

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 25, 1967

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on government orders tonight we would like to call first the Committee of the Whole House, deal with Bill 97 while the First Minister is still in the House, and if we make reasonable progress on Bill 97 we would then propose to move out of Committee of the Whole and go over to the resolution standing in my name with respect to the hours and days of sitting of the House, and if we make reasonable progress on that resolution, then get on to second readings and perhaps call - I believe there's some request that we call the Natural Products Marketing Act Bill - we could call that one first as the third item of business tonight. So we would like to follow that general order of proceedings and see what progress we can make in these various items and hopefully be able to touch on all of them.

I would therefore ask you, Sir, to call the Committee of the Whole House. I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bill 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. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would be obliged if the committee would turn to Bill 97, the one to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, and take note of the fact that certain amendments to the Bill are being distributed which I would like the committee to consider and which I will be glad to introduce and explain as we come to them. They are not major amendments but they do tidy up some things that had been overlooked at the first writing of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 97. Committee ready to proceed? (Sections 1 to 3 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, after (3), I would like to move a new section (4) which you have in front of you and which reads as follows: (4) Section 59 of the Act is amended by: (a) adding thereto immediately after the word "also" in the second line thereof the words "not more than one-half"; and (b) by striking out the words "to the extent of \$350.00" in the third line thereof.

May I explain this amendment. As the Bill stands at the present time, when the House meets the members get their expense allowance right away and \$350.00 on their indemnity, that's all, and it was thought useful at this stage to knock out that \$350.00 and allow a payment of half the indemnity during the session and the other half being payable when the session ends. The \$350.00 item was put in in 1947 and times have changed a lot since then, so this gives the new regulation as to how the money may be paid out and I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: New section (4) (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (4) -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Now of course that means, Sir, that all the subsequent sections have to be re-numbered and I so move, but I will deal with -- perhaps if you'd call them the way they are in the printed bill it will be easier to follow.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll call the numbers in the Bill as printed and perhaps save some confusion that way. Section (4) as printed; 61B (a) -- passed; (b) --.

MR. ROBLIN: May I move on 61B, Mr. Chairman, after the word "council" in the second line, add these words: "Or the member recognized by the Speaker as occupying the position of Leader of the Opposition." The reason for this is to make it clear that neither the members of the Executive Council nor the Leader of the Opposition are entitled to the \$20.00 per diem which I think would be regarded as fair. I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you going to move the rest of that motion?

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you. And by re-numbering the said section 61B as subsection (1) and by adding thereto at the end thereof the following subsection: (2) Where the Speaker is occupied in performing duties or functions in his capacity as, or relating to his office of Speaker of the Assembly, on a day when the Assembly is not sitting and he is not attending a meeting or sitting of a Standing or Special Committee of the Assembly, he shall be allowed and paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund, (a) an indemnity of \$20.00 for each day he is so occupied; and (b) the amount of the expenses incurred by him in performing the duties or

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)... functions as approved by the Comptroller-General.

When I move these I advise the committee that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of the subject matter of this resolution and recommends it to the House. Members will recognize that this will give the Speaker the right to claim \$20.00 a day if he's on official duty when the House is not sitting or when he's not attending some special committee down in Winnipeg. I think members will agree this is a reasonable provision to be made for the Speaker's expenses in this connection.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: 61B as amended -- passed; Section 4 of the Bill -- passed; Section 5 - 64 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on (5), that includes both -- oh, you're (a) (b) and (c), are you? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On page 2 at the top of the page we have passed (a), (b), (c) and (d).

MR. CAMPBELL: Call the next one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 64 -- passed; 65 (1) (a)

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, with regard to 65, subsection (1), in looking this over it seemed to me that it would be preferable, if the Bill is going to be passed, to have a set number of years rather than the three Legislatures. I recognize what the Honourable the First Minister said when he was speaking on the Bill and I think he said that in the ordinary course of events it would probably represent 12 to 15 years, but on the other hand, I think we have had during the fairly recent years a case where there would be three Legislatures within the space of actually less than six years, if my recollection is correct, and that situation could happen again. I realize that it doesn't happen very often, but wouldn't it be better to make it a number of years instead?

I'm of no firm opinion about the number of years, as a matter of fact I wouldn't object if we took the lesser of the two figures that the First Minister mentioned, and if I'm correct in my recollection of those figures, I think he said 12 to 15. I wouldn't care if it be even 12, but I do suggest for consideration that it would be a better way to have it than the Legislatures, because sometimes these accidents do happen and Legislatures last a --(Interjection)-- Yeah, you thought I was going to suggest 45 eh?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I see the honourable gentleman's point but I think that three parliaments really puts us in a longer qualifying period than any other jurisdiction, because it's either two parliaments or ten years - yes, two parliaments or ten years - nine years in Newfoundland. I recognize the point my honourable friend makes, but in looking over the history of the life of the Legislatures in Manitoba, and in the other provinces generally speaking, I myself would rather take a chance on three sessions rather than the other one. I don't really think -- it may not turn out to make much difference in the long run but I would really prefer to leave the Bill the way it stands at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS ... a question to the Honourable the First Minister. What if somebody were in the third parliament, but if one of the members was to die, how many years would he qualify - the fact that he has been elected three times.

MR. ROBLIN: Well if he were a member of three parliaments, he would qualify. --(Interjection)-- No, you'd have to contemplate the fact that -- in that case of course it should be pointed out he is not entitled to the full pension. His family are not entitled to the full pension, it's to the half pension should that happen.

MR. CAMPBELL: I didn't prepare a motion and I don't even propose to move one, but the fact that has been mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Boniface does pinpoint this case, that in the event of one or two very short Legislatures happening, then it could be possible -- to take a specific case, it could have been possible that a person elected in 1958 and again in 1959 could have been in those two and could have moved into only the first or second year of the 1962 one and have qualified for a pension because he would have served on three Legislatures. Actually, in that case I guess he would have been only four years or five. It's for that reason that it seems to me that a set number of years would be preferable.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, wouldn't the solution be to say three Legislatures or not less than, and put the number of years so that then there would be a clear-cut understanding as to what is meant.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on the same token, if you've had three elections and instead of death a member for some reason or other would retire after one year, like right now if a member would -- this would be his third session and he - not session, Legislature - and if

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... he after this year would decide through ill-health or any reason to retire, would he qualify, the fact that he has served one year and he's had three elections?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, you do get these hard cases that members bring up and you do get situations like that, but I really think that we're not really going to be worried by them.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I think it's pretty well taken care of by the limitations on allowances provided in subsections (a) and (b) of that section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 65 and 66 were read section by section and passed.) Section 67 --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on 67, I wonder if my honourable friend the First Minister would co-operate with the members and provide the members of the Assembly with a list of present members who are eligible to contribute to the fund and the amount that they would be expected to pay per year.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, there is and I'd like to say that both in Sections 671 (1) and also again in Section 68 (4) (b), though that is not in the paper, I propose to change the date from 1968 to 1969. Regarding the point raised, I may say that any member now sitting in the Legislature is entitled to join the pension plan if he wishes to do so and he can himself work out the amount of his back contribution by the rules that are laid down here, six percent of whatever your previous payments were.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just the indemnity?

