

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 15, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps by leave I could make a correction. In making earlier remarks I may have left the wrong impression relative to the attempts of the Government House Leader to negotiate a position relative to amendments in The Legislative Assembly Act. That is not the impression I meant to leave. In the current amendments which are under suggestion, I am quite aware of the attempts of the Government House Leader to reach a consensus by all sides of the House. My reference was to earlier movements of the government, and I just want it clear that it wasn't with reference to this particular amendment which is under consideration by the House at the present time when I said that there was no attempt to co-operate or negotiate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON(Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be desirable now to complete consideration of Bill No. 70 on second reading, after which we will then go into Law Amendments to deal with the bills that have been submitted to that committee. Would you call Bill 70, Mr. Speaker?

## BILL NO. 70 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 70, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first let me put my position quite plainly, where I stand on this bill. I do not intend to support the bill. I will give my reasons why I am not prepared to make that commitment to this House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, ever since this government has been elected it has been preaching restraint. I, you and many other people here in Manitoba know that it's been a phony issue. Nevertheless, phony or not, we are now being asked to in some respects raise salaries of members of this Assembly, increases, pension —(Interjection)— yes, the honourable member says, I'm getting one. Yes, I agree. Wee are all getting an increase in this House. That is a formula that is in place and that is one that I voted for in the past, and I must say it's still in effect. I think it's a good formula. It's one I recommended to this House, or something similar to it, that people who work for the minimum wage should be tied into something like that. Members of this Assembly of the government side of the House decided that that sort of an issue was not one that they could support, and you know, when we look at raises of 3.3 percent for people who are working on the minimum wage, the wage settlements that the government is in the process today of trying to negotiate with its employees of 6 percent or less, we then find that we are asked to increase salaries of members of this Assembly, certain members, and I'm not arguing that their positions don't warrant an increase. I know the positions, I know the jobs that the people have to do.

But when we're looking at some positions and the salaries in this House being raised by 100 percent, others by approximately 30 percent and some by about 17 to 18 percent, and then we look back, Mr. Speaker, and we see that in the collective wisdom in this House of the collective

majority, they saw fit, not to — they didn't have to buy the formula that was being advanced. There were other methods and other formulas, but at least to have looked at the situation. But no, they saw fit, in their wisdom, not to support that, and now they come along and as my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg Centre said this afternoon, the government decided in the first mini-session, without any by-your-leave whatsoever or anything with the other side of the House, and you know, to operate in this House we have to have a certain amount of co-operation. And I'm not one who feels that people who are elected to public life should work at a rock-bottom level. I think members that are elected to this Assembly do, in the main, a good job and are worth their salt. But when it suited the Progressive Conservative government for their mini-session — \$1,000, take it or leave it. You know. No consultation whatsoever with members on this side of the House. Sure they scored brownie points on it. They looked good. Last year we got a magnificent increase of — what was it? 38 cents? 38 cents. Again no consultation with this side of the House.

This year. This year, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to consult. And I feel sorry for their members of the back bench. I agree with the Member for Winnipeg Centre. Yes, I realize that people who have to come in from out of town, who have to live away from home, are entitled to increases. Those increases, I find no objection to whatsoever. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we can't pick and choose what we want in this bill. This bill is put before us. We have to buy it in its entirety or we have to vote against it. There are good things in this bill that I would be prepared under circumstances to vote for. But in the main there are more bad things than there are good things, and so I have to vote against the bill. It's like your old omnibus bill that —(Interjection)— Well, I'm sorry, I didn't hear what the honourable member said, but if he wishes to make his contribution afterwards I'll be prepared to listen to him.

As I said, I am not opposed to rural members, northern members, having extra allowances. I think if we could get that out of the bill that would be fine.

Now we come to the part of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that to me, regardless of how you look at it, and I know that there's not a fixed position on this side, but I look at the position of pensions for members of this Assembly. The pension plan is here in effect, but given the situation of two members coming into this Chamber, both elected at the same time, and you know I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look at it fairly, we are all members, individual members elected by the electorate into this Assembly. Some become Cabinet Ministers, some become other officers of this Assembly, and when I say officers, they become either the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairmen of committees, and I know these people do an excellent job and they do a good job and they are worth the money that we as members of the Assembly pay them because of the jobs they have to do. I know because I spent some time as a Deputy Speaker of this Chamber. If it had been for the money that was involved, I can assure you I would never have taken the job. But I enjoyed doing it because I felt part and parcel of something of the way that this Assembly operated. —(Interjection)— No, as the honourable member said, I didn't even have to pay for the gavel that I broke. Perhaps — maybe that came under my expense allowances. I understand that they put a steel shaft in the gavel afterwards, so I couldn't break it.

But to get back to what I said. We look at this pension scheme. We have members both elected at the same time. They serve eight years or two Legislatures in this Assembly. Supposing it's eight years, that is 24 percent of whatever the best five years — or the last five years of when they served in this Legislature. Under this plan that we have now, there are additional pensions for those who are Ministers of the Crown. There are additional pensions for you, Mr. Speaker; even I could qualify under this bill to make some more contributions to get extra time figured in. But we go back to those two me — eersight years, 24 percent. The other one, elected at the same date, he becomes a Cabinet Minister, and on the basis of his salary, as it was in the past, can, over a period of eight years pick up another 18 percent. And they're both defeated at the same time. They both go out of this House. They both have been elected equally by members of the population of Manitoba as a whole, and on election day when the electorate are electing us to this Chamber, they are not electing us as First Ministers, Ministers of the Crown, Speakers of this Assembly or front benchers, middle benchers, back benchers; they are electing us collectively as 57 members, all equal in this House, and it depends on the majority of the seats that are gained in that election, whether you sit on that side of the House, whether you sit on this side of the House.

But here we have two members that can go out of this Assembly, one with a pension of approximately 24 plus 18, that's 42 percent, the other one out with 24.

Now, as a socialist, Mr. Speaker, I cannot buy that kind of a concept. Absolutely not. There is no way. If honourable members who are Ministers of the Crown, Speakers, there are many ways that you can augment your extra emolument that you receive to work it for a pension. And you know, with the rugged free enterprisers that we have. Mr. Speaker, on that side of the House, with

their friends across the street over here in the Great-West Life, I say to you, go over there, and see if they'll give you the same kind of a deal. See if they'll give you the same kind of a deal for eight years' service, for the extra emolument that you receive for what you would receive in this Assembly.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is no way. Friends of yours they may be, but they're not going to give you that kind of a deal. Absolutely no way. And so, Mr. Speaker, while I feel for those members of the back bench who have to travel from their homes, who have to live here in the city, I know that the costs of living are high, but nevertheless, if this bill was to pick up the cost-of-living expenses for those people, then I might be, as I said, I would have no hesitation whatsoever, and to me it would make no difference whatsoever because I am a city MLA and it wouldn't make any difference to me. But I feel for those people who have to travel back to their constituencies. I feel for those who are in remote northern communities where they have to travel back home, and even though we have some features in here that help them, nevertheless, those things, good as they are, do not outweigh the bad features of this bill.

And so, Mr. Speaker — oh yes, there's another portion of the bill that I can't say really that I agree with, members of boards of commissions who are members of this Assembly, who, Mr. Speaker, we don't control their remuneration, not this Assembly as such. That is controlled by Order-in-Council, by the government. Really the only salaries a week that we have anything to do with in this House, are yours, Mr. Speaker, the Chairmen of Committees, the Deputy Speaker. Those are the only salaries that we as members of this Assembly really control one way or the other. We don't control the Minister's salaries because there is another method of determining. And I'm not saying that the salaries that the Ministers are receiving at the present time are adequate, because I don't think they're adequate.

And if the vote was here that the government saw fit that they wanted to bring in legislation to increase those salaries, I would not be opposed to that, but as far as the pension is concerned, no, Mr. Speaker, under no circumstances can I support a concept that makes first-class and second-class members of members who were all elected equally to this Assembly, and just by the grace of God they may be sitting on that side of the House, and depending on whether they are members of the treasury bench or whether they are members of the back bench, depending on that whim and the chance of fate, will depend on their service in this House, how they will be remunerated when they retire.

And so, Mr. Speaker, having said that, as I said before, there are more bad features in this bill than there are good features, and especially when we have had the phony restraint issue preached at us and the people of Manitoba for the past 18, going on 19 months, and now we see that with some of the increases and the suggestions that are moved in this bill, and you know, Mr. Speaker, I might even be able to buy the pensions if we said that these pensions would come into effect at the date of the 32nd Legislature. The 32nd Legislature, not the 31st, so that members, when they are running next time, they know that those are the conditions that they are running under and the people of Manitoba know what they are. But I find it very interesting that a tidbit bait is put out to the opposition that you can buy, and members of this side of the House, can buy back to June 28th, 1973. They want to share this blame, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to share the blame with them. No way.

We've had phony restraint from Day One of the life of this government. You've made your bed, now lie in it. As far as I'm concerned, you have preached restraint, now practise some of the restraint that you've been preaching for the last 18 or 19 months. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, this kind of legislation always brings on great difficulty for members, not because they, themselves, don't know what their respective positions are, but because taking any position usually leads to recriminations of one kind from people who take the opposite position, that somehow one is not being sincere. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that all that one can do is try to ignore what others will say and state what your position is with respect to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who feels that the members of the Legislature, or the Cabinet Ministers, are making a sacrifice and are not well paid. I know that there are many people in modern society who think that I am an archaic relic of the Depression, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that members of the Legislature now make approximately \$22,000 a year, because they make an indemnity plus a tax allowance, which raises their indemnities to \$22,000. Members of the Executive branch make approximately \$35,000 a year.

Now, those are not the highest salaries in society, those are not salaries which are comparable to similar work done in other legislatures. In most cases, we are lower. But Mr. Speaker, I have

to look at it completely objectively and say that one of the main reasons that I became involved in politics is that I thought some people work too hard and make too little, some people work too little and make too much, and that one of the major, if not the major, thrusts of my political life was to try to remove that inequity somewhat. And legislative indemnities, although I've had to deal with them from time to time, have never been a major thrust with me, and I have to tell members of this Assembly that I do not agree with those people who have got up and said that we are making a sacrifice, that we will do better in the outside world. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that most of us did not take a reduction in salary to do this job, and most of the Cabinet Ministers did not take a reduction in salary to do this job, and I believe that the members of this Legislature are very strong charactered people, high qualified people, and they have been lured into politics on the basis of the salaries as they existed.

Now that doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that I would say that there should never be a legislative salary increase. On the contrary, I participated in dealing with some. I voted against the first one that was ever presented when I was in the House. I did, as a delegate from my group, discuss with opposition members a formula which was a sensible formula, Mr. Speaker, which, and I'm not going to deal or try not to deal with the motives behind it, but last year in this Assembly the members worked for some reason for what was almost a half a Session, which was really a month's work, for \$669, and I don't know why that was considered to be such a wonderful salary by those who were then in charge. But there were no complaints with it, Mr. Speaker, no complaints with it. The members in this House worked for \$666 plus \$333 expenses. Wasn't that what was given for the first Session? And last year although there was a cost of living index in the pension, for some reason and let's not discuss the motivation, members of the government said, no that's too much and we're not going to pay it.

So when people come in now and say that we made sacrifices and we're not well paid and we're not paid well with regard to other provinces, let them remember that they set the pattern last year for the kind of salaries that are now being received. As a matter of fact if those things had not been done, much of this bill would be unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, because we would have taken the normal increases and the government wouldn't have had to look around for 10 different ways of paying salaries.

Look at what is happening. We are going to six legislative assistants. There are how many Cabinet Ministers at the present time, 15? There will be 15 soon. There will be 15, there may be 16, and I make that as a prediction.

Sixteen Cabinet Ministers minimum, 6 legislative assistants, that's 22; a Speaker is 23; a Chairman of the Committee of Supply is 24; a Government Whip is 25; a member of the Manitoba Water Commission is 26; the Hydro Board is 27; the Telephone Board is 28; which three of you have been left out? And why? Who are going to be these three dolts who the government says is not going to get anything? —(Interjection)— Three lucky ones, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that all of the MLAs, which is perfectly legitimate, should have had the regular salary increases, and there wouldn't have to be sought ways of dealing with the opposition Opposition Whip, the House Leader, all of these people, in order to spread the goodies, in the hope that a salary increase would not meet with any serious criticism. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could make it plain. Those people who get up and say that it's desirable and necessary and legitimate, I hope that they will respect my views in the same way as I respect theirs. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I do not see these changes as being necessary. I don't think that they are a proper way of dealing with the matter. I am not going to tie it to restraint, I'm not going to tie it to the cost of living. I'm not going to say, you having treated other people badly, we should not treat ourselves well, because I believe that we are relatively well treated.

