposition for second reading of 107. But I want to say that there appears to be a division between the Honourable Member for Charleswood and the Honourable Member, Mr. McGill from Brandon West. If they are in concert one with the other, then I would suggest that the objectives of the Honourable Member for Brandon West would be achieved by voting against Bill 107, and in effect depriving the people of Brandon of being heard in respect to the propositions contained in Bill 107. - (Interjection) - I didn't hear my mumbles from Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if it is a sincere desire of the members of this Assembly - and I'm not trying to differentiate between that side or this side or any side of the House - but it is historic in parliamentary procedure in this House and other jurisdictions that in order for the people to be heard - and I, in all respect, Mr. Speaker, believe that they should be heard. But the only way, Mr. Speaker, in which they can be heard is by the forwarding of the bill from inside of this Assembly to the outside of the Assembly, and the Honourable Member for Charleswood has now suggested that the people of Brandon should be deprived of a right - (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Lakeside says, "nonsense." I suggest that I know my honourable friend's psychology at this present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Charleswood. Point of order.

MR. MOUG: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Labour says that it is my wishes to deprive Brandon of hearings and this is exactly the opposite thing, I rise for that reason, I say I rise to speak tonight only because I want to see Brandon have a hearing; and no other reason.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order on that matter. The Honourable Minister of Labour.



MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do is to penetrate the mind of my honourable friend from Charleswood that the only way that the people of Brandon can be heard on Bill 107 is for it to come out of this Assembly and go into committee and his — (Interjection) — tomorrow, the next day, it doesn't matter really. — (Interjection) — My honourable friend from Lakeside, Mr. Mumbles of the Assembly I don't pay too much attention to anything that he says at this time of the evening. I do say, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Pardon? — (Interjection) — That's right, that's right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Rule 40, our own Rule — "When a member is speaking no member shall interrupt him except to raise a point of order or privilege." I don't know if the honourable members desire this rule to be read when each speaker gets up and is recognized by me, but I have no difficulty in repeating the rule. The only problem is that I'll be transgressing one of our own rules which is repetition. So I would hope the honourable members would remember it. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe — well I know that you're perfectly correct. And while there may be some admonitions directed to us because of the hour of the evening, there are some of us who are still capable of suggesting procedures in the House that are reasonable, intelligible and in the best interests of the community as a whole, and if my honourable friend from Lakeside can ascribe to this I leave it to him. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am attempting to do is to inform the House that in my opinion — and I have been wrong on occasion, but what I am attempting to do to members opposite and to my colleagues here, too, that support for the motion that has been proposed by the Honourable Member for Charleswood of a — I wonder if the caucus meeting of the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Social Credit may desist just for a moment while I am on my feet. I respect very much, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, who from time to time — who is so flamboyant on the rights of the Opposition that he should at least . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. — (Interjection) — I said order, please. I would like to indicate to the Honourable Minister of Labour not reflect on any member in the House. There was a caucus behind him as well. I wish he would continue his speech on Bill 107. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out that a member has privileges as well when he is on his feet as the likes of a correspondent lawyer from some college in which he got his degree.

What I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the House, speaking on the motion of the six-month hoist, in consideration of Bill 107, the net effect of that motion. I feel, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Charleswood who proposed the motion didn't really know, or if he did know, he didn't consider the significance of the motion, because this would deprive the citizens of Brandon, the citizens of the Municipality of Cornwallis, an opportunity of being heard before the Municipal Committee of this Assembly.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, on reflection, that the Honourable Member for Charleswood should withdraw his motion, or if he didn't withdraw it, that he should not be supported. I suggest that in respect of Bill 107 itself that it would be advisable for this Assembly to agree to the second reading of this bill in order, Sir, that it goes out of the Assembly to the Municipal Committee in order that the public may be heard. This is the process of democracy, this is the way that we have operated for 101 years in the Province of Manitoba.

Now the question may arise, Mr. Speaker, as to when representations should be heard, and in my years of experience in this House accommodations have been made in the committee so that people have a reasonable period of time to come to the capital city in order to be heard. It's three hours by road time between here and Brandon approximately, without violation of our highway traffic laws; surely to goodness it is only reasonable to suggest that there will be equal opportunity for the citizens of Brandon, Cornwallis and any other interested party to come to the capital city on this bill. But they cannot be heard, Mr. Speaker, unless and until Bill 107 is given second reading. So I suggest to my honourable friends opposite they part company with the Honourable Member for Charleswood on the six months' hoist and allow the people from Brandon, Cornwallis and any other interested municipality to be heard. This is the true process of democracy.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister now entertain a question? In view of the fact that Bill 107 was introduced this morning at 1:30 and in view of the fact that the government

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . has refused to allow adjournment of motions on second reading, how would the people of Brandon and district know about a hearing to be held either tonight or tomorrow? — (Interjection) — I'm asking the Minister that just spoke the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie that this is not unusual at this stage of — (Interjections) — Do you want to hear me or don't you? — (Interjection) — Not as weak as your question. I think my answer will have far more strength than the question — (Interjection) — oh, you were most insulting, I admit; but I would suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that I give more credit and more creditability to the people of Brandon if they are interested in this than my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie will ascribe to them; and I suggest, I suggest to my honourable friend the answer will be an undertaking by the representatives of the constituency of Brandon and also Cornwallis, that they will inform their constituents as to when the bill will be before Municipal Committee. And in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that there is an onus and a responsibility on the representatives in this Assembly for the respective constituencies to request that before the subject matter is considered in Municipal Affairs that a certain period of delay ensue in order that representations be made.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister entertain a supplementary question? Does he not consider his answer an insult to the people of Brandon and district?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I — if I may, Mr. Speaker — I do not consider it an insult. I do consider the motion that is before this House of a six-month hoist, which will deprive the people of Brandon an opportunity, an insult to the people of Brandon and Cornwallis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The Honourable Minister of Labour, The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to indicate that there appears to be no way in which the Whips of either parties can agree as to the length of the division bells and once again I leave this matter in your hands to call the vote when it's reasonably proper to have it called.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I would ask you to give serious consideration and perhaps take the matter under advisement because the ruling that you make now will be used as a precedent in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Obviously if there is no rule, then surely what must follow is a common sense application of an understanding of parliamentary tradition. The rules of the House are founded on practical common sense application of procedures that have been found to be workable. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that reason would indicate that after the bells have rung for a reasonable period of time the vote should then be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Attorney-General say what length of time is reasonable? Precisely. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think I can attempt to — Mr. Speaker, I think that a reasonable length of time as we've had the ringing of the bell on the same bill now and if the members of the Opposition are interested surely they would be here. We're not calling for a vote on different bills, it's always on the same bill and this is the third time, and it's obvious to everybody I think, Mr. Speaker, that they're trying to delay, this is a delay tactic and I don't think that this should be allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to consult with the Whip of the Opposition. I would be prepared, the members of the government are

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . . ready for the vote, I'm awaiting your decision; we are ready to call a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood,

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, it's not that we want to delay the proceedings of the House or the Legislature . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would he speak to a point of order?

MR. MOUG: I was speaking for this side of the House. I'd like to speak on a point of order, Sir. It's not that our party wants to delay the proceedings of the House, or delay the passing of this bill, but Sir, we have something that's very important to look into, as well as we are short one or two members that have gone down town to pick up some coffee and sandwiches . . .

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. We are governed by our rules, but where our rules do not cover the matter we go according to the Ottawa rules or the House of Commons and there I understand they now ring I think for 40 minutes; it used to be for several hours that they could ring the bells, and certainly I don't think that the few minutes that the bells have been going warrant to call the question at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour,

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest in all deference to my honourable friend from Rhineland that a precedence was established this evening, when you, Sir, ordered the bells to cease and a vote to be taken; so therefore until a substantive motion is presented to this House upsetting or changing that decision of yours, the precedence has now been established in accordance with the voting in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: There was no precedent established. I only adjourned the House for five minutes for a conference. — (Interjection) — Wrong. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to indicate to the two members of the Opposition, I'll give them sixty seconds to call in their members then I will close off the bell. State your point of order. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I feel that it's unfair for you, Sir, at this time to ask us to bring our members in in a 60-second period of time when you know that I have declared that one or two of our members are out of the building.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has no point of order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The Honourable the Minister of Labour called for a substantive motion. A substantive motion cannot be brought in without proper notice; so certainly this cannot be done at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is a normal procedural motion which is to hoist a bill. It requires no notice according to our rules. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to make in speaking to a point of order is that if in the judgment of the Chair — (Interjection) — I was rising on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Right, Mr. Speaker. I assume that you were entertaining the other members on points of orders and I rise in the same way. My point, Sir, is that if in the judgment of the Chair it is the correct procedure to have the vote taken then the only thing that need be done insofar as the Chair is concerned is to ensure a reasonable amount of time for members to be advised — and I don't know, Sir, what that would be in terms of minutes, but in a matter of a few minutes and they should be here.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. We have heard from the spokesman of the Conservative Party that they have gone, they have left the House to get some coffee and sandwiches, and our rules are quite clear — Rule No. 11 on Page 8 — "That every member shall attend the service of the House and of each committee thereof of which he is a member unless leave of absence has been given him by the House," and I don't recall that anybody asked for leave of absence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell has something to offer on a point of order?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it not clear in our rules that there shall be no debate in the House once a division has been called?

MR. SPEAKER: Sergeant-at-Arms, shut the bell off. The motion before the House is to adjourn, and I don't even have the member that moved the motion, so I really don't know whether it's proper any more. — (Interjection) — The seconder is missing. Right.

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Froese, Graham, Johnston (P. la P.), Moug, Patrick and Weir.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafranksy, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 7; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House now is the amendment to give second reading to Bill 107 -- (Interjection) -- that's right; the amendment is the six-month hoist. Are you ready for the question? Order. I'm in the midst of taking a vote, a division. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Speaking to the motion before us dealing with the six-month hoist, I would be in support of the motion because I don't believe the bill as it is before us is one that I could support. I made my objections earlier on some points but on this matter of an award that is to come about, from the Municipal Board under the Municipal Act, I certainly would like to know more just what the situation is here. It seems too much - it smacks like a deal of some kind has been made. Certainly this is completely different from any other towns or cities in the province where we have farm lands within the boundaries of a town or a city and I feel this is improper. I feel it's unfair.

On the other hand we find that there is going to be an award made and we know that the Municipality of Cornwallis apparently has large reserves and that these reserves are now to go by piece and piecemeal to the support of the City of Brandon because there's going to be a reduction in taxes within the City of Brandon and the amount of these reductions is to be made up from monies received from Cornwallis Municipality. Evidently this is going to be taken from the reserves and through the award that is supposed to be forthcoming and I certainly do not subscribe and I cannot support this particular way of doing and bringing about a bill before this House. I most strongly object to the measure before us contained in this bill and therefore I will support the motion to hoist the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

. . . Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise at 10 minutes to 12 to talk on this motion and I rise under a set of circumstances which I think are unfortunate. Mr. Speaker, we are in the second or third week of the speed-up; it's known that during speed-up period when we attempt to try and carry out our responsibilities, we sometimes stretch ourselves to the limit of endurance and to the limit of our patience and as a result we find that some of the wisdom that we had in the earlier part of the session during which we attempted to try and deal in a rational and proper manner with the affairs of the House and the matters before us, are sometimes forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can say with some degree of sincerity that we on this side have attempted to deal with the matters presented by the government in as reasonable and objective way as we can.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SPIVAK: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't expect the members opposite to agree with my conclusions now, as I believe they do not agree with many of the other conclusions that we've arrived at. But we have a function as Opposition to oppose the government and through a measure of debate in the House present to the people of this province an opportunity to examine critically the manner in which the government stewardship and conduct of the public purse . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I am prepared to give him some amplitude in his introductory remarks but the bill before us still is Bill 107. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm intending to discuss, and I will be discussing the bill before us. My purpose is to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it is now, I believe, less than 14 hours since the bill was first -- (Interjection) -- that it was introduced for second reading by the Minister. And I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce can just hold his remarks. I will be very happy to listen to his remarks, whether it's 1:00 o'clock, 2:00 o'clock, 3:00 o'clock, 4:00 o'clock this morning, but, Mr. Speaker, I must tell the Minister in case he doesn't know anything about the Legislative procedures, that what information is passed in the newspaper isn't information passed in this House. The truth of the matter is the Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced this bill for second reading at some time this morning between 9:30 and 10:00, if I am correct; and as I suggested, Mr. Speaker - my arithmetic may be a little hazy at this point - it's approximately 14 hours since it was first introduced.

Now this bill is an interesting bill, Mr. Speaker, it's a bill that in many respects is similar to the City of Winnipeg uni-city bill. It does not contain the similar provisions but it affects 40,000 people instead of 500,000 people and it warrants consideration which is as serious, as involved and as time-consuming as the uni-city bill. It does not warrant, Mr. Speaker, one-tenth or less than one-tenth of the consideration that's been given to the uni-city bill. And there was an attempt on our part to fulfill the function that I indicated was the function of the Opposition, albeit that there may be some who may disagree with that function, which is to try and mobilize public opinion and awareness of the issues that are placed before us by way of legislation or in the estimates of the various departments. Our purpose, Mr. Speaker, is to convey, through the media and through this Legislature, to the people of Manitoba the basic criticisms that are to be levelled at government legislation that has been introduced. This is the check and balance of government legislation. This is the role of the Opposition to be able to constructively criticize and offer alternatives and at the same time alert the public to the realities of legislation that's been introduced, much of which is introduced in language that is not well understood because of its legal phraseology by the vast majority of people. That's our function, and we believe we've carried on that function reasonably well. And we believe as well, Mr. Speaker, that we've attempted to try and carry on our responsibilities in a way that we can be rather proud of, and we are proud of our achievements so far.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, and having indicated that now let me talk about our bill that is before us now. Mr. Speaker, we've indicated as well that this bill is a bill that deals with amalgamation involving 40,000 people. If we examine what took place in the uni-city bill, we find that the government first produced a White Paper. They then had hearings throughout the community. The purpose of the hearings was to in fact listen to the people. We have argued and we have attempted to try and convey to the government that in our opinion those hearings did not really give the people the opportunity to get the information that was

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . desired by many of them in the questions that was asked of the Minister and the other Ministers who were present and the officials who the government assembled to be present at the meetings. But nevertheless, there was an attempt. Mr. Speaker, to at least have meetings with the different areas and to be able to find some response from the questions that were asked to be able to get a better bill. And there's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, some of the very same questions that were asked in those meetings and which were not resolved have been asked in the committee, still remain unanswered as far as government policy and we will not know that until we are in a position to deal with the final amendments to be furnished by the government on the uni-city bill. But nevertheless, the discussion that took place was preparatory to the final legislation that was introduced, and it's obvious from that legislation that was introduced that there must have been some influence on some of the sections because some of the sections are in fact opposite to what was first suggested both in the White Paper and by the Minister. And that's the way it should be, Mr. Speaker, because as a result of the discussion and debate, the government amended its position, recognizing that it had listened to people and as a result of that, determined that there were certain other matters that could be considered or amended.

And then, Mr. Speaker, let's understand what happened next. The Minister in order to facilitate the House did something which was probably not unique in this Legislature but certainly something that he has to be given great credit for. He presented us with a draft bill. It was not the printed bill, it was not the final bill, but it was handed us to give us an opportunity to examine some 687 sections in some 400 pages that we had to deal with. Mr. Speaker, we took that bill and we had it for one month. We had the opportunity to consider it for one month and then it was finally presented in its printed form and we have had the opportunity for public hearings and we will be dealing with the clause by clause in the next day or two. The whole procedure, Mr. Speaker, has taken -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: If the honourable member was so satisfied in the way this was done could he tell us, could he explain why the same motion was moved by the Party on that bill, Bill 36?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to tell the Member for St. Boniface. We did not move it because we thought the procedures were wrong; we indicated our belief that it would be impossible for the kind of scrutiny to be given to the various clauses by the administrators to be taken at committee. We indicated as well, it was our belief that it could not be handled in the short period of time from the time of passing the bill to the actual taking over of authority by the council. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that position was supported by others who appeared before the committee. So, Mr. Speaker, we did not object to the procedures. And, Mr. Speaker, whether we did or did not, what is really germane to the debate today, this evening, the following day, is the fact of whether the procedures applied for Winnipeg should not have been applied for the City of Brandon; whether in fact the principles in which the government operated in trying to present a bill which would meet the approval of people, should not apply or follow with respect to the bill dealing with Brandon. Why Brandon who only have 40,000 people should not receive the same kind of attention from this Legislature, should not have the same kind of debate, should not have the same kind of rationale as far as procedures are concerned as the bill for the uni-city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, this is very important and is basic to the way in which this bill has been presented and the reasons for the hoist that have been expressed. We are aware of the fact and the government is aware of it, that we are in the last stages of the session. We are aware, as well, that there have been some 15 bills presented to us from the time that the speed-up motion was introduced and we were under the impression, and possibly our information was incorrect, that there would not be this quantity of bills. We did not anticipate some of them - and I'm not going to deal with them now because we'll have opportunity to deal with them. We believed as well, without knowing about the Brandon bill and without seeing it printed, that the likelihood was that the Brandon bill would be a bill that would take a precedential step that would be similar to that of Winnipeg. Because if there was one rationale to be found in the uni-city bill, if there was one plea on the part of the Minister of Urban Affairs - and I attended that first meeting when he presented his position to the people of Greater Winnipeg, the first meeting, the first community meeting - the one rationale was the attempt on the part of the government to get close to the people, to be able to explain something to them so that they would be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . able to understand it and so that they would be in a position as a result of their understanding it to be able to work within the framework of the legislation that was being proposed so that it would work better. If there was one attempt on the part of the government, it was to make the municipal government important and close to the people. Mr. Speaker, in the speeches that have been presented and certainly in my address with respect to the uni-city bill, I pointed out that that was an essential ingredient, because no attempt at changing or restructuring of government will be successful unless in fact it is related to the interests of the people and unless it's understood, considered by the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, let's look what has happened here. -- (Interjection) -- Who's a farce? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I again indicated that in my opinion, and I say this again, that the Minister did not answer the questions that were asked of him. This is true of the meeting that I attended and from the news reports it was true in the meetings that many of the other ministers attended; so that in terms of giving meaningful information to the people, I suggested that that was a farce in that respect. I believe that those meetings did not accomplish the objective. But, Mr. Speaker, when I talk and debate this bill, I'm talking about the objectives and the aims of the government; the express aims of government were to accomplish it through those meetings. Well, if that was the express aims of government, why are they not proceeding with this in this bill? -- (Interjection) -- Well if they were a farce in the first place and the government is prepared to stand up - or the Minister of Transportation is prepared to stand up and now admit that they were a farce and for that reason they're not going to proceed with it in Brandon, then Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to accept the Minister of Transportation's judgment. And I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's not very much that I would accept that the Minister of Transportation says in any case.

Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Flinstone from Thompson will allow me to continue. Mr. Speaker, the government has taken the position that we have to pass the bill tonight. The government has taken the position that it's essential and necessary that the bill be passed within a 24-hour period and they have used the devices that they have available to them to be able to accomplish this. We understand that there are going to be hearings that are going to be held, and the hearings themselves may be held within a few days, but nevertheless, the procedure that's being followed here by comparison to the procedures that were followed in the City of Winnipeg are farcical. And if anyone wants to talk about a farce, it's the performance of the government in this particular situation; because, in effect, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, the implications of any bill, of any piece of legislation will not necessarily be understood by the mass of people, it only comes as a result of public debate, public concern and by information that's disseminated both by Government and by Opposition; and that's our effective role. Government has a responsibility as much as Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the way in which we do this is through the normal debate in the House and as the Honourable Member from Morris has said on more than one occasion, and in answer to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who continually says, this is where the action is; this is where the decisions are made. We have debate and this is where it comes and this is where the information is transmitted. It comes about as a result of a course of events which allows both the Opposition and Government to be responsive to the questions and comments and influences of people small and large, people who from all walks of life who influence the individual members and acquaint them with their position and point of view on a particular situation. This is why, Mr. Speaker, we have carried on tradition that is well-known by everyone in this House of the opportunities of having debates adjourned, postponed so that the information can be disseminated and so that there can be that kind of response. Not just a response in the final hearings before a municipal committee or before a law amendment committee or before an agricultural committee, dealing with a bill that has already passed second reading and is on its way at rapid speed towards third reading; but rather the opportunity for the kind of debate or political awareness on the part of people so that in fact attitudes and expressions can be indicated so that public positions can be in fact taken. This, Mr. Speaker, is the way in which we've operated here and this is the way in which we've operated in the House of Commons.

We also have other practices, Mr. Speaker, which indicate that in certain situations because we're attempting to try and speed up, that in effect we will carry on procedures through the night rather than adjourn at the normal hour that is set by the rules, . . . and

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . our ability to jointly try to reach agreement and solve the problems that are before us. Mr. Speaker, this may be true in many cases, and we have agreed, and no one can suggest that we have held back the variety of bills that have been before us. We have caucused them, we've had an opportunity to have them examined by people who are experts in the field and we've had an opportunity to be in a position then to make an assessment; and we've made our contribution to those areas in which we feel the legislation has been incorrect, and our record will stand by itself and we have nothing to be ashamed of in that respect.

But, Mr. Speaker, because we're at the last, because it was the government's decision to bring this bill at the last, because it was a government decision to call this bill now, we are now, because they have had to rush it, we are forced into a position where we must accept it because they have the will and they have the device within this Legislature to force it, to absolutely force and stop debate on second reading in this bill and force it. Mr. Speaker, this is why we have had to hoist it for six months; not because we believe that the bill should be hoisted for six months, we do not believe that. What we do believe is that it's essential that there be the kind of debate that will give us the opportunity to be able to present the position.

Mr. Speaker, I did not believe that the government would be so utterly foolish and ridiculous and arrogant and dictatorial in the way they handled themselves tonight. Mr. Speaker, those are the words that describe -- these are the words that describe people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . people who have either become so imbued with power that they do not understand their legislative function or they are so obsessed that they are the only ones who know what is good for Manitoba and nobody else that they can't be challenged; but nevertheless the mark of arrogance which is displayed by the presentation tonight is utterly shameful and contemptible; and Mr. Speaker, I could cite individuals who have to be marked with that characteristic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have attempted to be tolerant in recognizing that a reasonable time had to be provided for the opportunity for presentations to be made, and we have recognized as well that there should have been a legitimate time allowed for the kind of debate so that public opinion could be mobilized properly to understand it. It doesn't follow, Mr. Speaker, that our particular position in any given issue, whether it be the Member for Brandon West or the Leader of the Opposition, or the Member for Swan River, necessarily will be accepted by the public; that's not the issue. But the issue is presenting positions and having that information transmitted through the media, there is a public awareness of a document that I suggest the vast majority of people will not understand, and whose implication they will not understand unless its mobilized this way. Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of debate, that is the purpose of having adjournment, that is the purpose of going through the procedures as difficult and as cumbersome and possibly as ridiculous as they may seem to many people who are outsiders who will view this situation and say that the fact that the Speaker is in the Chair or that the Mace is there, or the fact that we bow and every other procedure that we have is utterly ridiculous and foolish. It's a tradition and heritage that we've had, and, Mr. Speaker, we have bent that in order to try and facilitate certain situations, in order to try and be reasonable in the way we have been able to carry out our responsibilities. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no justification - and I want to repeat that - absolutely no justification for us to be in a position to have to bend it in the way that the government has demanded.

Mr. Speaker, the bill itself has shortcomings, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member from Brandon West who I am sure will have an opportunity yet to speak, if the government is going to keep insisting that we go all night, then we're going to go all night.

The Member from Brandon West has already dissected this bill and presented his criticisms of it and those criticisms have not been answered. And there are corrections, and the members opposite, some of them know that this is the case. Mr. Speaker, it's not uncommon when the bills are eventually presented in the various committees, for the government to come in with a rash of amendments because they themselves are recognizing as a result of the debates that have occurred in the House, as a result of public presentations to them, not in committee but in advance of committee, and it's not uncommon for members on the opposite side to come in with amendments, and it's very common, Mr. Speaker, for those amendments



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . .to in fact be introduced. In fact, Mr. Speaker, many of the amendments will be similar if the public pressure has been correct. Now I know the Honourable Minister of Finance is not here and I know there are some amendments that are being proposed by him and I've had an opportunity of examining and I know our amendments, and making some comparison. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that in one particular amendment that the government has introduced, it's the same amendment that we've introduced, and that's not an uncommon feature, Mr. Speaker, and it comes as a result, not just of the presentations that have been made at a committee, but they come as a result of the pressure, the discussion and debate that occurs in the media, in the press, in the letters to the editors, and the letters the individual members receive. And we're being basically being denied this at this time and we're basically being denied the opportunity of carrying out our function.

Mr. Speaker, is this bill what the people of Brandon really want? -- (Interjection) -- Ask them. Has the Minister of Transportation asked them? No. How do you know this is what the people of Brandon want? -- (Interjection) -- I don't know. Ah, now we have - very important, because, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this is what the people of Brandon want. -- (Interjection) -- We'll find out. When do you expect us to find out? You think that when we go to committee we're going to be in a position to find out. Let me ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture how many people are going to appear before the committee? Five people, ten people, fifteen people?

Mr. Speaker, in the uni-city debate, in the uni-city debate, we had a White Paper, hearings for a period of six months. We had one by-election in the city in which the issue was debated. We had public discussion. If I was to bring the newspaper clippings on the uni-city bill I think I could stack them this high in relation to the 500,000 people that are affected. Now that was over a period of time. What are we going to have in this? We're going to have a debate that the government would like to close less than 24 hours after it's introduced it. We're going to have a meeting that may be held within a couple of days and we're going to say, "Yes, we know that's what the people want."

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of alternatives, and this has been recommended to the government already. One is, because of the situation, to hold the hearings in Brandon; that's been recommended already by some I believe in this House, for a very good reason. To hold them in Brandon so that the people of Brandon can be heard, so that we'll know what the people of Brandon really want. Mr. Speaker, the argument against this is that we will be breaking precedent. Now I have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have legal authority to have a committee do that. The question of breaking precedent really at this point, to me, becomes irrelevant. I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. We have already broken precedent with the reports of the Standing Committees because we have not received yet the report of Public Utilities, yet this goes against the very tradition and past practices of this House. But nevertheless, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, our House Leader says, "well it's within the legal rules, we can do whatever we want, we're not going to follow past practices and tradition, but we're going to bring it in whenever we decide to bring it in" - - because he has the legal framework within which to do it. That's a breach of tradition, that's a breach of practice. But the suggestion is made that the committee hearing be held in Brandon. The argument advanced, by the way is, My God, we're going to break tradition, we're going to break, you know, procedures. What does it mean for the future?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government can't have it both ways nor can they talk out of their mouth from both sides. Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for that kind of rationale after the way in which they themselves have applied the rules and tradition and past practices to suit them. The government are traditionalists when it suits them and they're not traditionalists when it doesn't suit them.

Let's go and examine our situation and let's see how unreasonable the suggestion would be, if in fact we adopted a position in saying that because we are in speed-up and because it's necessary to try and make up for what has happened in the past, because of the fact that the bill has been introduced so late, because it's being attempted to be pushed through in less than 24 hours, what would be wrong in suggesting on that basis that the committee have its hearings in Brandon at a stipulated time so the people of Brandon can be heard. Mr. Speaker, is there anything unreasonable about that procedure? It can be argued it's unreasonable because it won't accomplish the objective, but I suggest, and particularly the Minister of Transportation, that in likelihood the people of Brandon would be better heard in Brandon than they would be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . heard in Winnipeg.

The other suggestion would be that we are setting a precedent that would be very bad for those situations in which we may have amalgamation in Thompson or in Portage la Prairie or in Dauphin or in Swan River, or what have you. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we would be setting a bad precedent. I would think we are going to be setting a good precedent, and I'm going to tell you why we're setting a good precedent. We're setting a good precedent because, Mr. Speaker, we should be at the areas where the people who are involved have an opportunity to be heard because these are the people who we should be listening to and these are the people who should have the opportunity for consideration and for the opportunity to be able to understand what is happening to them.

Now one of the members of the government has indicated that some municipal officials have had some knowledge of this document. That's not unusual, we know, and I'm not in any way chastising the government for that. It's a common thing that at least some proposals are discussed in advance because elected officials have to be in a position to have some idea to make their contribution. But elected officials are not the people and they have authority to represent the people only so far and the people have to have the opportunity and should be heard, they should be heard; and they should be given the opportunity to be heard. And, Mr. Speaker, the denial of that opportunity is wrong. Now the government can stand up and say, we're not denying the opportunity to be heard because after all we're going to have committee hearings and we're going to call them within two days or three days and the people can come forward. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the people will have to come 140 miles to deal with a bill that affects the structure under which they're going to live as far as municipal government is concerned; ostensibly this is being done in the interests of the people because the people are going to have something better than what they've had; but at the same time, we're not going to explain it to them. We're not really going to spend time with them. We're not going to send the brochures out; we're not going to have the public meetings that were held; we're not going to show the slides that we have; we're not going to send the paraphernalia out that we did in unicity. No, none of this. None of this. We'll do it afterwards and we'll tell them how great everything was, how great we accomplished it, but we're not really going to listen to them. Because I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is the people may say that they don't want it and that the objections that are being raised may be meant stronger than the government realizes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time it's happened. The government was ready to call an election on the auto insurance last year and the Premier so announced until he realized that maybe the people didn't want it; until he realized that it wasn't as strongly felt as he thought it was. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a lesson, because it doesn't follow necessarily that the government on the opposite side really are in the best position to judge what the people want, are really in the best position to make a judgment of what the people really want to live under. Now again -- (Interjection) -- You're elected for. If that's what you're elected for, and I say that to the First Minister, you take that responsibility, why did you have the hearings in the City of Winnipeg? Why do we go through this whole procedure? Why did we do that? Because if you're elected for it, you could have brought the bill, we could have the public hearings afterwards. You decided to do this because (a) you wanted to test it, you wanted to test it, you wanted to understand what the people felt; you wanted to insure that the people would understand it fully; you wanted to be sure that the people would be able to relate to it; you wanted to get it closer to the people. That's why you did it.

And what are we doing in Brandon? Well in Brandon we're going to try and force a bill that has to be passed in 24 hours because the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources didn't have his breakfast this morning. And then in turn, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have a hearing in two days or three days, we'll have the hearings, it'll be over with, the bill will be passed. Now, Mr. Speaker, why one way for Brandon and why another way for the City of Winnipeg? -- (Interjection) - It's a poor comparison? Well I wonder if the Minister of Transportation is prepared to go on Brandon Television and tell the Brandon Newspaper that it's a poor comparison, and the 40,000 people don't rate the same kind of procedures that were applied in the City of Winnipeg. -- (Interjection) - I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, their elected officials are 100 percent behind it. In the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I know the hour is getting late or maybe it's a little early, whichever way you want to look at it. I did read out Rule 40. I've got a lot of time.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . That's one of the things I do have. As I indicated, I did read out Rule 40 which indicated that no member is to interject when a member is debating a question. I should also like to indicate that if a member invites interjections then he is calling upon his own head the problems and the sins that create the errors of our procedures in this House.

I have asked all honourable members to conduct themselves in a gentlemanly way, to address their remarks to the Chair, not to use words that will create heat, and I think that if we utilize our common sense we can probably get over this little obstacle we've got.

I should like to indicate one other thing because the situation that has been created has put the Speaker on sort of a precedent setting course. I want to indicate that it isn't a precedent, and I want to indicate it for this reason - when a division is called and members leave their seat, the Chairman or the Speaker must assume that they are not interested in taking a division; and after a certain reasonable time he must, if there are no Whips available, make a decision of his own. So I want to indicate that this is not a precedent that has been created tonight.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition,

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the comment has been made the elected officials want this. Well in the bill itself we talk about a Brandon planning area and there are a number of municipalities, Cornwallis, Daley, Elton, Glenwood, Oakland, Whitehead, Town of Rivers involved, Town of Souris, the Village of Wawanesa. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation has suggested that this is what the elected officials want. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation is as ignorant about this matter as he is about his own department and it would be just as well, Mr. Speaker, that he not discuss this matter.

Mr. Speaker, there is a division of opinion and there is division of opinion, Mr. Speaker, among a group who may very well be a minority and this becomes very important, Mr. Speaker, because it has to deal with the problems of government. Government has an obligation to lead; government has an obligation to proceed in the best interest of the majority; at the same time the problem a government always has is to ensure that minority rights are protected, that in effect minority rights are protected as best they can be. Whatever the minority may be, in whatever situation it may be. And that those people who have an opposite opinion have the opportunity for full expression and to be able to use the vehicles that are available to them to express their dissent and to try and influence the decisions that ultimately will affect them. No one is quarreling with this and we know that there is a dissent. We know there are people and they may be a minority who do not feel as strongly as others about this kind of bill; and we know as well that some of these people will obviously appear at the hearings. And the people that will be appearing will be some of the elected officials. What the people will feel or say we don't really know. Do we really know what the people are going to say? Are they really going to come 140 miles to Winnipeg? Not likely! And yet many of them are going to be living under a different municipal structure and different controls which they will really be unaware of.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced as well, that if we were to talk about the Unicity Bill and we had enough of a presentation by Mr. Axworthy supported by the J.C.'s poll that was produced even though it was against Unicity Bill in the majority, that the kind of interest that exists among people with respect to municipal structure is very remote and is not very strong, that in effect government is really remote from the people, that in effect the awareness of what really is happening does not exist. And, Mr. Speaker, as one who campaigned in a by-election and has some knowledge of what people were talking about with respect to municipal matters, I can suggest to you that municipal matters in the unicity were not a factor at all in the by-election that was held in St. Vital, not at all. Because in effect the people themselves really didn't understand what was going to happen, they're confused by what's happened and they're far removed.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is really what is going to happen in this bill and it's going to happen in a disastrous way for a government that is supposedly committed of trying to accomplish something better than it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I've made this contribution because it is our belief and our feeling that hearings should be held in Brandon, not in Winnipeg - in Brandon and not in Winnipeg. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, we feel that there should be sufficient time to debate this so that there will be a public awareness of the bill itself. We feel, as well, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. SPTVAK cont'd.) . . . . that we would be interested in hearing the contributions of the members opposite; all we've had is the contribution of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Industry and Commerce and they have not satisfactorily answered the questions and comments made by the Member for Brandon West.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we feel that we should be allowed to proceed on this bill in a normal conventional way, recognizing that we are in a speed-up situation, recognizing that this inhibits our ability to be able to carry out the procedures that would normally be followed if we were not in the speed-up situation. We recognize this, and we believe that we have a duty to cooperate with respect to this so as to facilitate the working of the House; and as I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, I think if one looks at the record, we have followed that.

