

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, May 1, 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

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Provincial Secretary.

I'd like to ask the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker, what is the state of negotiations between the Government of Manitoba and its civil service with respect of wage conditions and increased wages and salaries.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, as may be known to the members, under the terms of the agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Government Employees Association, the Province of Manitoba is represented in salary negotiations by a negotiator, a member of the staff. I'm informed that negotiations are progressing satisfactorily and I'm looking forward to having the report from the negotiator soon.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, then. Can I be given to understand that there is no stalemate at the present time in negotiations?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct. There is no stalemate.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Secretary as well with regard to an answer he gave I think this afternoon on the question of studded tires. In view of the weather would he give an extension of say, 10 days or 15 days for those people who still have studded tires on their cars? I think the condition of the highways tonight would strongly recommend it.

MR. McLEAN: That's a good recommendation, Mr. Speaker. I think under the circumstances that really nothing very much is required. I'm sure we can all use our native intelligence. I am informed that the weather will be quite warm tomorrow and I would anticipate that within two or three days studded tires would not be essential and I'm sure that in that interval of time no action will be taken if anyone has kept them on longer than the Order-in-Council provides.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but I was a law abiding citizen and took mine off yesterday.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Provincial Secretary whether this is the same type of enforcement of regulations that he's applying at the present time to Regulation 21/67 which of course deals with the question of the curfew which we haven't got, but we have on this building?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that's entirely a different matter, is it not?

MR. PAULLEY: But the same principle, if I may respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker. That we have a regulation and normally regulations should be adhered to. In either case my question to the Honourable Provincial Secretary: Is this a similar circumstance?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reply of the Provincial Secretary. The only problem I think in that is that unless there's a fixed time, we could end up with some injustice, someone who wants to abide by the law but in view of the circumstances accepts the statement of the Minister tonight and three days from now finds himself in difficulties. If the Minister were simply to say five days' extension and then consider it after that if needed. But whatever is needed something fixed so there'll be no arguments insofar as prosecutions.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder in view of the Minister's answer, if we couldn't consider that matter closed.

MR. MOLGAT: All right. Then I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. While he was away there was an announcement in the newspapers of an increase in fees or in premiums by MMS, and the question was asked then of the Minister of Health whether this contravenes any agreement made with the province. The reports are that there was an agreement made with the Premier some two years ago when the last increase came through, that there would be no other increases without consultation with the Premier. Now this I

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) understand was not an official thing, that is not something that is legislated but an understanding. Now, was there consultation with the First Minister prior to the increase?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague the Minister of Health answered that question adequately the other day.

MR. MOLGAT: The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that according to news reports the arrangement had been made with the Premier himself and not with the Minister of Health, and that was the reply as I recall from the Minister of Health as well. Now if the arrangement was with the Premier, then I think we have to deal with the Premier to get a reply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Minister of Health checked the correspondence dealing with this matter in the House and has given the House all the information that I can give.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. According to the Return Order of the House No. 59, it shows that the Labour-Management Review Committee held four meetings and the Vice-Chairman received \$8,900.00. Would it be right to assume that he received some \$2,200.00 a meeting or does he perform some other duties and functions for this committee?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it's quite obvious that he doesn't receive that fee for four meetings, and I'll take the member's question as notice.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . Mr. Speaker, the Premier's reply. The Minister of Health said on Friday that this agreement was supposed to be with the First Minister and the First Minister wasn't here. He didn't answer that at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that matter should be considered closed at this stage. I recall the Minister of Health speaking to this matter and the First Minister has given his opinion. I think we should consider that matter closed and continue with the business of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust if the matter is going to be considered closed it will possibly be reopened when we get the Hansard outlining what the Minister of Health said, because I frankly don't think the Minister of Health did give an answer on the subject so far as the First Minister. I'm prepared to leave it until we get the Hansard, but at that time I would hope that if the reply is as I recall it, that it can be reopened.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder in the opinion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he can substantiate this statement that he put to the First Minister with regard to -- Do you feel you can substantiate it?