It is not really that difficult to manage on \$35,000 a year. It is not really difficult and it is not really to be underpaid to get \$22,000 a year for six months steady time. And the suggestion that all of these little additions are needed from the point of view of the work that is being done, Mr. Speaker, I say with whatever the members will or will not accept from me, is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the issue of a pension. I frankly, have not yet been able to figure out exactly what this means, but I gather that a person will be able to get a pension of 70 percent maximum of his legislative salary, but he will be able to include both salaries. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason whatsoever for retroactivity. I really don't know why people who have accepted employment and worked on a particular wage in 1973, should be dealt with retroactively. I really don't know why this provision — pardon me? Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says, "It's not compulsory." It is not compulsory to take any of your wages. It's not compulsory.

But I want to tell the honourable member, although I say, and I will say that I don't think that I am worth much more than I'm getting, I tell the honourable member that I am worth as much as he is, and I have always had that difficulty of people saying, well if you don't think it's necessary, you don't have to take it. Pardon me?

**A MEMBER:** By next October, as leader, you'll be getting it.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is, I tell the honourable members, as I have said when this discussion has come up in the past, we have to agree on what the salary is. There will be different views on it. But my view is, and you can do whatever you like with it, I have never pursued the argument that Cabinet people are underpaid. I think that they are reasonably well paid, that they are certainly within, I would say, the top three percent wage earners — I'm talking about Cabinet Ministers — the top three percent wage earners in the population. I can say that without any difficulty at all. The top three percent.

And the pension that is now being proposed, I haven't really gone into it as to how fair it is, but the Member for Logan makes a very strong point, that somebody some day should have the guts of saying, we are going to say that this is what is necessary, but in order not to be talking about dealing with ourselves, deal with the next group that comes in, don't give something retroactively to the last group.

Wouldn't it be legitimate for you to say that we have a new formula, it shall now apply, not to the last group and this group, but to the next group. And that being the case, Mr. Speaker, and you know, they say that some people get up and say, I'm going to be courageous, I'm going to vote for this even though I know there will be criticism, Mr. Speaker, the reverse is also true. There will be criticism, there will suggestions that people are posturing, that people are going to vote against something and hope that it will go through. I tell you that when I vote against it, I will urge everybody else to vote against it, too. And if it doesn't go through, I can assure you that my future plans have not involved any increase from the Manitoba Legislature, and that my plans will not change one iota.

And therefore, those who want to do that, to think that the negative vote is somehow a form of posturing, you can do it, I guess I will have to claim, as has been claimed the other way, I have the conviction that this is right and I don't care what people say about it. Mr. Speaker, I have the conviction that what I am doing is right, and really I don't care whether there are those who will choose to attribute to it, motives which I tell you do not exist.

It is not a question of anything else other than saying that this particular bill, which seeks ways of getting money to a particular group of MLAs which seeks to provide MLAs with moneys retroactively, when the member says it's not compulsory, I wonder, if there is a right available to a group of people, why all who are in that category should not take it, but say that that right should not be available.

When you said Medicare should not be made available — and there were members on that side who said that you shouldn't have Medicare, may I tell the Member for Sturgeon Creek that it is not compulsory to have Medicare paid by the state. It's not compulsory. You can pay the doctor yourself and tell him not to sell a bill to Medicare if you're in principle against it. But nobody does that. The right is made available whether you agreed with it or disagreed with it, it is there, and will be applied for equally.

But Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has to tell me that it is legitimate to do that, to take people who worked four years ago, and say, you have a retroactive right to receive a salary that wasn't there at the time, which you were in charge of, and you didn't pay. Well, Mr. Speaker, those people who will say that is right, they are the ones who will have to get up and justify themselves, just as I am justifying the position that I am taking on this bill at the present time. It has nothing to do with the government treating other people badly; it has to do with the fact that there was a formula in existence, that it should have continued in existence, that the formula that is set out here, which tries to deal with 28 government MLAs in terms of extra salary, leaves out three. I'm worried about those three that are left out. —(Interjection)— Was it five?

I say that if you had raised everybody equally in the last two years, every member of the House, you wouldn't be in the problem of having to have five sore thumbs of people who don't get an extra emolument. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, and strictly because of the formula, and I do not want to bad mouth those who say that this is a terrific job, that you have to lure tremendous people into politics, that if you don't do this kind of thing you won't get them. Let that be their opinion. I disagree with it and I hope that they will have the reciprocal respect to say that the opinion that I am expressing, they disagree with — if they happen to disagree with it, and I'm trying to persuade them — and not question the basis upon which I am making this statement.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the second time today I find myself rising for the purpose of explaining to the electorate, to the voters, to the people of this province, and to the members

on the government side and my own side why I am going to be voting in a certain manner in a few moments, and I hope like the Member for Inkster that I am not accused of profiling because I assure you in all sincerity and honesty that I rise not to profile or not to make political hay out of what would seem to be a topic that one could use for that purpose, but I rise to put into perspective a number of my own thoughts on the issue of remuneration for MLAs.

The First Minister when he introduced this bill into the House the other day said it is the type of bill that each First Minister introduces with some trepidation, with some fearfulness. Well given the First Minister's government's actions over the past 20 months, if I were in his place it would have been more than mere trepidation, I would have been shaking in my boots, Mr. Speaker, because what he has foisted or attempted to foist under the phony guise of restraint on the people of this province is inconsistent with what is in this bill for his own government and for us also. So it is with that in mind that I have to say first off that I will be voting against the bill. Not as a matter of public posture, not as a matter of profiling, but as a matter of philosophy and principle, and I believe that this government, if they are going to ask the people of this province, the workers of this province, the minimum wage earners of this province, the low wage earners of this province, to suffer under the type of restraint that they have attempted to force them to suffer under, then it is incumbent upon them to restrain themselves.

This is not a restraint bill, Mr. Speaker. It is one of the few bills that has come before this House that is not a restraint bill. It by no means is consistent with the restraint philosophy of the members opposite, although it is, I would suggest, consistent with their own philosophy of how society should be structured in economic units. It is not consistent with what they are trying to force upon the people of this province. Because throughout this bill, Mr. Speaker, we find a number of subtle subsidies, that they are increasing their own wages, and they are increasing them in many respects and in many instances very substantially.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that yourself comes under the provisions of this bill for an increase, and that your indemnity will be increased for being the Speaker of this House by 20 percent, I believe, if I'm not incorrect, and that the expenses are there. And, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, I do not begrudge you that increase, and given normal circumstances in normal times, I would suggest that perhaps you are worth more than that which is due to you by this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to be quick to add that these are not normal times. These are times of the phony restraint. And if the phony restraint is going to be out there, the I want to the phony restraint in here.

So I would suggest that if we are going to apply to Peter, Paul, and Mary in the workforce an increase of 6 percent or 3.2 percent or less than that, Mr. Speaker, then we must apply that same sort of restraint within these Chambers. I feel that it is only right and just, and on the side of angels to do such as that, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy-Speaker — and this gives me some opportunity, you know, in one's reply to the Throne Speech they have an opportunity to go and to praise the Speaker, and to praise the Deputy-Speaker, and to make those sort of remarks. This gives me another opportunity — the Deputy-Speaker, I think has done a very capable job. There have been some very very tense moments in this House that he has helped to diffuse, as have you, Mr. Speaker, helped to diffuse with a sense of wit and a sense of fairness. And so I do not begrudge the Deputy-Speaker an increase from \$1,250 to \$2,500, but, and again it's the large "but" that we have to direct our attention to, but people out there are not getting those same sort of increases.

So again I have to say that what is fair on the outside of these Chambers should apply inside, because if we are to be in these Chambers to reshape society in the image of what we would like to see, then I think we must be honest not only with the electorate, but honest with ourselves. And I think that's the purpose for which we are here. So when this government says that the working society, to single out a specific segment of society, is entitled only to 6 and 7 percent, and those are the type of guidelines that they try to impose from within here on the outside, then they must also impose them within here from the inside, and that is not done.\$

There is another subtle subsidy which is one that is one by omission that I don't believe any member speaking has directed his or her attention to, but I would like to, and that's the sessional per diem allowance. Because if you read through the Act as it stands, through Bill No. 70, you will see that the sessional per diem allowance is increased from \$25 to \$40 a day which is a \$15 per day increase, and that I will have more to say about in closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, but you also have to take into consideration what the old Act said because this repeals Subsection 59(5). And what was said in Subsection 59(5) was that this sessional per diem allowance would exclude members of the Executive Council; Leader of the Official Opposition, my leader; and Leader of the recognized Opposition.

Now in the past it had excluded those persons, but if I am reading this bill correctly, or the amendments, and I assume that I am and will stand corrected if not, it does no longer exclude those people. Now that is a substantial perk, Mr. Speaker, because it's somewhere in the

of \$4,500 to \$5,000, of course depending on the actual length of the Session. And if we have a Session in the fall it will be even more than that for a one year period.

So that is a tremendous increase as far as I'm concerned in the salary of Cabinet Ministers and the salary of the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Now I hasten to add that it is due the Leader of the Official Opposition and probably much more, and if it were normal times I would not begrudge him that perk. But the times are not normal, Mr. Speaker, and that is a point that I will try to make throughout, that this bill is not a timely bill and that it does not keep with the philosophy of the government in regards to restraint. That is a substantial increase, Mr. Speaker, for individuals in this House who didn't receive it previously, and also for those of us who did receive it, it is also a substantial increase, and I will direct my attention to that later.

We also find now, Mr. Speaker, under 59(1), that the Government Whip now is entitled to an indemnity, and the Government Whip was probably always entitled to an indemnity because that is a difficult job. I do not begrudge their Whip, who has been faced with the onerous task of keeping that side in line, as our Whip, who is also included in this has been faced with the onerous task sometimes of keeping this side in line. I do not begrudge them the money in normal times, but it is not those times that this government would like us to believe that we are in now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I've heard something from one of the member's opposite, and I just have to remark as to something that was said outside of these Chambers as we were leaving. One of the members from the government side said "Well, we should pull this bill, and that will show you." I would challenge them to pull this bill because I think it's a bad bill, and if that's the way they feel, if that's what they honestly believe, then I would encourage them and I will go on record as encouraging them to pull this bill. Talk is cheap, and that is from the previous Minister of Labour, who was known to have had those words thrown at her by the minimum wage earners who suffered under her reign as Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap, and I am going to take that money if this bill is passed, and I will say quite unabashedly that I'm going to take that money, and I'm going to take it for one specific purpose, Mr. Speaker; I'm going to take it so that I have more money with which to use to try to defeat that government. That's what I'm going to use that extra \$15.00 a day for, Mr. Speaker, to try to defeat that government, and put the government that represents the people, the New Democratic Party government back in power in this province, so that we are not forced to stand and speak on bills such as this in this House, Mr. Speaker.

And again, we see the House Leader of the Official Opposition also coming under the provisions of this Act with a new allowance of \$2500 and, I know, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader works hard for that; well, the official Opposition works very hard, and by that I don't mean to infer that the House Leader of the government side doesn't work hard — I know that he does, also.

But, again, we are not in the normal times, Mr. Speaker, and we see two more Legislative Assistants added to the list, Mr. Speaker. I think enough comment has been made on that subject by others of my caucus.

And we see a mileage allowance increase to the members, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not certain what it represents in actual cash value, but I do have to commend the bill on this one point because it seems to tie it in with the allowances coming to civil servants pursuant to the provisions of The Civil Service Act and therefore, takes it out of this political realms so that we are not forced into the position of determining what is the value of our trips to and fro as far as mileage is concerned. I think that that is fair and equitable, and I commend the government for that particular provision. And Mr. Speaker, if times were different, I would probably commend them for other provisions of this bill, but times are not different.

So Mr. Speaker, I will not address my remarks to the pension part of this bill as I feel there are others on this side that are more capable and have a better understanding of that, but again, let us recognize it for what it is; it is a perk, and it is coming to the people in this House, it is not accruing to the people outside of this House, so Mr. Speaker, we have to be wary of changes such as that.

And to be brief on this subject, I would just like to make one suggestion — that if the members opposite, the government of this province, are convinced that they have to change the per diem, I would like to see it worked into a formula, Mr. Speaker.