MR. ROBLIN: Indemnity and expenses both count for the six percent.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, if a member signifies his intention to contribute and if he makes application, I suppose that the government would submit a bill to show the amount that he owes to the fund.

MR. ROBLIN: ... be the case. This is something probably that the Treasurer's Office will do. But I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that the date 1968 shown in the second line of 67, subsection (1) be changed to 1969. The reason for that is that some members may have, if they wish to join, very substantial backpayments to make, and it was thought desirable to give them another year to make them in rather than the short period originally specified. So I move it be made 1969.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT(Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I have a question. In my particular case, I presume I would qualify and I may not be able to pay this backpayment until 69. I agree to do it. In the meantime, I make my third allotment this year and next year I die. Is my widow entitled to half of it or would it not be until the balance of it had been paid up or would she be not allowed ...

MR. ROBLIN: I would interpret this to say that when you decide to join the plan both parties have entered into a contract and both parties or their estates will complete the contract, so that your estate would be expected to make good on what you owed and at the same time your widow would be entitled to a 50 percent payment.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: 67 (1) is it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. (Sections 67 (1) to 68 (4) (a) were read section by section and passed.) Section 68 (4) (b) -

MR. ROBLIN: In connection with (4) (b), I make the motion that the numbers 1968 be struck out and the number 1969 inserted for the same reason that I previously offered.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 68 (4) (b) to 74 were read section by section and passed.) Section 75 --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have some explanation on 75 under the Regulations. I'm wondering if the Honourable the First Minister who is sponsoring this Bill might give us some general outline of what the regulations are likely to encompass.

MR. ROBLIN: ... be remarkably simple, Mr. Chairman, they'll just be a form by which we invite you to apply to join the fund and the form will probably give the particulars: when did you first join the Legislative Assembly and a few things like that, who is entitled to the 50 percent pension in case you should die and matters of that sort. They'll be only matters of a routine nature necessary to get the facts on our files.

MR. PAULLEY: The point raised by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that if you've only made a partial contribution then your widow, if indeed it is a widow, would have the opportunity then of electing as to whether or not she or he may pay up the balance still owing in order to qualify or otherwise. These are the sort of things that you visualize in the regulations, are they?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this is covered by the statutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but I mean if the amount in order to make a member fully entitled to pension is only partially paid, that would be covered by regulations, would it?

MR. ROBLIN: I presume so. I think that probably they'll get the Civil Service Superannuation Fund people to handle this, now that I think about it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: ... Mr. Chairman, to those who paid up by 1969.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6 of the Bill as printed -- passed, Section 7 of the Bill -- would the Honourable the First Minister perhaps move the amendment to change Section 6 to 7 in the last section.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 97 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole has adopted Bill 97 with amendments and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): 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. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that, by leave, Bill No. 97, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the word "now" be left out and the words "this day six months" be added to the end of the question.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on Bill 97 the other day on second reading and my position has not changed one iota insofar as the bill is concerned. What I said then I still believe, and I believe conscientiously, Mr. Speaker. I said then that I knew I would be accused of being a hypocrite and I hear chuckles to my left. Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty sad day in this House when a man can't stand up, whether he's in a minority or a majority, and speak up for the things that he believes in. I have stood up in this House on many occasions and spoken on those things in which I believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the amount that we are proposing here is reasonable in the light of the priorities of this province. I do not believe that it ties in with some of the things that the government has refused to do. The government can pooh-pooh all they want my comments, Mr. Speaker; people can accuse me of what they wish; those are my beliefs. Whether I stand to gain personally or not, matters not, Mr. Speaker, and it is not because I am a wealthy man because I am not such, but I think that we have a responsibility here and I speak as such an individual.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the House that this be an entirely free vote; let the members vote as they wish. I will say this to the government. I'm prepared to say I will not consider this to be a vote of confidence if it does not pass. I've said this once before during the course of this session, Mr. Speaker, on another bill, and I'm quite prepared to have it on that basis, that the members vote as they wish; let the matter stand or fall on the decisions of the members themselves and not on party positions; let then each individual do as he pleases. That is the basis on which I am prepared to have this, that it not be a question of a party vote, that it not be a question of confidence in the government, and let the decision be made by the members individually.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word on this particular motion, I welcome the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in this regard. I indicated on second reading that as far as this group I happen to lead, we were going to approach the matter

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . of indemnities and pension on the basis that the Leader of the Opposition has now suggested. I join with him in this approach to this matter. I am prepared as a member of this Assembly to take my chances with the electorate, if indeed I am taking a chance with the electorate, on how I vote on this particular resolution.

I welcome the opportunity and I join with the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in suggesting to this House that this be on a non-partisan basis. This was more or less the decision of members of the caucus of the New Democratic Party, for which I was chastized for the other day. I certainly agree with my honourable friend and I'm prepared as a member of this Assembly, albeit the Leader of my party, to stand up and be counted the way I will cast my vote for the resolution proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party and the main motion proposed by the Premier of the province, if indeed we are to consider the main motion after the amendment is considered.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add a very few words. I feel that the part that disturbs me in this is that something like this that is personal, it would seem that the ground rule should be that we should, because we're going to profit by it, that we should vote in favour, and if not, that we're hypocrites. Now I said before that there is no way that you can divorce this from politics, if on one hand we'll say we're the ones that must decide, it's our responsibility. Therefore, if it's our responsibility we should be able to vote as we think that we should.

Now I think that this is the answer. The amendment that we have in front of us now would not bring the downfall of the government. It would be a free vote for all the members. Therefore, I don't think it would be fair to say any longer that maybe a certain group can very well complain and make noise and vote in a certain way because they're sure that they're going to get it. I think this is wrong. If we accept this, what are we doing voting on this bill? Why doesn't the government say, like they did with the Cabinet Ministers' salaries, this is it; we've decided that the members will be paid so much and this is it. If not, I think that we should have the right to vote as we see fit.