We believe that this matter should be debated in this House for more than this evening, that it's worthy of discussion and debate and the ability to marshal public opinion, which may very well support the bill; which may not support the bill. Although we recognize and know that there are some who dissent from the bill and we know that their rights have to be protected to be able to express their opportunity to dissent. And we know that the government will say - Well, we are going to allow committee to be heard; we are going to provide sufficient notice; we are going to do all of these things; we can anticipate all of those things. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have to deal with this bill at undue haste, dealing with 40,000 people, one-tenth of the number who live in the unicity who have been exposed to a situation for the last six months, puts on us a greater onus to ensure that reasonable debate occurs in this House, that there be an opportunity for the fullest kind of expression, and that further what is accomplished is something that the government's objective is, which is to bring a structure that will be closely related and in the interest of what the people really want, in which they have had a say, in which they can feel a part. Because no municipal restructuring will occur with any benefit to the people if the people who are going to be involved are not a part of it. That was fundamentally the philosophy that motivated the government with respect to unicity bill meetings. The objective of those meetings I do not think were met and we've said this before. The objectives of the bill and the way it's been presented I do not think are met, but I think that the attempt by the government to have that was a desirable thing, and I think what they attempted to do was the right way because I do not believe that unless this happens, that you are going to be able to provide a government structure that will be close to the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the case of Brandon, Brandon is not only not second best; Brandon doesn't even count on the basis of what the government has done; Brandon does not count for the kind of scrutiny, the kind of debate, the kind of discussions that will bring it close to the people or have them involved. What Brandon counts for is to be brought in at the end and pushed through.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the Minister of Labour is not present because he was present, and I've used this example before, when we attended the Air Canada meetings in Ottawa when the government basically announced its position. We met with the Prime Minister on that occasion. We rented a room called the Railroad Room in the House of Commons and I remember the Minister of Labour's remarks when the Prime Minister walked in, and he said, "My God, we're in the Railroad Room and they're going to railroad this right through." And Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the Minister of Labour is not here because this is in effect what's happening. What we have here is an attempt to railroad this through, and the question has to be asked of the government "Why?" Why? Why is it necessary to go through this kind of agonizing procedure rather than give the opportunity to the people so they could both hear the debate in the House over a reasonable period of time and the opportunity of presentations by them with proper notice?

Mr. Speaker, I again point out that, in our opinion, the only way in which you can make up for the fact that this has been brought in as late as it has, would be to have the committee hearings at Brandon, because it would relate it to them better than by having them in Winnipeg and it would give the opportunity for the kind of scrutiny and hearings that should be held.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, some of the points made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition merit some reply at this time, and that's what I intend to do. May I begin by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I suppose it's to be expected that in the closing stages of a session, this session, the last session, sessions before it for many years back, there has been a certain mood of ill-feeling well up to the surface at some time or another, causing members of the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . Opposition to regard the government as using its majority in a blustering and bullying way - I suppose that's understandable - and members on this side, I must remind my honourable friends for their information, get the very distinct impression that members on the other side are using every opportunity to be intransigent and to slow down and delay the passage of legislation. The only guarantee we have under our system is that the Speaker, using the rules and his judgment as to what is fair, will prevent either from happening.

But addressing myself to the bill before us, Bill 107, I would like to take the points made by the Leader of the Opposition pretty well in series as I recall them. First of all, he makes a very strange comparison between Bill 36 and Bill 107, the Unicity Bill and the City of Brandon Bill. He said that there should have been the same procedure and he implied, I suppose, that much the same kind of time should have been taken for both bills to have been considered in equal way. I show honourable members that Bill 36 contains 327 pages, having to do with a monumental restructuring of city government in every particular and in every specific, involving a multiplicity of full-blown city government, and Bill 107, instead of 327 pages, is seven pages, and of the seven pages one full page is corrections, two pages constitute legal description of boundaries, so that there are six pages of text, of statute law.

Now that is one point that surely even my honourable friend cannot escape or ignore.

Now, is the Bill complicated? Is it lengthy? It's obviously not lengthy. Is it complicated? I believe that the Member for Brandon West as much as said, if he didn't say directly, that the bill is clear enough in what it purports to do. The Honourable Member for Brandon West had one point which I believe had validity, and that was that we had to ensure - and when I say "we" I mean this Legislature, I mean both sides of this House which constitute this Legislature - had to ensure that there would be ample opportunity for presentation of briefs and views on the bill and that there should be ample notice of such committee hearing on the bill. Having said that and having impressed that on us, not as though we needed any persuasion on the point, I think that any other argument the Opposition has pretty well falls to the floor.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition would have us believe that it is unprecedented to deny an adjournment on a bill in the speed-up portion of a session within the same 24-hour period. I would refer him to Page 2349 of Hansard of May 23, 1968. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in 1968 my honourable friend had something to do with the administration of government and the affairs of this Legislature, and that, interestingly enough, also involved legislation having to do with boundary revision of two of the suburban cities of present day Greater Winnipeg, and I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that other precedent could be found for that as well. But it's not that precedent itself is the superseding consideration here. We have indicated to honourable friends opposite that we will take all reasonable steps to ensure that there is opportunity for adequate notice of the committee hearing and that the committee hearing itself will last, obviously will last just as long as there are briefs and presentations to be made on it. If honourable friends are really interested in what they say they are interested in, which is to enable those who are really really interested in Bill 107 to make their presentation, the best way they can expedite that is to allow the bill to pass.

Now, I readily admit, Mr. Speaker, I readily admit that one can look at this very much from two different vantage points: from the Opposition vantage point and from the Government vantage point; and maybe it really could be said by a third person looking on from the outside that neither side has that much more logic to their position or their stubbornness - maybe that's the word - than the other. But the point is that we have, I really believe in this connection with Bill 107, we have made more of an undertaking to try and get cooperation on this bill, procedure relative to this bill, than my honourable friends opposite. We have said that the committee hearing, just to make sure that there is adequate notice so that it cannot be said that there isn't adequate notice, that instead of three days let there be four days elapse between now and when the committee meets.

Now the Leader of the Opposition says that there wasn't any opportunity for consideration of the subject matter of this bill. Does the member realize that a Royal Commission was established by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and that the Commissioner did hold extensive, according to my information, very extensive hearings in the City, in and near, in and around the City of Brandon, at which time many many different groups, individuals and municipal councils made representation to him. I've heard no one question the competence or the impartiality or the objectivity of Mr. Dulmage, so one assumes that this recommendations at least

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . have that merit behind them, that they come forward from one who is sort of universally accepted as having impartiality and objectivity.

The subject matter of his recommendations are for the most part incorporated into the bill and, conversely, for the most part the subject matter of Bill 107 derives directly from his report. The report was made public in April and tabled in this Legislative Assembly in April, some three months ago approximately. In addition to that, subsequent to the tabling of the report, representatives of the municipal councils in and around Brandon have met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs - isn't that right? - on more than one occasion, so that representations have been coming forward in that way as well.

Now I understand my honourable friends opposite have said, individually and severally, that Bill 107 can pass; they are not opposed to Bill 107 going to committee. Let it go to committee and that is precisely where we can determine what the view and what the position is of the residents of the area and their elected municipal representatives. It seems to me that of all the ways that we can go about this, that among the best instruments or methods determining the local views is through the instrumentality of the Standing Committee. Now, is it unreasonable to expect those people to come to appear before Law Amendments or Municipal Affairs Committee? My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe that all of a sudden in this year 1971, the last week of July, it has become unreasonable and unfair and somehow demeaning of Brandon that their representatives should come before the Law Amendments or Municipal Affairs Committee here in the Legislative Buildings of Manitoba, which are just as much their buildings as anyone else's, and, Mr. Speaker, it's not as though, it's not as though other very major legislation that has been passed in years gone by affecting people in other parts of the province, towns, other cities, other municipalities of Manitoba, it's not as though on any single occasion has any effort been made or even considered to take the bill to some other community outside of the Legislative Buildings of this province for representation on the bill itself.

Now, we recognize that there is a real, a real and important need, from time to time, to have committees of this House meet inter-sessionally in areas outside of the Greater Winnipeg area in other parts of the province, and I think that we are arranging to do so, Mr. Speaker, to an extent that my colleagues, my friends, when they were in the government, did not undertake. We are making provision for the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and I believe one other, to meet inter-sessionally with specific reference for them to meet outside of the Greater Winnipeg area from time to time as is required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could make this further point, that when the Leader of the Opposition suggests that somehow we are less concerned with Brandon than we are with the City of Winnipeg, I wonder in what sense he means that, because, you know, if we want to take this down to the level of a primary grade argument of primary grade school children, I could counter by simply saying that when they were the government the amount of legislation that they had forthcoming that related to Greater Winnipeg was greater than the amount of legislation that they had come forward that was relating to Brandon. Is that to be taken as an indication that therefore they were preoccupied with one community as opposed to the other out of proportion?

We have before us a bill which is seven pages in length; another bill that is 237 pages in length. Principles of both in certain limited respects are the same but the mass of detail, the mass of administrative structure and procedure that must be provided for in the one case so far exceeds what is involved here that any comparison that anyone would try to make between the two simply, I say, becomes laughable, and I say to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that having undertaken to make more than sure that there will be ample opportunity, ample notice of time between now and the calling of the bill before committee, I think it behooves honourable members opposite to be candid and admit that insofar as trying to get the necessary degree of harmony in this Chamber we have done our share, and that if they want to display an equal respect for Parliament and its traditions, that they will want to demonstrate some tangible little willingness to yield on their part with respect to this particular bill, and in the end there will be representations by the people before the committee and, in addition to that, in the end ultimately under our system of government we are accountable and, if what we are doing with respect to the wishes of the people of Brandon and surrounding municipalities is as far from the mark of what they really want as my honourable friends pretend, then

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . obviously they will deal with us at the next election - and what can be a better test than that?

I say to my honourable friends in conclusion, that if they try to push this argument that our concern for Brandon is somehow less than what they think there ought to be, I simply say to them that if they had manifested a solicitude and concern for Brandon when they were in government, maybe they would have brought forward legislation of this kind four or five years ago. I say to my friend the Member for Rhineland and his contribution, although in this respect uncharacteristically brief, nevertheless it was very much to the point, one valid point in his argument which was -- I'm sorry, I said a "valid" one -- a very concrete point that my honourable friend made; he said he was objecting to this bill because it was impinging on the tax levies and tax revenues of the R.M. of Cornwallis. I'd like my honourable friend to consider this fact, that for years the residents of the City of Brandon have had to incur certain costs in paying for infrastructure for people, some of which were working in industries located in the R.M. of Cornwallis; that in and around the City of Brandon in the peripheral area around the City of Brandon, that there are problems there with respect to municipal services. We have negotiated an agreement with Ottawa under the DREE Program so that moneys are available for infrastructure purposes to provide municipal sewerage and water in that peripheral area in the rural municipalities which have become urbanized and built up but which is still in the R.M., and it makes sense if you are going to put infrastructure money in for urban infrastructure that the area come under an urban municipal government.

Is it fair to allow a rural municipality to enjoy the benefits of industrial development but the load of infrastructure costs left being largely on the shoulders of those living in the next municipality, an urban municipality, but which is deriving none of the benefits of the industrial tax levy? I'd like my honourable friend from Rhineland to consider the obverse, in other words, of the point that he was making. So for all of these reasons, given the fact that this is, in relative terms, a short bill, given the fact that we have or will make provision for adequate notice before the committee meeting, there will be adequate opportunity for those really interested to be heard and that, I think, Mr. Speaker, was the principal concern of my friends opposite earlier today. It seems to have changed.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize anyone, I'd like to indicate we need about one minute for the technician to change the tape, so everyone can cool off for a minute.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to get into the debate but I do wish to make a small contribution and I understand that you had a trying time tonight, but I listened to most of the debates; I've stayed in the House; and I listened to the First Minister, and I hope precedents that he found in 1968 will not be the example used in Bill 36. I hope not. The reason I make this point, Mr. Speaker, is because when the Minister of Labour sat on this side and every time there was, at any time, there was a debate adjourned, a bill adjourned and not given, say, 48 hours when the rules were suspended, and the Minister at this time joined with the Official Opposition, which was the Liberal Party at that time, and called the government arrogant and so on, and protested bitterly, you know, for -- and I was going to say the bill which is introduced, you know, this morning but it's already another morning so it was introduced yesterday morning, and I don't think there was really sufficient time, and the argument isn't are we for the bill or against the bill, I think the argument is that proper hearing be given to the people of Brandon.

The first point I wish to make is we cannot support the six-month hoist because I don't think it's in the best interest of the people of Brandon or the people of Cornwallis or the surrounding towns. On the other hand, I'm not prepared too readily, either, to support the bill on second reading unless the Minister agrees to some points. But I wish to get back to what the First Minister had to say and the House Leader. I am somewhat concerned because to me it doesn't matter if the member is from Emerson, Logan or Rhineland here, I think every one of us are elected by people to represent people in this Assembly and I think all of us should have the same right as anybody else, and to my knowledge I understand there has been some deal made with the Official Opposition that the bill would be passed tonight, and I think if the House Leader requested this permission in this House I think everybody should be informed because we are elected by people . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

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

MR. GREEN: I would ask this be a point of privilege from both sides, that the members of the Opposition did not agree to pass this bill tonight and I never said they agreed to pass this bill tonight. No such arrangement.

MR. PATRICK: Well, I won't argue the point, Mr. Speaker, but this was intimated to me that there was an understanding.

The second point I wish to make, if criteria for - and the House Leader did institute closure twice tonight - if the criteria for instituting closure because we have to prorogue on Saturday, I think it's wrong, completely wrong. If we have to stay here till Wednesday, let's stay here and do justice to a bill like this one. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that doesn't matter to me but the Minister of Labour should know real well when he sat on this side there wasn't a time that the government of the day which used to do the same things as the present government is doing and I don't know why the governments get in that position and do the same mistakes and do the same thing, because really, I think if the House Leader would have allowed the debate to close we would have probably finished it in half an hour tomorrow morning. I'm certain this would have happened. -- (Interjection) - Well, I don't necessarily agree with that, Mr. Speaker, because really, this bill, I think, is a very important bill because you do either one of two things: you either support the City of Brandon or you're against the City of Brandon and support Cornwallis and six municipalities and half a dozen towns or so.

When we don't know the problems, we don't know the reasons, we haven't got the time or didn't have the time to study, I don't think that we can make proper assessment what is in the interest and what is the proper thing to do. Should we vote for the bill or against the bill? So what I would like to see and I wish to recommend to the Minister - and I think it would be in the interests of this government and in the interests of the people of Brandon and Cornwallis and I'll say why: in my opinion, I think it is as important as the unicity bill. I think it is important, it's extremely important to the people of Cornwallis and the surrounding municipalities. Why not go to Brandon and hold a hearing there? Why not? Because you know real well if we had hearings here two days from now you will only be able to get two or three representatives either from the municipality of Cornwallis and maybe somebody from council from Brandon and that's all you'll get, but I think there's more than that. I think there's business involved; industry's involved; there's many personal people involved holding property and it will affect many areas. I know that your industry will have to pay a much higher tax if there is an amalgamation or annexation of Cornwallis. Was there an agreement made when the industry located in that area for how long they'll be able to pay tax on the structure, the rural structure? I think this is in itself very important because if you don't do this I think that what hope have you got to bring any other industry in?

Section 4, subsection (3) I think is one of the most important points in this bill and I want to quote Section 4, subsection (3) because I think it's again confiscation of assets. We're legislating before even the award is made by the Municipal Board which is I think a real important point in this bill. This is the whole thing, the whole substance, so in my opinion I don't think there's anything wrong with the committee going to Brandon, be it one day; it could be a one day hearing. You'd leave in the morning at 7:00 o'clock, you'd be back here that night, and all the people will have the opportunity to appear there. Be it private citizens, be it people from any other municipality, people from all the other towns surrounding, I think they'll have an opportunity.

