

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, April 21st, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 118, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (6).

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to take a moment to introduce some students in the gallery. I believe this is somewhat of a record; they are the youngest group that we've had this session. We have 60 students of Grade 3 standing from the Birchwood School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Pratt and Miss Rodger. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways. Has any decision yet been taken on the location of the bridge across the Saskatchewan River at The Pas.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Has any recommendation been received from the Council of the Town of The Pas?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, why then is there any delay, because the Premier when speaking at The Pas at the time the House was there in February announced that as soon as there was a decision by the town council the bridge would be proceeded with.

MR. WEIR: Problems in relation to obtaining of right-of-way, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister or his department doing anything to resolve the difficulties which have arisen in the negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and its employees as a result of aldermen moving - making or announcing that they're going to make a motion seeking compulsory arbitration?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, we're not aware of any difficulty.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and/or the Minister of Health. Last night's paper carried an article suggesting that the Federal Government was about to implement legislation dealing with the manufacture, distribution, and possession of LSD and other drugs. Yesterday, I received a Bill from Ontario. They have already had first reading of a Bill to deal with it. What is our honourable friends opposite doing in this regard to keep in pace with Canada and the other provinces?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health, I can say that the matter has received consideration in the Attorney-General's Department. Their advice, as I recall it - and I'm speaking now only from memory - was that this field of legislation was, they felt, constitutionally within the powers of the Federal Government. I note with interest that the Federal Government is introducing legislation on this matter.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. The Ontario Legislature passed an amendment to the Public Health Act to deal with it. The question of course would be then, why can't we do likewise?

MR. LYON: You'd have to ask Ontario as to why they did it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we would like now to move over, if we may, to the resolution appearing on Page No. 3 proposed by the First Minister on Transportation, standing adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George unfortunately is sick at home with the flu. In fact I believe that the Minister of Education has been visiting him - I don't know in exactly which way in this matter - and I doubt that he will be in today, but we have no objection to any one else speaking.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Could I suggest that anyone who might wish to take part in this debate do so. The reason I make that suggestion is that it seems likely that next week I will be down in eastern Canada to perform a function which can't very well be postponed, and I would like if possible to have this resolution dealt with so that I might close the debate before that time. No doubt the Leader of the Opposition might wish to speak on this matter, and other members, and perhaps they'd be kind enough to do so now and we can then, if the Honourable Member for St. George does return in the next 48 hours or so, we can then give him his opportunity.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do intend to speak, but unfortunately I do not have all the information that I wish. I would probably be ready on Monday, but I have no objection if anyone else wishes to speak.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I intend to take part in the debate but it would be on Monday, and I'd have no hesitation in following other speakers on Monday in the debate.

MR. ROBLIN: Might I request the co-operation of members opposite, or any others who wish to speak, in concluding this matter on Monday so that we may deal with it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: ... this matter stand for Monday. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I, like the others, have been caught a little off on this but I do have my notes and I'll try to go through them today, Mr. Speaker, to speed up this.

I do feel that this is one of the more important pieces of legislation -- or recommendations rather that will deal with northern Manitoba and consequently I have made notes on it. Perhaps the most significant principle in this resolution is the readiness of government to associate the difficulties in northern Manitoba development along with those experienced in other areas of the province. We have found in the past that principles and equalities were established for southern Manitoba while the north was either ignored or penalized because of distance, administration, costs or sparsity of population.

Perhaps one should say in uniting services for southern Manitoba that we have discriminated against the north. It is only in the past few years that we have given northern development any amount of consideration. Because of this history of discrimination, the north has a lot of catching up to do. It might even be suggested that in the past the readiness of government to concede the north to native inhabitants would be an exchange for the free use of the more acceptable portions of the southern part of the province. The announcement of large, rich mineral resources of northern Manitoba of course has changed that thinking in recent years and we find that the development of the north is coming into its own.

Equalities in respect to overall provincial developments are just as important to northerners as in the western Canadian equalities important to the relation of the development of western Canada with the rest of the Dominion. While I'm not an expert in either, I can vouch for the difficulties experienced in respect of northern development from the costs both in living and during business. There is no doubt that the load in costs are out of line with the rest of the province in respect to travel, freight, living, and business operation, and the discrimination and inequalities relating to these costs have always been evident, just as the hardships are that follow.

To date, northern allowances and higher wages have not provided adequate solutions because of the escalating formula used for calculating our personal income tax. The popular

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) . . . . demand today is for relief on an income tax level in respect to those who live in the north and are subjected to these higher costs. This relief should be made more generous in accordance with the particular area in which you live and how much you are isolated. While this could in effect help many of the people of northern Manitoba, we must also remember those that are on a minimum wage, and of course the relief in the income tax level would not assist them. The north is not always one to find itself out of step with the rest of Canada and it does not want to be treated differently. Fair consideration in respect to equality by both government and private enterprise would go a long way towards encouraging orderly northern development and perhaps eliminate the north-south boundary which separates the province to date.

At present, gas for cars costs more in that area; air rates on the northern basis are out of line when compared to those services that are offered the rest of the province - or the rest of the country. Rail rates are higher when one takes into consideration mileage, service and equipment. Granted, operation costs are high in most respects. This, Mr. Speaker, should not be an effective argument if you accept the policy of fair and just treatment on a nation-wide basis. Why should we of northern Manitoba be singled out as being exceptional to other areas of the province or the country? Far too often we find it impossible to consider legislation or regulations that would give the north equality, while on the other hand we find that over and over again policies have been made and carried out that do not include the northern parts of the province, or the country, because of one reason or another.

When it came to the development of Thompson, we find that the CNR could not immediately have funds available for the construction of a spur line into Thompson. The International Nickel Company put up that money so that this project could get under way, and repayment was made on a basis of revenue derived from this spur line. It is my understanding that this line was paid for in approximately two years.

The point I make at this time is the indication of the tremendous revenue that the Hudson Bay Line produced. Any business that can pay off its capital costs within a period of two to three years certainly must be considered very productive. This figure does not take into consideration the large additional volume of revenue that comes from other areas such as The Pas, Flin Flon, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake, Kettle Rapids, the Nelson River Hydro Development, the Churchill wheat movements, and the growing population throughout the whole of the north that depend in many cases entirely on rail transportation for everything they buy.

Surely the time has come to reassess northern transportation and communication systems and the rates charged. Perhaps some pressure can be brought to bear to see to it that they are kept in line with the charges made in the more competitive centers of Manitoba and Canada. Now is the time to promote fair treatment and equalized costs and break down the barriers that isolate our northern frontier. It might be interesting for members to note that the original cost of the Hudson Bay project, including the 510 miles of railroad, the Port Nelson mistake, the Port Churchill terminal and harbour board facilities, was approximately \$49 million. Also, the capital used to build this complex was raised through the sale of public lands in the three western prairie provinces. This certainly makes this truly a western seaport.

It might be interesting for members to hear the report to the House of Commons in 1933 by the Minister of Railroads. He reported a deficit for the operation of the Hudson Bay line of approximately \$3,650. The operation at that time included a movement of less than 3 million bushels of wheat. Their revenue was from passenger service about \$40,000; their freight and express - \$74,000; their telegraph and miscellaneous revenues - \$10,000; and their wheat haulage was \$210,000. Today, Mr. Speaker the rates have increased and so has the use of the line. Granted, there has been additional cost, but surely the increase in the business which has doubled many times over must be one reason in itself for a review of the whole operation of the Hudson Bay line. Certainly it can be said that the only thing that holds back the development of Port Churchill today are the policies of the Federal Government with respect to Rail Traffic Rates, Harbour Board facilities, and Canadian Wheat Board policy in respect to the encouragement of larger volumes of wheat being shipped through the Churchill terminal. We know only too well that the eastern industries lobby continuously against the expansion of Port Churchill and we resent the intrusion of these eastern industries in the operation of the western seaport.

Let's refer back to the release on the adjustment of freight rates in 1965 to bring the freight rate to Churchill in line with some of the other areas of Canada in respect to carload shipments. A Montreal port official attacked this plan to give Manitoba Port of Churchill

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) . . . . parity on railroad carload rates. The secretary of the Montreal Port Council called this move electioneering and said that the council could hardly believe it can happen without prior consultation between the Federal Government and the eastern seaports. He said that the council was strongly opposed to any move to increase the use of Churchill because it is an artificial enterprise opened due to the war. He went on to say, "We don't mind the status quo but we will rise against any government plan to increase its use." He said facilities in Montreal should be used to capacity before any attempts are made to use the Port of Churchill. The port official went on to imply that the parity with Montreal represents a subsidy to Port Churchill and that further use of facilities at Port Churchill could bring about an imbalance which could cause a drop in Montreal shipping.

He concluded by asking why the Federal Government doesn't do something about declining water levels on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway before subsidizing Churchill. But who is subsidizing who, Mr. Speaker? The Montreal port official should be reminded that the Port Churchill operation was under construction well before the first war. The grain was being shipped eight years before the second war. The Montreal official conveniently forgets to say that the full use of Churchill port facilities in western Canada could give the grain farmer approximately 20 cents per bushel additional revenue for his grain. The Montreal port official, in speaking of subsidies, conveniently forgets that he is talking about a western Canadian product which should and must be used to support Port Churchill. Grain was the prime reason for developing Churchill in the first place. Also, the subsidy on freight would be much less - and mark this, Mr. Speaker - would be much less on 800 miles to Churchill than it would be subsidizing freight rates of 2,000 miles to Montreal. He doesn't mind advocating control of the Great Lakes but conveniently forgets the control of Hudson Bay icing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the old story, all for the east and nothing for the west until we fill their pockets. One can't help but wonder if the eastern seaport official's message may not have got through though. Surely his statement must indicate that the eastern port officials have been approached in the past before any move is made at Churchill.