MR. MOLGAT: When we get the Hansard, I'll be pleased to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Or is it merely a press report?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't substantiate conversations that the First Minister has, but if it's not correct that he had an understanding, then I'll accept that statement from the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I should say, in case there's any confusion about this, that there is no secret understanding or verbal undertaking or something which is not available for the record, because any arrangements that were made were as a result of correspondence exchanged. The Minister of Health has read the correspondence; he knows what's in it and he's offered his opinion and statement to the House. There's nothing further that I can add to that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question however, to the Honourable the First Minister is: Were the newspaper reports of March 1, 1962, which contain reference to a statement that the Honourable the First Minister made, that prior to any increases being undertaken by MMS or MMA the matter would be referred to the Minister of Health of that time, which is the present Minister of Education. Were those newspaper reports correct? I think this is the question that my honourable friend -- I would not ask him to answer this immediately, but I do respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he should take the opportunity of going back to that day and read the reports, which incidentally were read into the record this afternoon by my colleague from Inkster.

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot undertake to verify newspaper reports or to make myself responsible for what appears in them, but the MMS were under the obligation, as I understand the matter, of notifying the government when they intended to make some changes and notify us they did. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it was a very quick notification, I have to admit, but they did notify the government in advance, about the same time I think that

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) the news hit the streets, but as far as I can tell they carried out their part of the arrangement in that way.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like the honourable gentlemen to know that it is not my wish to restrict any debate in this matter, but Bill 68 is still under debate and I'm sure that if there is any searching questions to be asked, they can be asked at that time rather than at this particular time. Shall we proceed?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, may I say that we asked this question because the First Minister wasn't here during the debate of Bill 68, because I wanted to ask this question this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: But I'm sure the Honourable the First Minister will be here for the duration of the debate on Bill 68 which is still under consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: Are you prepared to guarantee that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. The other day I requested to know if there had been any investigation in respect to the explosion at Brandon and the Minister gave us an answer, but when I asked him as to the source of the inflammable liquid, he said that the source was not in the report. I wonder if he could tell us if he has received any indication as to where that source was?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. FOX: Would the Minister of Labour kindly undertake to do that? I think this is worrying some of the residents in the area. They'd like to know what is creating this problem or what did create it.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Some time ago Moray Street in St. James was considered as an inner perimeter route and a crossing and bridge was going to be built crossing into Charleswood across the Assiniboine. Recently, the Metro Corporation has made another study and came out with some alternate proposal. I wonder if the Minister has the alternate proposal and where has the location been proposed now, because this is certainly of great concern to many people in St. James.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I do not have these proposals.

MR. PATRICK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister be getting these proposals after they're finalized by the Metro Corporation or the engineering department?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I believe these will be given to the Minister of Highways.

MR. PATRICK: Before the Orders -- (Interjection) -- Yes I have. I'd like to direct the same question then to the Honourable Minister of Highways. Will he be getting these studies and will he be making this public?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, before any action can be taken by Metro, they have to be approved by the government. I am aware of various areas that are under study but there's nothing definite can be spoken at this time.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary who is in charge of the Centennial Committee, I believe. Is it a fact that certain Centennial grants are available for the various musical festivals throughout the province - or has the fund been exhausted - and will there be funds available for this same purpose in 1968?

MR. McLEAN: I think, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to check that information. I'm not personally aware of the answer to the question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Last week I asked him about a problem in the fish industry, a surplus of certain species of fish particularly in the frozen form that were being held in storage, and he promised that he would check into the matter. I wonder if he has any further report to give the House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): No, I'm sorry there's nothing further at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we would ask you now to leave the Chair, Sir, and we will retire into Law Amendment Committee to return to the House when we have completed our work in that committee, and I would suggest

(MR. LYON cont'd.) that we ask the Clerk, when the work is completed in Law Amendments Committee, to ring the bells to summon us back into the House. -- (Interjection) -- Whenever we finish in there.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you moving a formal motion of adjournment?

MR. LYON: No, I'd just ask you to leave the Chair, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I now leave the Chair and remain on call. Is that the . . .

MR. MOLGAT: If you're seeking a motion of adjournment, I'd be happy to move one.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm only trying.

Resumed sitting at 11:40 p. m.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the 9th and final report of the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their ninth report.

Your Committee has considered Bills No. 112, The Universities Grants Commission Act; and No. 117, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to enquire of the Minister what is the expected order of business of the House now. Does he intend to simply pass these two bills, by leave, and then the House will adjourn or does he intend to proceed into Committee?

MR. LYON: . . . the next order of business, Mr. Speaker, to proceed into Committee of the Whole House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to that course of action because I think that there is no need to proceed at twenty to twelve at night into a very important bill. I know of no great urgency why it has to be done tonight. I frankly don't think that that is a sound way to operate the House, a sound way to operate on legislation on a bill that is an extremely important bill -- (Interjection) -- No, no, I know you are talking about the Medicare Bill which is the next order of business if we go into Committee of the Whole, and so if that's the intention of the government, Mr. Speaker, then I refuse to give leave.