Now, this is not new. The House of Commons do it now quite often that the committees of the House go to the people now; they go out to the country points and hold their hearings there; so what's wrong? The point is if it would be an easy thing to make a decision I'd say it's not necessary, but I think to the people of Cornwallis, to the people of Brandon, I think it's a very very important issue. Look how contentious it is in this House. We've spent a whole evening here debating this issue and I think it is contentious and it must be just as contentious to the people of Cornwallis, surrounding municipalities, and Brandon as well. Knowing that this is the case, what's wrong with having a hearing in Brandon, giving them advance notice that the committee will meet there, what day it is, be it a Friday all day? And I think this could be accomplished. So if the Minister can give this commitment, I'll support the Bill - if you can hold a hearing, and I think it would be in the interests of the people. On the other hand, I don't think that the six-month hoist is doing what it should do. I don't think it's in the best interests of the people in the area respecting this bill, so if the Minister will not give any commitment, the only thing we'll have to do is oppose or vote against the bill on



(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . .second reading but we cannot support the hoist. So these are the points that I wanted to bring to the attention of the members and I hope that the Minister introducing the bill will give very serious consideration that the hearings be held in Brandon. I think it's most important.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with regard to the various comments that have been made so far in regard to the particular motion in respect to the six-month hoist. I think it is important that members of the Legislature review some of the sequence of events that have led to the introduction of this particular bill before the House at this time.

In December of 1970, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointed Dr. Andrew Dulmage under certain Terms of Reference to look into the entire question relating to the boundaries of the City of Brandon, the Municipalities of Elton and Cornwallis. Part of those Terms of Reference was that the Commissioner should examine the boundaries from the point of view of the health and economic well-being of the majority of the people residing in the region. Dr. Dulmage then commenced, with the assistance of the Planning Branch, the Assessment Branch and other departments of government as he needed to call upon for research and other important data over the following two to three months. Most important, by February, 1971, the Commission held a series of hearings. When honourable members speak of hearings and discussion with the people in the Brandon area, they should know that in regard to this particular Commission that there were probably more submissions, certainly more submissions considering the population and size of the area, more discussion already in the Brandon area on the subject matter of this bill than in fact there was on the Unicity Bill, and I think that honourable members should attempt to maintain a balance in their criticism and realize this. And I would just like to refer to some of the submissions that were made in Brandon in the form of actual written briefs in respect to the very subject matter that we are dealing with.

On February 19th the City of Brandon presented a brief. I would just like to take a few moments now to refer to some comments of the Honourable Member for Charleswood, who apparently had not caucused with his seat mate the Member from Brandon West or he would have known better, when he questioned and cast some doubt as to the position of the City of Brandon, in particular the Mayor, Mayor Wilton of Brandon, in respect to this entire subject matter, inferring that the City of Brandon was opposed to the matter that was before us in this bill.

I would refer the honourable members to a brief that was presented by the City of Brandon on February 19, 1971 to the one-man Commission, in which the City of Brandon presented to the Commission a map in which they outlined to the Commission the extent to which they suggested the boundaries of the City of Brandon should extend. And let me say to the honourable members, because I know it's difficult to see from across the way, that those boundary extensions were much more radical, much more far-reaching than anything that you will see in Bill 107. In fact they cover the majority of the land area included within the municipality of Cornwallis.

This was the official position of the City of Brandon at that submission, a position in favour of radical and extensive boundary changes, and Mayor Wilton, in the last few paragraphs of his brief, had this to say - and I would read this to honourable members as I feel it sums up precisely the position of Brandon in this regard: "We in Brandon feel that the Brandon community is something more than just the city proper as it has been constituted. We want to provide adequate services for the whole of the community but the burden is now too great for the limited tax base we are struggling with. We feel there must be a redistribution of tax dollars as stated by Local Government Boundaries Commission. The only way this can be done is to extend our boundaries. This of course disrupts the status quo. However, we are living in times of great change." It's very important, I believe, if I could just mention at this point, that honourable members recognize this from time to time, that we must be prepared to change with the transitions of economic and social events from year to year. These events demand change, and the City of Brandon zeroed in and focussed on that very point in their brief to the Commission.

"Our people demand more and more and this demand extends to our neighbours in the adjoining municipalities who make use of the Brandon facilities now without cost. In fairness, some of this burden should be shared by others; the status quo must give way to the realities

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) . . . .of modern days. The present high mill rate in Brandon is not the result of waste or inefficiency by the Brandon administration; it is the result of an honest and sincere desire on the part of the representatives and citizens of Brandon to provide a happy, efficient, full life for the whole community. The council of the City of Brandon feels justified in making this submission to you considering all aspects of this matter, and I urge that in your report you give effect to this submission." This is the City of Brandon speaking to the subject matter which we are dealing with this evening, in their official submission to the one-man Commission.

There were a large number of other submissions presented to the one-man Commission. There was a submission by the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis - and it is no secret that the R.M. of Cornwallis objects in the main to the extension of boundaries. There is no hiding of that fact; it does exist. There is a basic difference of point of view between the City of Brandon and the R.M. of Cornwallis insofar as the basic nature of this change. I think it's reasonable that this should be. I would suggest that for those living in Cornwallis there would be logical bases for opposing any alteration in the status quo, because certainly the status quo assists and makes better the position of Cornwallis, as against the change in the status quo as requested by the City of Brandon which would improve the situation of the City of Brandon in view of the changing complexities of the surrounding areas imbued of the growth of industrial developments within the city area.

In addition the Rural Municipality of Elton presented a brief, Brandon School Division No. 40, the residents of Chater, the residents of Grand Valley Road, Ratepayers Association of Cornwallis, the Brandon Chamber of Commerce - and I'm informed by my colleague the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the Chamber of Commerce very strongly supports the extension of the Brandon boundaries into the R.M. of Cornwallis, very firmly believes that this would be a move that would be in the economic and social interests of the people of the Brandon - and area communities. Residents of Ward 3, Rural Municipality of Cornwallis; residents of Ward 1 and 2, Rural Municipality of Cornwallis; residents of the southwest corner of the Municipality of Cornwallis.

Briefs also presented: Stonehouse, McAllister, Veterans Residence on Braecrest Drive in Brandon.

So let the honourable members not suggest, not leave a false impression in this House, not leave an impression to the public, the Province of Manitoba, that this is suddenly a bill - measures that are being proposed at this late hour that have not met with any discussion, any debate, any thought-provoking discussion within the Brandon area. As I stated before, there has been more debate, more discussion, more submissions, as per population on this matter in the City of Brandon than there has been on the Unicity Bill in the Greater Winnipeg area. I challenge members to demonstrate otherwise in respect to that very issue.

In addition, after Dr. Dulmage completed his report, presented it, and there was, I think, some general agreement, consensus, even by those who are not in agreement with the recommendations of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Minister accept a question?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. MCGILL: Would the Minister say what date it was that he received the recommendation of the Brandon Boundaries Commission?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, all that I can say to the honourable member that the day I received the Brandon Boundaries Commission, Dr. Dulmage's report, was the day, I believe, immediately prior to my tabling of it in the House; and I believe I tabled the report in the House in the early part of April, and that in fact is the very essence of the next comment that I would like to make at this point, Mr. Speaker.

After the report was presented to us, it was then filed in the House in early April. I made it a point to not only file it in the House but to give to the honourable member, as I think he will agree, a copy of that report so that he could commence his study of it at that time. The report was also, I understand, made available to those interested within the Brandon and Cornwallis area. So that there has been not a vacuum that has existed during the past three months but there has been a period during which there has been ample opportunity for intensive study, research and review.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.)

Comment was made by the Leader of the Opposition that there hadn't been time for experts, expertise, to contribute towards the review of the matter before us. This is not true. Experts could have been working on the recommendations of the Dulmage Report so they could be prepared to criticize it at this time. There's no problem. Because if they had been prepared and if their research had been completed, then there would be no difficulty and the Leader of the Opposition would have no choice but to admit they would therefore have no problem in criticizing the contents of Bill 107, because Bill 107 simply specifies some of the major recommendations of the Dulmage Report, except for some minor adjustments in regard to the boundary changes, but in essence the legislation is specifically the recommendations of the Dulmage Report.

During that three-month period there has been a further discussion, I believe - an informal discussion in the Brandon area - and certainly there has been discussion at my own level, and also there has been discussions with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and there has been discussions involving the Member for Brandon West. First there was a submission that was presented to us in my own office; the Minister of Industry and Commerce was present which involved the representatives of all six surrounding municipalities, plus the Town of Souris - I don't believe the Village of Wawanesa was present - plus the City of Brandon, in which there was an extensive - I believe it was a discussion that lasted at least two hours, two to three hours, in which each of the municipalities presented to me their views in regard to the proposals of the Dulmage Report. Out of that discussion, out of that particular discussion, let me say to the honourable members opposite that suggest this government is intransigent, refuses to budge when it hears the view of representatives on matters, there was a very basic decision arrived at on my part which I communicated to those representatives at that meeting, and which is now implied by way of this legislation, a basic change, and that was that we would not adopt any compulsory implementation of the Planning Commission involving the six surrounding municipalities. We would only make that permissive at this stage, and this is a basic change from the recommendation in the Dulmage Report to the provision which is in this bill. This was done out of deference to the proposals that were made to myself as Minister, and to the Minister of Industry and Commerce at that particular meeting.

Later, I had a meeting with the Municipality of Cornwallis, and I want to say at this point that all my meetings with the Municipality of Cornwallis have been most amicable, and I have found them in my own discussions to be very sensible and reasonable representatives and I have nothing but the highest regard for the representatives of the R.M. of Cornwallis. Further discussions then took place and this is a series of discussions. A further discussion took place involving representatives of the R.M. of Cornwallis, and the representative for Brandon West, and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in which there was further discussion as to the possibility of some alternative to the Dulmage Report and they made representations to us as to what they thought would be the merits of an alternative which they proposed, - an alternative that would involve some boundary extension but not to the same extent to which the boundary extension is indicated in this bill. Furthermore our decision after further review and discussion was then communicated to the R.M. of Cornwallis verbally; so that let no member suggest that we have been working in a vacuum; that suddenly the people in the Brandon area are confronted with a massive piece of information foreign to them, unknown to them and which they are ignorant of. This is far from the truth. There has been tremendous input already on this issue insofar as Brandon and area is concerned.

Now proceeding on from that point, Mr. Speaker, the question is where do we proceed from here? Already we have had this input that I've enumerated. I, for one - I am anxious that we should move from this stage to the stage of a committee so that we can hear representations, so that we can give to those wishing to present briefs as much notice as is possible, and it would be therefore my desire, I'm sure of all honourable members here, that we provide as much opportunity as possible and that we round up second reading of this bill, so that we can begin immediately to give notice to the interested parties in Brandon and Cornwallis; so that despite the fact that we're already late in the session we can give them a reasonable opportunity - although let me say to honourable members opposite, they will not have great difficulty even at this late point in preparing their submissions because they've already been working on this for many months and there's nothing, as I said, strange or foreign to them in all this legislation.

Insofar as whether or not there should be a trip to Brandon - I have no objection to

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . travelling but it would seem rather odd to me that we should want to spend, at this point, when we're already involved in the discussion of the unicity act when we are already spending only about five or six hours it seems to me outside of this House each day, that we'd want to spend three hours travelling to Brandon and three hours coming back, taking possibly one-third of the representatives of this House to Brandon, I think that the people of Brandon would think this to be a very unreasonable request, especially since it would be without any precedent and in addition we have dealt with many bills involving many communities and towns without for a moment ever suggesting that we should travel to those communities. Already during this session we have dealt with bills that affect Flin Flon, Morris, The Pas, Thompson, practically every community but Selkirk, and we haven't, to my knowledge, to my knowledge, and I believe my friend here the Member for Rhineland will agree there never has been a suggestion that this committee should travel to Flin Flon to hear representations from the Town of Flin Flon -- I think we would enjoy the trip to Flin Flon but there has been no such suggestion along those lines. The fact remains that there already has been ample discussions, submissions, and hearings existing within the Brandon confines; we wish to give ample notice to the people of Brandon so that they can certainly journey to Winnipeg - it's not that much of - as the Minister of Transportation states, it's a good highway - and so that we can hear their representations here. Some of the members opposite suggested that if we went to Brandon we could get it over with in an afternoon and an evening. I wouldn't like to suggest that we would want to squeeze the submissions of Brandon and Cornwallis into an afternoon and an evening. I would think that with the submissions we would want to -- (Interjection) -- Oh, Killarney too was pointed out to me -- (Interjections) -- I don't think it would be fair -- (Interjections) -- I don't believe that it would be fair to attempt, or leave the impression with the Brandon people that we would want to squeeze their submissions and briefs into an afternoon and evening. I just don't feel that the people of Brandon and area would appreciate that. I think that we would want to indicate to them that we are prepared to listen to as many submissions as come to us. We might wish to ask a number of questions and if it takes a number of days we would be prepared to deal with those briefs and submissions, and I do believe that the impression that is left by members opposite that we would some way or other travel out to Brandon on an afternoon and evening and then come back and that would be it, I don't believe we should leave that impression with the Brandon and Cornwallis people, because in fact there might be many more submissions and much more need for questioning and discussion than that, and I don't believe just because we want to complete this particular session, wish to speed through those hearings. If it takes a day, two days, three days, a week -- I hope backbenchers don't get upset at this -- I would think we would want to spend that time with the people in Brandon and Cornwallis if that is what is required to have ample discussion. So there is no, no suggestion here that we would want to avoid that.

There is also another careless statement that is being thrown about here, that this is a bill which affects 40,000 people basically. I suppose in a way that statement can be made but on the other hand it does not, as my leader pointed out, does not compare with the unicity bill one iota. Basically what happens in this bill is that there is a transfer to the City of Brandon, a portion of the Municipality of Cornwallis represented by a population of approximately 1,600 people, and that is basically the number of people that is involved. Even if one person is involved it is very important that the matters relating to that person be given serious consideration. But let us not be carried away by gross and massive exaggerations that only, that only upon close scrutiny leaves itself open to the accusations of being a deliberate attempt to carry people away emotionally.

I would now like to simply close up by a few further statements. I heard a comment that was made by one honourable member opposite that really this - in some sort of disparaging way towards the Minister of Industry and Commerce - that after all this was just a commitment, a promise on his part. Let me say to you that I think that in political life the commitments that we give to those that express their confidence in us, is probably the most important part of democratic process, and that once we cease to take our commitments and promises seriously, once we pussyfoot on those commitments, attempt to avoid them, then in fact we begin to cause a corrosive influence to occur insofar as the very fabrics of the democratic process is concerned. I think in fact that we will observe that in many parts of the world today there has been a decline in the health of democratic society simply because the public have not been able to take their elected representatives seriously, because they haven't produced on the

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . commitments that they gave to them when they went to them, namely the electors, asking for their support at election time, and I think that rather than disparage the Minister of Industry and Commerce that we should commend him, we should applaud him on his conscientious effort to bring forth fruit from his conscientious commitments that he made during the 1969 election campaign, and I think this should be kept in proper focus by the members opposite. I'm sometimes just a little worried when I hear of those disparaging remarks because I wonder if the honourable members would for a moment suggest that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should take his commitments lightly. I would hope that that would not be the intention of the honourable members opposite, because I would hope, and I would trust, that they would have just as much enthusiasm and vigor in support of the democratic process as those of us on this side of the House have. But when I hear those comments I become just a little uneasy as to the basic foundation of some of their tenets and their philosophy that they outwardly profess to hold.

Another very important concept that we should give witness to here is the urgent priority that this government gives to decentralization and economic and social life in Manitoba. -- (Interjections) -- Well, I think then I will have to go through a series of examples. -- (Interjections) -- You know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: The Honourable Members love to sing praises of decentralization. When they were in power they sung the merits of decentralization, the importance of decentralization, but they never produced; but let me tell you in two years this government has strongly demonstrated its belief in economic and social decentralization in Manitoba. Repeatedly, repeatedly this government has indicated and proven its concern for the people outside of Greater Winnipeg, and let me give you examples so that you know, so that you will know that these are not just words or phraseology. First, this government has indicated firmly its belief that the City of Brandon is an important area for decentralization and the development of economic and social concentration outside of the Greater Winnipeg complex; and it has done this by a number of ways and means. It is no accident that last year the City of Brandon issued -- I know the honourable members don't like to hear this, and they don't want the people of Manitoba to hear this -- but it is no accident that last year that government policy assisted in the City of Brandon building permits represented by value greater in total than the value of building permits issued for the entire Province of Saskatchewan. It was no accident, it was as a result of policy direction by this government that assisted in that development. And this government is concerned that in addition to assisting that particular economic uplifting within the Brandon area, that that development should be encouraged by the restructuring of these boundary areas -- and if we are going to consider seriously the importance of building Brandon as a regional centre in southwestern Manitoba, then we're going to have to be prepared to take important steps in order to improve the structure of the Brandon area.

And I would like to go on with other examples insofar as the other areas outside of Greater Winnipeg are concerned but debate will provide numerous examples of where this government has demonstrated its desire that people in Manitoba be given the necessary options to choose whether to live in a comfortable fashion, whether it be in Greater Winnipeg, northern Manitoba or in rural Manitoba, this has been a persistent and a deliberate policy on the part of this government.