And this is the formula that I would suggest, and I suggest it in all seriousness, although I doubt it will be taken as such. I have to note that our per diem right now is \$25.00 per day, Mr. Speaker. I also have to note that a minimum wage earner in this province, at the moment, makes approximately \$24.40 per day for an 8-hour day at the present minimum wage. Now that, Mr. Speaker, will be what they will make on July 1st. On January 1st, according to the information given to us by the government during this session, in 1980 the minimum wage for an 8-hour day will increase to \$25.20. So my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is if they feel it is necessary to increase the per diem allowance,

that they tie it in, since it's so close already, to increases in the minimum wage, because that is what we are talking about when we talk about a minimum wage earner's salary. That is the money that they need and, believe me, it is used on food and housing, primarily. There is very little left over after they have paid for their food and housing. And that is what our per diem allowance is supposed to be for us — food and housing. So if we say that 30,000 people in this province, many of whom have to support families, should be able to live on \$25.20 after January 1st of this year, is their per diem allowance, then I say, let us say that people in this House can afford to do the same, and that would be the most equitable system — as the minimum wage increases, and we can calculate it on a 8-hour day, so will our per diem, and so we will find that those of us who are forced to live in the city away from our homes during the session will be surviving on much the same as a minimum wage earner is surviving.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that will give us a better perspective of some of the problems that those minimum wage earners have. Because what the government is saying, they're saying that \$25.00 is not enough, that we cannot live away from our homes on \$25.00 a day, but I know, Mr. Speaker, that for those who are forced to live right here in the city at their homes, \$25.00 a day is not enough, and if we experience difficulty as legislators, then I think perhaps it will give us a better perspective, a better understanding of what we are trying to force on the people of this province who are forced into low wage jobs such as minimum wage earners.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I will just have to reiterate that I cannot support the bill, because the times, Mr. Speaker, are not in keeping with what the government would have us to believe is a restraint program. And this bill is not in keeping with what government would have us believe we should try to impose on those outside of this House. Therefore, I don't think that it is an appropriate bill within this House.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I regard this bill as containing, in two major ways, one that there are some long overdue changes and also, that there are some straightforward adjustments.

I believe that many of the references to the daily allowances, etc. are things that properly should be indexed, and should be basically adjusted, depending on the rate of inflation and the cost of living.

The one, I suppose, major improvement in the bill has to do with the possibility of a member being able to obtain a pension on the full amount that they earned. It strikes me as ridiculous for a minister to only be covered for ½ of his income, or even less. Anybody who has a job is normally covered to the full extent of their job, as measured by the dollar value, so I believe that that extension which affects Ministers, Legislative Assistants, the Speaker, Committee Chairmen, etc., is long overdue and should have been implemented by this House some 20 years ago.

I also understand from the remarks of the First Minister that all other provinces have such provisions in the sense of pensions available, and that we are the last one to fall in line.

Mr. Speaker, there are some omissions in this bill that I think could have been considered by the government, but that weren't. For example, I believe there should have been a re-examination of Research Allowances. I know, as a member of the Opposition Caucus, we find it almost impossible to provide a sufficient salary to a researcher, and when one considers that the government has at its fingertips hundreds, literally hundreds, of full-time researchers and executive assistants, etc., it would only make sense, I think, to allocate a specific position to the Caucus, or to allocate additional funds so that the Caucus would be able to hire a full-time person and also undertake certain research capabilities and functions, which do have a cost factor.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, the Member for Brandon East and the Member for Seven Oaks, in supporting this bill, and as they themselves said, they support the bill and intended to vote for it, but have an engagement in Brandon and had to leave, but their speeches are on the record in support.

One of the general points that I make in supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I don't intend to speak much longer, is that I believe it is essential to attract and retain good people in government, and that that is a prime motivation and should be a prime feature of people in political life. I also recall very much the House Leader and myself sitting around a table, I guess in the late 1969 period and early 1970's, discussing some of the needs and requirements of members of the Legislature, and I recall how we talked about certain improvements that were long overdue. Many of those improvements, Mr. Speaker, have been made in the past decade, and I recall very clearly, when I entered this Assembly in 1966, some of the poor conditions that were then in effect for members of the Legislature. I recall that the salary was around \$4,800, rumored to be going to \$7,200, which it was. I recall across the hall the members' locker room. Each member had a locker, and there

was a cold sandwich machine and the usual pathetic coffee machines and cigarette and chocolate bar machines —(Interjection)— a good cigarette machine, high quality product, and in the basement was a cafeteria which, if you'll pardon the impolite language, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to as an armpit; a dull, dank place with pathetic lighting and poor food, and that is where everybody in the building had to congregate to acquire something to eat.

Since that time there has been many improvements, and I just wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have fought for these improvements. I fought in our government for the indexing of MLAs' indemnities, which was put into effect, and for a decent restaurant for MLAs and a decent cafeteria for civil servants, which is now in evidence downstairs, and for offices for MLAs, which is very long and overdue. We made some improvement there. We gave half the office space in one wing to each of the two main parties, and when the government came in they made an additional improvement of giving all of the offices to the opposition, which was a step forward.

So Mr. Speaker, for these reasons in general I see this as an evolutionary process, and I take the long range view. I believe that there is no question that in the short run, the immediate short run, this bill will largely benefit the present government. But in the long run I believe that most of the provisions in the bill will benefit the legislative process, and ultimately the democratic process. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote in favour of the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's some period of time now since we last had a debate like this one in this House, having to do with adjustment of benefits of one sort or another for members of the Assembly, and I think it's obvious that for any government that has to introduce measures like this that it is indeed an uncomfortable period of time, because obviously it's very difficult to try to impress upon people generally that these things have to be done, notwithstanding that there appears to be such an obvious conflict of interest. So it's not an easy thing for any government to do, and I recall that we had to go through the same pain, as I'm sure members opposite are now enduring, but it's nevertheless important that it be done from time to time. So I don't want to take the position that somehow we on this side can't appreciate that, and can't understand it for what it is.

I think that one of the reasons that lends itself to the opposition to debate however, or to the proposals of the government in this debate, Mr. Speaker, is of course the overposturing of this government on a number of issues, and that is what has given credibility to some of the comments that have been spoken by members of this side of the House this evening, Mr. Speaker, and I can't say that I fault those people who have made those points because it is true that the government has tried to impress upon the Canadian, or the Manitoba public, and beyond that the Premier's tried to impress the Canadian public that we have to cut our cloth a little finer, and that we must accustom ourselves to a little less than what we have been accustomed to before or than our expectations. In that light, Mr. Speaker, it's not difficult to understand the comments of the Member for Inkster, or the Member for Churchill, or other members who are speaking in opposition to Bill 70.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to follow that trend other than to make that one observation, because if one was to go at length on that point, Mr. Speaker, I think that one would have to conclude that there will never be a time in the life of the Conservative government, when it will be an appropriate time to bring in this kind of a measure, given their philosophical bent.

So where does that get one, Mr. Speaker? Obviously it's a dead-end approach. And so we have to face it on the basis that yes, the government is indicating guidelines to the general public with respect to their expectations, but feels somewhat privileged to go beyond with respect to what it is required to maintain a member of the Assembly, to maintain Cabinet, to maintain government.

I would have to say, though, Mr. Speaker, that departing from that, would be one important fact which I think was overlooked by some of our members when they made their comments, and that is, that they were trying to make their comments on the basis of the six or eight percent guideline which is sort of the feature of this government. And Mr. Speaker, without being critical, I think one has to recognize, to be fair, that six or eight percent guidelines would be in context if we were doing this every year. And that's an oversight on the part of some of our members that have already spoken.

I think I recognize that with respect to most measures in Bill 70, that these adjustments are based on three or four years, and perhaps in some instances, several years, so that in essence, it isn't as gruesome as some members would want to make it out. And I make that observation.

But Mr. Speaker, I want to go further. I believe that to make the Legislature function, and this

is where I believe that the Member for Inkster and I probably would never agree — to make the Legislature function more in the interest of a truer democracy, that there has to be greater public funding of the legislative process, and it is in that context that I make my contribution here this evening, Mr. Speaker.

I truly believe that elections should be financed by the public purse. I have always believed that, Mr. Speaker, or at least if not in whole, in good measure. And we have seen that in a number of provinces in Canada, to date, and certainly under The Federal Election Act, which by the way members opposite have used to good advantage, as well as we have, Mr. Speaker, and I think we have to admit to that. And so we shouldn't be hypocritical on that issue. We are doing it, we're doing it perhaps even through the back door. I say perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I can't prove my point. But in any event, it's time, Mr. Speaker, that the government brought in a measure under this bill, or an amendment to it, that provided for some measure of public financing of elections, perhaps even the operations of political parties, but certainly elections, because if democracy means anything, Mr. Speaker, it has to mean proper access to everyone to the democratic process without financial limitation. If it means anything, it has to mean that. Otherwise it's a farce, Mr. Speaker.

Political ideology can only be looked upon by the public, who participate in the electoral system, in the election process. The process of electing governments, school boards, or municipal governments, or whatever, can only be carried out properly if each particular group, ideological group if you like, Mr. Speaker, is able to present its case, and the public is then in a position to assess what it is that each particular group is trying to promote, to aspire, to convince the majority that their position is the position that should be supported. That would be a much truer concept of the democratic process than what we have had to date.

Now, this is nothing new with respect to my own thinking on it, Mr. Speaker, and I have to admit that we had an opportunity to do it when we were in government, but I could never win that argument. I have to admit to that, Mr. Speaker. In the first nomination speech that I gave, Mr. Speaker, that was a point that I raised, that had to be done. And in my more idealistic period in my life, Mr. Speaker, I thought that it had to be done then, and that was almost 14 years ago, and we haven't yet arrived.

But Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give up, because I believe the day will arrive when we will support the concept, in this Legislature, of some measure of public funding of our elections, of the political parties, of the political structure in this province. And I don't care which political party, Mr. Speaker. I have no problem with that. There isn't one ideology who has a group of people, or where a group of people represents an ideology, and who have a following that should be denied that right. I don't hold bars to any. If any group is in a position to convince the majority of Manitobans as to what kind of government we should have, what our economic policy should be, what our social policy should be, I say, the people make that decision. But they should be equipped to make that decision. And the argument should flow freely, based on ready access to the necessary funding to allow for the proper dissemination of information, to allow for the reasonable use of the media, and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill should be amended, should be amended to provide for the broadening of the democratic process, the enhancement of the democratic process, so that gradually, but surely, we keep moving on into the area of a truer democracy. And I'm sure that I would invite some reaction from that side, because I know there are people there that don't truly believe in the concept, that they perhaps do believe that might is right, and it's too bad if one group has the bucks and the other one doesn't, and therefore we don't get a fair play of ideological discussion during the process of an election campaign.

I believe it is healthy for any system to have a . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My honourable friend now is talking about an entirely different piece of legislation. He's talking about The Election Act, and this is The Legislative Assembly Act. I rather think that he should confine his remarks to the bill that's before the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point that the House Leader is making. I thought it would be reasonable, given this early hour in the evening, that some latitude would be allowed, because Mr. Speaker, I'm not pursuing it, I just simply wanted to comment.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . latitude within the bill, but when he jumps out into an entirely different Act altogether, then I think it's asking a little too much.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that I do want to contain myself within the parameters of Bill 70, but the point I'm making is that while some may take the position that it's comfortable to oppose, I'm not going to take that position, I'm going to vote for the bill, in recognition though of the fact that it's very easy to go the other direction because this government has given us that kind of opportunity with the way in which they have conducted the affairs of this province over the last 18 months, Mr. Speaker. But I'm not going to seize on that opportunity because I believe in the principle of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the principle of the legislation. Some of the things that are being corrected now should have been in place years ago, and it's whenever you try to catch up on something that you end up with debates of, you know, it's a 50 percent boost, or it's a 100 percent boost. Yes, if it wasn't there before and it's there now, it's a 100 percent increase. That is true. But perhaps it should have been there, and therefore the increase may have been 5 percent or 10. So one has to view it in the proper light, Mr. Speaker.

Members who are not in Cabinet, and who have other sources of revenue, I'm sure many of them, if not all of them, find that it's reasonable within that other revenue source to contribute on the total amount of their earnings towards a retirement program. I think society has gone a long way in that direction, and where it is not built in, where it is not built in, Mr. Speaker, in the workplace, then of course government has encouraged it through things like RSPs, things like deferred profit programs, profit-sharing programs, and so on. So society has recognized fully the validity of some system whereby people are able to contribute on the basis of their earnings towards a secure position in their older period in life.

I believe this bill is modest, because I'm sure there can be arguments that the 70 percent limitation should apply to the total contribution rather than to the indemnity. In that connection I give the government some credit, that they haven't allowed it to be open ended. I think it's reasonable to have that limitation. I think 70 percent, based on the indemnity, is adequate, Mr. Speaker. I also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is some lessening of public spending here because of the new formula with respect to eligibility, so that there is some reduction as well.

So I have to look upon this bill as relatively modest, not overly — well, I couldn't say it's a greedy approach to fulfilling one's own desires, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination. I wish, as the First Minister had stated earlier the other day, that we didn't have to do it this way. Now, maybe there is another way; I don't know if there is. I know we looked at it, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, and you know, the idea of the independent Commission looks very attractive, but quite frankly I am afraid if you went that route the Commissioners would recommend salaries that just would not be acceptable to any member of the Assembly, and certainly not to the public, because the way the private sector abuse things, I'm afraid is quite different from the way we look at things here in this Assembly with respect to the expenditures of public funds.