Now nobody can gain on this if it is a free vote. Let us stand up and decide what we want and be counted. I for one said that I did not want to battle on the amount. Some people feel that we will never get together on this. Some people might feel that it is \$5,000, some might feel \$10,000 and some feel \$7,200. I feel that it is too much.

Now the principle of pension, we have the Canadian Pension Plan. We have -- I think that all of us except the Cabinet Ministers contribute to a pension somewhere else and they could have their pension, and especially if we are raising the indemnity, we could -- if there was a way that we could take advantage of the same kind of pension that the Civil Service can take, this would be fair. So I don't think that this is quite right, but I don't object so much to this principle. I object mostly to the timing of this in the priorities. I feel that we should bend over backwards to show the example to the people of Manitoba, especially when we are going through a difficult time like we are, and I think it's practically adding insult to injury. In one or two sessions ago we brought in a tax on heat, and a pension. That bill was not -- I think it was withdrawn -- and now after a sales tax of 5%, after taxing the clothes, after taxing services, clothing and services and shoes and all these things, I think it is the wrong time, and even if it's just to show, to inspire confidence to the people of Manitoba, I think that it is our responsibility. So I want it made quite clear that this is the main thing that I object to at this time, with the priority that we have.

And then I have a personal reason. I think, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly won't make a speech in aid to private schools at this time, but the way we have been treating a certain group of our people, closing our eyes, pretending that this problem does not exist, and we have been making it more difficult for these people, I think that it is wrong to come in and bring a bill such as this one. I therefore certainly will support this bill for the main reason that I said, the timing and the responsibility.

Now we have been told in the past that apparently we are sure to get it. The same thing was said at the time of the pension a few years ago. Some of us felt that it was wrong and we did the only thing possible, we opposed it at every possible chance we had, and thank God -- the people of Manitoba should thank God that this bill was never passed. Therefore, we have the same right, the same chance. When that bill was debated at the time, the dying days of that session, it was pretty well taken for granted that it would go through anyway.

Now I think that this is a very reasonable approach that my leader took when he said -- and I know that we have been told that we can vote as a free vote on this -- I think that this is

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . reasonable and I think that the government should accept this, especially in view of the fact that the Leader of the Official Opposition has stated that as far as he was concerned it would not be a non-confidence vote in the government.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll just say a very few words on this subject. I agree with those who say that the failure or success of this bill should not be regarded as a matter of confidence in the government. I certainly don't regard it as a matter of confidence in the government and I think that is not an unreasonable attitude to take. On the other hand, I have to accept the responsibility for it because under our constitution measures of this kind that call for the expenditure of public funds can only be introduced by those who occupy the positions in the Executive Council.

So regardless of how people vote or what their conscience tells them to do, and I respect the rights of conscience, it is still necessary for me to accept the responsibility for introducing the bill in the first place, for recommending it to the Legislature, and being willing to encumber the public funds to this extent. No matter what happens in the vote, that responsibility cannot be denied by me nor do I in any way attempt to evade it, because that's what the constitution provides and that's what I think we should adhere to.

I am not going to rehash the arguments for and against this because there are just as many arguments on the side that is in favour of this bill as are against it; I think more logical arguments. I think we have to consider the position of men and women who aspire to membership in this House which now sits some four or perhaps five months of the year and which involves duties in the other time of the year which are considerable and for which I think we should pay a fair remuneration.

Now there are differences of opinion as to what that fair remuneration is. I can only say that in my opinion the amount specified in this bill is not unfair, all things considered, not only in relation to our own province but in relation to other provinces as well. I know that in some circles the move will not be popular; it never is. Nevertheless, I think it is right for me to accept this responsibility at the present time and to make these recommendations to the Chamber and that's what I do. So while I respect the conscience of others who wish to vote on the other side of the question, I intend myself to adhere to the course with which we began and to recommend that the Bill not be given a six month's hoist but be read a third time.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Froese, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Clement, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 38.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker, or reverse division.

MR. ROBLIN: I think we should take the count in the proper way, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members please. I was reminded once before that the bell was not rung on a vote. That will never happen again.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Clement, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Forse, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 38; Nays, 15.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we move now to Page 18, the first item?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that for the remainder of the session, the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 8:00 p.m., and each sitting shall be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and the Rules with respect to 10:00 o'clock p.m. adjournment be suspended, and that the Order of Business for each day shall be the same as on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think there is very little that need be said with respect to this annual resolution that is brought before the House, usually at about this time of year. By reference to last year's proceedings I find that the same resolution was brought before the House on the 15th of April and that the House subsequently adjourned I believe it was on the 26th of April. This year we are bringing it before the House, moving it on the 25th of April so I don't know what that betokens for the end of this session.

We are presently I am told in our 70th day of sitting for this current session. The bulk of the work with respect to bills is now well advanced. We now have some 31 bills I believe on the Order Paper for Committee of the Whole House and third reading. We have another eight or nine bills for second reading to clean up and we have another two bills reposing in Law Amendments Committee at the present time, ready to be reported out to the House.

We still have some time left in Supply but I understand that compared to when this motion was moved last year we are in roughly the same position, if my memory serves me correctly from my quick review of the journals of last year; so I move the motion, not with any sense of inhibiting in any way the debate of members of the assembly on public matters that are coming before the House but rather in an effort to expedite the handling of the business of the House in what all of us would consider to be the last days of sitting of this particular Legislature.

I am hopeful that the wording of the resolution meets the approval of the members and that we will have the support of all sides of the House in agreeing to this motion which is I think in the interests of cleaning up the business of the Legislature of Manitoba in a proper fashion and one which is in accordance with the traditions of the House in past years. By that I mean of course that when we complete the government business there will be, although no time is allowed for private members resolutions while we are under the operative part of this resolution, that thereafter when government business is concluded we revert back as has been the practice although there is nothing to sanction it in the rules, clean up any remaining business that may be left from private members. So I would ask for support of this resolution and I would hope that if the members of the House might see fit to bring it to a vote tonight in order that we might invoke its provisions before too long.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when I was observing the processes in the House for a period of time, I had thought that it was going to be one of the Centennial projects this year that we would be in session on our National holiday, the 1st of July. It now appears that we may adjourn somewhat before that date. I don't rise to object to the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I think that we have reached the stage where we may find in fact, that the resolution will be useful to the processes in the House.