I would simply like to call upon now at this point the Honourable Member for Brandon West. I look upon the Member for Brandon West -- and I say this in all sincerity -- as one of the most conscientious representatives in this House. I think he is a representative that is anxious to see that Manitoba prosper, and in particular of course his own area should benefit from that prosperity, and I would call upon him to demonstrate leadership to his colleagues; to persuade them to desist from any approach that might appear to be an approach which would be curtailing the passage of this bill this session; that would appear to the public at large as an approach that wants to delay or postpone for a six months' period the passage of this bill, because six months are important to the City of Brandon. My colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has indicated that it is critical to DREE, as evidenced by the letter that the Minister tabled, whether or not Brandon would receive millions of dollars in DREE grants in order that certain service lines could be extended to the area immediately south of Brandon, critical and crucial to the City of Winnipeg. And let me say to the Member for Brandon West that if his party, and if he by being a part of that party, should succeed in hoisting

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . this bill for a six-month period, and if by so doing he endangers, endangers the chance of the Federal Government providing these grants and these monies, then the responsibility for that must rest fully upon the shoulders of the representative for Brandon West because it's up to the Member for Brandon West to demonstrate leadership and capacity to persuade his colleagues on the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like at the outset to thank my colleague the Member from Charleswood for his motion because it enables me to make some further observations in respect to the subject before us, and I might say about his motion that while I may not support it in principle, nevertheless I appreciate his -- the ability to join and to make some comments in respect to the observations of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, in all this debate, no one has really explained what happened between the middle of April and the middle of July to this bill, No. 107. No one has really come to grips with that serious omission and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that here is the crux of the problem; all of the wondrous events that have occurred this evening are as a result of the omission of someone to provide a printed copy of the bill to this House in reasonable time. Now, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that someone over there goofed, and there is -- (Interjections) -- a saying in flying -- a few years ago they replaced the oil pressure gauge with a light, a light that flashed on red, and we called that light the idiot light because we thought it was intended for people who couldn't read an ordinary gauge, who couldn't assess a situation and needed a warning light. Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the idiot light is flashing on the other side at the moment. Three months, Mr. Speaker, between the time that the report of the Brandon Boundaries Commission was submitted to this House and the time that it appeared in this Assembly, last Friday.

Now, might I also thank the Minister for making reference to the fact that I had participated in some discussions prior to the presentation of this bill. I am pleased that he invited me once, a couple of weeks ago, to be present when the members of the Cornwallis Council were in his office. That was very recently, and at that time I expressed to him privately my amazement that the government was still intending to introduce this legislation in this session at this late date.

None of the problems with respect to this legislation could have occurred in my view, Mr. Speaker, had there been ample time, and reasonable time in which to examine this bill and to distribute it to all those people who are concerned, the governments particularly, for the consideration of the clauses, the specifics of the bill based on the report of the Brandon Boundaries Commission. None of this, I submit, would have happened; we wouldn't have had this fantastic performance this evening. It goes under the name of the democratic process of government. We wouldn't have had, for instance, the remarkable logic of the Minister of Labour this evening, who said really the way to handle a major piece of legislation like this is to have a non-stop debate on second reading so that we can get it to committee and the people can be heard. This is the way to do it. Would he have stooped to that kind of logic, Mr. Speaker, if it hadn't been that they just run out of time on this bill; if it hadn't been that somebody goofed over there and they didn't bring it into this House until Friday of last week. He wouldn't have suggested it because it doesn't, it doesn't wash, Mr. Speaker. There's no way of comparing this with the unicity bill. The unicity bill was brought in in draft form, and I didn't really, I wasn't really impressed by this kind of democratic process. I thought it was a normal thing. I wasn't particularly impressed by the performance of the Minister of Finance in doing this, nor of his presentation a couple of months ago perhaps of the printed bill. This didn't seem to me to be unusual at all.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's red carpet treatment compared with the -- and I must say it -- the shabby way in which the people of western Manitoba are being treated by the way in which this bill is being presented in the dying days of this session. There's no reason, and nobody has explained to me why the bill wasn't printed and out six or eight weeks ago. The Minister of Municipal Affairs talks about our experts studying the Boundaries Report. Were his experts studying it, and if so why didn't they produce the bill? Where was it? All we needed was the specifics and there would have been no complaint. We could have dealt with the matter; we could have ironed out the things that were not in the bill; we could have known by now I presume what the boundaries of the wards would be so that the people of the Brandon area and the rural municipality and development could have decided whether this was a good way of

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . . electing representatives. The councillors of the City of Brandon could have known before the end of July that they were going to be turfed out in October and that somebody else would have to be elected. All of these things would have been pretty clearly understood. The principles would have been there; but the specifics would also have been there and we would have been able to make our decisions based upon the feelings of the people of Cornwallis, of Brandon, and of the other points. (I shall receive your questions when I'm finished speaking.)

The proposal on the Unicity concept was debated for several weeks as I recall in second reading. Nobody thought that was strange. The Minister of Labour considered that a reasonable way to deal with major legislation. I didn't hear him saying at that time that we should do it in one non-stop debate beginning as it did between 9:30 and 10:00 o'clock yesterday morning, and continuing to an inevitable conclusion today, based on the now position of the members opposite that there can be no adjournment of this debate, not because this is not a democratic way to deal with it, because they haven't got any time. And, Mr. Speaker, why haven't they got any time? Because somebody goofed; because they didn't bring in the bill.

Maybe this is why the House Leader has had difficulty in answering our questions about how many bills are still to come. We have asked him frequently in the last week or ten days, how many bills have we still to receive, and he has said, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure but I think three or four. Perhaps it was about at that stage in the game when the Minister of Municipal Affairs was cleaning up his desk for an anticipated prorogation that he found another bill, No. 107, and said "Whoops, wait a minute, we still got another bill to go" - so we got it on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, this just is not good enough for the people I represent. I don't know about the people that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce represents - that's for him to make a judgment - but I wouldn't like to go out to Brandon West and say to my constituents, "Look, I'd of liked to have debated this thing adequately, and found out where the boundaries of the new wards were to be, but there wasn't time." And I wouldn't expect that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce would want to go to Brandon East and say, "The fact of the matter is, we didn't have time" or, "the fact of the matter is, it didn't matter."

Mr. Speaker, this has proceeded throughout the evening in a strange fashion, and none of these events need to have happened had it not been that there had been somebody who failed to do their job on the other side of the House. The principles involved here generally, most of them have been known because we've seen the report. The specifics were never known until Friday. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has asserted that this government can do no wrong in respect to Brandon because Brandon is growing by leaps and bounds, and that in fact during the past year the City of Brandon had more building permits than the Province of Saskatchewan. I know the Minister of Industry and Commerce would want me to correct the Minister; what he means to say is, "more permits than the City of Saskatoon", I'm sure. You are now prepared to say that the City of Brandon had more building permits in total than the Province of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we're narrowing down the area in which a mistake was made on this bill, because mistakes apparently are possible, and I think it's pretty clearly evident that we're suffering tonight, and the people of Brandon are going to suffer in respect to the proper treatment of this bill, because that mistake was made. I think it's up to the government quite clearly to admit that mistake, not to say that everything we're deciding here tonight was due entirely to the fact that this debate had to go on immediately; it's due entirely to the fact that you're running out of time. And why are you running out of time? Because you didn't produce the bill, you forgot about it. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, why it is then that they deliberately brought in the bill on Friday last when it was a bill that required some careful consideration. I think everybody opposite, reasonable people opposite and most of them are, in fact I would say the people that we've been listening to tonight are normally reasonable. It may be late now but under normal circumstances and in normal debate their tendencies are to take some reasonable positions. But on this bill and tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that we have been the recipient, we have benefited by the kind of positions that are taken. They are strange and contorted positions and even the First Minister who usually is quite logical was hard put tonight to justify what has happened up to this point in the debate. He didn't tell me why he didn't have the bill earlier, he'd like to know, I think, himself why it wasn't here six weeks or two months ago.

This is our position, Mr. Speaker, that we insist that this major legislation as it

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . respects the area of Brandon be given the time that it merits, the time that it demands to properly consider, to get the explanations on those clauses which are obscure. Doesn't the Municipality of Cornwallis merit the reply to their frequent requests for some statement in terms of dollars, roughly, on what these tax-sharing agreements will mean. They've asked for that. They've said all right the formula that Dr. Dulmage proposes is reasonably understood. What would this mean in terms of dollars to us if we lost the area that Dr. Dulmage is suggesting be taken into the City of Brandon. Nobody came up with any figures in dollars and cents. Isn't that reasonable that they should know? Isn't there someone in the Municipal Affairs Department that could make a rough calculation and say all right this is going to cost in terms of your present industrial and commercial revenues on a per capita basis under the new boundary system so many dollars. Can you live with that? Is that going to make it possible for you to continue to service the areas that are left to you? A reasonable question, I would say. Why not? Why not, Mr. Speaker?

I think it's important that this debate continue under reasonable circumstances because of the error which has occurred. And I put it to the First Minister. I think we stand, all of us here, in defence of the democratic process, to make sure that where the majority prevails that the rights, privileges and positions of the minorities are heard so that in the end justice will be done or as closely as we can see that it's done, and that the real principles and aims of the bill are not lost in a misuse of the process and a contortion of the way in which this bill is being dealt with by the fact that a mistake was made on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Does the honourable member recall my indicating to the Municipality of Cornwallis while he was present, that the final drafting of the bill was being deferred until such time as we had had an opportunity to review the submission which they made to me, which was approximately two weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I was present at one meeting as an observer, I stated my position that I was not a party to the discussion. The point which really surprised me at that time that you were hearing out discussions with the municipalities without having the specifics there. What was the purpose of that? Why didn't you have the bill during these discussions like the Minister of Finance did? Why didn't you conduct the discussions with the bill in front of you so that we might have had these questions answered now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should indicate to all honourable members, as I've always indicated, questions must pertain to the debate that took place not to other matters which will open up further debate. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Honourable Member from Brandon West would submit to a question. He's expressed considerable concern about technicalities of the bill, etc., and time and so on. Is he in favour - does he want the government to withdraw this bill? Is this what you're in favour of?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my position has been and still is that the bill was introduced at a very late date in this session and that an opportunity is not now being given to properly deal with the terms of this bill.

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

MR. EVANS: A supplementary question. Is the Honourable Member for Brandon West prepared to vote to give this bill a six-month hold?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this thing erupted several hours ago when I attempted to adjourn the debate till the next day and was refused the adjournment because we only have several hours following the Minister's introduction of it. I don't intend to speak on it now because I would be repetitive, but I want to say this year and last year, both cases, on this side of the House I supported the speed-up motion always on the understanding that I thought it was going to be rationally used; on the understanding that there were five bills to come in. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, let me finish. There's no point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in that the honourable member is



(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . using the time for discussion on this bill to express his view as to the government's behaviour with regard to the present rules and I submit that that is irrelevant to the bill before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has a point, but I also must allow some latitude for introduction when honourable members do start their debates. I think I've allowed the same latitude to almost every other member. I don't believe there's one member this evening that has stuck with Bill 107 alone, except perhaps the First Minister and the Honourable Minister who introduced the bill, and the Member for Brandon West - since I'm picking on names. But let me indicate that I do allow this latitude, but only at the beginning. I have indicated to all honourable members they should stay with the debate before us. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this bill's being introduced despite any of the comments made by the government and the comment that was made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he asked that the Member for Brandon West plead with his colleagues to not curtail the bill, has to be the height of the ridiculous escalation of activities on the discussion of the bill. But I'm not going to speak on it longer, I'm simply going to say, Mr. Speaker, that again since you've allowed me a little bit of latitude, that I supported the speed-up, both years, with my colleagues; next year I want to assure you that I'm going to oppose the speed-up in the first place unless the government can keep their word, because they haven't kept their word to the House nor done justice to at least five important bills that have been brought in including the bill that affects the people of Brandon. Even though it's a problem that should have been solved and probably before this time, to do it in this fashion at this time does not do justice to the problem and the procedure, Sir, isn't doing justice to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member if he has any recollection of that session in that year when he was a member of the government, at which time on a single day, 33 bills were taken through Law Amendments Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister is referring to the time that also included the bill for St. James-Assiniboia, which he has also alluded to and made reference to here, I'd remind him that the bill was brought in with joint agreement of the parties, it was sponsored by one party, seconded by another party, with the complete approval of both sides of the argument in the case that was affected and that there was no analogous situation to what exists here. I don't mind 33 pieces of legislation, nor anyone else does if it is technical legislation. But there is no precedence for bringing in five pieces of major legislation amongst 15 others after the speed-up has been introduced on the pretense that all the important legislation was in the House. — (Interjection) — That's right. You know it too. You're just out of control and out of management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member says that bills were introduced on a pretense that all major legislation was before the House. Mr. Speaker, there was no pretention of any kind, I submit that this is a reflection on the members on this side of the House particularly the government and that the reflection should be withdrawn.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief. — (Interjection) — No I don't think, Sir, that they'll be 40 minutes. The comments that I would like to make are basically some questions regarding the bill and some of the comments of the First Minister and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The First Minister has stated that the best way, or it would seem that all of the Opposition feel the best way to get discussion on this bill is to get it in committee. That is one pretense they have been using. The other pretense is basically to try and corner the Member from Brandon West. That's what the Member from Brandon East just tried to do a few minutes ago but it didn't really work.

The thing that I would like to say, Sir, regarding this bill and the discussion of the six-month hoist is - I'll use the expression that's similarly used by the Honourable House Leader, "Will you buy two weeks"; would you vote for it if we said two weeks? You know, he usually throws another date at you and says - will you go for it if it's two; no, he usually adds later

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . on, no you wouldn't, you wouldn't buy anything. Would you buy two weeks? -- (Interjection) -- Yeah. And we're going to have meetins, we've proposed meetings in Brandon, and if we have the meetings in Winnipeg you'll have municipal people here from both sides, Brandon, Cornwallis and the other constituencies and the House Leader will use his usual same procedure of saying the only people that were here were municipal people, I didn't hear from any people. Where were the people? All I heard was from elected members. That's his usual statement. So let's go to Brandon and see if we can get some people there.

On the basis of the ward system, Sir, I'd like to say this. You're asking people to come and give representation on this bill. The boundaries principle, we've said we're not that much opposed to it, but we're talking about the ward system and if you extend the boundaries those new wards will go into the new boundaries and you're asking people to come in, give representation. There's other parts of the bill but give representation. On what? What are the boundaries of the new wards? Come in and talk about what? So let's go to Brandon and maybe talk about it with them and let them make some situations; but for heaven's sakes will you buy two weeks so that maybe we can have the boundaries. Will you buy two weeks? -- (Interjection)-- There we go -- so I've just said, the people will talk about what?

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs thinks that we don't read bills. If he wants to go about the Morris bill where they extend the town to the dikes, it was agreed upon by the municipality and the Town of Morris. The other bills, The Pas and Thompson were exactly the same as St. James-Assiniboia, complete agreement when they came in and presented it, between two bodies.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs must think the representations only come and see the government. Strangely enough, they have visited us, too. Strangely enough, I meet them at Clear Lake, many of them, and have chats. Strangely enough, they're not the only people in the world, the government side; strangely enough, we hear the other side of the story as well. And we are saying that there are unhappy people in Cornwallis, that the ward situation is being put upon Brandon with no boundaries and you're asking people to come in and give representation -- on what? Who are you kidding? And you're trying to sit over there and corner the Member from Brandon West, that's been your tactic all night. Will you vote for the bill or won't you? Are you in favour or aren't you? Stop beating around the bush and act like men. For heaven's sakes. So let's have it. Will you buy two weeks and will you go to Brandon and hear the people instead of just the municipal people? Give it a chance. Give it a chance. But give the people a chance when they come in here and make representation, that the facts are before them; and, Mr. Speaker, they know damn well they're not. They know it and they sit there and they've laughed about it all night. They laughed about the people of Brandon. The second largest urban area in the Province of Manitoba, and they say, come in and talk about, what?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the point of order was raised by the Honourable the House Leader when a colleague of mine was speaking earlier with respect to procedure, I think by the government or of the government, that he was being critical of, and the Honourable House Leader chose to exercise his prerogative, raise a point of order suggesting that that was not part of the bill. I would like to, Sir, remind the Honourable Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about a timing procedure that we have been forced into accepting, you know, quite an extraordinary one, to enable us to have some discussion of this bill. I'm referring specifically to the hoist that was given this bill by the Mayor of Charleswood, the Honourable Member from Charleswood, to enable, at least to enable the Member from Brandon West to at least have a few hours to consider the bill and to make a few pertinent remarks on the bill and for us to have some opportunity -- you know, we were having to think on our feet literally with this particular bill. We barely had an opportunity to caucus the bill in its printed form today because there had been some general disposition, I believe, to pass the other ten or twelve or fifteen bills -- at which we were making reasonable progress prior to the supper adjournment hour -- and then indeed perhaps to move into the Municipal Affairs Committee and proceed with another weighty bill, Bill 36 before us. And I won't suggest for one moment that the House Leader did anything that was not within his prerogative to do, but he chose to call firstly, Bill 99 for the second time in the same day -- an important bill -- followed by this bill, the second time the same day, and we have to account for ourselves in terms of providing

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . a critical review in opposition to those sections of a bill which we've had so little time to consider.