I believe, and I know in discussing it with many people over the years that appointing any Board or Commission to study this question, that the inevitable result would be a recommendation that we would be paring down very substantially before we would put it into the statute, Mr. Speaker, so I'm not sure if that is the answer. I know the dilemma. The dilemma is how do you give yourself an improvement in your workplace in terms of salary, condition, pension ability. That is a dilemma because there is no other higher authority that is able to do it for you, and if you appoint one, you are still the higher authority in any event. So the chickens come home to roost, Mr. Speaker. No matter how you make the decision, you ultimately have to accept the responsibility, and every government is in that position. So Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. MORRIS McGREGOR:** Mr. Speaker, when I entered this Chamber in 1962, as I recall, I think the total pay was \$3,900.00. Now, the Honourable Member for St. Johns is maybe more correct; it might have been \$3,600. And while it probably wasn't very good value in that day in not having the ability to get my point around as easy, or maybe it's even harder today in the minds of some, however, I do feel, and it may be only one man's opinion, that I'm the best buy that came through those doors.

But I also say today we're a very well paid position, and I say that when you move from \$3,600 or \$3,900 in the few short years that I've been here, up to a total of something in the order of — well, it depends what figure we're looking at — per diem, per day, \$25.00, it comes considerably higher than \$2,200.00. But in answering the Honourable Member for Churchill, he was referring to the \$25.00 as though we're getting that, I think all of us are aware that most of us earn a buck outside of this Chamber, and some of us earn considerable bucks outside of this Chamber, that half of that \$25.00 is taxable. So I've never been able, and I don't earn nearly as much as some of the other membjs, but there's no way can I even pay for my hotel room out of that per diem,

so if it was to \$40.00, I still won't get a hotel room paid; I'm still eating out of my pay cheque which doesn't make me very happy. We all get selfish, and that \$40.00 I've no quarrel with. If it went down to \$15.00, I would have no quarrel with it because the difference again is very little whether you go up — I look at it, the only people that gain on that \$40.00 is our Provincial Treasury and our Federal Treasury.

I could easily substantiate to this Chamber what it's costing me to be here; it's a real large figure, and I've stolen that from my children; that was my decision. I didn't have to be here in '62, '63, or the many elections since. I elected to come here because I get somewhat of a thrill being here, seeing things being done, having your finger on, and the biggest thrill I get when I get credit for something happening that really I didn't have much push to do, and sometimes that happens.

But I'm telling Mr. Speaker, and you're in the same position with 100 or 200 miles, or 300 miles from the Chamber, and you have problems out there, and you go miles to that corner of your constituency, and then come in here the following day to settle one thing that many city members don't appreciate. When we go out of here, this is my holiday, and I'm sure that many of you will agree that the amount of talking you do, I should have a good holiday. But really it is a fact, the hardest work is done once the doors of the Chamber close and we go out and we start tearing around to the functions; that's the way we get elected, and that's the easiest part. From election time I go farming, or catering to the particular premier of that day, and if I can be at the same spot by accident, that's fine. I take advantage of it if I can.

I think it's rather a shame you know that the Member for St. Boniface isn't here because I know the going over he gave us in 1966, or 7, or 8, and he filibustered that bill, almost a one man show, and to think he's sitting in the position with the indexing, as I understand it, he's got his full bundle, he could just get up here and tear everybody everywhere apart on it, because there's not a thing he can lose. Whether we go with it, whether we don't go with it, he's going to get the same pension. —(Interjection)— I tried. I did try. It was fair, but I thought we'd get a good shot from him.

But there's one point no one has mentioned though and that is on Page 3 of the bill, and it's one that my colleagues were recalling many times, addressing them down for, that we were not making a big enough donation, and it's just in the last shot we've got on this bill, it's Subsection 9, on Page 3, where it's moved from 6 percent up to 7 percent starting the 1st of January. Well, that brings us into somewhat of the same ballpark as the Civil Service and I think that's a proper one, because I've always looked at these pensions, and some will say we get a better pension than another province, maybe so. Well then I look at it differently. I think if they're getting a better pension they're better tax ripoff artists than we are. Because this will not carry itself, and our Minister of Finance — but it came so much closer to carrying itself than I could really honestly believe and I don't doubt my Minister of Finance in the slightest.

And for some of us who should come back here another trip, we'll be paying that 7 percent. The Honourable Member for St. Johns will, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is there now I believe, and we'll be paying that full 7 percent for no reason at all pension wise. Maybe that's a good move, his telling us we've been here our 20 Sessions, we can go out and let someone else, and maybe that's right. I sometimes think many of us in political life stay there because we're popular, because we're due at the right place at the right time.

As I said at the start I was not thrilled at all about this bill, there's many things that I'm unhappy about, and I did say from day one to our caucus, that I believe in equality. Whatever comes every member should have the same chance at it. I am sure as they were calculating who was going to be those three or five members left out, I don't know, but I don't look at that as — it does hurt one's ego if he's been here a long time and they don't really use him, but if my Ministers are listening to me, and be whatever side of the House I am on or whatever side of the House the Minister is on, are listening to me and serving my constituents, that's what I'm here for, not for big dollars, not for an ego trip, and for that reason on behalf of my colleagues, that I don't entirely agree with this bill and the way it's put in, but I will be supporting it in the broader measure of it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Member for Virden for

entering into the debate and bringing to this debate a perspective dating from 1962, and I think it was quite an objective perspective, and I'm glad that the Member for Virден has had his thrills in the Legislature. I frankly hope that he may even get a bigger thrill come this fall if there is some type of shuffle and I hope that because of his objectivity he might be sitting on the Treasury Benches come fall. But that's obviously not up to us to decide, is it?

Mr. Speaker, I joined this lengthy debate this evening because if in fact one is going to take a vote on this, one should state one's position and I've always been interested in public administration and the role of public officials and I think this bill, although it has some good features in it, really reflects a wrong set of priorities at this time, and I'll be speaking about a different set of priorities, I think, than most speakers have spoken about to date in this debate.

I think the bill deals with selective benefits, and there are some who are not being benefited or won't benefit that much from this particular legislation. And there are a number of people, primarily on the government side either as Ministers or legislative assistants, or members of boards and commissions who will indeed benefit from it. But the emphasis nevertheless is still on benefits and unfortunately the bill doesn't deal with ways and means of improving the role of MLAs. The bill doesn't deal with ways and means of improving the services that an MLA might provide to his constituents. And I think that's the tremendous drawback of this legislation. Indeed I think it's putting the cart before the horse.

Surely you talk about what you want to do, how you want to get what should be done, done, and then having done that you would then start talking about benefits. But this bill doesn't do that, it really in a sense looks back a bit, and it tends to deal in a rather haphazard manner with some benefits and it really doesn't deal with the role of MLAs in a positive manner. And I'd like to just spend a few seconds talking about the role of legislators.

I believe that the functions of an MLA are full time, and I think that some people are in vocations or professions that may allow them to carry on these activities outside the Legislature in a part-time manner, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe that these activities are ancillary to their primary functions which are that of being an MLA. And I think that members, really when they're in the House have the job or the task of dealing with the business of the House, which mainly is estimates. It's a fairly complicated matter and it's getting more complicated as we proceed. The Budget again is a complicated matter, and the laws that we deal with are also a complicated matter, and I think doing that job well requires much more research assistance than is being provided at this present time.

I think also that the MLA has to deal with constituency concerns and problems, and in that respect I think that we really should look at the whole question of communicating with constituents. We do have one frank per Session, but frankly I think that the frank for the northern MLA possibly isn't the best means of that MLA communicating with his constituents. Other jurisdictions have a communication allowance and the MLA is then free to determine what he or she thinks is the best means of communicating within the parameters of that allowance. But I think that's a question that somewhere, somehow, has to be looked at. And I'm not being critical of the Conservative caucus or the Conservative government for not dealing with this. I'm not singling them out for blame wholly. I think that this is something that Manitoba administrations have not paid sufficient attention to for a long time, and it goes back through the NDP administration, the previous Conservative administration, and the previous Liberal administration. I'm just saying that at some stage we have to say hold it, what are we really trying to do as a Legislature, and what are we trying to do as legislators. And I think we should think about politics in a much more positive vein. What type of constituency support should we be receiving with respect to constituency offices. Other jurisdictions have things like this. Do we have sufficient secretarial and clerical assistance to really deal with the plethora of constituency concerns that are raised with us all, as constituency representatives?

Now one good way of avoiding constituency calls is not to deal with them. You know, the phone stops ringing if you don't answer it, people give up after while. But that really means that we aren't doing our job well. In fact if MLAs do their job well the phone rings more as word gets around by word of mouth. And the busier an MLA is, the better it is for that person, but the better it is for the community, and the better it is for the constituency that that person represents.

But I don't think that we have sufficient clerical stenographic assistants to do that job particularly well. I think that's clearly insufficient. I find that there are drastic changes between being a civil servant and being an MLA, and I think that in some respects the civil servants are coddled far too much in terms of the physical facilities that they have. Many civil servants are housed in private offices when they really don't deal with the public very much. And MLAs whose job it is to relate to the public have to scurry around looking for empty rooms so that they may meet in privacy with a constituent who calls to discuss a confidential matter.

That really is not good enough and I know that members on the other side of the House can

say, well you guys didn't do any better when you were in government. And that criticism is valid and we're not trying to duck it. I think there were some attempts to improve it. There were some attempts to provide some office space, but surely we haven't gone far enough in that respect.

So again that's another area in which I think the role of the MLA, because we all start off as MLAs, would be improved tremendously, and it's not being dealt with at all in this legislation.

I think the greatest difficulties are faced by northern MLAs. I think they have by far the greatest problems in trying to get out to the remote and isolated communities that many of them represent. It is a very big problem. I don't know if it's acknowledged by members on the other side of the House, but it surely is a big problem. I think that the requirements, the financial assistance requirements for northern MLAs for them to perform their jobs well, especially in person, are just clearly inadequate, and again nothing is being done to try and deal with that matter. And this is a tremendous opportunity, I think, for the House to deal with politics in a positive way.

Let's talk about what are the impediments or the constraints to our doing a better job. Let's identify them, and let's see if we can overcome them. And my position very strongly is that we have to deal with these concerns first before we move on to the whole issue of remuneration and benefits because frankly, our basic remuneration is set in the legislation which allows for an automatic indexing ' unless of course somebody attempts to play cynical political games. But usually that's removed from that process, and I'm glad that it's out of that process and I hope it's not removed again, because I think when you remove that automatic indexing from the non-political milieu and throw it into the political milieu, the difficulty is then trying to come back into the non-political milieu without raising some cynicism from our side of the House, and frankly I am cynical.

There are certain attempts here to slide in extra remuneration that I think is totally uncalled for. The remuneration for legislative assistants is something that I would not like to see continued. I think it was a mistake of the previous administration to introduce legislative assistants. I don't think that their functions warrant any special remuneration. I think it's a mistake for this administration to go from four to six.

I've had an opportunity of seeing a number of Legislative Assistants with the one person who has performed a few functions, but not that many more that would distinguish him from, say, the Chairman of some of the Standing Committees has been the Member for St. James, who has done some work on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Public Accounts Committees. But really, the Legislative Assistants are clearly a perk, they are a sop to backbenchers who can't get into the Cabinet. I think that we should recognize that, and try and deal with it; if, in fact, these people somehow cannot survive without these sops, then maybe' maybe the base level of pay for an MLA isn't sufficient. But again, that's something that is ducked by this legislation, and it raises a lot of suspicion.

I'd like to raise one other matter with respect to improving the way in which MLAs might operate, with respect to improving the way in which a caucus as a whole might operate in substantive terms. I hope that the Government House Leader has had an opportunity to take a look at some submissions from The University of Manitoba and The University of Winnipeg which, I think, have been around for about two, three, four years with respect to some type of internship for graduate students in the Social Sciences, the university graduates. There is a Parliamentary Internship Program, I think, where a somewhat smaller body than the Parliament of Canada — we don't meet full time, but at the same time, I would ask the Government House Leader to look closely at the possibility of developing some plan of caucus internship, that is, these people would come on as Research Assistants to the caucus. I think that that type of program can be developed. Again, I fault the previous administration for not moving on this, but that doesn't mean that this administration couldn't have moved on it as well.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we tend, when in government, to forget about these types of requirements and I think that there is far too great a tendency to gloss over those items, and to really spend a lot of time talking about the nitty gritty of pensions, or how much more we'll get this year than last year; that is a mistake, and I think that it really does reflect a wrong set of priorities.

Now, the First Minister in introducing this legislation, indicated that he might consider some of the points that I have raised, but that might has been raised before in many contexts, and one again perhaps unjustifiably, but perhaps justifiably, gets a bit cynical about about that type of phraseology.

We might have a bill to regulate the travel industry. That was a proposal put forward in the Throne Speech at the last minute, but it, nevertheless, does in fact, do a bit to promote some type of cynicism on my part when I see these types of conditional proposals put in in relation to something else.