I would like to comment on two matters however. I trust that we now have all of the government bills, that there will be no further bills presented to the House at this stage, and if there are further bills to be presented, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the House not proceed to invoke the resolution until such time as all the bills are in, because last year we did proceed with the speed-up resolution before all the bills were before us and I frankly think that it does not make for good Legislation, because it means that a bill comes up for second reading say in the morning and is adjourned then immediately in the afternoon it must again be spoken to and I don't think that the Opposition can assess these bills properly under those circumstances. We have to understand that we don't see the bills until they are put on our desks. The members on the far side have every opportunity of discussing them in caucus ahead of time. We don't. I think that if we are to do our job properly there must be sufficient time for members on this side to study the bill, to seek any outside advice that they feel might be necessary, because again we don't have the departmental advice the way my

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... honourable friends do, and that this is in the spirit and intent of the work of the Legislature. So that's one proviso. The second one is the question of private members' resolutions. I recognize that in the present resolution we simply shunt private members out altogether.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this year in particular, the private members' resolutions have in no case been delayed, that is to the extent where on any day that was a private members' day, did we run out of private members' business and go into government business. So the private members' days have been used on private members' business quite properly and it's an indication of I think the value and the amount of private members' affairs before us. I think that this is really good for the House; that this permits not only members on this side, while it is true that members on this side make more use of it, but members on the far side as well, to come forward with suggestions and ideas and that there are some very worthwhile ones here on our Order Paper, and I wonder if it wouldn't be wise while wanting to proceed with the government business not to rush it unduly and possibly give in the course of discussing government business, nevertheless, one afternoon still this week at least on private members' business without waiting until the last day. Because you know what happens, Mr. Speaker, on the last day; if it's clear that this is all that is left, the urgency and the situation that arises ends up by having matters passed without some proper consideration, because we still have a number of resolutions before us that have not even been moved as yet and it would be I think useful to get them at least proposed and an opportunity for members to speak on them and I think we can accomplish that without in any way inhibiting the government business. So I would like to make those two suggestions to the Leader of the House. I think that they will be in the interests of good government and will in no way hold up the business of the government side or of this house.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable the Attorney-General that this is a resolution that we have had before us in this House I suppose ever since there was a legislature of Manitoba and after being in session for a considerable period of weeks or months, there seems to be a feeling among the government supporters and I guess in opposition as well, it's about time we got out of here, back to the hustings, and in the old days I presume that the main consideration was because the robins were returning the snow was off of the fields, it was time for us to get back to our farms. I suggest that with a few exceptions that we have in the House at the present time this is no longer a valid reason for us to speed up the business of the House and terminate the business of the House. I reject completely the arguments of the Leader of the Liberal Party in agreement as he suggests with the government.

It wasn't so very many moments ago, Mr. Speaker, that in our wisdom or otherwise, we voted ourselves an increase in indemnities and I suggest now that we have done that, that we should not have any speed-up at all in order that the people, the taxpayers of Manitoba may get full value or better value of their MLAs and full scrutiny of all of the business that we have before us. It is perfectly true as the Honourable the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader has suggested to us that we have a number of bills before us for second reading; that there are a number of bills yet to be considered in Law Amendments Committee, there are still a considerable number of bills that have to be processed through this House in order to be considered in Law Amendments Committee, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reason for a speed-up at this particular time. We are 57 representatives of the voters of Manitoba and we owe it to the voter of Manitoba to give full and careful consideration to all of the propositions that we have before us. It might well be, as my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition and also the Leader of the House suggests that there are a number of private resolutions before us, and I know, I know full well that on occasions there has been an inclination to slough these off, if not in fact, in principle, in order to terminate the business of the House.

We still have many important matters to consider, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest. We have the very important matter of the Bill to provide medical care services for the Province of Manitoba. It is in Law Amendments Committee I admit. It has passed its second reading which is in effect agreement in principle to the provision of medicare in the Province of Manitoba, but I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the debate on that bill is not yet finished. Those of us of this Party have stuck by our principles on medicare and we are going to have a lot more to say and we don't want this under the threat or even under the presumed threat of the termination of the business of this House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the rules of the House makes provision for 80 hours

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . of debate on the estimates for the fiscal year that we are now in. It's true we have already expended 77 hours and 20 minutes, if memory serves me correctly, in the consideration of those estimates. In other words, Sir, we only have about 2 hours and 40 minutes more to go on estimates before the question is put and concurrences are considered for the termination. But I want to warn the Honourable the Leader of the House, I want to warn the government that as far as we are concerned, when we come to the 80 hour limitation we are going to plead with the government for an extension of the 30 hours in order that we might give ample consideration to all of the estimates yet undealt with by the Committee of Supply. It's most vital in this House now I respectfully suggest that we do not terminate our sittings, that we give full consideration to the 354-odd millions of dollars that is under scrutiny.

The Leader of the Liberal Party can agree if he will with the House Leader on his beat up resolutions but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as far as us in this group are concerned, we do not agree with this. There was some difference of opinion as to whether we were worth \$7200 or \$4800.00. I want to say we're prepared to earn our \$7200 and stay here if necessary for the balance of the year to give consideration to the business of Manitoba and we are going to oppose the resolution suggested by the Honourable the Leader of this House. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to you, to him and to the members of the government we have not wasted time in this House at all on considerations of vital matters. I respectfully suggest there are other matters as well that have to be considered and I reject on behalf of this group as I have in the past, and will continue to reject, a speed-up motion which would be to the detriment of full consideration of the business of Manitoba. We're told quite frequently in this House particularly by the government that the destiny of Manitoba rests in our hands and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, it does rest in our hands and it's worthy of contemplated scrutiny without three sessions a day. I know, I know that many or most of us in this House at the present time are mentally and physically exhausted, and I make no excuse for that, I know that I'd love to get out of here. I'm tired after five years - or five months rather. It seems like five years it's true, Mr. Speaker; it seems like five years that we have been in session because of the job that has to be done. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the job is not yet done; we have a lot to do. And unlike the Liberal Party we of this party are going to oppose the proposition of the Attorney-General in his capacity as House leader so that we can get out where the air may be just a little sweeter and horizons a little greener.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words on the resolution before us. I'm quite in favour of the resolution to the extent that I feel that we should try and do as much work as possible in the days ahead and to speed-up matters if we possibly can. I notice for one thing that we have quite a bit of the estimates to complete. I was informed just today by the clerk that the estimates that have not been approved yet amount to some \$85 million and while the bulk of this is included in the Hospital Commission estimates, some \$63 million, that still leaves a sizeable item and it leaves another number of departments that we haven't considered and therefore I hope when the time comes that we've used up our 80 hours that we're allowed to discuss the estimates of those other departments to some extent anyway because I think it would be highly improper to not do that. I also feel that, especially the Department of Industry and Commerce in other years has already been passed up, if I'm right, or at least very little consideration has been given and I think we should do justice to that department and to what is being done there.