We must also take into consideration the world-wide demand for western Canadian wheat since 1959 and the tremendous increase in sales, yet this tremendous increase in our exports of grain has not proportionately increased the traffic through Port Churchill. In fact, our volume is decreasing. We border Russia but our exports to that country still have to go all the way through to the East and to Montreal. Surely Port Churchill deserves a better fate than that. We cannot quarrel with any group wishing to better conditions in their own community or province, but we quarrel with them if they are determined to do so by advocating discrimination against the growth in other parts of our country.

The MacLean Commission of 1927 reported that in accepting July 9th as the opening date and November 16th as the closing date when the ice was first sighted at Nottingham in 1927, we could produce a shipping season of 120 days. Today, we have 80 days, and this I might point out is in spite of the fact that today we have radar and many other modern instruments to deal with the icing conditions that we have in many of our northern waters and certainly in the St. Lawrence waters.

I am told that in respect to shipping accidents, the Hudson Bay stands up well to any other route in the east. In fact, many competitive ports would more than welcome our record. In spite of the record, we are being discriminated against in respect to marine insurance rates. In most cases, Montreal and Port Churchill are the same distance from many overseas markets. Mr. Speaker, whereas Churchill is less than 800 miles from the millions of bushels of the world's finest wheat and Montreal is over 2,000 miles from that very same source of product. This represents a saving to the western farmer of 20 cents a bushel if his grain is shipped through Port Churchill. This is a substantial gain for the western farmer in his net take-home pay without suggesting any rise in the cost of living to the Canadian consumer.

While on one hand we find that the Hudson Bay railroad rates in many cases are the highest in Canada, we do find that on the other hand the CNR has been given the complete rights to the Hudson Bay line at no capital cost. Surely this Santa Claus manoeuvre alone dictates that some effort should be made in the review of the policies of northern development.

It is a proven fact that Port Churchill could be used for a much longer period each year. A shipping company from Denmark with a polar fleet of 22 ships has indicated an interest in operating out of Port Churchill for an additional two months a year if the man-made handicaps were lifted.

Grain storage at Churchill saves the western farmer approximately three cents a bushel.

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) . . . . In spite of this saving to our western farmers, the Churchill terminals are left empty over the long winter season. This in turn causes congestion and confusion come spring or fall when the grain shipping season starts. While we are enjoying record-setting sales a week, I am sorry to advise that shipments through Churchill declined by over four million bushels this year and our terminals have not been used for winter storage - mark this - they have not been used for winter storage for two years. Certainly this is not progress for Churchill, but it is apathy on our part if we continue to accept these conditions without protest.

In spite of these setbacks though, Mr. Speaker, I think we must be optimistic in looking forward to increased use of our port for other products. We have rushed into a record-setting age of potash production; surely Port Churchill will be assured of the facilities necessary to handle these shipments of western Canadian natural resources. I read in the paper the other day where they are developing these facilities at Vancouver. We must get in on the ground floor if we are to protect our port in respect to the shipments of potash.

Proper facilities would allow Port Churchill to look after increased exports and imports of our growing mining industries and the pulp and paper industries in both Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. We can look forward with expectation to the results of the oil exploration which is going on just outside of Port Churchill, but to take advantage of this progress our port must have the facilities to handle the varied types of export and imports. I have just been advised of a typical example of the lack of adequate facilities at Port Churchill. A company wishes to use this port to import approximately 1,000 tons of explosives necessary to carry on the work of this exploration. At present, it seems that Port Churchill is still not ready to handle this product even though it is necessary to develop our north. A couple of years ago a shipment was brought into Churchill and it had to be unloaded by the residents in their canoes. Can anything be more ridiculous in this day of automation?

The present company I am referring to has been advised to use Quebec or other eastern seaports, in spite of the fact that the explosive is the safest of all explosives. Unless we can get action on this, Port Churchill will lose the freight credit and this company will have to pay in excess of \$3.00 per hundred more than if it was brought through Churchill. With more and more talk of rail abandonment in Western Canada, we must look for assurance of additional grain storage at Port Churchill along with the equipment to clean the grain, and that these facilities be used to their fullest capacity on a year-round basis.

Some have expressed the fear that if they are not using the present Port Churchill terminals, then it could be quite possible that the government are considering closing them and moving them out of Manitoba just as they are with the Air Canada overhaul facilities and the policy of closing down the armed forces bases in this province.

All levels of government and their corporations must be called upon to upgrade the facilities of Port Churchill. With the greater use of Port Churchill and the more diversified exports and imports, we think some planning must be done to prepare for the addition of storage facilities to accommodate new products, because if we are going to gain resistance in the use of Port Churchill because it is going to affect the delivery through eastern ports, then we must look to these new products for assistance because certainly they can't argue down there and say we are taking something away from them if we are using something that is already new.

If we are to get the most advantage out of this port we must consider the ways and means to upgrade both its facilities and those of the surrounding townsite. Churchill's isolation has prevented its growth these many years. Its development began long before town planning was considered necessary and consequently it is out of step with other more modern northern communities. The people of Port Churchill are very conscious of this and justly feel that the northern discrimination is at its worst in their community. Their history has been one of disappointment and frustration. They are the only large community in northern Manitoba without -- or rather in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker -- without sewer and water and the other many modern amenities ordinarily enjoyed in other parts of the province, and also very necessary, I might add, to attract others to their community. Surely the time has come for not only recognition but some form of assistance. Our modern industrial mining towns have set a good example of modern living in the north.

Since Churchill is historically a federal town, it is hoped that our Federal Government can agree to a plan of assistance that will bring Churchill standards up to a par with the other large townsites in the north. Perhaps the Federal Government could offer assistance equivalent to that which is being offered to the Northwest Territories. Such an indication would open the door

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) . . . .for local incorporation. I would hope that an investigation, as suggested in this resolution, will bring many of the facts to light once again and perhaps we can make some inroad into the inequalities in not only northern Manitoba but throughout the whole province.

In closing, I suggest that a member of the Hudson Bay Route Association, such as the Secretary, Mr. Jim Gray, be appointed to this committee. Certainly his Association has been a pioneer in the promotion of northern Manitoba through the use of the Hudson Bay Line in Port Churchill. Here is a good opportunity to officially recognize their work and put their library of information and history to good use. I am sure that Mr. Gray would offer many constructive ideas which, if accepted, would do a great deal for northern Manitoba.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise at this moment and support the resolution of the Honourable the First Minister in that I have been quite active in the Hudson Bay Route Association and also the branch line abandonment group in our province. I don't think there is too much left for me to say, Mr. Speaker, after the long oration of my deskmate here from the constituency of Churchill, however, there are a few points that I would like to add at this time.

Although some progress on the problem of creating attention to the Hudson Bay Route Association, or to the Hudson Bay Route, and also to the Port of Churchill is evident, Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied, and I daresay that I can speak for all the western farmers when I say that they are not satisfied. It appears to me that the natural obstacles to greater use of the Port of Churchill are very small compared to the man-made obstacles that are continually being placed in the way of progress for this particular port. It also appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that those eastern interests who oppose greater use of this port are very powerful and they have had a tremendous influence over the Province of Manitoba and its port in the past number of years.

I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a couple of clippings that I took out of our daily papers in the last couple of weeks, and the one was a tender for additional grain storage to the port at Prince Rupert; no mention of the Port of Churchill. The other one was the remarks of the Honourable J. W. Pickersgill when he stopped at Churchill the other day, and the Honourable Transport Minister said that he was very surprised and very disappointed if grain exports from the Hudson Bay port show a significant drop this year. Further on, when asked why the Churchill grain terminal was left empty two years in a row, Mr. Pickersgill said that the filling of the elevator was the Wheat Board's responsibility. This is the way it's gone on for a long time, Mr. Speaker. They continually pass the buck from one to the other. Mr. Pickersgill also added that his department was not happy with the decision of the Board to use boxcars to rush wheat out to the west coast during the winter rather than to the Port of Churchill. In his closing remarks at Churchill, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could give no firm promise that efforts will be made in the near future to extend Churchill's 88 shipping-day season with methods similar to those used in keeping the St. Lawrence Seaway open longer. I think the day has come when every member of the Manitoba Legislature should go out and fight for the same consideration for the Port of Churchill as has other Canadian ports received.

I saw some enlightening figures recently, and one was that last year 104 Volkswagen units were imported via the Port of Churchill. Advertised in the Saskatoon daily paper, these cars sold for \$100.00 less than those same units advertised when they came in through the Ports of Montreal or Vancouver.

Another thing that was most encouraging to me last year, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the USSR had three ships in the Churchill port for wheat. The Churchill people were impressed with the way these ships conducted themselves, and from all reports the Russians were impressed with the reception that they received from the people of Churchill. I think that it must be realized that the controlling factor, in order to make this port what it should be will be what we can do as Manitobans to urge some equality, and factors such as the decline of sales of wheat from the Port of Churchill by some four million bushels last year and the year before is very alarming when we know that agriculture is one of the number one priorities in our economy. We have a first-class port in the Port of Churchill and it can handle fifty million bushels annually, Mr. Speaker.