Mr. Speaker, let's understand very clearly that not all governments in the past have made a practice of it, but this government, this government accuses and puts the full responsibility of any bad legislation on the Opposition. They don't take it on their own shoulders if they pass a bill that has some stupid, embarrassing, untactical clauses in it; this government leaves that exactly on the role of the Opposition. They issue a press release and say had the Opposition been doing their job, had the Opposition been doing their job, we wouldn't have lousy Opposition like that, and that's a beautiful way of passing the buck, that's a beautiful way of passing the buck. So that little stinging remark issued by this government against this Opposition, you know, should for all times clearly understand why we're prepared to take till 2:00 o'clock, till 3:00 o'clock or 4:00 o'clock and use whatever devices we have to use, and make no apology for them, because quite frankly I'm not going to support the member's six-months hoist on this bill. But let's make it very clear that we have had to with this people's government, this government that believes in, you know, some communication with the people, we'd had to revert to these kind of gimmicks to enable us to talk about a bill that affects the lives of 45,000 Manitobans. And that's a reflection, and we've been casting reflections tonight on the government opposite and that should be cast again.

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the fact that we are not speaking about the Bill 107, so I would ask you not to rule me out of order. What essentially we are talking about is the motion before us by the Member from Charleswood, which I interpret to mean, or the purport of which is the nature of timing, of postponing a matter of principle before us, namely Bill 107, to six months hence, and I would ask him to allow me some latitude to discuss the matter of timing in this instance, I suggest to the House Leader and to the First Minister, you know, that we have been asked as in the opposition after having been involved in this session from when? — April 7th, April 5th - April 7th, I believe — April 5th was another important date. And, Mr. Speaker, that's not even good enough. We, again, as this government would like to blame this opposition for many things, we were firstly blamed for starting the session at that late date. Oh, they were going to be magnanimous about things and allow a few fellows that were running for a leadership convention, you know, in another party, and for that reason why they were ready to go. They had the legislation there and they were prepared to go but in a gesture of generosity on the part of the present government they said well we'll be fair about things, we'll let the Official Opposition have their little bang-up party and decide who's going to be the leader, so while we're prepared to proceed with the business of the people of Manitoba, we're going to back off. — (Interjection) — Thereafter, they decided that they had some priorities of their own; they had some priorities of their own, namely, winning a few by-elections. Well, they're pretty important priorities I must admit, particularly if it's successful. But, Mr. Speaker, what the Member from Brandon West was trying to say, and said very eloquently, was that the whole matter of timing, the whole question — and I'm not referring to the timing of this session, because if it is the will of us to stay here for one week, two weeks, three weeks or a month, we'll stay here, that's fine, there's no problem involved with that respect — but there is another matter of timing that you as a government have to accept the responsibility for. You've made announcements, you've taken action that suspends elections in Brandon; you've taken certain steps in anticipation of the passage of this bill. That I suggest to you is as pressing with respect to the timing and the necessity of proceeding with this bill than anything else and any schedule that we wish to impose upon ourselves, simply for the reason that we have been working hard and that we are nearing the end of the legislative calendar before us.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's in this context that I object most strenuously that we have to face what I would consider - with one exception, with one notable exception, namely Bill No. 36 - the major heart and guts legislation that this government is coming forward in the fields of agriculture, with respect to the Agricultural Farm Implement Act; in the field of . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I would direct the honourable member to contain his remarks with respect to the amendment that is before the House with respect to Bill No. 107. We are not discussing Bill 36. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker - I don't know what's happening, Mr. Speaker, and I don't pretend to be a parliamentarian of long standing. The other day in Law Amendments we all sit and found ourselves in a position which even the House Leader had to agree

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . was an uncomfortable one for the government, whereby once an Act was open we were restricted to specific amendments and we couldn't talk about the Act as a whole — a very fundamental basic procedure of the House even he felt was being progressively pursued along that course.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to speak in the absence of the regular Speaker, our Speaker in this Chamber, but tonight actions have taken place in this Chamber that I venture to say have never taken place in this Chamber before — have never taken before, have never taken place before, that's for sure, let's understand that — and we find every day, Mr. Speaker, every day, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes more difficult for members in the opposition to whom the rules are rigidly applied to, imposed on; indeed a member of the Opposition can ask a question, the Speaker will rule it out of order and then members from the government get up and make a speech on the question that's ruled out of order . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask you, Sir, as the presiding officer to state the question that is before the House for consideration. — (Interjection) — My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, if he want to dispute my right to ask the question that I am, let him . . . Mr. Speaker, parliamentary democracy gives to a member of an Assembly, at any time, the right to ask the presiding officer what is the motion before the House, and — oh, stop your babbling, you poppycock . . . Mr. Speaker, I ask you to state the question that is before the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! The motion, the amendment before the House is that Bill 107 be read six months hence.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, specifically to that motion before the House that this bill be read six months hence, let me address these following pertinent remarks.

I reject vehemently the attempt that is being made by both the Attorney-General, the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Municipal Affairs to have the Member from Brandon West placed in a position that this in some way represents his lack of interest or lack of concern for the subject matter, namely Bill 107 before us. Mr. Speaker, I reject, and in fact the remark that I felt most deeply concerned about was made by the First Minister. You know, if you don't like it, vote against it. You know, that's the kind of cute little trap that this kind of a situation or this kind of a bill and this action by the government would like to place the members of the Opposition into. Sure, that's the easy answer. You know, we can get up and vote against it like puppets, for, or against it; the whole business, Mr. Speaker, of contributing, performing a function is lost on them, even though they should be the first to recognize this. Never, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this government has a government needed so much help, indeed has expected so much help, as they like to point out as being an open feature of themselves when it comes to amending their lousy legislation, their poorly drafted legislation, their hastily drafted legislation. Mr. Speaker, I ask, I ask even such an independent observer as the Member for St. Boniface who has seen and sat with a few Law Amendments Committees, can he really honestly remember the times past when so many and such utter confusion reigned with the bills being presented to that committee, Law Amendments, with amendments following amendments and amendments to amendments and amendments and sub-amendments. Now, I invite . . . — (Interjection) —

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I remember that a bill was introduced, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As much as I would love to hear from my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface, it would be completely out of order for the Member for Lakeside to ask the Member for St. Boniface . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Come on! I haven't said a word all night, and I . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize, I recognize that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is not a Minister yet although soon to be I understand, and then perhaps I'll be able to ask the question directly of him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back and adhere to your specific ruling. The motion before us and the reason for that motion before us to enable us to make — what we at least, in

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . haste, and we object to doing it in this kind of haste — some contribution towards this bill. Mr. Speaker, the attempt that the members opposite are trying to make that by the time that we have used up in discussing this matter, the obvious lack of real communications back with those people that are being affected by this bill, which is an inhibiting factor in our discussion of this matter, our genuine pleas with the government to take this bill, much as they did the Unicity bill and accord to the people of Brandon and surrounding area at least a similar privilege and courtesy, to discuss with them, to search out those weaknesses of the bill — Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me that we're drafting an amalgamation bill, No. 36, upon which there are already 250 amendments — and it's pertinent, Mr. Speaker, this is pertinent, Mr. Speaker — we're drafting a similar bill under consideration right now, 107, but we're going through the same exercise that, and I admit we're only talking about 40,000 people here; so let's take the difference. It took 300 some amendments in Bill 36 that we're facing, and I'm a poor mathematician, I'll ask somebody to help me, maybe the Member for St. Boniface again if the House Leader's . . . — 300 amendments for Bill 36. All right, that covers 500,000 people; let's talk about Brandon, 40,000; there must surely be, you know, in ratio, possibly ten or twelve or fifteen good amendments that should be put to this bill. But I don't know what the amendments are, because I haven't heard from anybody! I won't have a chance to hear from anybody. And this is open government! In the meantime, and the viciousness of it, Mr. Speaker, is that in the meantime for us to say that they are attempting to put us in the position of blocking progress, denying the people what they want and in some way impeding what may well be good legislation. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I really shouldn't, I suppose, express surprise that this is the tactic that is becoming apparent by this socialist government that is confronting us opposite.

It seems to me that this is the norm that we can expect, the norm that we can expect. They call consultations, participation, as long as it's organized by them; you know, as long as they send out — the Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs whom another Minister called really a road show — as long as they send out a commission to study a matter — you know, somehow their commissions are so all important. I can remember a few of our commissions that were called everything out of this world, namely, the Boundaries Commission, headed by Bob Smellie to name one — that somehow didn't have any credibility at all in this Legislature; but when this government appoints a commission, my God that's the word from Jehovah on high, you know, that scribe that Moses is holding in his hand is going to come down pretty soon and put down the 11th commandment; that they are never wrong, and that they know — Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, again, you know, this kind of challenge, I support the motion — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: Do you or don't you?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I do not support the motion. I will vote in favour of the bill. I make absolutely no apology, absolutely no apology for taking up this little time on such an important matter. I chastise the government, I reflect the government on the manner and the way in which they have conducted themselves in this particular incident.

. . . . . continued on next page

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll only take a few minutes. I sit here and am amused at many of the statements made by honourable members opposite, because the fact of the matter is most of them really don't know what they're talking about in this particular matter, with all due respect, and I don't really think they know what they're talking about, and secondly, secondly, Mr. Speaker, secondly, Mr. Speaker, they can't seem to make up their minds, you know, whether this is a good thing to support or whether it isn't. But then I sort of have the idea that the Conservative Opposition, the Conservative Party in Manitoba, really doesn't want to improve Brandon's economic and social situation because they've moved a motion for a six-months hoist.

There has been much made tonight about the Brandon community being involved in these recommendations and hearings from the Brandon communities and so on, and I'd like to very briefly refer to an editorial written in the Brandon Sun dated Saturday, April 24th of this year, shortly after the Dulmage Report came out. Let me just read very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

"The Brandon Boundaries Commission Report is a document that every thinking individual in the area should read and ponder over." Now this was several months ago. "What makes it distinct from other Royal Commission reports is its style, its approach to problems and its frank assessment of the situation. Unlike run-of-the-mill commission reports which shroud their findings in shabby language and their recommendations in unclear terms, the Brandon Boundaries Commission Report is an example of how a commission report should be written. When one reads the report one realizes that one does not have to be an expert to understand it and grasp its message. Dr. Dulmage studied the problems of the area in detail and gave the utmost consideration to every individual who had something to say." And I hope my friend from Souris-Killarney is listening, and I'm sorry that the Honourable Member from Brandon West is not in the Chamber to hear this because I have something to say in a moment about a statement that he has made publicly.

"When he accepted the job as Commissioner, Dr. Dulmage must have thought about the possible damage that could come to his image as the president of Brandon University, but he did take on the job and, at the end of it all, the people of this region not only have come to know him well, something not all university presidents can boast about, but to respect his intellectual honesty and his concern about everyone's problems. While he was conducting hearings, it became clear that he was going to be a different kind of a commissioner, one who was willing to throw out ideas for discussion, get involved in a dialogue, and applaud or criticize other suggestions. And the same approach is reflected in his report in which he pulls no punches in saying what he wants to say; for example, his comments on Brandon's brief to the commission.

"In doing the Commission's work, Dr. Dulmage made all relevant documents readily available to municipal government, to citizen groups, to individuals. Perhaps he should consider making copies of this report available to as many people as possible." - and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the Minister of Municipal Affairs sent about 250 to 300 copies to the Commissioner for distribution in the community, and this was several months ago.

"There will be those who will agree and those who will disagree with his recommendations, which are far-reaching and in my opinion practical." (This is the editorial writer.) "He has laid down, in a sense, direction for the city and the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis. His suggestions regarding government grants in lieu of taxes or equalized industrial and commercial mill rates for the region and the tax-sharing formula are of such merit that they deserve the consideration of not just the Manitoba Government, but the federal and provincial governments across Canada, and the people of western Manitoba should be grateful to Dr. Dulmage and his Executive Assistant, Mr. Paul Panton, for a job well done."

Well okay, that's the Brandon Sun editorial of April 24th and, Mr. Speaker, the essential point that I want to make is that the bill before us, Bill 107 before us, contains nothing in it which was not essentially recommended in principle by the Dulmage Report. We do not go beyond the report. We are confined, we are restricted by the recommendations of the report. And I see Honourable Member from Charleswood agrees with that and I'm glad he agrees with it because I for one am confused by the various statements made by honourable members opposite because they seem to be taking various positions in the matter. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what I want to know as a member from one-half of the city at least, from the Brandon East side, what I want to know - and I'm sorry again that the Member from Brandon

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . West is not in the House to hear my remarks - but I want to know where the Member from Brandon West stands on this matter. Is he in favour of the bill to improve the situation in the Brandon urban area or is he against the bill? Is he in favour of passing this bill or is he not? Is he going to vote in favour of giving this bill a six-months hoist which effectively kills it? And I can't seem to get an answer from him, yes or no. Now, Mr. McGill did make a public statement, and I have a clipping from a newspaper, again the Brandon Sun, of April 24th.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to permit a question but just let me finish and I'll answer as many questions as the honourable member likes.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West was asked what he thought of the report and where he more or less stood on the question, and it's quoted again in the Brandon Sun, as I said, of April 24th. It's headed "McGill Praises Report." "The Brandon Boundaries Commission Report of Dr. Dulmage provides a good basis upon which to reach a conclusion on the city's boundaries and related problems, says Ed McGill. The MLA for Brandon West said, in an interview, he is impressed with the philosophy of the Commission's report which he said has been carefully prepared and is well documented, well thought out, and a scholarly effort, as could be expected from Dr. Dulmage. Mr. McGill said he is particularly impressed with the Commission's proposal for a district planning area and a council made up of elected representatives of Brandon and the municipalities, towns and villages."

Well, I'm not going to read the whole article. Let me go on to a couple of other paragraphs, the juicier paragraphs. "On the Commission's recommendation for an extension of Brandon boundaries, Mr. McGill said, 'On careful inspection, it appears that Dr. Dulmage is interested in taking care of those urban fringe problems which now exist and, having then eliminated them perhaps by inclusion into the City of Brandon, he would, by recommending tax-sharing agreements and district area planning of further extensions, possibly eliminate any further or future recurrence of the fringe area problem.' Mr. McGill added: 'It seems to me that this is a very important part of the total package recommended by the Commission, and if the District Planning Council and the tax-sharing arrangements could simultaneously be endorsed with any boundary extension, then we might then have some workable plans for the future.' "

Well, at any rate, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McGill criticized the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his delay in bringing in the bill, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs was very honest to members of this House and said that he wanted to have discussions with the people from Cornwallis and the other rural municipalities, and indeed he did have, and indeed he got various recommendations pertaining to this particular Dulmage Report. And they seemed to be against a general large planning area and they were against a large compulsory industrial commission. And based upon these considerations, the Minister scaled down the recommendations of the Dulmage Report.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that having read this article and coming to the conclusion of it, I thought I would know where the Honourable Member from Brandon West stood on the matter, but I looked at his last quotes and I am as confused as ever. He somewhat reminds me of Paul Martin, the ultimate in diplomats, who can say an awful lot of words or express many words and say very little. At the end it says, and I'm quoting again from the Brandon Sun of April 24th, -- (Interjection) -- well, you listen to what the statement is. "Asked if he personally . . ." (he meaning Mr. McGill as the Brandon West member) "Asked if he personally would support a government bill based on the Commission's Report in the Legislature, Mr. McGill said" - now listen carefully please - "I think it would be too much to expect that the report as constituted would be completely acceptable to any one of the jurisdictions now. I rather feel that this report has many features that will find common acceptance and, while there may be minor technical difficulties involved in some recommendations for change in what the Commission has proposed in the way of boundary extension, it may be that there is a good possibility of finding some common ground of agreement over what has been an entirely complex problem. "

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know where the Member from Brandon West stands. Is he for an improvement of the situation for the City of Brandon or is he not in favour of improving Brandon's situation? And again, I'm sorry he's not in the House. And the people of

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . Brandon West want to know where he stands. Not only do they want to know tonight, tomorrow morning, but they want to know in the next election.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: The Minister indicated that he would answer a question at the end of his presentation. My question is, will a hearing be held in Brandon on Bill 107?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable the First Minister indicated this and the other members on the Treasury Bench indicated that it is customary, traditional, and proper that representations about government legislation be held in the capital city of the province in the Legislative Building, in the legislative rooms. This building, these rooms, are the meeting place for all the people of Manitoba. It was pointed out that there are many cities and towns who have problems and who have pieces of legislation before us, and no suggestion has been made to go out to those particular cities or towns. I think the question has been amply answered earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't say that it was very enlightening to listen to the remarks of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear him quoting an article which stressed intellectual honesty. It was most interesting, Mr. Speaker, to find that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should be using those words when he is trying to point out some of these things that he thinks are important, and when he was finished he still didn't know what the Member for Brandon West has said. And I say this, that he must be very deaf or very dense or both.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister was speaking he made extensive reference to the Dulmage Report, and he stated in there that nowhere in this legislation did the present bill, as we have it before us, extend beyond the recommendations of the report, which was a Royal Commission Report if you want to use those terms. But at the same time he did not say that the bill contained all the recommendations that Dr. Dulmage included, and I would like to refer to the report, Mr. Speaker, Page 34 where it says, "An additional factor which has contributed to the relative increase in the tax burden of both residential and industrial commercial properties within the City of Brandon, has been the erosion of the tax base occurring when certain types of regionally-oriented services had been located in the City of Brandon."