However, I have one objection and that is the suspension of the 10 o'clock time limit. I feel that we should have some time later on at night when we go back to the hotel to consider some of the things that have come up so that we can prepare for the next day. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that the words "and the rules with respect to the 10 o'clock p. m. adjournment be suspended" in the fifth and sixth lines be deleted. --(Interjection)-- I asked him, yes.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is short of a seconder I'm sure we can provide one from this side of the House in order that the matter may be properly debated.

MR. FROESE: I conferred with him before I made the motion, Sir.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . over ourselves to see that this is seconded.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. LYON: If no one else wishes to participate in the debate, perhaps I'd just close the debate by making some reference to the comments that have been made - most of which I think were quite helpful - as we come to consider this annual resolution. I was reminded of course as I was listening to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party of that not so famous but nonetheless attributable saying of Churchill's when he was on the treasury bench once in the House of Commons, there was some move by the opposition who had been particularly cantankerous --(Interjection)-- to keep no, no - this was in London - to keep the House going for what he considered to be an over long time. I think they were getting on toward the grouse season and he thought that everybody should clear out, and he did make the statement which has always remained etched in my memory because I think there is so much truth in it, and it's words to this effect: "Parliament does no service to itself or to the public it serves by exhaustively long sessions." And I think this is very true. But that's appropo of nothing except my honourable friend's speech. I do wish to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I appreciate his evidences of co-operation on this resolution and I hasten to assure him and the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the Member from Rhineland that it is not the intention of the government to use this resolution this year or in any year for that matter as a gag rule or anything like that at all. It is quite the converse. It doesn't inhibit the length of time that the House sits, it rather elongates the length of time that the House sits, and rather than sitting a 5 hour day we're now going to be sitting approximately an 8 or 9 hour day --(Interjection)-- 2:30 to 5:30, is 3 hours; 8 to 10 is 2 hours; 3 plus 2 equals 5. Those are the hours that we have been regularly following. Hereafter we are going to be working 3 hours in the morning, 3 hours in the afternoon and 2 or 3, sometimes perhaps even more hours in the evening if we find it necessary to do that. So rather than inhibiting the length of time that the House has to deal with matters, physically at least we are elongating that length of time.

I suggest to my honourable friend that we concur with him 100 percent on this side of the House, that we too want the fullest consideration of all matters, of the bills particularly that are before the House, and particularly the piece of legislation that he made reference to, the Medicare legislation which is now in Law Amendments Committee. We, too, share that concern and we want to insure that there is the fullest consideration given to all of these matters, medicare and all of the other matters that presently are before the House. There's nothing in this resolution that will inhibit that debate at all; we want to make sure that the public business of this province in which all of us, each one of the 57 of us, has a responsibility and a duty. We want to make sure that we carry out that responsibility and that duty, notwithstanding the fact that we are going to be working longer hours than regularly. So we are as one on that matter and I hasten to assure him or anyone else who might be in doubt that there is any such intention on the part of the government to restrict debate. This will not restrict debate; it will increase the opportunity for debate.

My honourable friend made mention of the fact that there is a presumed threat of closing in this resolution. I think that is only partially accurate; I think we have all by consensus reached the time when we realize that the House is approaching the approximate time of prorogation. Anyone who would venture to give an opinion as to what that day will be, however, is a very brave man indeed. You know the old saying, the government opens the House, the opposition closes it. Well even that is sometimes only partially true, but we don't know on this side and I'm sure my honourable friend's opposite don't know when the House is going to prorogue finally after it completes its business, after due and reasonable consideration has been given to all matters. But there is no presumption in this resolution that the closure door is going to be dropped or anything like that at all, so I hope I put my honourable friend's mind at rest on that point.

Insofar as the matter of Supply is concerned mentioned by the Honourable Member for Rhineland - he mentioned that there is some \$83 million left to be considered - I would remind him that some 63 million of that has to do with the hospitalization estimates which were discussed rather thoroughly in Committee of Supply and then were left over for some further information with respect to a report that was to come down. So 63 million of that 83 million has been well discussed up to the present time.

I should also remind him of course that what we are following is not a government injunction, it is rather a rule of the House which was agreed upon after the rules committee last sat and I would suggest to any honourable member of the House that if they wish to have pause to look at this rule again that the occasion is going to be offered when the rules committee begins its deliberations after the house has prorogued and so of course that matter will be open for

(MR. LYON, cont'd) discussion and reconsideration. It is not a government injunction that limits the debate on supply to 80 hours; it is the rule of the House that limits the debate to 80 hours. My honourable friend said he's going to plead for an extension; my honourable friend had better start pleading with everyone of the 57 members of the House perhaps in the rules committee when it starts to sit because what we are dealing with is an injunction of the House, not an injunction of this government.

I don't believe there were any other matters that I have note of here that were raised by my honourable friend that I can usefully comment upon. The suggestion was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I'm sorry, that there be further consideration of private members' bills. I would be prepared at this time to pledge on behalf of the government that Friday afternoon, the regular private members' afternoon, be so treated as private members' afternoon this week, in its regular period, presuming this resolution passes tonight and we start the proceedings tomorrow morning - or tomorrow afternoon. We could start it then on Thursday --(Interjection)-- There's Law Amendments. We'll start it Thursday afternoon, if that's agreeable to everybody. Thursday afternoon when we meet at 2:30 we will take it that the rule then will be invoked and that we will begin our proceedings on the longer hours of sitting at that time. And Friday afternoon as I mentioned before will be given over to private members' resolutions in order that we can make progress, hopefully, with those matters, many of which are important. I thank the honourable members for their constructive suggestions and for their co-operation.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, would this include Saturday, too?

MR. LYON: The resolution includes Saturday sittings, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question of the Minister? I've asked him whether there were any further government bills to come. Has he any reply on that?

MR. LYON: The only bill that is not before the House is the usual Statute Law Amendment Bill which is the typographical errors and then of course the regular bills that do not come before the House until the last, the supply bills and all of the financial bills that are customarily brought before the House in its latter days. Those are the only matters that I have any notice of at the present time that are not before the House. The Statute Law Amendment Act, I really would not suggest we hold up the proceedings of longer sittings for that, because usually, and I think it is the case this year, it is more or less of a housecleaning bill to clean up typographical errors and other minor amendments in statutes.

MR. MOLGAT: A further question if I may, Mr. Speaker. Would it be the intention of the government to sit on Friday night and Saturday of this week, merely for the convenience of the members who may have plans, if the government could announce whether it intends to apply it or not this week.