As the Honourable Member from Churchill pointed out, Montreal and Churchill are the same distance from Europe. The Churchill grain storage capacity is five million bushels. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that this should be raised to ten million bushels almost immediately. Only 800,000 bushels of grain were stored in that port in 1965 over the winter, and in 1966,

(MR. McKENZIE, cont'd)..... 900,000 bushels were stored over the winter. The storage charges at the Port of Churchill are six cents for nine months; storage charges at other terminals in Canada are nine cents for nine months. There is storage space in Churchill for another 40 million bushels as of today, Mr. Speaker. The farmers therefore to me, as I understand it, are losing three cents a bushel on those four million bushels. That's a matter of some \$120,000, and the Harbour Board at Churchill will suffer a loss of six cents a bushel on those four million bushels. There is another \$240,000. Who is going to pay that? The Canadian taxpayer.

In 1965, almost 25 million bushels were exported through the Port of Churchill; in 1966, 22 million bushels were exported through the Port of Churchill. It costs 12 cents a bushel to take wheat from Saskatoon to Churchill; it costs 29 cents a bushel to take wheat from Saskatoon to Montreal. There is a saving for our farmer of 17 cents a bushel. Fifty million bushels at 17 cents a bushel - how much is that, Mr. Speaker? Eight and a half million dollars.

Another factor that alarms me, Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1966, that was the day that the Russian Wheat Agreement was announced, the price of No. 2 wheat at Montreal was \$2.20-1/4 per bushel. On the very same day, the price of No. 2 wheat at Churchill was \$2.13-1/4 per bushel. Why? Why seven cents less? From August 1, 1966 to November 9, 1966, out of a total of 95 million bushels of wheat leaving Fort William, only three million bushels went overseas; 92 million bushels stopped along the way at our subsidized freight rates.

The other remark that was raised by the Honourable Member from Churchill, which I might add something to, was that in 1927 the MacLean Commission spent a season exploring the Hudson Bay route and reported afterwards that there could be a shipping season of 120 days without the assistance of ice-breakers. Today, 40 years later, we only have 88 days. Captains of vessels trading in the Port of Churchill have stated, as the Honourable Member from Churchill pointed out, that this port is just as safe if not safer than the St. Lawrence. And as I stand here this morning, Mr. Speaker, my figures show that there are far less accidents at this port than there are in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The huge developments that were announced as of yesterday in the paper as taking place in Thompson, and the other developments that are going to take place in the northern areas, is more or less just starting to develop in this stage of our economy, the year 1967, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be very serious now in making our plans for the progress and the future of this port.

Tourism is another business that is going to increase in the world and I think northern Canada has a tourist attraction that hasn't even been looked at yet.

There are many other things, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to draw to the attention of the Legislature this morning, but in passing I would say that there are many obstacles in regards to getting full use of the Port of Churchill. The natural ones are being overcome very slowly; however, the man-made ones or the imaginary ones are the most difficult to overcome. And I say as legislators, Mr. Speaker, that we must get more trade, we must get more exports and imports via the Port of Churchill, because it is by far the most economical route to western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the preceding discussion to this will remain open until Monday. The Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolutions standing on the Order Paper.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution before the committee:

WHEREAS in recent years there have been increases and variations in automobile insurance rates;

AND WHEREAS concern has been expressed by the public of such increase and variations;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable in the public interest to study and investigate these matters;

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd) . . . .

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee of the House consisting of Honourable Messrs. Evans, Lyon, and Weir, and Messrs. Bjornson, Cowan, Craik, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Hillhouse, Shoemaker, Green and Paulley be appointed to review the variations in automobile insurance rates, as well as any rate increases which have been effected in recent years, for the purpose of considering and weighing the factors to which these increases have been attributed and thereby assessing the justification for such increases, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public, and to make recommendations;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee have power to sit during this Session and in recess after prorogation;

AND to report to this House at the next Session on the matters referred to it;

AND THAT the said committee may exercise all the powers of commissioners appointed under Part V of "The Manitoba Evidence Act";

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as approved by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution, and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

Are you ready for the question? Resolution -- passed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I just came in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 4 on auto insurance.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this resolution, I wonder if the Minister has been able to obtain any information from the B.C. study that is going on. I think it would be very helpful to the members who will make up this committee if they had - I wouldn't suggest that all of the transcript of evidence because I think that would be so extensive that there would be no possibility of the members reading it - but at least some summary of what has gone on in B.C. If we could have that before we undertake our own study here I think it would be very helpful to the members.

MR. EVANS: If there are no other questions -- well, I will answer this question at this time anyway. Yes, the Superintendent of Insurance has been in touch with the B.C. investigation and made arrangements to receive all of the documentation that is being placed before the British Columbia investigation. We are not at this time ordering forward the transcript of evidence; it will be in the committee's discretion to order it forward if they wish. My understanding is that it would cost \$4,000 to get the transcript and there'd be many hundreds if not thousands of pages of transcript and it may or may not be desirable to get it. The committee will have full power to secure that documentation if necessary. All other briefs are going to be made available to the committee and we have been in touch with the B.C. authorities in that connection.

There have been other investigations as well. In 1963 the Committee of the Ontario Legislature completed a general study on automobile insurance; in 1965 in Nova Scotia, the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities completed a rate study; in 1966, Alberta appointed a legislative committee to examine matters relating to automobile insurance, although I believe they have stood the matter for the present until they see the completion of the British Columbia investigation. We are in touch with the -- as much information as we can secure from these other investigations as well. So we will try to have a considerable body of documents and information available for the committee to study at once and be prepared to secure anything else the committee wants.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I notice that we have several motions here, or several resolutions setting up the various committees to do with different kinds of work. I must say that I was consulted earlier on in the session once in connection with what committee I might serve on, and it seems that I would be only able to serve on one of them, that was the only appointment that I would be given, and at that time they indicated more or less of the three committees which I would like or give preference to. However, since then I find that



(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . . there's one other committee being established, that on Rules and Orders, and when we come to it I definitely want to state that I want to be a member of that committee because it affects me personally, probably more than any other member of this House.

But in connection with this particular committee, I was wondering whether the government would see that I be notified of these meetings and whether it would be possible for me to become a member of the committee without a vote, if that is the main obstacle in this matter, because I find that various information is handed out to the members of the committees which is available later on to the various caucuses but which is not available to me. Therefore, I feel that so often I'm handicapped in this way in having the necessary material as far as research work is concerned. Therefore, I would like the government to give consideration to this matter and then I also would have notices of the meetings and I would have access to the material.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I notice that I'm one of the members on the committee that is to be set up and I hope that I can be of some value to the committee. I hope that it will not cost as much money as the one that the B. C. government is presently working on, because I understand that one cost a million dollars and that half of the cost of it was put up by the insurance industry. Now I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the insurance industry are making a contribution to the cost of this committee's work.

I was talking to two or three of the insurance men last month or so who had knowledge of this committee and they thought that it was pointless. Now I'm not saying that; they said that. They said that insurance rates, whether they be in British Columbia or whether they be in Prince Edward Island, are based on the loss cost, that is the cost of the losses plus the cost of administration and operation, and that if a million dollars was spent on an extensive study of this kind in British Columbia, that their findings would be equally as valid in Manitoba as they would be in British Columbia. I'm inclined to agree with them to a point, however, I would like to know whether or not the insurance industry intend to contribute to the overall cost of the committee's work.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I find myself in disagreement with the Honourable Member for Gladstone and I'm not certain that I am on this occasion, but if his suggestion was that -- or his recommendation was that the insurance companies should put up part of the cost of an investigation such as this, I would certainly be inclined to disagree, not because of the fact that it costs the insurance companies money, that's not the reason, but because I would think that to the extent that you have the insurance companies paying part of the cost that some people at least - I wouldn't be one of them - but some people would suggest that to the extent that they carried part of the load that they would use their influence to sway the opinion of the committee toward the point of views that they advanced. I think this should be a completely independent committee as I believe is suggested.

Unlike my honourable friend from Gladstone, I'm not a member of it and I do expect to take advantage though of hearing some of the discussions because I think it will be a very worthwhile investigation. I'm glad it's going to be held and I think that it's excellent that this province should have one to establish, to the extent that we can, just exactly the reasons behind these continuing rises in rates.

Now I think I know the reasons but there are people in this House and other places that don't agree with me on that point and I would hope that this committee could do something to arrive at a finding that would commend itself to the public. I certainly do agree with my honourable friend for Gladstone when he suggests that the industry should be invited to give evidence and make representations there, and I have no doubt that the committee will agree to that suggestion. I would think that they would take a special care to see that the various types of companies - the so-called board companies, the mutual companies, the co-operative companies, because we already have all of these companies operating in the Province of Manitoba - would all be given the opportunity to attend and I am sure that the committee will take the position that they will review, if not the evidence, at least the findings of British Columbia and other governments of the provinces that have held similar investigations, and I would think that by so doing that a lot of value could come from a committee of this kind.

I'm so interested in the subject that I expect to sit in on some of the deliberations myself and I would suggest to other members who are not named as members of the committee that they are perfectly at liberty to avail themselves of this opportunity as well, because the Honourable the Member for Rhineland has raised this question about his own participation in

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . . committees of this kind, and others - and I appreciate the position that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is in - but certainly according to our rules all of the members of the Assembly have the right to sit in the committee and even to take part in the deliberations. The only thing that they are prohibited from doing is voting, and I would think that the ones of us who attend would not find it difficult at all to persuade the committee that any and all material that is made available to members of the committee would also be made available to the ones of us who are interested enough to sit in on the discussions.