Now in terms of what this bill deals with, there are certainly some features which I could support, but there are two I think should be highlighted as being completely unnecessary. I think the sessional

allowance for Cabinet ministers is an extra stipend of \$4,000 to \$5,000 for Cabinet Ministers, and I think it's unnecessary; I think that Cabinet Ministers get a number of other perks which really aren't accounted for very well, but do in fact make up for a lot of things that Cabinet Ministers supposedly give up when they take on Cabinet responsibilities — car, Executive Assistant, secretarial assistants in carrying out their activities, much of which are administrative, some of which are political or constituency oriented.

So I think that Cabinet Ministers aren't particularly hard done by — they're not well done by, but they're not hard done by, so I think that this increase in the sessional per diem is a mistake. I do have serious reservations about Legislative Assistants, increasing the number from four to six, and of course, I have very serious reservations about the government acting through its power, through Order-in-Council to increase the indemnities of Cabinet Ministers and Legislative Assistants after the House prorogues. When the First Minister indicated that that might be a possibility, I guess my cynicism has been developed somewhat over the last nineteen months, and I have a tendency to believe that possibility much more than I believe the possibility that the support services to MLAs might be reviewed in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really do think that the bill is a bill at the wrong time, with the wrong set of priorities. That doesn't mean that I wouldn't support pieces of this legislation if they were part of a truly comprehensive package, but I don't think they are parts of a truly comprehensive package. I prefer to vote against the legislation; I will continue to argue for the development of positive support systems for MLAs and for the Legislature. I will continue to argue for improvements in the working conditions or the security provisions of MLAs or Cabinet Ministers. Not against those aspects, but I really do think that we have to bring the matter together in a coherent package, which doesn't exist yet. Because we're putting the cart before the horse, Mr. Speaker, I feel I can't support this legislation at this time, and I will be voting against it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. R. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that we on the opposition should all rise to at least state our positions on Bill 70. I intend to be fairly brief, Mr. Speaker, I think there's been quite a large number of comments that have been made, and I intend to be very, very brief. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that whether one supports this bill or opposes the bill, there no doubt will be criticism one way or the other. If one opposes the bill, I suppose it'll be said that one is trying to oppose the bill for political gain, or political mileage, and if one supports the bill, there will probably be some criticism, that we are trying to feather our nests.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, like the Member for Virden who mentioned that when he was first elected to this Assembly, he mentioned that he thought the salary was \$3,600 at that particular time. I'm not sure whether that included the expense allowance or not — the Member for Virden indicates that the \$3,600 included the expense allowance. I presume that it was \$2,412 or something like that. I recall when I first became involved in politics, Mr. Speaker, it was back in 1971 in a by-election when there was two by-elections held, one in St. Vital and one in Ste. Rose, and I recall that the indemnity then was \$4,800.00. Now, I didn't get into politics particularly to find a job of any kind; I felt that I had a great duty to perform. I felt that it was my duty to try and save the New Democratic Government that was in a minority position, and depending on Mr. Desjardins and the late Gordon Beard I the support o have very high respect for both these members — I think this tragic loss, the departure of Gordon Beard — I thought that the constituency of Churchill was very well represented when he was in the House. But I recall that one of the reasons I did get into politics was because I felt that it was necessary at the time to try and give the government a working majority, and I believe that the history shows that my efforts were successful, as well as the Member for St. Vital.

But, I was very enthused about getting into politics . I was very sincere about coming to this Assembly and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I wonder if my honourable friend would deal with the contents of the bill. Really, I don't know whether history of his entry into politics has got anything to do with what is contained in this measure, and I would hope that he would confine his remarks to the bill that is before him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to lead up to what was happening once I got into the Assembly. Well, I'm leading to that — if the House Leader would have a little patience, I'll be there in a minute.

When I arrived here, Mr. Speaker, I found that things were not going to happen as fast as I thought they would, and I had 31 or 32 colleagues to contend with in getting things done for my constituency. But the salary at that time, Mr. Speaker, was \$4,800 if I recall correctly; I thought it was adequate at the time, and I believe it was for that particular time. I was farming at the time, and I felt that I was entering into politics and I would, if necessary, spend 100 percent of my time at this particular job. I did not feel that it was right for someone to get into politics and not do a good job for the people who had elected him.

But, I found, Mr. Speaker, that when I got here, we had one room to work in, and I believe there were around 14 or 15 members occupying Room 228. It was a madhouse, telephones ringing all the time; there was no secretarial staff to speak of, there was not sufficient secretarial staff to look after the correspondence that we had to do with our constituents; phones were ringing all the time, we had no adequate facilities to meet with delegations or constituents that came in to meet with us. I don't know whether the Member for Elmwood, who is taking credit for all the improvements that have been made in the Legislature back in 1971, but I do know that for seven years I continually complained about office space, where one could go down and concentrate, or have a private conversation on the telephone, or have a place to write to his constituents, as the case may be.

So there have been a number of improvements. We finally, after seven years, did have a number of offices downstairs. But I have to admit that some of them are so warm in the winter time that it's very difficult to stay very long. But if one can stand the heat for a few minutes, I think that has been a big improvement as far as I am concerned.

I don't intend to support this bill, Mr. Speaker, because since 1971, my indemnity as a member of this House, has gone up from \$4,800 to, I believe \$12,200.00. And I feel that for the work that I am doing here, while I'm dedicated to spending 100 percent of my . time, if necessary, to do the job that I was elected to do, I have never found that I have had to spend the entire year to service my constituency. I do recall that in 1971, I believe I spent eight months away from home, and the mileage that I made that year was about 50,000 miles, in order to get acquainted and see what was happening in my entire constituency. But since then, I haven't had to be away that long from home.

For the time that we spend in the Legislative Assembly, I feel that the indemnity is adequate, particularly since the indexing feature was introduced a year or two ago. Although I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government last year, after the 1977 election, were doing nothing more than posturing by removing that indexing provision. I believe that they were just trying to make political mileage, by saying, here is a nice big government that's going to look after your tax dollars, we're going to be good managers, we want to set the tone for the rest of the private sector, we are going to cut back on the indexing feature which would amount to — I forget just how much it was, but the average industrial wage would vary from year to year and I think that was nothing but posturing when that took place.

Now we find that they are just reversing their position. Now they are asking for some extra benefits. There are other benefits that members of the Legislative Assembly receive, and that is, there are some franking privileges, and that helps the MLAs, there is also telephone service during the session, franking privileges, and I believe we are allowed to make one intersessional mailing to every constituent, or every elector, or every household in our constituency, which is a help.

I am concerned at what's going to happen in the future in regard to the larger constituencies, as recommended by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I believe that they have done a very good job, and I commend them for it. . But I do have some concerns about how a member will be able to adequately give service to the people in a constituency that they are entitled to receive. So I do have some concerns for the future.

I believe that there are some parts of this bill that I could perhaps support, but I can't buy the whole package like the Member for Transcona. I do believe that perhaps the per diem was adequate when it was brought in, but I do believe that it should be increased slightly, but I don't know whether it should be increased to \$40.00. I know if one stays in a hotel and buys three meals a day in a restaurant, he's having a problem. I would say that it isn't adequate. But if one rents an apartment and provides his own meals, if the family comes in, I believe that you could get by with perhaps a bit less, but I don't have any particular quarrel with that particular section of the bill.

The one that concerns me most is that the Ministerial remunerations, I believe is set by the Cabinet themselves. I believe that by Order-in-Council they can set their own remunerations,

salaries, and I'm wondering why it's brought back into the legislation, because I don't view the Ministerial salary as a legislative indemnity. It's a salary for a particular job, and I think that perhaps it should not be in the bill, not in this bill. It seems to me, I'm not sure whether there shouldn't be amendment, I believe there should be an amendment on Section 7 in regard to expense allowance, 59(2),(3), (4) and (7), and I think the (7) probably should be removed from there, but I could stand to be corrected on that. It will have to be somebody that's more knowledgeable with legislation than I am.

I think that the northern MLAs have a problem. I don't know how the Member for Churchill gets around his constituency. That's the largest constituency in the province of Manitoba, and I still don't know how he is able to service that constituency, having to fly in. I believe there should be some allowances made there, and there's nothing in the bill to provide that.

One of the things that I find is most lacking in my caucus is research. There has been some improvement in that direction. When I came here in 1971 there was no research allowance whatsoever, and subsequently there was some allowances made for that purpose, but I believe that has gone by the wayside now, and it seems to me that the government should have been looking at that particular item.

I do recall that during the 1977 campaign I listened to the Premier of this province tell the people of Manitoba that they would have to tighten their belts, and I'm sure that many of them in this province have had to do so in the last two years. I know there are many people in my constituency who do not have jobs because there is lack of work in this province, and I'm sure that they have had to tighten their belts.

I know that there are a lot of people who are on the minimum wage as well, and I'm sure that they have to tighten their belts because they have seen their minimum wage eroded by inflation over the last number of years. And I think that it's really immoral for a group of people who I think are in the upper middle class to expect to be paid a higher salary when those people out in the constituencies are having to go without services, in many cases services that were there before this government was elected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have been most lenient with the honourable member in letting him stray widely from the course of debate. However, I would appreciate if he tried to stay somewhere close to the subject matter of the bill. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm relating a request for money, for increased benefits for MLAs of this Assembly. And I am saying that I feel guilty asking for more money when we are asking the people in the province of Manitoba to take less. And that is why I believe I am speaking right to the point, because in my opinion, I am being asked here to support a bill that would give me some more benefits, and I can't do that when I know that there are others that perhaps need it more than I do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this piece of legislation. I will not take a great deal of time, because I think many members have expressed varying opinions on both sides of this legislation. I intend to support this legislation that has come before this House. There have been arguments put both ways in terms of the negatives and the positives as to the timing, as to the restraint program, and that is one of the greatest problems that I have in my own mind in terms of the government now bringing in legislation after freezing the indemnities of members last session, unfreezing them and increasing allowances.

I cannot argue about the increasing of the allowances, whatsoever, because I know what it costs me to service my constituency, and this was eloquently described this evening by the Member for Virden, as to the work and the expenses that go into servicing the constituency. I have to also say, Sir, that if we were in government, if I was in government, there is no doubt that we would be faced with the same proposition from time to time, and there is no doubt that we probably would have been faced with this proposition at this session, or the previous session. We likely would have made maybe some other changes, and maybe greater changes in terms of research assistance allowances in different aspects, so that although I can disagree with some of the moves in this bill, I cannot stand up here and say that we would not have done it had we been in government.

I know the government of the day will have to take the responsibility of at least indicating to the public that there is a restraint program on, and there is somewhat a bit of a lesser restraint on members of the Legislative Assembly. But leaving all that argument aside, there is no doubt that in terms of allowances and the cost factors that have gone in and the allowances that have

not been adjusted over the last number of years, arguments for that can certainly be made. And I believe that this legislation can be supported.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to Bill 70, I must indicate that it does contain some proposals which I would have no difficulty in supporting, and primarily those dealing with making it easier for a member of the Legislative Assembly to discharge his duties and responsibilities as a member of the House. And I'm referring primarily to members from northern Manitoba, members from rural Manitoba. So, insofar as the proposals regarding increases in mileage allowance, cost of living, I have no difficulty in supporting those.

However, there's one feature about the bill, Mr. Speaker, which will force me to vote against it, and that is this: contained within the bill, even though it's not spelled out in so many words but in effect that is the intent of it, and as the First Minister did indicate in introducing the bill for second reading, it does provide for a pension plan for Cabinet Ministers, for the time spent by them as members of Executive Council, and in turn related to their indemnity translated into years of service in terms of the formula that relates the ministerial indemnity to the members indemnity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you're just as well aware as all of us are, that the matter of remuneration of members of Executive Council is their responsibility, and not that of the House. The matter of remuneration of Members of the Executive Council; there's a section within The Executive Government Administration Act, which states that the government, Mr. Speaker, and not the Legislature, the government can set its own remuneration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is a pension? A pension is really nothing more than deferred income, postponed income, call it what you wish, but really it's tied to one's income. So, Mr. Speaker, if the government has the right to set the indemnity, the salary of its ministers, then surely, and so it should be, I'm not quarrelling with that, there's nothing wrong with that, but if it has that right to set its indemnity, then also it should accept the responsibility, if it wishes, to pay itself a pension, to make that decision and make the decision with respect to a pension scheme for itself, if it should so wish to do, rather than drag the whole Legislative Assembly into the decisionmaking process.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this fashion, by offering all of the Members of the House little tidbits here and there, there's an attempt to suck us in, to bribe us to do the government's dirty work. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to support a piece of legislation of that kind. Cabinet wants a pension for itself, I'm not going to argue that point; I know that a case could be made to provide a pension for Cabinet Ministers and this is now made available to ministers and other legislative jurisdictions in Canada, but, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that let the Cabinet make that decision, and not the Legislative Assembly.