MR. LYON: I think that would depend to a large extent, Mr. Speaker, on the degree of progress that we were making. I think we could have consultations later in the week to see what kind of progress we are making and perhaps arrive at some consensus as to what should be done on the weekend.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 43; Nays 10.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution carried. I take it we go back to page 1 now, and the Bills?

MR. LYON: We could go now to page 18, to the second readings of bills. I would ask you to call Bill No. 117 an Act to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act if you would, please.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't catch the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Bill 117, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill 117. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting situation that we face now and I must say that insofar as I am concerned I sympathize with the position that the Minister has been placed in by the events of recent days. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a case in my experience in this House of where the people on this side of the aisle could say to the government "I told you so", this I think is a conspicuous example. As far as I am concerned, I have no intention of attempting to do any gloating because I think the difficulties that we face are substantial and that we should all try and use our best judgment as to what to do under these circumstances. At the same time, I simply can't refrain from mentioning some of the things that happened three years ago - and I do it hoping that it will be useful as helping to chart our course from here on in rather than with any thought of recrimination because of what happened at that time.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House - and I emphasize many of us - three years ago urged the government to encourage a producers marketing board to look after vegetable marketing in the Province of Manitoba. We argued, frequently at length I think, that this was a type of operation that would be the most likely to commend itself to the growers of the province, particularly if it was found necessary in the light of the situation that existed to have a compulsory operation. I know that I for one, have taken the position for years and years and years in this House that while I in general would like to escape from compulsory features, yet sometimes they may become necessary, but if they become necessary, if we think that the situation requires compulsory measures, then it seems to me that there is all the greater need for a campaign of education to try not only to get the growers to acquaint themselves very very well with what is proposed, but also so far as possible to get them to be in agreement with it rather than to be reluctant about it, or worse still, in actual opposition, and I simply can't refrain from mentioning, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of that day certainly was not inclined to listen to the advice that we gave from this side. Some of us certainly suggested that a voluntary board should be tried at that time but my honourable friend of those days, the Minister of Agriculture, was determined that it should be a commission which meant a government appointed board rather than one that the producers themselves manned and supplied and I think that a mistake was made at that time.

In my opinion, it is essential whether you are going to deal with a complex and difficult and sometimes controversial subject such as this, to have an educational campaign precede the setting up of boards of this kind. Many of us at that time, Mr. Speaker, emphasized the very thing that the Honourable the Minister said yesterday and I want to quote one thing that he said. I have not had the opportunity to read as carefully as I would like to, the statement that my honourable friend made, but one statement that he made I think needs to be emphasized once again, and I'm quoting now from page 2837 of Hansard, yesterday's Hansard, and this is the quote "There are very many involved relationships between provincial legislation governing within - province marketing and federal legislation and jurisdiction governing inter-provincial and international trade". This is true and this was emphasized time and time again during the discussions that were held there; at least one of the members and maybe more, from this side of the House warned the government at that time that this might be, probably was, ultra vires legislation so far as the province was concerned. Many of us, Mr. Speaker, advised a delay and fuller discussion in a Committee before the legislation passed but at that time that was not heeded. Now I mention that, Mr. Speaker, not by way of recrimination, and I know there is no use of repeating the difficulties that have occurred before, but rather to try and lay a basis for some constructive suggestions later on.

Let me say at the moment, Mr. Speaker, that certainly I intend to support the legislation because I think that under these circumstances that it is necessary and advisable and I agree wholeheartedly with the Minister that sound marketing legislation, legislation that will stand the test of the court is desirable in the Province of Manitoba and I think it's a wise decision to make the changes that are suggested and then have a reference to the Court of Appeal to be sure that we are in the proper position with regard this legislation. So the important thing of course, Mr. Speaker, as always, is what do we do now?

I am assuming, Mr. Speaker, that this statement that the Honourable the Minister made yesterday was no off the cuff statement at all. This wasn't just decided upon at the last moment;

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) this wasn't just a casual statement. My guess is that not only the Minister and his advisors but the Cabinet as a whole, or several members of them, had been burning the midnight oil on this for some time. My guess would be, Mr. Speaker - and I'm imputing no motives, but I have a little bit of experience in this type of thing - my guess would be that we know now at least one of the reasons of the long delay in the Baron Commission report, because I am sure that my honourable friend and his staff have been aware for some time of what the commission was suggesting and that they were laying well-considered plans to meet the situation, and they may easily have - having looked at the legislation more carefully in recent years - they may easily have had a premonition as well that the Act itself would be declared unconstitutional.

So I am suggesting that this is a considered decision on the part of the government, and as I understand it, the government proposes three main things. First, vegetables other than potatoes will be dropped from the operation of the commission almost immediately. Secondly, the Marketing Commission will carry on with potato marketing until the end of June. And, third - here again I want to be completely accurate and read from the Minister's statement - I am reading now from the next page, Page 2838, and I certainly am not intending to take it out of context in any way but this is the statement after mentioning these various things that will be done. "The potato growers will be invited to inform the Manitoba Marketing Board, which is the supervisory body, whether or not they wish to submit a proposal for the establishment of a producer's marketing board for potatoes. Should such a request be received, a referendum in accordance with the Act will be held to ascertain the wishes of the producers."

And then I skip a half a paragraph or a little more, Mr. Speaker, and read something on the same subject after the Minister mentions this June 30th date. He says then and I quote, "If, by this time, the producers have requested a referendum on a producers' marketing board, or a marketing commission, the present Marketing Commission will continue its operations as far as practicable until the results of the referendum are known. If no referendum is requested, or if indeed a referendum has failed to carry favorably, the Commission will be wound up."

Now, Mr. Speaker I think that there we have the decision in addition to the two former matters that I mentioned, and I suggest in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that the time that is allowed here is too short. This is too short. This does not give the growers the time to adjust themselves to the changed situation. It does not give them the time to let the differences of opinion which have become quite definite over the period of years, it does not give the time for those to settle down a little bit, and this in my opinion would be an unfavorable atmosphere in which to try and carry on negotiations looking toward the setting up of either a marketing board, which I would favour, or a marketing commission, and I would suggest that this period should be considerably extended.

MR. ROBLIN: How long do you suggest?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I don't know that I am in a position to suggest a definite time at this moment, but let me put it this way. I think that in order to achieve the best results, the government has to take a more positive stand than is suggested in the earlier statement that I read, that the potato growers will be invited to inform the Manitoba Marketing Board of whether they want this or not.