Therefore, I would feel that the committee has a worthwhile job to do, and while I appreciate the fact that some companies may take the position that the Honourable Member for Gladstone related to the House of saying that it was pointless, I would think that it would be certainly the definite minority that would take that view, because the view that I have heard expressed is that the industry itself recognizes that the public interest is involved here and should have a full disclosure of the reasons behind these varying changing and rising rates and that it's all to the benefit of the companies themselves that a very full investigation should take place. So I'm all in favour of the resolution and I'm sure that the membership of the House is chosen in a way that we can be guaranteed that full and useful investigation will take place.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in connection with this resolution. I welcome it once again. As we are aware, a similar resolution was proposed a year or so ago and then an election interfered with the sitting of the committee. I don't know whether the same might happen again, you never know in this game - if you can call it a game that we're in at the present time - sometimes it appears as though it is a rat race rather than a game. However, if an election doesn't intervene, I welcome the opportunity of serving on this committee with my colleague the Member from Inkster.

When the committee was suggested - two years ago I believe it was now, almost - I raised the question as to the scope of the inquiry as to whether or not it would include an investigation into the question of public ownership of automobile insurance. The then Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities, the Honourable Maitland Steinkopf, indicated to me that that would be the case, that there were no holds barred as far as the scope of the commission was concerned. I appreciate very much that at the present time there is a resolution before the House standing in my name dealing with the question of compulsory automobile insurance, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the fact of that resolution being before the House should not preclude an outside examination into the aspects of publicly-owned automobile insurance.

Now I did say a few things the other day in respect of automobile insurance and I certainly am not going to repeat them this morning as I have no intention of holding up the progress of this resolution. I welcome it, Mr. Chairman, and I trust and hope that when the committee meets and the question of automobile insurance is before the committee, that all of the insurance companies operating in Manitoba, and the general public, to a large degree, will appear before the committee and give us of their views and their knowledge of this question. I am sure that other members of the committee like myself from time to time receive complaints and letters from people who feel that they have been dealt with unjustly, and I would like to extend, if it is possible, through you, Mr. Chairman, an invitation to those people to appear before the committee and give the committee the benefit of their attitudes and their viewpoints in respect of automobile insurance.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this committee but I would hope that the committee would take advantage to the greatest extent of the B.C. enquiry. It seems to me that we periodically have these investigations into automobile insurance - all over this continent in fact - and I am always impressed here in this House even during the estimates how so many of the top brass personnel are tied up in such a wastage of executive people, and these enquiries must, if they proliferate too greatly, add to the very cost of the insurance that we are trying to enquire into.

Now the Honourable Member for Gladstone mentioned that the B.C. enquiry would probably cost \$1 million. I wouldn't be surprised if it cost considerably more than that, and if he was hoping that the companies contribute to this, well if they contributed all over Canada and every province made its own simple little enquiry, it would probably be \$5 million to be tacked onto the cost of insurance in Canada. I would hope that the committee would, because the conditions which are exposed in the B.C. enquiry must be generally applicable across Canada, surely that should serve as the main source of information required. In the interest

(MR. LISSAMAN, cont'd) . . . . of economy I would make this plea, because these companies must suffer from continually giving the time of their personnel to appear before committees, and I can recall during the period of time that I have been here there have been many enquiries in various states across the line and in Canada. I know there is this continual pressure of those who believe that the state should run everything. I don't happen to be one of those people and I think this continual inquiry must tend to make the costs of free enterprise institutions much greater than they would normally be, and I would suggest that one huge enquiry, and so all-comprehensive an enquiry as the B.C. enquiry has been, should serve as the basis of our study in this province.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . this resolution, I would like to make a general comment which applies to this committee and the other committees that we are setting up. It seems to me that we are setting up several committees of the House at this session and I recognize that each committee is its own master and can settle its own rules and decide how it wants to proceed, but I wonder in view of the fact that there are going to be several committees - and during the course of this summer many of the members will have other functions that they have to attend because of the Centennial - whether it wouldn't be wise to get each one of the committees, or encourage them to meet before the House rises, have a preliminary meeting of the committee members and try and establish dates then to suit the members as to when the hearings will be held. I think that this would work out very much to the advantage of the members themselves who could then block off on their calendars during the course of the summer and the fall the time that will be required for committee. I think it would be very helpful to those who intend to appear before the committee if these dates were then published so that they could prepare themselves, because undoubtedly in the case of this one, the insurance one, we want to get the insurance companies, and the more notice that we give them the better opportunity there will be for them to be prepared, as well for any private citizens who want to appear before us. I think that this will apply as well to all of our other committees.

I have noted in the past that frequently we appoint committees during the course of the session and then they just get delayed and delayed, through no fault of anyone really and no intention of delay, but you just can't get the members together it seems, and then we come along in the fall and we have the next session coming up and there is an urgency to get the thing done, so we assemble the committee and I don't think it accomplishes what we want to see done. So I recognize, as I said, that we cannot, I suppose, instruct the committees that this be done, but I think there would be a general improvement if they would agree to do so and I think it would speed up the work of the committees. The first official meeting then instead of being purely a formal routine one could actually become a working meeting, and the time of the MLA's would be used to better advantage and I think the committee could then come out with some useful recommendations for the next session.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one brief further comment. It is a fact, whether we like to admit it or not, that the B.C. committee has spent in excess of \$1 million; and it is a fact, whether we like it or not, that the insurance industry paid 50 percent of the cost. Now I don't know whether that's a good thing or whether it's a bad thing, but I would suggest to my honourable friend that he immediately enquire of the B.C. government as to the working arrangements, the financial arrangements that the insurance industry offered, or did they in fact offer to share in the cost. Or was the situation in reverse; was it the government that requested the insurance industry to contribute to the cost. Let's find out all these details so that when we start working in the committee we will have all of the facts before us.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should make a comment or two. Although this is only the money resolution stage, I think it is perhaps appropriate that I answer the questions. My honourable friend the Leader of the House will make some comment about other members joining in on any meetings. Fullest arrangements will be made to notify other members and they will all be welcome. I think it would be appropriate, as the Member for Lakeside said, to provide enough copies of everything for the MLA's who attend whether they vote or not.

My honourable friend from Gladstone's understanding of the British Columbia arrangement is quite different from my own. I am told that the British Columbia government expects to spend a half million dollars on the cost of the investigation and that there may be an additional half million dollars imposed on the companies for their part of the expenses in making representations. I think it is a very different situation from the one described by the Member for Gladstone. There is no implication, as far as I understand it, of any private interest

(MR. EVANS, cont'd) ..... contributing to the government costs of the investigation in British Columbia. I think my honourable friend may not have been aware of that, but he says its a fact that they are contributing to the cost of this thing; it's not a fact. He just has a complete misunderstanding of the situation. My honourable friend from Lakeside is right; it would not be the right principle to invite anybody, particularly those whose interests are being considered, to contribute to the cost of an independent investigation. So I think my honourable friend is completely mistaken when he phrases it the way he does, that the insurance industry is contributing to the costs of the government investigation. They are meeting their own expenses as they would be expected to do.

I think there will be no holds barred as far as the government is concerned in inviting everybody that the committee wants to hear, whether they be line companies, that is to say board companies or mutuals or co-operative companies, or any other kind. I am quite sure the committee should have freedom to call anybody that they like.

The scope is pretty wide in the wording of the resolution and I know of no intention of restricting the conduct of the investigation. I don't know who will be the chairman of it, that will be for the committee to decide, but as far as I am aware and as far as my intentions would be taken into consideration, it would be to allow the committee full freedom within the wording of the resolution. My honourable friend will notice it is almost identically the wording of the previous resolution. There are some minor changes - they were of no significance - but the wording is about the same and certainly it's intended to cover the whole question as to say whether rates are fair, to go into such matters as mid-term cancellations, the question of compulsory insurance or compensation without fault, or any of the other matters that might well be brought before the committee. It would be my understanding that the committee would have freedom to look into those.

The Honourable Member for Brandon has commented on an important matter, that if full-scale investigation imposes a half a million dollars on a government and may well impose a further half million on those making representations, we are duty-bound I think as a committee to see whether we can make economies by making use of investigations or of testimony submitted under oath in British Columbia and see to what extent that has to be expanded or supplemented before we come to our conclusion, and naturally, as the Provincial Treasurer if nothing else, I would be very keen to see that the point of view put forward by the Member for Brandon is given due consideration by the committee and the committee's decision will naturally be its own.

The Leader of the Opposition raises a very interesting point about this extremely crowded summer that we are about to go into. I think it would be right to endeavour - we don't know when the session is going to end - but to endeavour to have at least a preliminary meeting of the committee to consider its proceedings, and it would be ideal if we could arrange a schedule of meetings and be sure that we could count on it at this stage. I think it is too early to say that that can be done. I can undertake to see that the committee is called together, but whether the committee will be able to accomplish that purpose of arranging a schedule that can be set in advance, I don't know. That will be a matter for the committee to decide.

But in any event, as far as I can see in the wording of the resolution or certainly in the intention of the government, there is no intention to be restricted or to consider that there are forbidden territories into which the committee should not enquire. It is certainly not my intention and not the intention of the government.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for agreeing that, if we can, we will get the committees together for a preliminary meeting. I wonder if it is in order ....

MR. EVANS: ... just say that I had not intended to say anything about any other committee except this one, and I think my honourable friend is referring to all the committees.