I have no difficulty in dealing with the pension portion of the legislation of the bill as it relates to members of the House, as it relates to indemnities, as it relates to those whose indemnities are set by an Act of the Legislature. But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to pensions for ministers, this Assembly has control of only one-half of the pension formula, if that. Only over one-half, only over the denominator, the bottom part of the fraction, Mr. Speaker, because in translating indemnity into years of service, you know, Mr. Speaker, that what this bill says is you take the indemnity earned by a minister or by a board or a commission member; you take that as a numerator over the MLAs indemnity as a denominator, and you convert that into whatever fraction of a year that works out to.

Now, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the remuneration of those members of the House, who serve on various boards and commissions, that works out to a fraction of a year. If one were to translate the ministerial indemnity into years of service, it works out to a fraction of a year, I suppose based on whatever the current year's indemnity will be, it'll be something in the order of three-quarters of a year.

But, Mr. Speaker, as long as The Executive Government Administration Act reads the way that it does, and I have no intention of wanting to see it changed, the power still rests with government to vary the indemnity paid to ministers, and, Mr. Speaker, we have no way of knowing that the indemnity of ministers will remain at \$15,000 next year or the year after, or \$15,600 or \$800, whatever it is, or whether the government may decide to increase its indemnity. And it may decide to double it. The government might say, well the ministerial indemnities were set back in 1967, I believe, 1966 or 1967, there hasn't been an increase for 12 or 13 years, so comparing with what has happened in other provinces, a case could be made to increase the indemnities to \$40,000 a year for the ministers.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you see what happens to that formula contained in the bill, then it becomes

\$40,000 over \$20,000, roughly. In other words, the minister receives the benefit or the credit of two years of service for every year of service as a minister plus his year of service as MLA. In other words, three years of service for each year that he is in government as a minister.

Now, we have no control over that, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot approve legislation which really will be giving Cabinet nothing more than a blank cheque to write its own pension plan — a blank cheque on the basis of which it can write its own pension plan, Mr. Speaker.

And, as I've said, this may well be, in light of the fact that the ministers have not increased their indemnities for the last 12 or 13 or 14 years, or, you know, it may be that as the First Minister professes to be a great expert on the meaning of that four-letter word, ending with the letter "k". And the Honourable Member for Rock Lake also claims similar expertise. —(Interjection)— That's right, that he knows what that four-letter word, ending with the letter "k" means. —(Interjection)— And on the basis of that, being experts, claiming to be experts in the meaning of that word, they may feel that that entitles them to an increase in their indemnities. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Rock Lake . . .

**A MEMBER:** Get out of the garbage.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Now, Mr. Speaker, here we are, "Get out of the garbage" — a four-letter word ending with the letter "k" to the government side of the House means "garbage" — that's what it means to them, it means garbage. It means a four-letter word, the four-letter word, I'm sorry, you better talk to your back-to-the-basics minister — the four-letter word means "garbage". Mr. Speaker, you see, they do lack the knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. I would hope the honourable members would give the Honourable Member for Burrows the opportunity to make his contribution. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. You know, you see, they've just proven my point. I was talking about the four-letter word, ending with the letter "k". To them it's garbage. And it shows the limitation of their mentality. The four-letter word of which they know not the meaning, that I was talking about, is the word spelled, w-o-r-k, which doesn't even enter their mind. So at least I can set my mind at ease that it's quite unlikely that the First Minister would want to reward any of his ministers for work, because that word is entirely strange and foreign to their vocabulary. Because you mention a four-letter word ending with the letter "k" — the Member for Crescentwood, he says that's garbage. So, fine, okay. So, at least we know that if there should be any increase in the ministers salaries, it will not be as compensation for work, but it will be for some other reason — you know, for whatever reason the \$3,000 a month is paid or whatever.

But, Mr. Speaker, the long and the short of it is that I cannot approve legislation, which gives this House control only over one-half the pension plan, and leaves the other half of the pension plan for the ministers and for those whom they choose to appoint to whatever position within their control. Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, that insofar as pensions for ministers are concerned, ministers have the responsibility to set their own salaries, let them accept the responsibility to set their own pension plan, and not drag us into it. Because, Mr. Speaker, what's going to happen; when this bill is approved, then the government will say, well, it was the House that approved it; it was the House that approved it, and if someone were to say, ah, yes, but you're the government, you have the majority, and there was no way of defeating it; the government would say, well, if the opposition would have presented a convincing enough argument to persuade us to change the legislation, we perhaps, would have changed it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be counted amongst those who approve that government's scheme whereby that government will be able to set whatever device, whatever pension scheme that it wants for itself, to pay itself whatever pension it wants to. Because, Mr. Speaker, it can do that, as I said to you before, the numerator of the fraction is in their control, the numerator is in the government's control, and by varying that numerator, by increasing the ministers' indemnity, it makes a world of a difference to the end result in terms of dollars and cents in the pension, in terms of pension benefits that the ministers would receive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised. Now, of course, there's a backbencher, who, a few crumbs were thrown his way, so he can see some benefits coming to him. —(Interjection)— He can see some benefits coming to him. But, Mr. Speaker, there are some backbenchers over there to whom none of these crumbs were thrown, and I would like those members to take a close look at this bill, and see how it would affect their pension position, three or four years hence, or whenever they become eligible for pension, and where they would be, and where a Cabinet Minister would be. And they are the ones who are going to be approving it.

Now the work ethic — well, Mr. Speaker, there's someone who reached the age of majority a couple of years ago, —(Interjection)— he's going to give us a lesson on the work ethic. I'm

ignoring the Member for Orchard, —(Interjection)— well, you know, the Member for Pembina, I'm completely ignoring him because he's never said anything worth listening to anyway in this House, and nothing that made any sense, so I'm ignoring him, but someday he'll learn, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Keep on babbling, Ben.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** And some day he will learn how this legislation that's before us is designed to enable, in the event of defeat, in the event of defeat, which is inevitable come the next election, which will enable the treasury bench to walk out of here with a nice fat cheque coming to their mail, dropped in their mail box monthly, and the backbench, as a bunch of suckers, supporting them, ending up with nothing.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is second reading, Bill No. 70.

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

**YEAS:** Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Doern, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen, Uruski, Uskiw.

**NAYS:** Messrs. Adam, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 31, Nays 10.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion carried.  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, we will proceed now to Law Amendments, and deal with the bills that have been referred there. We will just leave the mace on the table at the call of the Chair.

**MR. GREEN:** I wonder if the House Leader can tell us where Bill 70 is going to be considered?

**MR. JORGENSON:** 70 will be in Committee of the Whole.

**MR. GREEN:** Committee of the Whole.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am leaving the Chair for a short recess.

**BACK IN SESSION.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on June 15, 1979, and heard representations with respect to the various Bills referred, as follows:

Bill No. 54 — The Manitoba Data Services Act.

Edward J. Kirby, Q.C.

Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Public Utilities Board Act.

Vic Savino, Tenants' Action Committee.

Bill No. 68 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1979)(2).  
Frank Cvitkovitch, Mortgage Loan Association of Manitoba;  
Warren Barnard, Mortgage Loan Association of Manitoba;  
Walter Kehler, Canadian Bar Association, Manitoba Branch.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 37 — An Act to amend The Museum of Man and Nature Act,

No. 54 — The Manitoba Data Services Act,

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 27 — An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act,

No. 39 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1979),

No. 42 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2),

No. 59 — An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Public Utilities Board Act,

No. 68 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1979)(2),

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill 62, please.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING**

#### **BILL NO. 62 — THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital adjourned debate on my behalf and would waive the right to speak on this occasion, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to be lengthy on this although, Mr. Speaker, in the normal course the Minister of Finance would have introduced the Bill, would have made some comments about it, and in the normal course would have indicated any differences between the bill, as this is presented, and bills of previous years where there are sometimes variations. These bills are normally technical and can be dealt with in a quick fashion providing one knows that there are, or are not, changes. Unfortunately, because of the time the Minister of Finance only moved the bill and didn't speak on it and wasn't then available to answer questions, so might I just indicate that when we move into Committee I would hope that whatever member opposite will take responsibility for piloting the bill will be able to tell us the extent to which the form of this bill differs from that of previous years.

In specific, there is a section which I'm assuming is new, Mr. Speaker, and I have not compared it, but obviously it is new, and it is new because of changes we made in The Financial Administration Act, and relates to the decision of government to combine both Capital and Current Accounts, and yet concern was expressed on behalf of the Department of Highways that it should be able to enter into contracts for a fiscal year in advance of the year in which it was operating, and for other commitments which were possible before when we had Capital Authority. So in the Financial Administration Act, as I recall, there was some section that said that government could, with the approval of, I think, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, commit certain moneys in advance, something that I called a no-cut contract, that they could make contracts for expenditure of moneys beyond the current fiscal year. But I think the change that was made in The Financial Administration Act was that that commitment had to be authorized in the Supply Bill each year, and if not used in the fiscal year, by the end of the fiscal year, would in itself lapse. Well, if you look at the section that provides that, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are now authorizing, in excess of the normal Estimates that we dealt with, which presumably were Capital and Current combined, we are now authorizing \$100 million, which may be used by the government to contract ahead into future years.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't troubled, mainly because of time, to look into the amounts that we've

set aside in previous years for General Purposes, but it's my impression that we didn't put in amounts as great as \$100 million for General Purposes, and therefore I believe that in effect this bill before us, which purports to be current only, carries with it an Authority of \$100 million beyond the amount that we're dealing with in the bill, in the title, by saying that the government may commit \$100 million into future years, and as I read it, it's not only into the following year but can be spread over future years.

Now, I know that a building such as the Woodsworth Building I think probably ran 15, 16, even \$20 million; that's a big undertaking. —(Interjection)— Oh, the former Minister of Public Works says \$10 million, so then I was exaggerating. Well, if \$10 million will build a building of that size, if Highways can be committed for \$10, \$15 million, surely that's enough. So I really would like whatever Minister is piloting this bill in Committee to be prepared to justify a figure of \$100 million with some kind of a breakdown because it seems to me excessive, and then also agree, or otherwise correct my impression, if necessary, that this could be done for a number of years ahead to use \$100 million, and then next year there might be another \$100 million. Before we know it we may have a build-up of unused, authorized, but committed Capital in future years and be back with a capial structure. I may be wrong in my interpretation, Mr. Speaker. We did not have an opportunity to explore it and therefore I would like to hear about it.

The next thing is that since this government is budgeting for a very, very substantial deficit, which was originally planned to be \$91 million, and is now \$122 million of deficit in this current fiscal year, the government of course must have the Authority to borrow that money because it's going to spend that much beyond the revenues — \$122 million beyond revenues, so it says. I have reason to think it does not expect to spend it but — just some bookkeeping entries — but nevertheless, it says there will be a deficit of \$122 million so they need the power to borrow, so there's a section here with power to borrow, but how much, Mr. Speaker? One Hundred and Fifty Million dollars. Why have the power to borrow \$150 million when the government itself estimates a deficit of \$122 million, and I ask that, bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that much of this money in the deficit will be statutory funds to be spent. The prime example is the \$31,300,000 we were discussing about the exchange rate takeover from Hydro. That is a statutory amount. As a matter of fact, it's not even referred to in this bill; it comes up in another bill altogether, the one we passed this afternoon, The Energy Rate Stabilization Act, and I don't think that there has to be Authority to borrow for that because it's statutory, it must be paid, and obviously there's no money with which to pay it, then it must be borrowed.

But Mr. Speaker, maybe by a technicality there is a requirement that there be Authority to borrow, and I still dispute that because if you pass a special warrant between Sessions, you have the Authority to borrow the money, I'm sure. In any event, be it \$91 million, be it \$122 million, it certainly isn't \$150 million, and I would want an explanation as to why the \$150 million Authority is required.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Transportation, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the bills referred for Third Reading.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

#### BILL NO. 60 — THE ENERGY RATE STABILIZATION ACT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Bill No. 60, the Energy Rate Stabilization Act. 1(a)—pass; (b) — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I mentioned while we were debating this bill on Second Reading that there was an undertaking that at this stage of the Committee dealing with the bill we would be given charts, schedules or lists, whatever they are, showing all the takeovers proposed of foreign borrowing, the interest rates to be charged, the whole thing would be presented to us and even more particularly, we were promised that Hydro would prepare, and there would be available for us at this stage, a projection of the surplus which Hydro expects to acquire over the

5 year period referred to, calculated as of June 1st, 1979.

Could we have it, Mr. Chairman, before we deal with the itemized section by section?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would wait for just a half second, we have some tables here for him, and Mr. Curtis is just locating them at the present time. These will be distributed to the members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, referring to the Analysis of Financial Operations distributed, for a six-year period, . . . isn't that interesting, Mr. Chairman? We have this statement and I wonder if we could discuss it to understand just what it says.

As I read it, it says that in the five-year period 1979-83, there will be a surplus, a reserve as they call it, of \$72 million, which is that much more than the \$45 million that were revealed in the February statement. For some reason that I can't quite account for, they've added a year, 1984, to the projection that we were given last Saturday, and suddenly we're finding it dropped back to \$45 million. I'm finding that a little peculiar, Mr. Chairman, because we had discussed the five-year, which had showed a projection of \$45 million. Now with the change, we're shown a projection of \$72 million, and suddenly we're told in the 6th year which is, I guess, beyond that which is the fixed rate, there will still be a surplus of \$45 million.