Total property tax forgiveness by the City of Brandon in 1970 was approximately \$878,000. A list of property categories in which taxes are forgiven is presented in Table 9. The tax base in local government jurisdictions, including the City of Brandon, is in part eroded by the location in these jurisdictions of provincial government properties, because the Provincial Government places a limitation on the amounts of grants which it will make to municipalities in lieu of taxes. The limitation is five percent of the current Real Property Tax levy in a given municipality. In 1970, the City of Brandon tax revenues from the Provincial Government would have been \$496,333.36 had the limitation not been in effect.

The City of Brandon tax levy in 1970 was \$4,488,479.51. The Provincial Government's 1970 grant in lieu of taxes was \$224,423.98, or \$271,909.38 less than the amount which would have accrued to the city if provincial government properties were treated the same as other properties."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find that we have a bill in front of us which does have implications as far as taxation is concerned. It has far-reaching implications as far as assessment practices are concerned in surrounding municipalities, and at the same time we have a provincial government which is, as far as we know anyway, unwilling to change their system of grants in lieu of taxes where the report this Act was based on stresses the fact that there is a growth in equity there, and some of the financial problems that are really the problems that are the basic reason for the introduction of this legislation will be promulgated in the future without any change in the system that the province is now using.

We also find, Mr. Speaker, that we have a provincial government now who, by their own admission, have embarked on a program which espouses government control of many industries which in fact will lead to increasing government buildings, in further increasing inequities that are already apparent, where we will find in a very short time, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a problem which the author of this report states to be a gross inequity, will in fact be even greater as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, legislation that is proposed in this Chamber is normally proposed in a manner in which it will attempt to rectify some of the gross inequities that exist in our society,



(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)

and yet the Provincial Government in this particular field has failed, or in fact ignored, the problem that will become greater and greater every year as they persist in their socialistic philosophy of government control and government operation of more and more industries and businesses.

So, Mr. Speaker, I see this as being one of the major issues in this legislation that has not really been answered. The government has not accepted all the recommendations. They've accepted some, and for that I think they have to be commended. But they're still not facing the main problems that exist in this type of bill that we're facing today.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rhineland - and I'm sorry he's not here at this time - I think made a very worthwhile contribution to the debate when he considered the assessment legislation that is inherent in this bill, and I heartily endorse the expressions of opinion that the Member for Rhineland expressed at that time because I see something here that should be cause for alarm by other municipalities throughout the Province of Manitoba. We find a special consideration being given to certain municipalities; certain procedures are being opened to them which are a result of a particular situation, and it could very well be, Mr. Speaker, that that same type of procedure will be forced upon other areas of the province where the same type of situation does not apply.

We have long stressed the importance of changes in the assessment practices in this province, but Mr. Speaker, I suggest that any change in the assessment practices of the province have to be equitable, fair, and justly administered to all. We have to recognize in doing so that there are differences in various areas, and that has to be part and parcel of the assessment that occurs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite do want to hold a caucus meeting at this time, I'll gladly stop while they hold their caucus but, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's rather revealing to us on this side of the House that they hold their caucus meetings in the open - in fact they do say that they are open government, although sometimes we question that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first items that's mentioned in the bill, and I realize, Mr. Speaker, that maybe I should not be talking about this bill at this time but the amendment that's before the House; however, I think that the two are almost synonymous and with your permission, Sir, I would like to talk about the Brandon District planning area that is being proposed for this particular bill. And in talking about that, Sir, I would like to go back to some of the remarks that the Minister of Municipal Affairs made earlier when he quoted from a submission made by the Brandon Council to the Minister, or to Dr. Dulmage in the presentations that they made before the Commission, where he stated that the City of Brandon was very sympathetic and wanted to share with the rest of the community in the planning and that, that was going on at that time. But you know, Mr. Speaker, it's rather strange, and I don't just point the finger at the City of Brandon here, I think that it's equally applicable to political parties, to communities, and indeed to individuals, that when you want to state a specific point and to emphasize your point you wear a certain type of hat, and indeed the next day when you are dealing with another subject matter you might very well wear a different type of hat.

It brings to mind the representation that was made by the City of Brandon when the Town of Rivers was certainly doing everything they could to ensure that the Air Force maintained a base at Rivers - and I haven't got the quotations in front of me, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that I can give the general gist of what went on, and the city was entirely agreeable to support the Town of Rivers in their presentation to the Federal Government to maintain the base as an Air Force base, but if the base was going to be closed, and there was talk of the Airport being remodelled and used as an industrial park, then the City of Brandon could not support them in that particular field.

Now, this stand is no different than that taken by governments because many times we've seen this government, and other governments too, who will talk out of one side of their mouth one day on one particular issue and quite easily talk out of the other side of their mouth on another issue in a subsequent case. But it does point out to me something that is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, and that is when you're talking about planning, a district planning area, I think one of the first things that you must have to make a planning area succeed is a certain level of unanimity and goodwill which will go along with the initial stages, and we have seen some evidence here where there could in fact be conflict of interest between the City of Brandon and say, for instance, the Town of Rivers, and this is really no different than it is

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . between the various planning councils in the government of this province. Mr. Speaker, the very area of planning in itself is not a unanimous field today. We find, we have the Municipal Planning Committee, we have the Planning and Priorities Committee of government, and we have various other planning jurisdictions of government, and I would venture to say, Sir, that very seldom will you find two of them in agreement at any one particular time. In fact, Sir, the very concept that established the Metro system of government in the City of Winnipeg and led eventually to the unicity bill that is facing us, was the urgency that was required for long-rang planning.

Mr. Speaker, we also find that we have other changes coming up in government legislation which does, to a certain degree, take on the aspect of planning, and Sir, I ask the question at this time whether or not there might be a conflict of interest between the planning that is devised or proposed in that type of legislation as compared to the planning that is included in this type of bill. Perhaps we should in fact have a complete bill which deals with nothing but the subject of planning, and remove the question of planning from all other aspects of legislation. In that way, Sir, we might in fact get some semblance of order in the whole field of planning for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have no basic objections to the bill at this particular time. I do know that inherent in the passing of this bill there will be some indication to other municipalities that what is happening in this bill could very easily happen in other areas of the province. However, Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I feel that I am inclined to support any move to put this bill forward to committee so that representations from the various people affected can be heard, and I sincerely hope that that hearing would and should be held in the Brandon area.

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

MR. MOUG: If I may, Sir, just by leave of the House, I would request that the amendment be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment by the Honourable Member for Charleswood in respect to the six-month hoist.

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

YEAS: Mr. Froese.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Enns, Ferguson, Girard, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Spivak, Turnbull, Uruski, Walding and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 1; Nays 39.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it and I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My intention is to make some remarks with respect to Bill 107. I should like to say at the outset that we went through the exercise that we just did, Mr. Speaker, because on a matter of technicality, Mr. Speaker, as you will well recall, my colleague the Member for St. Vital was ruled out of order from speaking on this bill to which -- (Interjections) -- from Riel, from Riel, pardon me - and to facilitate that and other contributions to this bill, the first that we're hearing in this Chamber, I believe it's quite understandable, and the records will show it's quite understandable, that far from being a privileged motion it was in fact the only posture open to a responsible opposition to discuss a very important bill before us, Bill No. 107.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if precedence can be shown where an important bill like this - I'm not referring to a bill where there's common consent; I'm not referring to the kind of resolutions that we passed unanimously in the House earlier on today; but where an important major bill like this has been introduced in a day and an adjournment refused in the same day - an adjournment refused the same day. Let's understand that, Mr. Speaker. Now I'm going to proceed for quite a little while and if the members opposite want to encourage me, Mr. Speaker, then that's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think I'm entitled to read Rule 40 again to all honourable members, and it states: "When a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . except to raise a point of order or privilege." Now I'm certain that the Honourable Minister of Labour will be delighted to know that I'm having the staff stand by to turn the refrigeration units on as soon as the House is cleared, and we'll probably be paying overtime for that, but that's the only way I can cool off this place for tomorrow, and therefore I would request that all honourable members conduct themselves accordingly so that we do not generate too much heat or the units won't work, won't create enough coolness in the Chamber by tomorrow morning - or should I say this morning? Anyway, it's rhetorical right now. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I question whether or not research would indicate an occasion where a bill of this nature and of this importance was introduced by any government into the House and an adjournment refused on the day that it was being introduced for the first time; and I have to say that, Mr. Speaker, to underline the whole . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe that it is one of the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, that once a vote has been taken, that it is improper for a member of the Assembly to reflect on that vote at the same session, and in all respect to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, who's immature insofar as procedures of the House is concerned, I suggest that he's out of order in referring to a vote that has already been taken in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should wait for your ruling on the point of order. Was it in fact a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I see the honourable members are inclined to have a bit of fun with the Speaker this evening. I should like to indicate that I've allowed a lot of latitude this evening and this morning, and in order to have as much freedom of speech as all honourable members would like, I must continue to do that. I have considered the matter that the Honourable Minister of Labour has raised. He has stated a rule correctly that, in my opinion, I do not believe that the Honourable Member for Lakeside was expressing what the Honourable Minister of Labour happened to receive on the other end. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my intention to repeat precisely what I just started saying before I was so rudely interrupted by one of the doddering members of this Assembly whose conception of the rules is somewhat . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: The honourable member made a statement and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you certainly rule that there were . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to all honourable members -- it looks like I'm going to have to have another drink of water. Page? I would suggest that all honourable members conduct themselves like gentlemen. It's 3:05 and I'm certain that all our nerves are a little frayed. Consequently, we'll have to use a little more control than normal, and I would suggest that those who are thin-skinned should put something on, and those who intend to throw barbs should consider it once or twice before they do, and maybe we shall get out of this Chamber before the sun rises. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of privilege . . . that were made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside in reference to myself, that I do not think are parliamentary. I think the remarks of my honourable friend were insulting. I request it of you to rule as to whether or not they were a breach of the privileges of this House and whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside was casting reflections on me as a member of this House, and in all due respect to you, Sir, whether tempers may be frayed or otherwise, I still think that the conduct of this House should be proceeded with in accordance with the rules of parliamentary democracy, and I ask for the withdrawal of those remarks by my honourable friend from Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On the point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Labour, let me indicate to him that the phrase "doddering" came in only as a suitable phrase when he questioned my political maturity . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker . . . my honourable friend . . . said, and I rose on a point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and I ask you to rule on the admissibility . . .

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

MR. GREEN: . . . of privilege, I believe I have already referred to rules which indicate that insulting references to a member of the House are breaches of the privileges of that member, and I may find it difficult to put my finger on it immediately, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that I gave you that reference, and if you don't recall it immediately I will spend a few moments and get it for you, but I think that the Member for Lakeside would know that it is there; you, Mr. Speaker, know that it is there, and I think that the matter could be well dealt with if the Member for Lakeside would merely withdraw his insulting remark.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, let me issue a withdrawal with respect to the remark made, unconditionally. I accept the fact that my political judgment can be classified as immature or any other fashion, and that, I suppose, is not insulting, and that's fine. I recognize that the remarks that I made about the Minister were indeed not called for.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say or affirm for the record that I accept the withdrawal of my honourable friend from Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me underline for the record how deeply I appreciate that acceptance from my friend, the Honourable Member from Transcona. If it's something, Mr. Speaker, that I've always wanted to treasure when I retire from public life, is to have that kind of a notice to slip under a pillow case between my doddering old head in old age, and to think that I had that apology spoken so sincerely, spoken so sincerely . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . from that great humanitarian, that great man of the working people, none other than the Minister of Labour of this great province of ours here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 107. Mr. Speaker, this bill that is now before us has wide implications for many people in this great province of ours. This bill will involve the municipalities of rural Daly, of Cornwallis, of Elton, Glenwood, Oakland, Whitehead, Brandon, Rivers . . . towns like the better part of southwestern Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never pretended to be an authority on the intricacies of urban development and urban reorganization. I have, Sir, from time to time made my distinct effort to impress upon those who are in charge, the importance with the subject matter they're dealing with, and certainly you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, must recognize that when we're dealing with this kind of a bill, that the essential element is citizen participation, and have we had that tonight on Bill 107? I look, Sir, in the public gallery; I see not too many. Not even my esteemed agrologists are here tonight to listen to the particular words of wisdom that we should be discussing and indulging on in this particular bill. So I ask you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, where is the citizens' participation with respect to this bill? Where are those delegations that should be concerned with respect to this bill? And really, that is the crux of the matter of the few brief remarks that I would like to make with respect to this bill.

Has the government sincerely and seriously made an attempt to make this bill public to the people of Manitoba, or the people of Brandon particularly, and the surrounding area, in the way that most bills normally are? I know for instance, Mr. Speaker, that a bill dealing with such a prosaic item as farm machinery, I know that the Minister of Agriculture undoubtedly called in the Manitoba Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, some representatives of the Dealers Association, to discuss with him in his office the bill, and to have some indication of the bill, not necessarily privy to the final and complete clauses of the bill, but to indicate to them and indeed to field off some of the obvious pitfalls or errors that might be contained in a bill no matter how well it's drafted.

Mr. Speaker, I know the representation that's been made by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. They had their Royal Commission. There have been discussions. There have been hearings with respect to what should be done about the amalgamation problems surrounding Brandon and area, but what the people have not had an opportunity to hear from is what they decided to do, what they decided to do, arbitrarily, on their own hook, with their own advice, no matter how good it is and no matter how correct this bill is. But there is a difference. There is this constant attempt being made by the government opposite that when they send out a task force, that when they send out a commission to listen to deputations, to listen to representations, to hear the people,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . to tell them what they think is wrong, that that somehow is participation in the eventual bill that's placed before us.

This is precisely the same procedure, Mr. Speaker, that they took with Bill 36 and this is why, quite correctly, some of those hearings were called what they were called. I don't want to repeat what they were called, Mr. Speaker, because we may be unparliamentary, but the fact of the matter is -- and even if I want to give the government full credit, they went out to listen, and that in itself is fine and commendable -- I would suggest to you that the commission studying the affairs of Brandon went out to listen, to Cornwallis, to Brandon, to the municipal people, individuals, associations and business. But that's only half of the exercise, a very correct and a very necessary one. But for them to come back and complete the other half at quarter after three in the morning --(Interjection) -- and by God, you ought to be lucky we kept you here. You ought to be lucky we kept you so we're having some discussion on this bill. You want to ram this stuff down -- I know how it is. When were we going to discuss this bill, my friends, the principles of this bill? When were we going to discuss the principles of this bill when you refuse adjournments?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: When were we going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member address himself to the Chair and the other honourable members offer him the courtesy of having the floor while he's debating the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm incensed at the suggestion, and I -- you know, and if they want to continue making me repeat these statements, because I think they bear repeating -- you know, the whole responsibility, the whole responsibility, the fact that this bill, 107, received two or three hours' debate is our fault. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that fault. I accept that responsibility. My God, do you think the people of Brandon, 45,000 people in Manitoba, aren't worth three hours of our time? It's your fault that it happens to be at 3:00 o'clock in the morning, not our fault. Not our fault. And for them to suggest anything otherwise is sheer utter garbage and nonsense; and if they want to be worried about when they go to bed at night, as all of us do and should be able to be in a reasonable state of mind and put our reasonable energies to work planning good legislation, then the stewardship of this House under the leadership of this House Leader begs a lot to be questioned, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you think that I or any of my members are going to apologize for spending three hours on Bill 107 -- the records will show that it was precisely that what was spent -- it'll forget the fact that it happened to be, as we all can't forget right now, that it happened to be 3:00 o'clock in the morning. But the fact of the matter is that what took several weeks, months of Commission, of public hearings to ascertain what were the needs in Brandon and what were the requirements in Cornwallis and surrounding areas, we are now being asked in the middle of the night, in the wee hours of the morning, to complete the other half of that exercise by having the bill thrust in front of us; and that, Mr. Speaker, we object to. We say that that smacks of totalitarianism, socialism of the rankest order -- big government centralism and you name it, and they have the nerve to talk about decentralization. It's just fantastic, Mr. Speaker, the kind of guff that we are being asked to accept by members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying simply that I recognize the kind of propaganda, the kind of publicity that members of the government -- and I also recognize that they have more means at their disposal than I have. My goodness, you know, that grey envelope that arrives at my home every week -- thank goodness I still get it because I am to date still a member -- you know, of government news releases, yea thick. They undoubtedly will have their virtues extolled with respect to what they are doing in terms of this bill with respect to the Brandon surrounding community. So I have but limited means and limited time to underline and to try to, you know, at least offset the barrage that's going to come and has been coming all evening from that side, that somehow we are the culprits. You know, we're the 30 mean people that want to take a little bit of time and talk about the affairs, very important changes that are happening to the lives of people, of 40,000 citizens of Manitoba in the Brandon surrounding area. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said to you earlier, we accept that responsibility; I accept the manoeuvre that we had to go through only because of the stubbornness of the government, that we had to resort to that kind of a technicality to discuss the bill. I make no apology for it. I think it's proper and I think it is in the fullest interest of preserving the democratic freedoms of our parliamentary system here in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know that honourable members are tired. Some of us are less than enthusiastic about the quality of the debate that has taken place, but I feel that something has to be said to clarify the record that has been confused through the small hours of the morning. The First Minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Industry and Commerce have spoken, and have told the story that had to be told about the formation, the background, the basis for the production of the bill. But what have we heard, Mr. Speaker, from the other side? Well, they said they wanted time to debate. We've taken a lot of time to debate, Mr. Speaker, but I think when Hansard is analyzed you'll find that perhaps 10 or 15 minutes of what was said by the Opposition members dealt in some way with the principles of Bill 107 and the rest was an attempt to try and embarrass the government because the government was producing a bill, albeit late in the session, but a bill that was desired by the people of the Brandon area.