MR. MOLGAT: That's right and I don't intend to repeat my suggestion on each committee. I think that the comment is sufficient for all of them. I wonder then if we can get the committees to agree to do that. If one of the Ministers - and I don't know which one whose responsibility it would be - could contact the Centennial Corporation and obtain for the preliminary meeting of the committee a calendar of events for the summer, as extensive as we can get it, so that the members then will be as fully informed as they can as to what likely things will take up their time in various areas of the province and any other information that the Minister could get so that we could arrive at a schedule for hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution --passed. Next resolution before the Committee:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Committee would agree to treat this as being read and appear on the record of the proceedings. -- (Agreed)

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the First Session of the 28th Legislature on Friday the twentieth day of January, 1967 adopted the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature, on Thursday, the 29th day of March, 1966 unanimously adopted a resolution that the Government consider the advisability of establishing a special Committee of the Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and the licencing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, as set out therein, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable;

AND WHEREAS pursuant thereto the Legislative Assembly did on the 26th day of April, 1966 appoint such a special Committee with power to hold public meetings and to sit during that session and in recess after prorogation and did authorize the Provincial Treasurer to pay expenses in connection therewith;

AND WHEREAS said Committee never met due to the calling of a General Provincial election;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of establishing a special Committee of the Legislature with the same duties and the same powers as set out in the said Resolution passed on the 26th day of April, 1966.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee of the Legislature be established to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional Associations and the licencing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, as set out therein, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Special Committee shall consist of Hon. Messrs. Baizley, Johnson and McLean, Messrs. Beard, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Hillhouse, Johnston, Lissaman, Masniuk, Petursson and Stanes:

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT the said Committee may hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next session of this Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee in recess after prorogation as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is in committee of course because it has to come in by way of money resolution because it's money that possibly will be spent between Sessions that's up before us at the present time. I don't believe any long explanation is required of this resolution. It had its genesis, I believe, last year. It was a private resolution moved by the Member for St. John's which was passed unanimously by the House, as was the previous resolution. A committee was established last year; the committee dissolved with the House when the election was called; it is now being re-established to carry out the work that was originally intended that should be done. There was another resolution passed again this year and this one that appears before us now is in pursuance of the will of the House this committee be established to look into the matters which are committed to it. There is very little else that can be said about it. I recommend it to the committee and hope that it will be approved.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I certainly wish to give my support to this resolution. I have expressed some concern about the regulations that govern the different professional associations, the licensing and the disciplining in the past. I feel that we've had a situation now that because of the conduct of a few professional men at times the public tends to maybe lose confidence in a certain profession and I don't think that this should be allowed to keep on going. I think that this is certainly a welcome resolution. This was from the Member from St. John's last year, I think, and then this committee will finally get started.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . I think that it is quite important.

It might be an idea - I don't know if we should change these terms of reference and so on - it might be an idea to maybe start with the law profession because I think that a lot of the others will probably fall in place when this is done. I see where my honourable friend the Member from Gimli thinks this is a good idea. I think that probably then we could go to his profession. It might be a good idea. And talking about this, I think that before passing the Medicare Bill it might be an idea to bring in the schedule of fees that we would pay the doctors. I think that I expressed some views - of course this is a different debate, this is the question of Medicare - but I think that it would be a lot easier - it is related to this - if we had a schedule of fees and if we made sure that we have the proper regulation regulating the doctors also.

I think that sometimes some of the professional men, those that should know better, seem that if you ever mention anything about any member in their profession, it's a personal insult. I think this is wrong, and I think that no profession - we're dealing with human beings, with men - no profession has a monopoly on honesty and no profession is all black either - or no group of men. So I think that we should realize that. I for one don't like to see any committees or disciplining boards or any board like this composed solely of people of that particular profession, whatever that profession might be, and I hope that we'll have a chance to discuss this at the time.

Now I think that this is going to be a very important committee. It will have to do its homework and I'm just expressing a fear here of - not even a suggestion - I see that two of the members are mentioned on the previous committee and that they will be now on this committee. I wonder if this is wise. I wonder if this will cause postponement or will hold back the committee. It seems to me out of 57 members it might be better to divide the work so that we are not held back at any time. The members that I'm talking about - the Attorney-General seems lost - I think that there is Mr. Craik and Mr. Hillhouse are mentioned here as members of this committee and they were mentioned on the previous committee.

Now this is just a thought. I wouldn't want all the other members to be held back because this member is at another meeting of another committee. It seems to me that we're enough here that maybe the Attorney-General should consider this or at least make sure that these two members will be available and have enough time because there is so much work to do on this that we shouldn't be delayed.

I hope also, like the Leader of the NDP said, that the people that might be able to contribute anything to the work of this committee will have a chance to be present. I hope that the aim and the terms of reference of the committee will be well publicized and that the people will be encouraged, those that have some contribution to make.

So I think these are the only remarks I have at this time. I certainly welcome this committee. I think it is greatly needed and it probably will prevent maybe certain things to happen, and if we do this now it will be easier to control these different professions and I think that it will give the confidence back to a group that maybe some of the public have lost because of just the action of a very few of some of these people in these professions.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to repeat anything that has been said in previous debates over the last year and this year on this question. We now are going to have the committee; it will sit; it has a very responsible task to perform which will have very far-reaching and long-reaching results. I hope that this committee will give the time which is required for this and will investigate what is being done in other jurisdictions.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface mentioned some of the problems of licencing and the fear that licencing should not be confined to a particular group for its own members, and we'll have to study this aspect of it. For example, I understand in the State of New York there is one licencing body which is responsible for all licencing in all professions, and this would set certain standards that would apply in principle rather than make it possible to have restrictive provisions in any one profession which would keep out people who are capable of contributing in that profession. On the other hand, the State of California has one board which looks after discipline, and regardless of what profession is involved, this one board is charged with all appeals and all regulations and practices in regard to discipline so that there would be a standardized procedure applicable to all.

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . .

These are matters we would have to study and I would hope that we will have the time or take the time to give it the proper attention. I have had sufficient enquiries from so many different professions that I am sure that there will be a great deal of interest of a positive nature from many of the professions, so many of whom feel that much could be accomplished each in their own professions.

I presume now if we pass this resolution we'll be able to deal with Bills 51 and 61 which are being held by the Speaker pending the creation of this committee and we could then proceed.

I would think, and I would agree with what the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party said in relation to the earlier resolution, that it would be well to meet quickly and establish certain, if not dates at least guidelines, because there is a fair amount of research material which will have to be accumulated and I think it would be well to have that material in hand before the committee actually starts to work. So it might well be that a preliminary meeting could bring in help from outside which could start work on the accumulation of material and I hope that that could be done quite soon.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief comment on again the work of the committee and a suggestion to enable it to do its work better and speed it up. I wonder if the Attorney-General could undertake to make a list of all of the associations that are likely to come under the scrutiny of this committee in preparation for the first meeting of the committee, and then that the Acts covering these associations be gathered for the committee members so that they would have them all ready and easy to discuss. There might be then at the first committee meeting suggestions from members of the committee for any additions, and quite obviously there might also be other associations who would come before the committee at a later date. But at least if what we have on hand at the moment was available, I think it would again make it easier for the committee to proceed with its work.

In general terms, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that I approve wholeheartedly of the work of this committee. In past years we have dealt with this on a piecemeal basis and I think it's been most unsatisfactory. I recall some years ago in particular, not so much recently, but a few years ago we seemed to get regular requests from various associations, particularly in the medical and paramedical fields, coming before us and asking for the right, for example, to use the term "Doctor". I recall that this was always the subject of great debate in the House as to whether or not it was right to give this permission, and it always appeared to me to be a ridiculous thing for the House to be settling because this was really an academic question and not one of politics or not one of legislative concern, a much more academic concern.

It had been my suggestion at that time that this should be referred to the university and that they be the body that determines whether or not the title "Doctor" was approved for certain professions. This carried on and we had various requests at different times for associations who wanted this and others who wanted to be incorporated. We have before us this year again some two requests, for the incorporation of associations and the other for an amendment.

So I think that this over-all approach will be a useful one. It may be that out of this we may establish a permanent form in the future of analysis for these requests so that there be some established practice rather than having a tremendous variety of Acts all with different types of provisions. So I support the appointment of the committee and hope that it will be ready to give us some useful suggestions for the next Session.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable members for their comments. I think we will move immediately to follow through on the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that we gather preliminary material together for the consideration of the members of the committee, that is the basic material such as the Acts and so on, and we will endeavour to call the committee together as soon as possible, if not - I doubt if it will be possible before the end of the Session - but as soon as reasonably possible thereafter in order that we can set the general terms of the inquiry and so on.

I would take some minor dissent from the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface about the purpose of the committee being to set at ease the minds of the public concerning any professions. This is not the case and this is not the reason for the committee being established at all. It's being established for the reasons that appear in the operative section of the resolution, to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and the licencing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in Manitoba, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical

(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . . and applicable, and all aspects of that matter can be looked into at the time.

I believe those were about the only comments that were made. We'll be happy to carry through on the worthwhile suggestions that have been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. Next resolution before the Committee deals with the Committee for the consideration of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly.