MR. LYON: I move, seconded by the Honourable 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 Bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we have to deal with the first question, have we not?

MR. LYON: Leave was not granted, Mr. Speaker, so the motion can't be put.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I believe that this is a substantive motion and it is a debatable question, and I think that it is proper for those of us in Opposition particularly to speak on behalf of the whole House at this time at night as to the advisability of going into the Committee of the Whole to consider any further legislation today.

I am not going to plead old age or anything of that nature, but I do plead, Mr. Speaker, that maybe as an accident of birth or a process of due exhaustion, that I am mentally tired tonight as I am sure that other members of the House are, and in addition to that, I am physically tired. We have been here in this building from about 9:00 o'clock this morning which I suggest would make it what - 12, 15 hours - and not only is it 15 hours in total time, Mr. Speaker, but during that time, the course of that time, because of the business we have not had the normal periods of rest in between the sittings. We came here and came into a formal sitting this morning at 9:30; we went into committee after while. We sat in the committee until 1:00 o'clock or thereafter and then we came back into this House at 2:30 and went back into committee to 6:00 o'clock or after. So even without the 15 hours, Mr. Speaker, those 15 hours have not contained the normal period of break.

Now I appreciate very much my honourable friend the Attorney-General is a young, energetic, handsome, and sometimes inconsiderate young man, and I think that this is at least

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) up to this point, Mr. Speaker, one of the times that he is being inconsiderate. He has another trait that I give him credit for, sometimes he can be bent or will give consideration to moderation, and I respectfully suggest -- I agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party that there is no particular rush at this particular stage in the evening and in this spirit I am keeping my remarks short. I do not threaten the old red hat but I do appeal to the Leader of the House, if he hasn't too much consideration to those of us in operation -- Opposition -- and I can't even get my words correct I am so tired, Mr. Speaker -- that if he hasn't the consideration for those of us in Opposition, think of his colleagues because they have had to sit around all day albeit the Whip did miss up once, but I guess that was because of sheer mental exhaustion at the time a certain amendment was passed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Leader of the House to reconsider this motion, and if he remains steadfast, I appeal to his boss the Premier of Manitoba, in the interests of good government for Manitoba, to not insist on us proceeding at this stage with one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have had to deal with for a considerable period of time, namely, the bill to provide medical health services.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all unmoved by the eloquence of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I should say it had been our intention to suggest that we move into committee, and if it was not the will of the committee to proceed with the Medicare Bill, then perhaps to move along the list to other bills. However, he has brought home to my mind, if not to my heart, the fact that he has been working 15 hours a day and so have the rest of us, and there is no attempt on the part of the government to want to snowball through important legislation at all. It had been the suggestion, or the thought though, that we might with some advantage move onto some of the other bills tonight and clear those up.

I judge it is not the disposition of my honourable friends opposite to do that extra work tonight and so we are not going to crack the whip, we are going to accede to their request, and if permitted, I will then withdraw the motion and move adjournment in the hope that there will be extended tomorrow that same degree of co-operation and understanding that we have had from the opposition throughout in order that we can make progress with the bills. We have been held up considerably by hearings outside of the House but we are not unmindful of the points that are made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party. In the spirit of co-operation, we will move adjournment if we can have the same spirit reciprocated tomorrow in getting some work done.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm even prepared to extend this spirit of co-operation tonight and say I will give leave to the reading of the two bills as I had indicated to begin with.

MR. LYON: That would be helpful, if I might rise on a point of order I guess it is. If we could get that motion through tonight it would then put the bills onto the Order Paper for tomorrow and then we could proceed to deal with them tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: I have no objection as I stated in the first place when I asked the question.

MR. PAULLEY: I have none either, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): I certainly have none either, Mr. Speaker. The other leader, the Leader of the New Democratic Party complained because he put in a long day. I think I have put in a longer day today than he has because I have at least put in 17 hours already.

MR. PAULLEY: You're good.

MR. LYON: Well that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would, by leave, move that the report of the Committee be received, that is the report relative to the two bills, the ninth report of Law Amendments Committee, after having withdrawn my motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I believe we dealt with the report of the Committee.

MR. LYON: No, I had to move that by leave and leave was not granted. I understand that leave now will be granted so I move, by leave, that the report of the Committee be received, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

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

MR. LYON: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: And the meeting time tomorrow?

MR. LYON: At 9:30 in the morning. I think we had better stick to 9:30. We all have to be at the same place at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Tuesday morning.