MR. ENNS: . . . the Honourable Member from Lakeside to one further part of that statement wherein it indicates that the date mentioned, June 30th, was not in any means as a guideline for a referendum or vote, but merely that we would want to have by that time some indication of their intent. The actual time is quite loose here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I quite understand that, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my honourable friend for trying to keep the discussion completely accurate, but I think that even the intent could hardly be arrived at at that time. I want to emphasize again that I think there must be an effort made - and I am sure that the department can use its good offices in connection with it - to try and help in resolving the difficulties, the differences of opinion that exist between two groups of growers, both of them substantially interested in this question, and that we should allow a little longer time, maybe a considerably longer time. Quite frankly, I think it would be much too soon to start on a campaign, the kind of campaign that I do sincerely advocate as being necessary later on, but it's too soon to start on it now while what might be called the surcharged or heated atmosphere is still very much to the fore.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is a difficult situation to deal with. I'm not trying to pretend that it isn't, but I really think that the government could have done more than is

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) suggested in the proposals that the Honourable the Minister laid before us yesterday, because in the next paragraph to what I read a moment ago we come to - and I have to read more to get it in context than I would wish to - but once again quoting, here's what the Minister says. "It is important to recognize, and those who will be reading the report of the Commissioner of Inquiry will recognize that the Commissioner of Inquiry has found that the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission has largely achieved the objectives which were set out for it, that of achieving the orderly marketing of the crops under its jurisdiction, of achieving a dependability of supply of a quality product to our consumers and of achieving some stability of prices for the producers."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if the Commissioner had really found that they had achieved those objectives to a considerable degree, that he would have given a better report than he did. I doubt that they have been so fully achieved, but if they have been even reasonably well achieved, and I don't deny some achievement, then I would think that we should plan instead of saying that after this comparatively short interval that the commission will be abolished or disbanded, that instead of doing that, that we should try to salvage something concrete out of the situation. The proposal that I would make - and I don't advance it as being something that has been given mature consideration because I like other members on this side of the House, this has come up very recently and I have not had time to think about it as carefully as I would - but couldn't the commission, couldn't the commission carry on for a longer period than this as a voluntary organization; keep the powers with which you clothe them to the end of the year that you have spoken of, but carry them on during a longer period as a completely voluntary organization.

I would think that if we would do that, that with all the criticism that has been voiced apparently by the Commissioner - and I certainly have not had time to read the full report but I have read carefully the digest of it, and it's a very brief digest of course of a 123 page document - but in spite of all the criticisms that have been voiced, there still has been something accomplished here and I would think we should try to salvage something out of what has been accomplished.

My suggestion would be to make use of the facilities that exist in order to carry on as a voluntary board in the interval, and in the interval while it would be hoped that the very facts of the situation would tend to let the feelings between the two groups and between the commission and some growers who have not been satisfied with their type of operation, to let them settle down and dissolve to a certain extent, that we might be hopeful at least that we could get them all working along the same lines. I would think that if that were done we would find that there would be a good bit of support returned to the commission on a voluntary basis, and the very fact of negotiations and operations being jointly undertaken would be a major factor in leading toward some better understanding between the two groups.

Mr. Speaker, I would hazard a guess that if we could get the two groups - and I refer to them as two groups because I know that there are differing opinions on this question - if we could get the two groups of growers working together on a voluntary basis first, and working only to the extent that both of them are willing to do, that we would be performing a real service toward eventually getting what all of us want, and that is the sound marketing program in the vegetable field in Manitoba.

My guess would be also, Mr. Speaker, that we would probably need some changes in personnel because I would suppose that perhaps the clash of personalities that develops under conditions of this kind might make some changes in personnel necessary, but this I think could be worked out if everybody, with the co-operation and assistance of the Department of Agriculture and its officials, would work with both groups in a co-operative endeavour and make it very very plain to them that they were going to have to work out a program jointly and that the government was not going to impose one upon them, and I would think that this would go a long way toward undoing the difficulty that has developed.

Now I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I know that it isn't an easy situation to face, but I do think that there is something more than has been proposed up to date can be salvaged out of this situation, that the Commission facilities which undoubtedly have been built up to a considerable degree during the year, the building that is there, the processing facilities are available, the sales organization that has experience, could on a voluntary basis carry on and still make a contribution and that the very fact of two groups working close together on a voluntary basis might finally bring about the unity and outlook that I hope we will achieve some-time later on and would be the best basis in my opinion on which to start and plan a campaign -

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) not rushing it, but to plan a campaign looking toward, well looking toward whatever solution they themselves decide on. My inclination would be to hope that they would go along the recommendation of the Baron Commission of working toward a Producer Board.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two in response to the address that's just been delivered by the Honourable Member for Lakeside because I appreciate very much the fact that he has given us a constructive and helpful review of this question which when related to his long experience in this field is certainly something that is well worth considering. I want to thank my honourable friend for the tone of his remarks and to say that we appreciate the fact that he has attempted to approach this problem in a constructive way.

I'd like to make it perfectly clear that the government still believes very firmly indeed that a system of orderly marketing in the vegetable field is going to prove to be best and that we still want to give our best efforts to convince those concerned that orderly marketing in the vegetable field, and particularly with respect to potatoes, is the best way for the industry itself and indeed is good for all aspects of our economy. Now it has to be frankly admitted that the marketing commission idea as far as I am aware is a new departure in this province when we set that procedure in motion a little while ago; and I think although we may not have been so free with our concern about the matter in the debate, it certainly was always recognized by us that this was an experiment and we had to recognize that there was no guarantee it was going to work as well as we should like, because it brought in several levels, several economic levels who were concerned in the potato business, not just the producer but the wholesaler and certain aspects of marketing as well which made it a very complicated and difficult form of marketing operation. I want to say that we are very grateful indeed to the strenuous efforts that were made by those who were concerned with this marketing commission to make it work. It is, however, a finding of the Baron Commission that though it might have worked satisfactorily in the technical economic sense, which I believe it has, it certainly didn't succeed in carrying with it the opinions, the unanimous opinions of those who were engaged in the trade, or indeed in other people in the community, and when it became obvious that this was the case, as it did about a year ago, the government decided that it would be a good thing to have an impartial examination of this new Commission to find out what was causing the difficulty and to see what the next step ought to be, and as a result we established that inquiry into the Vegetable Marketing Commission. Now at the time - this is something I want the House to note - at the time the Minister stated that when the results of this Commission were available to us there would be a vote. So I wanted that to be clear because it's probably been overlooked in the minds of some, maybe not those in the House, but in the minds of some that we made it perfectly clear that ultimately we expected to have a vote in this matter because in a field of this kind it is highly desirable I think to take a vote if you aren't operating a compulsory plan. Consequently that was made quite clear when the inquiry was started into the Vegetable Marketing Commission and nobody need be a bit surprised at the fact that we are now recommending that a vote should be taken whether for the commission type of administration itself or for a straight producer marketing board, because that was a statement of policy that was made some 8, 9, 10 months ago.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside says that we ought to extend the time limit for receiving requests for a vote, and he may well be right. The reason why the June 30th deadline was set was because that was the normal end of the potato marketing year and if we go past June 30th then we're faced with the fact that we're entering a new potato crop year - I should have said a crop year when I first mentioned the date - a new potato crop year and one can see the complications that would arise if we had to make changes or abandon one form of marketing for another in the middle of a crop year, how much better it would be if we could arrange to have it at the time stated. But that's not a compelling reason, and I'm the first to admit it, and that if more time is required to achieve a harmonious approach to this matter and if the people in the production end of the trade feel that more time is required, I do not see why we should refuse to accommodate them in that respect. So I certainly want to say to my honourable friend that I appreciate the point that he makes and I'm sure the Minister will take that under consideration and endeavour to be as co-operative as possible with those who are concerned.