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to have the rules, orders and forms of proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba examined with a view to recommending such amendments as might be deemed in the interests of the orderly and efficient conduct of the business of the House;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that a Special Committee of the House be established to give consideration to the rules, orders and forms of proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and to report thereon to the House;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that the said Committee sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation and report at the next Session of the Legislature;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee of the House consisting of Mr. Speaker, Hon. Messrs. Lyon, Roblin, Hon. Mrs. Forbes, Messrs. Campbell, Klym, McKenzie, Molgat, Paulley and Stanes is hereby appointed to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly and to report thereon to the House;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the said Committee of the House have power to sit during the present session and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on the matters referred to it at this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the Committee in recess, after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, to me this is a very important committee because it will be dealing with the rules under which we will be operating here in the House, and I know from previous occasions when this committee was set up, a similar committee was set up, that as a result certain restrictions have been placed on my group especially, because I am representing the only -- being the only representative of my group, and therefore I feel that I would want to be a member of this committee. I would request that the government give consideration to this -- probably not only request but I think much stronger: that I insist on being a member of this committee because I feel that it's a very important one to me and the effects of this will be prevailing over the whole Legislature for the next number of years, and therefore I feel that I should be placed on the committee.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said, perhaps better than I can, that all members of the House are ex officio members of all committees of the House. They have all the powers of the members of the committee except the power of voting, and arrangements have already been made with the Clerk of the House whereby notification will be made to all members of the Legislative Assembly -- all 57 of us -- as to the meetings of any or all of these committees in order that members may avail themselves of the right to sit in on the various deliberations. I'm afraid I can't accept the premise or the insistence -- I believe that was the word he used -- of the Honourable Member for Rhineland that he be on this committee, because there are various members of the House, on all sides of the House, who would like to be on the committee and who because of the small number cannot be on. There are a number of members sitting behind me who would love to insist that they be on the committee but they can't, because the numbers are restricted. My honourable friend has the full rights, as have these members who are sitting behind me, to be on the committee as a person who can sit and hear what the deliberations are and participate in the deliberations and do everything but vote, and I suggest that in the circumstances the committee remain as it is. He will be accorded all of the courtesies that apply to any member of the committee, and the only thing he won't be able to do is to vote and we will make sure that he is



(MR. LYON, cont'd) . . . . informed of all of the sittings of the committee when the committee meetings are called.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't accept the Honourable Minister's statement just like that because there's no reason why the committee cannot be enlarged and that representation can be put on the committee from my group. All the other groups are represented except the one that I represent and therefore consideration should be given. On previous occasions we've had a committee of this type and I attended some of the meetings, and while I can hear the discussions I have no way of putting any motions forward. Not being a member you cannot submit your own motions and speak on them, and therefore I feel that this is actually discrimination here in the House against one particular party.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there are only three parties in this House, officially recognized parties, the Progressive Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the NDP Party. There are no other officially recognized parties in this House.

MR. FROESE: That's the very thing, Mr. Chairman. This was done at the last committee that was set up and the government is responsible for the very thing that my party is not recognized in this House, and I take exception to that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that I'm going to have to break the degree of unanimity that has appeared to be in the House this morning on these resolutions, because quite frankly I support the contention of the Member for Rhineland in this matter. I'm one of those who believe strongly in the British parliamentary system. I believe that it was established and operates best on the two-party system. The British have maintained it that way. Canadians don't seem to have been able to do so - that's their own choice. But, recognizing that, I think on the other hand that we have to admit the situation as it exists, and while it's true that the Member for Rhineland is the sole member of his party in this House, the facts are that it has operated in elections as a party, that in other jurisdictions it does have a larger number of members, and while the government may take the position and sticks with it here in the House that due to the numbers it does not constitute a party from a House standpoint, I think that the realistic facts are that from a provincial standpoint it has operated as a party.

Well then, when we come along to the rules, the rules after all do bear in a number of cases on party matters. We have amended them in the past insofar as questions of the right to speak, for example, over a longer time depending on the party matter and so on. So I think that the Member for Rhineland has here some claim to being not only present at the committee meetings but having the right to vote on these particular matters.

I would also point out that the composition of the committee, Mr. Chairman, at this point, would leave room for the addition of another member. The total of the committee at the moment is nine, on which the government has six members - pardon me, 10; is it 10? Oh, plus the Speaker, yes. But insofar as the balance it's - that's right it's 10, so that gives the government seven members, in a sense, but leaving the Speaker out let us say six actual direct government members. There are two members from my own party and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, so this leaves the balance - again leaving the Speaker out as an extra - of the government having twice the number of members on the committee as then have the combined opposition, and this is not in any way a reflection of the membership in the House. The membership in the House is very much closer than that, as the government well knows and has found out on the number of votes how close it is. So the addition of one more member would still leave the government in its traditional position of having a majority on the committee; it would not upset that and I'm not suggesting that we should at this time, but it would give I think a more proper representation for the combined opposition side of the House and would put the Member for Rhineland on the committee as an actual voting member. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the name of Mr. Froese, the Honourable Member for Rhineland, be added to the proposed committee.

MR. LYON: I'm wondering if that is in order at the committee stage. I was just going to suggest to my honourable friend that we could probably bring this to a head by moving, by leave, such a motion when we got back into the House before the Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I would think the resolution can be amended at the committee stage, can it not, in the same way as we can amend at the committee stage a bill or any other proposal before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is considered a money resolution and it can't be amended at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd be prepared to move that consideration be given to the advisability of it adding the name of Mr. Froese, the Honourable Member for Rhineland; it's the wording is the question.

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member for his motion, I think that's perhaps the best way of treating it. I rise to say, with some reluctance, that I can't really support the motion because of the precedent that would be involved in it. If I thought any real hardship was being done to the Honourable Member from Rhineland I would be the first to agree, but I'm sure that he will avail himself of the opportunity to be present at all of the committee meetings because of the interest he has in this, and I suggest that we would be forming rather a bad precedent to insist that one member, who is in the same position as any other one member of the House, should as a right be able to insist that he be on any particular committee of the House. I don't think we should accept that, or the committee should accept that because

...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a motion before us, do we not now? I must say that I find myself in a bit of a peculiar position, and I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland might find himself in a similar position as I was as Leader of a party, saying something and chastised because I attempted to take an independent viewpoint on the matter. I also wonder whether or not in this particular case whether it would be advisable not to support the motion, because I remember in this House in 1953, and prior to that he was a member, but in 1953 there was a member, one member, and he was in effect the Provincial Leader of the Communist Party of Manitoba and he was in this House and he was not recognized other than an individual, and his party was not recognized within the House at all, and I'm wondering whether or not we would be establishing a precedent that would be hard to control in the future.

Now maybe the Honourable the present Leader of the Liberal Party is speaking for a call because as I visualize the destiny of political parties in Manitoba, it could well be that they are too long. There may be one representative of the Liberal Party. It could well be, Mr. Chairman, that there might only be one member of the New Democratic Party in this House. And I would suggest, I would suggest that this is the manner in which we have to look over the proposition. It's fine to establish precedents but they're awfully hard to stop. Now in our Elections Act, in our Elections Act we have over the years recognized the fact of political parties, and I suggest that before we recognize any other political party, at least that party must show support within the House. Now my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, in all due respect, cannot on a party basis propose a motion before the House, because unless it is by courtesy my honourable friend cannot receive a seconder to any motion which he intends to propose.

I would deal with this matter a little differently, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, if the member for Rhineland, who happens to be a member of the Social Credit Party of Manitoba, could with support propose within the House a program, platform and program of the Social Credit Party of Manitoba. But he can't do this except by courtesy, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I can't find myself in agreement with the proposition of the Honourable Leader of the LPP. I'm reluctant, quite frankly, on a personal basis to say this to my honourable friend for Rhineland. I know that the honourable gentleman does make invaluable contributions to the debates within the House. But I want to say to him quite frankly that if I couldn't propose a motion in this House without having to rely on somebody by courtesy to assist me, I wouldn't ask to be considered in the House as a member of a political party for the purpose of this Legislature.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I share the views just expressed by my honourable leader, but I would just like to add a few observations. I certainly don't object to an individual sitting on a committee and if the Leader of the Opposition had said that there should be another person, and even if he identified the other person, it would have been an acceptable type of motion to vote for. But when he bases the entire presentation of this name on the fact that the person named is representing a political party that sits in this House, then I say, Mr. Chairman, that we can't support a resolution which selects that person on that basis, for two reasons, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the views of the House should reflect, or the committee should be composed of people from the government side and people from the opposition side, and those are the two sides of the House. It should also reflect opposition opinion, and therefore it's been split into the two parties which reflect opposition opinion. Now if we were to try to have opposition opinion reflected by every single

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . party that sits in the opposition we may have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where people will declare themselves as constituting a political party. The Honourable Member for Rhineland keeps saying "my group." I would ask him what is the definition of the word "group"? He hasn't given us a definition of that word.

But I want to deal with it from a statistical basis as well. If the Leader of the Opposition's proposal were acceptable, we would have 100 percent of the Social Credit Party people represented on that committee. One hundred percent of that Party would be represented on that committee, and possibly 20 percent of the New Democratic Party, a similar percent of the Liberal Party, and maybe 25 percent - I haven't figured it out - of the members of the Conservative Party, and I don't think that we can establish or should establish a principle that because an individual sits here representing a political party - and I accept the fact that they are political parties - that he automatically should get status on a committee. I think that the committee should reflect the views of the members of the House. I think that they do. I think that the Member for Rhineland's views are adequately reflected by various of the members of the Liberal Party who will sit on that committee. That being the case, I don't think that we are going to lose any of the contribution that could be made even in an official way, and of course the Honourable Member for Rhineland can appear in an unofficial capacity and let us know exactly what he thinks.

So my position, and I think the position of my group, is that committee should reflect both sides of the House. The manner in which the Leader of the Opposition puts forward this proposal is a dangerous precedent and I say an unacceptable precedent to follow, that a party, no matter how represented, is entitled and should have a voice on a committee of the House in an official way, and therefore I can't support the amendment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, it is quite interesting, the various comments and remarks that are being made. The last speaker mentioned the percentage figures that would be represented for my group and he says that it would be 100 percent. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House here that in the eight years that I have been in this House never have I been appointed to one single special committee, whereas other members have served on five, six, ten committees and more, and this is going to be the first time that I will be named on a committee, on a special committee, the one that's following, and I'd be quite happy to give up that position on that committee and go on this committee, because I feel this is more important to me and, as I have said before, I have sat in on the House Rules Committee on previous occasions but not being a member you cannot put forward your propositions and I think this is a handicap, and certainly the government, with all the members that they have, should be able to give this little consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, this Rules Committee is one that I am always interested in and I am interested in the effort to get the most widely agreed to rules that we possibly can, and so I am glad to see the committee being set up again. I won't take any time to debate that factor at the present moment at all and shall confine myself to the motion that is before you.