Mr. Chairman, there's no date on this statement. We are not given the statement in the form which we requested which was the itemization as it was shown to us and distributed last Saturday.

I wonder whether this is prepared by the same people that prepared the other and why it is they're just giving us the bottom line, if I can use that expression?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, in answering first the question relating to why is there 6 years here, Mr. Chairman, 1979 relates to March 31st, 1979 and then we go the five year from there, so 1980 would be your first year, March 31st, 1980, your first year. So then there's actually five years from March 31st, 1979 that is shown here. That is the reason why we've sort of given you the results as of March 31st, 1979 now that the next five years forward.

In answer to the second question, Mr. Chairman, the analysis before you was prepared by the Finance Department from information that they received from The Manitoba Hydro Department and the figures.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't but help asking whether the figures were based on substantially increased revenues and mainly of extra provincial sales, and whether they were reductions because of any changes in foreign exchange rate fluctuation as between February and June?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that the figures for 1979 were increased by some \$5 million over what we were dealing with to bring it to the latest figure. This is my understanding.

Further, that it relates to the exchange rates as of March 30, 1979 at that particular time. That's what the values are related to.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I thought we were dealing with June 1st figures, but now we're told that those are really March 30th figures, which are much closer to the February 22nd we had been looking at.

Now, I think that last Saturday we were told that there were substantial increases beyond that, and I therefore would like to confirm, Mr. Chairman, that these projections that we find in the sheet distributed today, are still related back to March 30th and not June 1st as we requested. The reason I make that point is that I had the impression that it would show a much more improved picture over the February. Now, we're not being given what we have. I certainly don't, Mr. Chairman, intend to hold up in any arbitrary way, the discussion, but I will go on record, Mr. Chairman, of stating an impression, which I think is a fair impression, that had we received what we'd been promised, that is a June 1 statement, it would have shown even a greater surplus excess of revenue over expense on the basis of Hydro not getting any help, whatsoever, from the province but, indeed,

paying on its foreign debt as it matured.

And therefore, the only input in this whole exercise was to comply with a policy recommended by CICA, and not insisted on at all, but a recommendation and not binding in any way, but that Hydro could, and that's what I find in this statement, build up a reserve substantially in excess of the figures we've been previously given and build up that excessive revenue to that much greater extent than previously indicated.

May I just ask one more question whether there is a reserve of say, 10 percent, calculated into these figures under Item 2?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would repeat his last question with regard to the 10 percent reserve figure?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'll put it in a way that can understand better, Mr. Chairman. I'm looking at the statement, the March 31 statement prepared in February 22nd, the third last line on that statement. I'm now looking at the statement given to us last week. The third last line showed what they call "Reserve Provisions" and indicated what we built up to show was a \$45 million surplus available at the end of that five-year period. Is that the same line that is comparable to the line shown at the bottom of the page distributed today? Is that the comparable line? That's really my only question. I'm assuming that the answer is not available. As I say . . .

**MR. MINAKER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would give us about a half a minute. Mel Anderson, who was involved in the preparation of these, is coming down right now.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman. By all means. I wonder if I could then just make some points on this other statement and . . . I'm trying to rush this, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

This other statement indicates the coupon, the interest rate payable on foreign exchange borrowings by Hydro in the 4th column and in the last column shows the Canadian equivalent rate, and I just draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and that of other members of the committee who are interested, that in just about every case there, the Canadian rate is substantially greater than the rate payable on the foreign exchange borrowing in foreign currency. I don't expect that it's available now, but it would have been interesting to see the difference in amounts because, Mr. Chairman, I am predicting that the Government of Manitoba will be receiving substantially more in interest from Hydro than it will be paying out in interest plus exchange to the foreign lenders.

Now we don't have that information and, Mr. Chairman, I think that if we are right it will show in the wash and since I don't think we can convince the government otherwise, I'm prepared to let this go section by section, knowing full well that we have established clearly, I believe, especially last Saturday that there's no need for this bill, at all.

So I don't want to spend much time — I don't know if others want to spend much time dealing with it section by section whether we think it's an exercise which is not necessary — but will cost money to the people of Manitoba as taxpayers, rather than to the users of Hydro power.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. In answer, it would appear that Hydro would be paying higher interest rates from this sheet. Mr. Curtis advises that they have done a calculation for this forthcoming year based on the rates as of March 30th, 1979 that if they stayed with the foreign interest rates that the Hydro would be worse off by some \$2 million. It will be advantageous to go over by \$2 million.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Let me just make it clear then. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What we are told is that Hydro will be losing \$2 million by paying Canadian rates of interest rather than foreign. Hydro will be paying \$2 million less by Canadian rates than it would by foreign rates, but that must then include the cost of the foreign exchange fluctuation. I'm assuming that; I want that confirmed.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that if Hydro was paying on the foreign exchange rate, for the year 1980, they would be paying \$2 million more than if they were paying it on the Canadian equivalent.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, then the picture is even better for Hydro, and — well tougher on Hydro than we were given the impression before. What we are told is, by the takeover by the government, we now find the government will be collecting certain sums of money from Hydro by

way of interest on Canadian rates; it will be paying lesser rates to the foreign lenders, but because of the exchange rate fluctuation the total sum payable by Manitoba will be some \$2 million in excess of what Hydro would have to pay, and that that \$2 million is a loss to the Manitoba Government, and part of the \$31 million, which they claimed it would be costing this year. I think that's correct, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to be told if it's wrong.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I understand the Honourable Member for St. Johns said that if the Hydro is paying off in Canadian equivalent rates, rather than the foreign exchange rates, and that if the rates hold as of March 31st, that they will be \$2 million better off under that operation, and that is correct.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And the corollary is that in the same year the Manitoba Government will be paying taxpayers' money, \$2 million in excess on this exchange — that will come out of the \$31 million which was set aside in Supplementary Supply, that's a corollary which must be true.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that we are only putting in foreign exchange fluctuations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Page 1—pass; Page 2—pass; Page 3—pass; Page 4—pass; Page 5—pass; Page 6—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be Reported—pass — the Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if by leave we could now proceed to Bill 62 and 70.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do we have leave? Bill 62. - -

### BILL NO. 62 — THE APPROPRIATION ACT 1979

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I hope you will bear with me; I just spoke on that bill and I mislaid it for a moment. Now I have to find it to see my notes, Mr. Chairman, if you deal with it . . . yes, I guess clause by clause is quite . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause by clause. Clause 1—pass; Page 1—pass; Clause 3 — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** 3(1) provides \$100 million to be set aside for future commitments, and I would like to have a breakdown of that \$100 million, or a justification of why it is so great a sum of money.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that the majority of the appropriation is for highways that were not completed last year, and also the Government Services facilities. The department is now gathering all this data, and we will mail it to the honourable members once that the data is collected.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, how could it be for highways that were not completed last year, when we're dealing with an item for next year's commitments. We are already passing in this bill enough money as requested in the Estimates committee, and I think, Mr. Chairman, you may recall that on occasion you acted as chairman during the Estimates Review, and we dealt with \$1 billion, some \$600 or \$700 million worth, including highways, for this year. What we're dealing with now is a commitment for next year; the authority to commit up to \$100 million this year for next year, for the following fiscal year, and as I say it's done in order to provide sufficient money so that government will not be strapped. What happens around the spring of the year, is that when they forecast a good season, they say well, let's ask for tenders for the following fiscal year, and we must have authority so to do. But I'm not aware of any occasion, and I'm out of date, Mr. Chairman, I don't remember when they needed as much as \$100 million to carry over from one year into the next. I don't remember that and I suspect that it's just arbitrarily thrown in as a sort of a cushion, and if it is, it's not responsible, Mr. Chairman, that's the point I'm making.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe it'll be self-explanatory to the honourable member when he gets the information on the complete package. It relates to commitments for next year related to contracts that are let out now, and it's the authority to provide the capital.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, when will we get that? Today, or next year or . . .

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, my understanding is it'll be by the end of the month.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, we're being asked to pass an authority for \$100 million without having \$1.00's worth accounted for, and we have a general statement being made, that we will get a list. Now, I do not believe that that list will total anywhere near \$100 million. Am I wrong about that? Like, I would have expected it to be \$15 million, really.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I have been advised that this is not the authority, this is just the commitment, and the authority will be voted on next year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Sorry, Mr. Chairman, this is an authority to commit. And that authority to commit must carry, must carry; next year the appropriation must be enough to honour the commitment, but the authority to commit is here. And that means, Mr. Chairman, that in fiscal ending March 31, 1980, by that time they will have had the right to commit the government to \$100 million expenditures in the following year or in the following years, and this is a departure, Mr. Chairman, because they said, we're going into realistic accounting process, we are going to lapse authority, Mr. Chairman, my point is, and I want to be correct, I'd better wait until the honourable member can hear me. I believe that this is, in effect, a Capital Authority for \$100 million. That's what I think it is. —(Interjection)— I think it's over and above the Consolidated Revenue, that is the combination of Capital and Current that was the change in procedure by this government, that they are now getting an additional \$100 million of authority to commit for future years, and in the face of the fact that they said we are going to only ask for what we know we have to expend, but we want the authority to commit.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the principle. Absolutely. I know, I've been in government long enough to know that government has to have the flexibility to make commitments for the future. My question is, \$100 million? I don't remember that Highways needed more than 15 in any one spring over into the next, and since we don't have the list, and we're certainly not going to sit here for a month and wait for it, I'd like to know whether the government is going to be able to produce real figures that can show us today what they're going to be committing 10 or 11 months from now, that will be anywhere near \$100 million.

And I'm saying that they're just asking for this great big flexibility, which in effect I think will just make somewhat of a mockery out of the fact that they're saying, we're not asking for Capital Authority. Because again, I say I do not recall Capital Authority, that is Schedule B, in the old Capital bills being much more than \$100 million for all general purposes.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, last year under this section, there was some \$65 million authority or commitment passed which appeared in this year's Estimates, and were voted on. And as is called for under Section 3(2) that follows. And this year it is anticipated that \$100 million worth of work can be proceeded with next year, and will be included in the Estimates next year. This is a commitment at this point that they can proceed with the contract work that's required, the tendering and so forth. But the actual approval of this money will be in next year's Estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** I just wish to ask the honourable member one question. Under the old system of accounting, would this Capital Authority have shown on either the Capital Estimates or the Current Estimates?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that in previous years, what would happen is there would be a clause in the contract that would say that this contract is only going to be carried through, providing that the Estimates have been approved for that particular item, the saving clause, as they call it. It's my understanding that the Capital would not appear in any schedule until that year that the work is being done.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not really asking about the contract. Would this item, under the old system of accounting, have appeared in the Capital or Current Estimates of the fiscal year for which we are now voting supply?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that before they started using the saving clause that it would have appeared in the Capital, and that was some four or five years ago that they started using the saving clause. So that after that point in time, it would not have appeared in the schedule.

When it was spent, it would be charged.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3(1)—pass; (2)—pass; 3—pass. 4(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; 4—pass. 5—pass. 6—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** 7, Mr. Chairman, seems to me to be a new section. I don't understand it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, firstly, this section was recommended by Legal Counsel, Legislative Counsel, and Section 7 provides a means whereby all payments related to projects authorized out of the Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund will be made out of an appropriation and be recorded as an expenditure from that appropriation. This relates to a change in accounting policy which eliminates the former practice of maintaining reserve accounts. This section is required to clearly define the manner in which these funds will be utilized.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7—pass. 8—pass. 9—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I was asking earlier for a justification for the sum of \$150 million and the corollary to the question is, is it necessary to have authority to borrow that portion of the moneys which are statutory, required to be paid?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that the Legislative Counsel indicated that there should be made some provision to cover moneys to fund the anticipated deficit as well as the expected flood costs, and this is an estimate, and it was by recommendation of the Legislative Counsel that this section be included.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Does that then mean, Mr. Chairman, that the statutory requirements for payment have to be authorized to be borrowed? What happens if the government doesn't have the authority, it still has to make the payments, so why should it be necessary to have authority to borrow? Now it may be I'm asking the question of people who are not responsible for knowing the answer, but I marvel at the fact that we are now projecting that need beyond the anticipated loss. However if that's the way it has to be, Mr. Chairman, it's only an indication of where this government seems to be leading us into a greater and greater mess of borrowing.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that we still have to have the authority to borrow and this is the section that covers it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9—pass; 10—pass; 11—pass; Schedule A—pass; Preamble —pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported.

### **BILL NO. 70 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. Page by page.

Page 1—pass; Page 2—pass; Page 3—pass; The Honourable Minister responsible for Telephones.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, there's a technical amendment here. I move

THAT Clause 7(a) of Bill No. 70 be amended by striking out the figures and word, "5 and 7" in the sixteenth line thereof, and substituting therefor the word and figure, "and 5."