Now when the statement of the Minister referred to the Commission having achieved its objective, that statement really is I believe the opinion of the commission itself as well as the opinion of the Minister and that he reports it in that way, and that underlines our concern that

(MR. ROBLIN, cont'd) the principle of orderly marketing should not be lost sight of in this whole problem. It is an unfortunate combination of events that the legal question that has arisen came on our desks about the same time as the report of the Marketing Commission came, and it would have been possible for us to deal with the legal matter I suppose and say the marketing commission business can be dealt with at a later date, but it did not seem to us to be right to the House or to the trade having the two subjects before us or about to become before us not to try and deal with them both at the same time in order to give a clear picture to those concerned as to what we thought the shape of things to come was likely to be in this respect. And so we felt that although it was not part of the bill that it would be a mistake if the Minister did not tell the House all he knew about the Baron Report and also to give the reactions of the government to that report as the matters were all bound up together in the way that they were.

Now the main point that my honourable friend left in my mind was the fact that he hoped that this Vegetable Marketing Commission regardless of what happened with respect to the vote or what have you would carry on on a voluntary basis; and at first hearing that commends itself I'm sure to those who would like to salvage something from the experience of the Vegetable Marketing Commission. I think we'll take another look at it, but I regret to have to tell my honourable friend that our study of the matter so far has indicated that without the control over the trade that amounts in effect to a compulsory plan that all the producers must adhere to, that it is not possible to carry on the work of the marketing commission effectively, unless we're lucky enough to get a very large proportion of the people concerned to volunteer, which is a very debatable proposition at the present moment, that it does not seem to be practical. Now this point was discussed, my colleague tells me, with the Vegetable Marketing Commission themselves; in fact it's the whole reason for the compulsion in the first place, that the thing won't work as a marketing machine on a voluntary basis unless you get a very large proportion of the people in voluntarily which is something that no one can count on.

So while I appreciate the suggestion, I know that is given in an effort to be helpful to us, and while I by no means rule it out at this moment by saying that we reject it, I think we'll take another look at it, walk around the problem two or three times and see what it looks like tomorrow morning, the information that we have received so far from the experts in the department, from the Vegetable Marketing Commission itself, are to the effect that a voluntary board would simply not work. So we've reluctantly so far come to the conclusion that unless we get a favourable producers vote that there is no point in carrying the commission on beyond that point.

I do, however, say that, and I say to other members who may speak in the debate, that the government will be happy to receive all the help we can get, the constructive advice that people can give us in dealing with this question and we'll give careful consideration to what we hear. But I think that really the best policy would be to have a vote of the producers as soon as is reasonable and effective and if it means we have to extend that June 30th date well by all means let's do so. I don't think we want to prejudice a successful vote - and by that I mean a vote which says yes we want a producers marketing board - I don't think we want to prejudice a successful vote in any way at all. We want to be fair to all points of view, those who are for and those against; we have to recognize our duty to consider the other side of the question, but we would not like to do anything that would prejudice the result of the vote and we want to give the full time that may be required and the government will do all that is proper in taking a vote of this kind in giving information and facilities to those who are making their living out of growing potatoes.

It basically boils down to this, that if the marketing idea is any good at all, if the commission idea or the producers marketing board is any good at all, and we've had a couple of years to try it out, then we should be able to convince the producers in the trade. If we can't convince 65 percent of the people entitled to vote that this is a good scheme and that they ought to put their endorsement on it and it ought to carry on, well then obviously the idea is not such as that could be imposed when we consider the society in which we operate. I believe, and I hope that I do not prove to be an optimist, but I believe that the merits of the general plan are sufficient and the experience that we've had is sufficient to convince a considerable majority and adequate majority of the potato growers that they should carry on. That is what we will be directing our efforts to to get a proper vote called; government has to be careful that we approach it in a sufficiently unprejudiced or unbiased way to be fair to all points of view, we've got no business becoming an advocate in that sense of any particular party in this scheme, we've

(MR. ROBLIN, cont'd) got to be as impartial as we can. We don't want to do anything to prejudice a fair and reasonable vote and I hope that the experience we've had so far will convince the majority of potato growers that they ought to continue.

Now we are discontinuing the other vegetables. Should we do this? Well it's pretty clear from the Baron Report that we should at the moment. That does not however bar producers of other vegetables also asking for a vote if they want to do so. It's up to them. But it seems to me that at this stage of the evolution of the vegetable industry in Manitoba that our concern should be in the first place related to the potato grower. I would like to hope that the experience of the past few years, while not being completely satisfactory, while being deficient I believe in its approach to the human problems involved here, and there are many, while we have to acknowledge that there are difficulties in this connection I do hope that all in all it will commend itself as being a suitable marketing system. But as of last August or thereabouts we were pledged to a vote, and a vote we shall have and the producers shall make up their own minds what they want done with their industry.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member of Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment tonight I should like to advise that I mispoke myself when I talked about the day on which the longer sittings should take effect - I believe my first suggestion was Wednesday and then it was Thursday. I believe I was right in the original instance, it should be Wednesday, tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 and then sitting again tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock with a new Order Paper. Now I spoke privately to honourable members opposite and I hope that that would be agreeable to them that we would start on the longer sittings tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 and carry on and see what progress we make by Friday before we make any firm commitments as to what happens on the weekend.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . owing to our honourable friend not knowing what he says that we are prepared to agree with him, we may meet tomorrow evening. We're in his hands now or in the hands of the government. If he decides that we are going to meet tomorrow night, that's all there is to it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, there's not unanimity in my group but we are prepared to go along I think, . . . the odd individual who . . .

MR. LYON: I thank my honourable friends for their co-operation. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare that the House do now adjourn.

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