I am delighted to find that the Leader of the New Democratic Party quotes such an excellent precedent as what happened in 1953. I agree with him. Those were the days when things were done properly in this House and I appreciate his belated recognition of that fact, because any time that my honourable friends want to refer back to those good days, they will have my unqualified support, Mr. Chairman. I don't agree, so whole-heartedly though with my honourable friend the Member for Inkster for whose opinions I usually have a great deal of respect, because he seems to say that he can't support a motion that's based on ratios arrived at by political divisions, if I understood him correctly. No? That's not what he said? Let me see if I can get it a little bit closer: that he can't support a motion based on membership in a political party. Well then I'll have to ask him what, if he'll . . .

MR. GREEN: I said that I can't support the motion based solely on the fact that the person represents a political party.

MR. CAMPBELL: Based solely on the fact that a person represents a political party. Well now then, Mr. Chairman, what do the other members in here represent? Aren't they picked from the political parties, all the rest of them? They all come from political parties in here that are named to the committee so far, and --(Interjection)-- well, it seems to me that they - well I'll admit that some of us, myself at least, I certainly must be picked because of the fact that people recognize that I'm the right person to be put on the committee. This is a proper basis. But everybody else, everybody else must be picked because they belong to that particular party. Solely. I'm not going to let my friend, Mr. Chairman, amplify his speech

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . .any more. I've got him where I want him now and I think he'd better just stay there.

So, I come to his next argument, which dealt with the statistical position, and he thought that the statistical position couldn't be justified. Well it can't. This is true; this is true. Statistically it can't be justified, but can the present distribution here be justified statistically? The government side, if you count Mr. Speaker, has seven members; the Opposition, which is almost equal to it in total, has three; so are they 2-1/3 times as big as we are? You just can't get this statistical position to work out accurately, and so we come back to the argument that I think was perfectly properly used by my leader, and that is, the government will still have a majority; if my honourable friend is placed on the committee the government will still have a majority, a substantial majority, and why not allow the honourable gentleman to be placed on the committee of his choice. Now the Honourable the Attorney-General used some such term as that he didn't want to establish the precedent that a single member here could insist on being put on a committee. Well this isn't a case of him being able to insist in this position. It's just the other members have to try and insist on his behalf, and I think it's only fair . . .

MR. LYON: I was referring to the words of the honourable member when I used the word "insist".

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, well . . .

MR. FROESE: . . . said "request."

MR. CAMPBELL: This is an argument between my two honourable friends, not between me, and they can debate over the question of the word, but no single person here is in a position to insist. But the rest of us I think have a right to insist on what appears to be reasonably fair play, and here is the situation. Mr. Speaker will probably be the chairman of this committee if we follow established precedent, and I suggest that we should. Mr. Speaker will be the chairman. That's all to the good. Then there will be six members of the government party, and as it stands now there would be only three of the opposition. Now if there were any danger, any danger in the world by the addition of my honourable friend placing Mr. Speaker in the position of having to decide a matter in that committee on the basis of party affiliation, I would be the first to say that he should be relieved of that responsibility. If this brought it up to where the opposition members were in a position to put the Speaker in that difficult position, I wouldn't advocate it at all. But we wouldn't. The majority would still be six to four, and I suggest that on the basis of reasonable fairness that we should accept the motion.

Then I make another suggestion to the government, and that is that we frequently find in this House that situations arise where, for the expedition of business, we find that we have to ask - and it will happen before this session ends - we have to ask for unanimous consent in order to do certain things that the House as a whole wants to do, and that's a proper thing to have happen once in awhile, and that's the case where one member is in a position to insist on certain things, and in order to help that person - it happens to be this way in this House - in order to help that person to feel that he is given a fair deal, I think we ought to pass the motion.

MR. GREEN: . . . if the honourable member would permit me a question. Does not the honourable member agree that the views of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the rights and privileges which he would have to have protected would be eloquently represented by the Honourable Member who just spoke, who sits on the committee?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes, I intended to refer to that, Mr. Speaker. I intended to refer to that because I saw that my honourable friend was looking at me when he was saying that he thought the views -- but for the edification of my honourable friend, whose education I would like to advance, I must point out to him that the matters that are discussed on the Rules Committee are not economic ones, on which my honourable friend and I do share some opinions, but the Rules Committee is not based on economic and financial considerations. I must point out to my honourable friend that they have to do with the conduct of the business in the House here, and even though he wants to put the Honourable Member for Rhineland and myself in the same bed, economically and financially, yet we might just happen to have differing views on the question of procedure in the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have very little to add to what has been said, but I think that the Attorney-General seemed to worry about starting a precedent and I don't think this has been clearly demonstrated. I don't think that this is the case at all. But on the other hand - I wonder if he would think about it for a minute - would it be right to start a precedent

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . . that nobody, no other members unless they are members of a party that have enough numbers, could ever be part of a committee? You might have some independent members come in; they could never be part of a committee; and I think that this is the danger. I think that they are elected to the Legislative Assembly the same as the honourable member, and I think that certainly we all agree that it would be wrong that because he is alone and he wants his party represented, he should be on every single committee. I think it has already been said that he would be welcomed to listen in on the deliberations and so on, but he shouldn't be a member of each committee but this is not what this motion is asking at all.

Now we are dealing with the rules of the House and I think that more often we have to turn to him and say, "Will you co-operate?" than any other single member of this House. In the last two or three years we have had this occasion many times, and I think that he should have a chance to be in on the discussions. Just a few days ago we asked for his co-operation and I think that it is only fair, especially in this one, that he should be there. He's not going to change everything by himself; I don't think that there is that much fear. I think that he should be in there as a duly qualified member of the committee. We are not establishing a precedent but we are also refuting the idea that he should never be part of any committees or that an independent member of this House should never be part of this committee. We might lose some valuable men, people at this time who could contribute to a special committee, and I certainly think that we should in this case vote in favour of the motion of my Leader.

MR. LYON: . . . a final word. I don't want to prolong debate on this matter. I would merely point out to my honourable friend, he says he has never been on a special committee. He was, and he will acknowledge, that he was consulted about the three special committees and was put on the one of his choice, the Agricultural Committee. He was also consulted about all of the standing committees of the House and I merely point out for the record that he is a member of the following standing committees: Privileges and Elections, Public Accounts, Agriculture and Conservation, Municipal Affairs, Law Amendments, Statutory Orders and Regulations. And so, far from being unfair to my honourable friend, I suggest that the government and all the members of the House have bent over backwards to accommodate my honourable friend on not only standing committees but on special committees of the House. I repeat again, if I thought there was any prejudice occurring to him or to the group that he represents, I would support the motion. I am confident in my own mind that no such prejudice results and I welcome, as all of us do, that the honourable member come to all of the meetings of the Committee on Rules and participate in the deliberations of that Committee. I can't, however, find it necessary to support the motion, well motivated as I'm sure it is, of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I can't suggest that the Social Credit Party should be represented by the same numbers as the New Democratic Party - it just doesn't seem to hold water; and I suggest that considering all of the circumstances that we are being fair to my honourable friend and that there is no intention on the part of the government to be unfair at all. We merely suggest that this Committee should proceed with the membership as has been indicated from the various parties.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, hearing the Honourable Minister speak, he's certainly not quite saying what should be said, because I referred to Special Committees, and I still maintain, and he knows well it's true, that I have yet to be put on any Special Committee in the House over the last eight years. He referred to the motion that is next on the Order Paper. This committee has not been established yet. We're speaking on what has taken place since I came into the House up to the present time, and I still maintain, and I know, and he knows well too, that I have not been on any Special Committee in the last eight years and I am quite willing to forego my position on the other committee that is coming forward and be placed on this committee, because this one is more important to me than the other one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put and due to the fact that it's my amendment, I would just like to say a few words on the subject. The Leader of the House said that his concern here is the, I believe the precedent that it would establish. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there would be any precedent in this matter. I think we have made some changes in the past when a name comes up and someone wants to be added. In fact we have made a change in the past in the case of the honourable member in question right now, not on a special committee it's true, but on a standing committee of the House. It was back in 1965. At the previous Session we had asked the Committee on Privileges and Elections to make a

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . particular study of The Elections Act, and this had proceeded and the report was turned in by the then Attorney-General, the Honourable Mr. McLean, at the very opening of the Session of 1965 on the second day, on the 23rd of February. The report of that committee came in. Then, as is normal for the Committee of the House to select the names of the members of the standing committee that was established a few days later, the committee met and made its report giving the names of the standing committee members.

At that time the Honourable Member for Rhineland moved an amendment, and his amendment asked as follows: "that the report of the committee be referred back to the committee with further consideration of my request to have my name added to the Committees on Privileges and Elections, and Statutory Regulations and Orders, and there was a debate at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I think the general tenor of the debate was that a free member did not have any special right to be on these, and the House supported that point of view and opposed the amendment. But because he had a particular interest in one of the committees, that was the one on Privileges and Elections which was again dealing with specific matters in which he had some concern, the very same day after turning down officially the request that he be put on two committees, it was agreed by the House on motion of the Government Whip that his name be added to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and this was done on a voluntary basis by the House.

No precedent was established by that, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that no precedent will be established now by adding his name to this committee. I think this is one where he has a rightful claim for concern, because the rules of the House, while they deal with each of us as individuals, also deal, Mr. Chairman, with the question of party. Now say all you want that he doesn't represent a party here, fine. He doesn't and I don't necessarily agree with the views of his party, but he has a special concern nevertheless, and Mr. Speaker, the rules are there for the protection of minorities and the rules of the House are very important.