And the Honourable Member from Brandon West, he said a few things about the principles of the bill, but what did he say? Was he opposed to the bill? Well, he appeared to be and yet he indicated that he was anxious that the bill be before a committee. Well, there's no reason why the bill couldn't be before a committee except that it was obstructed by his colleagues -- (Interjection) -- It's not true, the voice says. Well any government caucus with less fortitude would have adjourned the House, and what -- (Interjection) -- yes, that's right. And what understanding, what commitment would there be to the people of the Brandon area? It would be all on the shoulders of the Honourable Member from Brandon West because he has to take the responsibility, because he's the key man in that caucus whose concern must be about this bill. Time and time and again his colleagues got up and they didn't argue the principles of this bill, Mr. Speaker, they talked about a hoist; they talked about haste. What about haste? If the honourable members want to hear representations, if they want to hear the people and not politicians talking about it, then they should have been anxious to get it into committee as quickly as possible. But that wasn't their desire.

I don't know -- I won't impute motives, Mr. Speaker. I mean, the people who read Hansard and the people who understand the exercise or reflect on the exercise that's happened here tonight and this morning, will have to weigh what has taken place here and try and understand, if they can, the strange ambivalence of the Honourable Member from Brandon West and others of his colleagues. Because he knows, he knows, Mr. Speaker, that after hearing the delegations of the people of Manitoba, his constituents and others, it is open to him or any member of the Legislature to move that the bill not be reported if they're satisfied that the bill isn't ready or that the delegations have been so impressive that the legislation should not proceed. But that isn't what they were saying. They weren't saying they were opposed to the bill in principle. They wanted to hear representations and yet they were frustrating that very thing.

Now what was their exercise? Their exercise was somehow to suggest that we're not free to go to the people. This government has gone to the people with more commissions, with more fact-finding commissions, with more task forces than any government in the province's history. Mr. Speaker, we've gone north, we've gone west, we've gone east, we've gone south. We've gone in respect of landlord and tenant legislation, dental mechanics legislation, fact-finding commissions in respect to legal aid, the problems of the north - you name it, Mr. Speaker. They say that we're afraid to dialogue with the people. Exercising the responsibility that we have, we set up a Royal Commission and there was dialogue in respect to Bill 107, the principles underlining it, Mr. Speaker, and that dialogue produced that report, the report that was in the hands of the Honourable Member from Brandon West and others of his colleagues for three months, and this bill was tabled, this bill was tabled last Friday -- (Interjection) -- yes, that's right. And where are the delegations? Where are the delegations that have been approaching government in respect to it about the report? The dialogue was continuing. The fact of the matter is that for some reason members of the Opposition thought that they would like to show, through an exercise they put on here tonight, that they can obstruct the progress of this House. And perhaps they think they've succeeded, Mr. Speaker, but we're prepared to go on. My department is ready to introduce further legislation. Legislation is ready, and if we want to go on all summer I'm sure that can be arranged. We're in no hurry, Mr. Speaker, with this bill. If the delegations want to make their presence known -- (Interjection) -- yes, you've got a question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: Certainly.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: In view of the statement made by the Minister that they're prepared to take some time to discuss legislation, why do the government not allow adjournments on a bill that's been introduced 24 hours ago?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, surely, surely honourable members could have been able to speak. Obviously they indicated tonight that they were prepared to speak and wanted to speak, but what did they say when they spoke? Even that crusty, friendly old -- that crusty, friendly Member from Birtle-Russell, after going through all this exercise, after going through all this exercise said, "I have no basic objections to the bill and I'll be willing to see it on to the committee," and this was the tacit implication of everyone who spoke on the Opposition side, Mr. Speaker, and I say -- (Interjection) -- I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the honourable member is rising on. Mr. Speaker, I listened -- (Interjection) -- you'll have an opportunity to speak. Mr. Speaker, I listened fairly intently to the form of dialogue that was going on and I did not record any objections on principle from the members who spoke, other than the Member from Brandon West who showed an extreme ambivalence as to whether or not he was for some things or against some things, but he was certainly prepared to see it get on to committee. And he was the only one who really -- (Interjection) -- You want to rise on a point of order?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we went through a delightful exercise, delightful for the Opposition, but I don't think that the people of Brandon will be impressed with either the representations made by the Member from Brandon West or from the people of the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do realize that it is about half past three in the morning. I do realize that we have before us a very important bill dealing with matters of concern with a very important part of the Province of Manitoba, and it is not my intention at this time in the morning to really deal with recriminations and the conduct of members of this House during deliberations on Bill 107. I appreciate very much what has transpired in the debate on this bill. I appreciate very much that there was an inclination on the part of members opposite that this bill should not be proceeded with and that it should be defeated by devious methodology. But I am interested, as a member of the Assembly of Manitoba, in the forward thrust of Brandon and the environments around Brandon.

It may seem strange to some of my friends opposite that I, as a member of this Assembly and a loyal Manitoban, have taken the time out, Mr. Speaker, to go to Brandon, to talk to the Mayor of Brandon, to talk to the councillors of Brandon, and to find out what are the desires of the city of Brandon and also the rural municipalities surrounding Brandon. And I think that I can properly say, Mr. Speaker, that unlike the Johnny-come-lately, the Leader of the Opposition, going to Flin Flon during the Flin Flon strike, that I went and have been in an interest non-political to see that the well-being of Manitoba is enhanced, and my mumbling friend the Leader of the Opposition consistently awaits until he sees some possible political advantage before he comes involved or takes a concern with any part of the province of Manitoba. And having observed my honourable friend since he entered this House, I find that this is so true, unfortunately.

But what are we dealing with in Bill 107 apart from the inefficiencies and the deficiencies of the Opposition and particularly its leader? What are we dealing with, Mr. Speaker? We are dealing with a proposition respecting Brandon that can well mean the forward thrust, not of the City of Brandon itself, but of the whole community of Brandon. I'm sure I do not need to say to the honourable member who represents West Brandon, of the satellite growth that has taken place outside of the formal boundaries of the City of Brandon. Surely I, as the representative in this House from the City of Transcona, should not have to stand up in this House and point out to members of the House how much I am interested as a Manitoban in the forward thrust of the community of Brandon and its surrounding areas.

I have watched, as a member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, over a number of years, the growth in certain industries in the Brandon area. I have watched the input of public funds into Simplot and other chemical plants in Brandon. I have watched the progress, if one calls it progress, of the involvement of the Province of Manitoba financially where, insofar as Simplot is concerned, we put up 28 millions of dollars in a total investment of \$30 million, and gave it away to a corporation whose head office is in Boise, Indiana. And as a result of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . .government involvement in the area surrounding Brandon, we have created through the action of previous administration, such pollution that is beyond simple imagination. This, Mr. Speaker, is why I am concerned with the development of Brandon and its communities. And I don't give a continental, whatever the hour is, this is a matter of supreme importance to all of us, and my honourable friend from Rhineland can mutter . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the word that the Minister was using - is that parliamentary? Continental?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not only is it parliamentary, but it is also true. My honourable friend the Minister of Transportation has a choice of words that we don't usually use in debate and I don't know whether it's parliamentary or otherwise and I make no comment on his vocabulary. I do try, however, Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, to keep within due bounds and I must confess from time to time one is prompted into an inclination to go beyond the bounds of due proprieties, and I do normally, prompted by the ineffective, inefficient Opposition that we have.

But I am interested in Brandon. I am interested in Bill 107. I note that it appears as though the honourable representative for Brandon is now leaving the Chamber, but I want to say to the people of Brandon, despite his absence in the House at this particular time when we are dealing with a very important bill, we are concerned with Brandon. And, Mr. Speaker, what about other areas surrounding Brandon? I challenge, I challenge almost without exception, the members of the Conservative Party to tell me of their involvement in an endeavour to save the Town of Rivers, which is one of the municipalities mentioned in Bill 107. I ask the Conservative Party representatives in this Assembly tonight, how many of them journeyed to Ottawa to impress upon the federal administration that their course of action in the closing down of the Rivers plant was wrong? How many?

MR. MOUG: Sir, I rise on a point of order because there were two members asked to go. I was one, the Member for Virden was the other, for that very reason.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm so happy to know, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend . . .

MR. MOUG: And you weren't there. The big Labour Minister. You weren't there.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm so happy to know that my honourable friend from Charleswood was asked to go. I want to know how many went, because I did on at least two occasions, as a representative of Manitoba; not of any political party, but as a representative of Manitoba, in an interest in holding within Manitoba an industry, and I'm referring now, of course, to the air facilities at the Town of Rivers. The Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, who appear to give lip service to the Brandon area, were very noticeable by their absence in representations that were being made to Ottawa in respect of Rivers. I wonder how many of the Conservative Party representatives in this House would condone and support the activities of the Industrial Development Corporation under the auspices of their present leader when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce where, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, a sell-out to Boise, Indiana, \$28 million of \$30 million of Manitoba funds to give control to a chemical industry in the Province of Manitoba to the detriment, Mr. Speaker, not only of the area around Brandon because of its pollution, but to the detriment of the farmers of Manitoba because they control the price of fertilizers in the Province of Manitoba. And this, and this, Mr. Speaker, is the outfit that are now expressing concern because of Bill 107 that we have before us.

This is the outfit, Mr. Speaker, that says will you please allow the bill to be heard by the people of Brandon? And that is the outfit that all day long today have endeavoured to prevent the passage on second reading of Bill 107 in order that the people of Brandon may be heard. And I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Brandon should be heard, and they will be heard, and I trust and hope that when they are being heard that they will draw to the attention of their champions, including the champion who wanted to shelve this bill and kill it completely, that they'll come in here and tell this - I guess the word "decrepit" is possibly unparliamentary so I can't say the decrepit Opposition, but I guess I'd better use the word "inefficient" Opposition - exactly what they are.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, so far as the City of Brandon is concerned and the community around Brandon, what has this government done? It has given to the City of Brandon, by Brandon's right, more impetus to advancement than any other government in the whole history of 101 years of Manitoba; and this ineffective, incompetent, inefficient Opposition has used all



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . of today to try and prevent us on this side of the House in forwarding a bill dealing with the problems that are presently prevailing in the City of Brandon and its surrounding municipalities. A cry, a cry because of the possibility of one of the municipalities, Cornwallis - and I'm well aware of the situation of Cornwallis because in my years in this House I've taken the time out to look at the problems of our rural municipalities as well as our cities. Of course there is apprehension to a certain degree in the municipality of Cornwallis and the possible effect of the extension of the boundaries of Brandon, but we have to face up to the fact that we are progressing in Manitoba. Communities have to change.

Reference has been made, Mr. Speaker, to Bill 36, of changes in the Greater Winnipeg area. Well, I think some of those of us who for years have been associated with a part of a community, as I have been in the City of Transcona -- I've had the honour and the pleasure, during my term of office in this House, of producing a bill for the creation of the City of Transcona, the City of East Kildonan, West Kildonan and St. Vital, but I'm prepared -- (Interjection) - Pardon? They will, Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of the Leader of the Opposition, because he can only see death confronting him, but as far as I am concerned, but as far as I am concerned, thank God there's a few of us in Manitoba that are not purveyors of doom and gloom, that we can see a bright horizon in Manitoba, but while that insignificant individual is a leader of a once upon a time progressive, responsible party, we will have decay and rot, and God help Manitoba if the likes of him ever really assumes a responsible position in government.

I don't mind, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind as a member of the Treasury Board, approving estimates to provide him with the same salary as I receive as a Minister of the Crown, but when we discuss the matter and the subject content of Bill 107 regarding Brandon and its communities, we're looking to new horizons and a better deal for the people concerned and a better deal for all Manitobans, and I respectfully suggest that my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights, his horizons are not for the future of the Province of Manitoba but rather an enhancement of his own idiosyncrasies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to keep within due bounds but after having heard the remarks of the Minister of Labour, I assure you that it is going to be very difficult, because the Minister talked about pollution in the Brandon area, and, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate for the people in the Brandon area that the garbage that we have heard in the last 20 minutes was committed here in the City of Winnipeg because to add that amount of garbage to the already polluted area of Brandon as described by the Minister would be absolutely intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister said he was well aware, and I am inclined to think that he is more well-worn. We've heard the type of diatribe that this Minister has put forward from time to time, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, he had on three occasions in the last 20 minutes mentioned the word Bill 107. And when we talk about Bill 107, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to realize the implication that this bill puts forward to the people of Manitoba when you're dealing in the concept of regional government. We find that the concept of regional government expressed in 36 is somewhat different than the concept of regional government that is expressed in Bill 107, but the basic concept and the pattern, Mr. Speaker, remains the same. In an effort to gain some semblance of political control, this government is following a pattern that they have used quite successfully in a principle of trying to divide and conquer. They have the concept of pitting one segment of society against another and, in doing so, trying to wrest political control when the real problem is not political control but trying to do something for the area concerned.

Here we find a single-ward system which is also evident in the unicity bill, is being put forward at this time, and I don't believe that this concept is or does receive the unanimous support of those concerned. However, they are going to go through the motions, Mr. Speaker - they've told us they will - of holding hearings; they've told us they're the Democratic Party and they will listen to people, to most people, but apparently they won't listen to opposition in the House.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that there ever has been any attempt on the part of the Opposition in this House to dictate to government. I don't believe that there has been. I think there has been request made to government, and what started off earlier this evening as a simple request which was turned down, has blossomed into a full scale debate tonight, and really, Mr. Speaker, I wonder who is going to be the winner in this. I don't think the

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . contributions that have been made to the debate tonight by the Minister of Transportation will really benefit the people of Manitoba. I don't know whether the contributions of other speakers tonight will really benefit the people of Manitoba. I think, and I sincerely hope, that the contributions that will be made by the representations from the people of the area concerned will be listened to; and Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the time when those representations can be made, and I sincerely hope that the province will consider doing everything in their power to accommodate the people; and I suggest, Sir, that it would be expeditious on the part of the government to take a few members of this House to the City of Brandon rather than have two or three dozen or hundred, as the case maybe - and we don't know how many there will be - come to the City of Winnipeg. And if the government is sincere in their efforts to listen to people and to present the opportunity for people to take part in the democratic process, I don't think this is asking too much.

So I would once again urge, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister consider seriously the possibility of holding the hearings in the City of Brandon.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The question before the House, moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that debate be adjourned.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, McGill, McGregor, Moug, and Spivak.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Johannson, Jenkins, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uruski and Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 11; Nays 24.

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the second reading of Bill 107, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: The Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker. Recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion is second reading on Bill 107.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Desjardins, Doern, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Girard, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Spivak, Turnbull, Uruski and Walding.

NAYS: Mr. Froese.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 34; Nays 1.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it and I declare the motion carried. The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie has any statement to make at this time. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of the House are that a member who is seated in the Chamber must vote and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie hasn't indicated a vote.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the House Leader did draw to your attention that I didn't vote, Sir. I might say that the reason I didn't vote, Sir, is the method that the government introduced this bill. I might say I'm in favour of it but their method of ramrodding it through without proper time to wait, without an adjournment . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie sit down? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I, on a point of order, simply indicate to you, Sir, that if there was anything in the procedure that we followed this evening with respect to this bill that was not in accordance with the rules, you would have brought that to our attention, Sir. The Honourable Member for Portage may protest the method we followed for whatever reason,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . but it was in accordance with the rules of this House; therefore, in accordance with the rules of this House, he must indicate his vote.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, during previous votes on the bill, and I contain myself with difficulty, but I heard the word "disgraceful", I heard the word "frivolous" and I heard the words . . . -- (Interjection) -

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member has no basis upon which a debate can take place at the same time. I merely wish to note, Mr. Speaker, without saying anything further, that a member in the House was in his seat and did not vote.

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn. I'd like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we would want - and I understand that there is general agreement, which is indeed a surprising thing, but I understand that there is general agreement that we not meet in the House tomorrow at 9:30, that we go direct to Committee on Municipal Affairs for the unicity bill and that we adjourn the House until 2:30. If that is not satisfactory, let anyone say it now and we will, by rules, be here at 9:30. If there is general agreement, then we will come back at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

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