Sometimes I know we're criticized for spending a great deal of time discussing the rules in this House, but they are vital to the whole operation of the House. They come to us by long tradition; they're not immovable, they are things that can be changed; but they are nevertheless the key on which rests our whole operations here, and the rules are there for the protection of minorities, Mr. Chairman, not for the protection of the government, and I submit here that my honourable friend is a minority in this House but that he has a special concern on this committee. This is a committee that bears a very special relationship to the members and to he in his capacity, whether we recognize that here officially or not, and that in this particular case the House should put this honourable member on the committee, that he has a right to be there, and under our minority concept of the rules, that he should be on that committee and I would ask the members of the House, not on the question of precedent - there is no precedent here - but on the question of the protection of individuals and of minorities in this House, that his name should be added.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The motion before the Committee is: that the Committee give consideration to the advisability of adding the name of Mr. Froese, the Honourable Member for Rhineland, to the proposed committee.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows: Yeas 11, Nays 37.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion lost. Resolution -- passed.

The next resolution before the Committee deals with a committee to be appointed to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba. Are you ready for the question?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment shortly on this. This committee, as the members will be aware of, was set up at the last Legislature and dissolved at the time of dissolution of the last Legislature. I believe that one preliminary meeting was held. We find ourselves in somewhat the same situation as the earlier committee that was set up this morning, that is the one enquiring into the automotive insurance industry, insofar as that members of the House will be aware, particularly the rural members will be aware of a present ongoing Inquiry by the federal authorities dealing with much the same matter, that is the whole farm

(MR. ENNS cont'd).... machinery industry and its special problems. I would think that this committee should make every effort not to attempt to duplicate the efforts that are being put forward by that committee. Indeed, if we use the present Federal Inquiry's information right, it could help this committee in first of all defining our sphere of inquiry as it relates to the province only. We could also make use of much of the material that was prepared by the farm machinery groups, that is, industry or the farm organizations who have prepared briefs for the presentation to the Federal Inquiry that was held here, I believe, in early February, if my memory serves me right.

I think that I would like to, if at all possible, convene this committee for preliminary meeting prior to the House rising so that we could make an effort to get some preliminary work done, and then if at all possible set up our schedules. I have not the information at hand as to when the Federal Inquiry is expected to come down. I would rather hesitate to say that it would come down in time for this committee to give full consideration to it. It would of course be very convenient if this were to occur. In that event we may well decide to hold some of our meetings at the latter stages of the summer or the early fall, where we could use or have a close look at what the Federal Inquiry Commission had to say about farm machinery.

I would also recognize that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead withdrew one of his resolutions on the Order Paper earlier in the Session with the understanding that was given to him by me that questions of his concern, or his group's concern, would come under the scope of this Inquiry and that certainly is our intention, and with that I would simply ask members to support the setting up of this committee.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a long discussion about the cost-price squeeze that the farmer finds himself in. Everybody in the House has recognized that, and certainly the cost of farm machinery is one of the contributing factors. Now I'm not certain, Mr. Chairman, whether this committee is empowered to deal with the price of farm machinery. Apparently it is to investigate and report on all aspects of the sale and use of farm machinery and repairs, so I suppose that it would deal with the price of the machinery and the price of the repairs of same. I know the farm union did present a brief earlier in March - two months ago. Well they presented several; the one that I have before me is Manitoba Farmers Union Supplement to the Royal Commission on Farm Prices, and there's certainly some very startling figures given on Appendix C, in which they report the cost of farm machinery, several of the major items required on a farm, and the tremendous increase in the last 15 years or so. It's surprising; a tractor, for instance, that cost \$1,000 in 1935 costs \$7,200 today; that is the tractor they suggest that will do the same amount of work. Seed drill \$230.00, now \$1,400; so certainly if this committee will do anything at all to alleviate the cost-price squeeze, I am all for it.

One of the things that I would like to suggest that this committee do, is to investigate the value of this Farm Machinery Syndicate Act and the effect that it has had. Now it was set up with a real purpose in mind and facilities for borrowing money by a group of farmers, a syndicate. To me it seems that not too many farmers in Manitoba have taken advantage of this legislation, and I wonder why. I wonder why they haven't. Back four years ago, the Minister of Agriculture made a statement: "If we are going to have the family farm, we must have some sort of rental deal whereby the farmer will be able to rent the machinery he needs when he has good crops." Now the Farm Machinery Syndicate Act provided for a group of farmers to get together and buy heavy equipment that they could use more effectively, and certainly would reduce their capital costs. I wonder if the committee would look into that aspect of it and also the possibility of setting up some system whereby farmers can rent machinery. That is, just everyone knows that it isn't good business for a quarter section farmer or a half section farmer to invest \$10,000 into any machinery item - I was going to suggest a combine that he uses for 10 days. It would be ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... draw his attention to the fact that I think these are matters that should be discussed in the committee and now we are considering ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm not on the committee and I won't have an opportunity to discuss it. All I'm saying is I hope ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: All members can attend the committee meetings.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Are we not in committee now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LYON: ... the possibility of spending the money between sessions for the purposes

(MR. LYON cont'd).... of the committee to sit. That's what we're discussing right now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I think this is the time to discuss it. I'm just hoping that the committee will consider these various aspects of farming when they deal, when they are in fact working - that is, the syndicate. Another aspect that I think they should look into is this: 76 percent, so I'm told, of all the financing that farmers make use of in financing implement sales, are provided by implement dealers and I suggest that this is a pretty expensive way of financing farm machinery. I wonder if this end of it would be looked into as well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Minister for carrying out the promise which he made to me some time ago during this Session, that he would indeed look into the question of farm implement testing, and that as a result of this promise he has seen fit to announce that he will set up this special committee. I think this is a very positive approach on the part of the Minister. I recognize that the Minister certainly is willing to accept reasonable suggestions and so forth.

I just might cite some examples of what we may deal with. The Minister had mentioned a moment ago that we have a federal jurisdiction taking a study of farm implements and matters related thereto, and that we don't want to cover the same ground, and I think this is reasonable. But I think there are areas which we will have to deal with, areas which the federal authorities will not cover, and that is a Farm Implement Act. We had a Manitoba Farm Implement Act; I think we have to go through that one. We have repair service problems which could be provincial or federal. We have purchase contracts which have to be looked at, and of course this comes under the Farm Implement Act, and the question of warranty services and so forth. And of course the most important, in my opinion, is still farm implement testing. So with these few remarks, I simply want to conclude by stating that we do have an area to cover and that I do hope that we're not going to cover the same ground because I'm sure that we don't want to spend people's money in duplication of services, and I'm just thankful that the Minister has seen fit to carry out this type of study.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe my Leader would like to say a few words on this and he's coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a worthy committee that is being set up here and I hope they bring in a good report so that the effort can be a successful one. However, Mr. Chairman, if the government is interested in maintaining its record and if they insist that they will be using it against me in not being able to be on the Rules Committee, I extend to them my previous offer. I'm quite happy to relinquish my position on this committee and suggest that my name be withdrawn.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution. I'd just like to make a brief comment on the origins of the resolution because we originally moved - that is my members did, my colleague the Member from LaVerendrye constituency moved, at the beginning of the Session of 1966, that such a committee be established, and at that time I did not relate as to how the resolution had come about but I'd just like to say a very brief word because the member who is responsible for it is now sitting in the House.

This had first been suggested to me at a meeting in Hamiota constituency at which the Honourable the present Member for Hamiota was nominated a candidate for the Liberal Party. He'd had a study group doing some work beforehand on questions of interest to the Province of Manitoba, and one of the recommendations of that study group was that this whole question of farm machinery prices was one that was probably foremost in the minds of the farmers and required a complete study. Arising directly, then, out of that meeting and his work, we then introduced the resolution in the House which was subsequently accepted by the government. So I just wanted to make that word of comment now that the Member is here in the House.

I support the resolution. I know that last year the committee was established and while it was very late in the Session, I think to the credit of the committee it can be said that it actually did hold one or two meetings - two I believe, very late at night as I recall the situation, but nevertheless the meetings were held and I think some preliminary work done. I would hope that preliminary work will be available to the present committee and anything that happened in the intervening time.

I would hope too, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will look beyond just the matter of the prices of farm machinery and the sale and so on, because I think that there is here a golden opportunity for Manitoba on another aspect altogether but related to agriculture, and that is the



(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... development of a further farm implement industry in our province. We've already made some good steps in that regard. We have a number of firms, some here in Winnipeg and some now outside of Winnipeg. They are doing a good job for themselves. They are employing a lot of people and they are producing good products. They're doing a good job for agriculture because they are closer to our problems here in the west and to our agriculture in the west. They're much more resilient to the needs of the farmers than is an industry based 2,000 miles away from us, and it would be helpful if we came out of this and developed programs - double barrelled programs - one to aid agriculture, the other to aid industry. And so I hope that the committee will take a broad view in this and come back to us with recommendations along these lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has adopted four resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: ... resolutions and get them off the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, the resolution standing first under this item in the Order Paper.

MR. LYON: ... agreed as read.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, that the resolution standing in my name relative to a special committee of the House on rules, orders and forins of proceeding of the Legislative Assembly, be adopted.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Secretary, that the resolution standing in my name relative to the establishment of a special committee on professional associations be adopted.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the resolution standing in my name be adopted and read a second time. I wonder if at this time, Mr. Speaker, I may make a correction that I neglected to do at the committee stage, that is the substitution of the Honourable Member from Roblin, Mr. McKenzie, by the Honourable Member from Virden, Mr. McGregor. I wish that he be on that committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.