Mr. Chairman, I would explain that this is a drafting error and would be just a technical correction.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Page 3 as amended—pass; Page 4 — The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, with regard to Page 4. Mr. Chairman, I've made my position on this. I would like to have a vote called on Section 11, which deals with 71.1(1), 71.1(2), Chairman, I wish to register a nay vote with respect to this legislation being retroactive. Call the question on the item.

**QUESTION put on Section 11, MOTION carried.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Page 4—pass; Page 5—pass; Page 6—pass; Preamble —pass; Title—pass; Bill be Reported. Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker.

*The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.*

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, will you call the adjourned debates on Third Readings, beginning with Bill No. 2, please?

### ADJOURNED DEBATES — THIRD READING

#### BILL NO. 2 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

**MR. SPEAKRR:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** It stood in my name, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to make just a few comments on this. Members will note that a new bill was printed, that is there's a reprint completely of the bill, there have been very substantial changes made to the extent that it was necessary to print a new version of the bill to incorporate the amendments in Committee. This supports the fact that it was a very complicated bill. It involved a great deal of review and I must say that in my opinion the review and consideration of the changes was made in a cordial and in a positive manner and that it seemed to go smoothly. It took four mornings to deal with it, Mr. Speaker, and I only hope that, that complicated as it was, that we didn't overlook anything that might yet need further correction.

There is one item which I had hoped I could persuade the power of the majority to agree to remove — and I failed — and that was the power that the Minister of Finance, whoever he may be in the future, will have the authority to insert into Public Accounts such statements as he deems necessary. I don't agree with that. I think it's wrong and I say that as it applies to any future Minister and I hope there will be many New Democratic Ministers who will not take advantage of this clause, because I think it's too broad and unnecessary. Nevertheless it was dealt with in that way.

There's another point that I didn't agree with, it was a matter of disagreement between the Minister and me and other members that were present, and that was a peculiar argument, Mr. Speaker, and that is that up to now when refunds had to be made for taxes collected in years previous to the then current fiscal year, they were shown as an expenditure and clearly charged as an expenditure of the province. The bill now changes that from being an expenditure to being a reduction in revenue. I think it's wrong in principle, to show that in this year, for example, we collected X minus Y dollars, when the fact is, we collected X dollars, but we had to pay out Y dollars because of previous years. Nevertheless, we did change it sufficiently to know that it will be clearly shown in the revenue side as being a reduction of revenue; I disagree with it, but at least it will be more clearly shown in the future.

We also provided something that I was glad the Minister accepted, and that is the provision in the bill that wasn't there earlier, which definitely states that all Capital Authority lapsed. Now, until we had that, I believe, there was still the possibility of some Capital Authority being overlooked as far as lapsing is concerned, and lying in the books of the province, to be available for the future, and thus in contradiction of the government policy with which I've stated often, I agree, of combining

the Capital and Current Authority.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the question arose as to why it was necessary to make many features of this bill retroactive to April 1, 1978, and the reason we were given, as I interpreted it was, that the government had made certain changes in their accounting policy in contemplation of the change that was brought into this bill, and as a result it became necessary for the government to retroactively change the bill a year back in order to compensate, I guess is the word, in order to justify the change that was made at the administrative level without the authority of the law. I believe they should have waited for the legislation before they made changes, because I think that we all agree and, Mr. Speaker, I even remember your standing very close to where I am standing now and saying, "Retroactive legislation is not desirable." So I'm quoting you as my authority, Mr. Speaker — which I don't do too often, you must admit in saying that it should not have been necessary to bring in retroactive legislation, especially back some 14 months or so. Nevertheless, it was done, and we had to agree to it because we couldn't let the Public Accounts be in that peculiar situation of being improperly presented because it was designed in contemplation of change.

It may show a little bit of presumption on the part of government, knowing that it has the majority control it can do things and later on ratify it, but the debate was made difficult because we were presented with a fait accompli, and I think the role of the opposition, which was very much evidenced in four solid morning meetings dealing with this bill, that the opposition did have a role, and did play a role, but in this one case it couldn't make much of a contribution because it was already pre-empted due to the fact that the accounts had been changed.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, although we failed in certain principles in persuading the government of certain principles, I'm glad that we were able to persuade the government in other respects, and therefore were able to come to a substantial agreement on many portions of the bill.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

#### **BILL NO. 57 — THE METALLIC MINERALS ROYALTY ACT AMENDMENT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 57. The Honourable member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as stating that the passing of this bill is the only accomplishment of the Conservative administration during this session of the Legislature. I say it as an accomplishment for the Conservative Party and its Mines Program. I'm certainly not in accord with it and I certainly, Mr. Speaker, intend to do everything I can in the future to reverse the accomplishment and make it into a New Democratic Party accomplishment when we resume the reins of government, but I say that because the session has had virtually no productive value to the people of Manitoba or to the Conservative Party, with the exception of the passing of this bill, which certainly pursues their philosophy, which certainly should give some satisfaction to the Minister even though he and I will certainly disagree as to its benefit to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill because I didn't know whether it was this one or the other one I wanted to speak to.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

#### **BILL NO. 3 — THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR'S ACT AMENDMENT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Provincial Auditor's Act and Certain Provisions of the Statutes of Manitoba respecting the Duties of the Provincial Auditor. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering, it stands in the name of the Minister. Has it been moved? I think we better move it, before we deal with it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN** presented Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Provincial Auditor's Act and Certain Other Provisions of the Statutes of Manitoba respecting the Duties of the Provincial Auditor, for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. I think it should go on record that last night at Law Amendments Committee, during the review of Bill 3, Section 13(1.1)(d) and (e) were unanimously referred to an intersessional review by the Public Accounts Committee, and I would not want it to be misconstrued that this move should in any way limit the scope of the Provincial Auditor presenting his present audit, and that it is the Legislature's wish that the Provincial Auditor continue to perform his audit in the same manner as he has in the past, and provide Legislature with the same type of report as we are now receiving. And as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, this statement is being read into the record to clarify that fact, that we feel that the Provincial Auditor should continue to report to the Legislature in the traditional manner.

**MR. SPEAR:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I really am somewhat confused by the honourable member's statement. There was no Motion to refer anything, and there was no referral. What the Minister told us, is that he thinks these sections should be withdrawn, and that probably a good idea would be to have them looked at by Public Accounts Committee' and that that kind of discussion was necessary. But, there was certainly no formal referral; there was no motion by the committee that the matter be referred. There was an indication that that would be done, and there is no argument with respect to that, Mr. Speaker, but I do think that I should formally indicate that I heard of no referral.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think that the present report, with some exceptions which I will argue when those things arise, are in any way inhibited by the removal of those two items, whereas the inclusion of those two items have great implications for what the Auditor can report on in the future, and we will postpone this discussion to whatever meetings of Public Accounts we are going to have, to which this item was not formally referred.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, the members have both dealt with the matter I wanted to deal with, so I won't repeat that, but I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it came out louder and clearer last night than up to now that the use of private auditors by the government's decision, which I think was clearly established, was not the recommendation of the Provincial Auditor will result in approximately \$100,000 of additional expenditure to the Crown corporations; that, in addition thereto the audits prepared by the private auditors will not be in full compliance with the requirements of The Provincial Auditor's Act, so that in addition to the additional over-expenditure of money, the Provincial Auditor will still have to add to the audit those features which he is bound to do in order to comply with the Act.

Now, I didn't know myself, Mr. Speaker, what a sensible decision we had made back in the early part of this decade when we turned over the audits to the Provincial Auditor. Never did we say that this is a great matter of policy; we thought it was a sensible approach to making full use of civil servants to do that work, but last night, it became rather clear that there was a substantial saving to the people and to the users of the utilities or the agencies, in doing that, and the government, for a dogmatic reason, for one of a matter of principle or policy which I think it has difficulty itself in comprehending, has carried out what turns out to be with them, a matter of policy, but actually is costly to the people of Manitoba and the users of the utility.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I can't resist the opportunity of reminding the Honourable Member for St. Johns, what has become very clear.

In the whole debate with respect to this bill, and the auditing in general in the Province of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party is not prepared to acknowledge the ethics of a professional association; not prepared to acknowledge that outside auditors, private auditors can do a job and do it competently; and that they have reinforced something that my Premier has often stated — particularly to the Member for St. Johns — have shown a continuing bias against this particular

profession in this House not so much by what just one member said, but particularly by what the Member for Lac du Bonnet said on one occasion in this House and by what the Member for St. Johns has said in this particular case; and, Mr. Speaker, that will be noted and taken note of.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for St. Johns decides that there is no policy or principle that guides the decision that was made by this government, I tell him that he is wrong. The principle and the policy that guides this government is simply that we are prepared to acknowledge that not all wisdom is within the arms of government; that we're prepared to accept the qualifications and the professional competence of professions, in this case Chartered Accountants, and that we reject returning to a state of normalcy which is all that we are doing, what is being done in all jurisdictions including the federal government; and that the honourable members have done a pretty good job at, in describing as something out of the ordinary. Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 27 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT**

**MR. JORGENSEN** presented (by leave) Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to be absolutely certain about that of which I speak. We are now at the report stage in this particular bill I understand. Is this correct? I want to make sure. We proceed from this point on by leave and if someone wanted an amendment on the report stage presented tomorrow morning, it could not be considered until Monday morning. I want to be absolutely certain that that is the case. So that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I want to acquiesce to the persuasive arguments of the Government Whip and grant leave.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, since I have no intention of calling for the yeas and nays, I wish Hansard to show on record the position that we have taken on this bill throughout. I wish to repeat without reading it into the record, all of the arguments that I made on the amendment and indicate that this group is voting against this hoax.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please . . . Bill No. 27.

**MR. GREEN:** What hoax did I vote against?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Do you want to withdraw that?

**MR. GREEN:** Before I withdraw it, I want to know what hoax I just voted against. He said Bill No. 60 was called.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, Bill No. 27.

**MR. GREEN:** What's 27?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'll get to 60. ,

### **THIRD READINGS**

**BILLS NO. 27, 37, 39, 42, 54, 59, 60** were each read a third time and passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, rather than asking you to transfer from Hansard what I said on 27

into this section, I will repeat that I have no intention of calling the Yeas and Nays, but I wish to go on record for this group as indicating in the terms that was put in the amendment to the motion to have the bill read a second time and for the reasons therein given, that I wish to record that the members of this group will not vote for this hoax.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do you adopt the Motion on Division? (Agreed) I declare the Motion carried.

**BILL NO. 62 — THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important at this point that we in opposition recap some of the observations which we have made during the 1979 session. I will only take a brief period of time because I know, due to the hour, that that probably would be the best course of action. But I do believe that it is pertinent that we note some of the developments, some of the observations that I believe are becoming clearer and clearer to Manitobans as to what is occurring under the stewardship of the government across the way.

As the 1979 session of the Legislature comes to a close, I believe that it is becoming more and more obvious to Manitobans the extent to which the Conservative Party policies across the way are affecting the lives and the pocketbooks of Manitobans. You know, we were led to expect great accomplishments from the Lyon government. We were promised a booming economy, jobs were committed, and we were promised a secure and prosperous future.

After 19 months, Mr. Speaker, the bloom has indeed faded. The Tory government in this province has demonstrated repeatedly its incompetence and its indifference to legitimate needs of Manitobans; incompetent, Mr. Speaker, in that more and more Manitobans, particularly younger Manitobans, are being forced to leave this province to go to other provinces, to greener pastures. In fact, as has been noted previously in this House, 1978 saw the greatest outmigration of jobs from this province of any other year since 1966. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, during 1978 — and I wish the Minister of Economic Development was present — we have seen the highest rate of unemployment in the province of Manitoba since years dating back to the late 30s.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these are just some of the facts which came to light during this session. Other facts came to light and were revealed as respect to the omissions or commissions by the Conservative government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, we observed a paltry, miserable increase in Manitoba's minimum wage, but at the same time huge concessions were made to Abitibi Paper Company to the extent of some \$900,000 by the Minister responsible for Natural Resources in this province. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, where the government declared itself to be cutting costs to the bone, it gave auditing work, as was noted earlier this evening, to large private auditing firms to the extent that some \$100,000 of taxpayers' moneys were gobbled up in additional costs.

And Mr. Speaker, at the same time observations were made during this session that the government across the way saw no harm, in fact they thought it was quite in order that senior bureaucrats of their Crown corporations were permitted to purchase memberships in Manitoba's specially social elite clubs in this province, such as the Manitoba Club.

Mr. Speaker, tax concessions were made during this Legislative session to the extent of millions of dollars that were dished out by again, the Minister responsible for Natural Resources, to Hudson Bay Mining Company, to Inco, and to other large mining companies in this province, dished out by the Minister responsible for Natural Resources.

And at the same time, the Minister of Health and Social Development must assume responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for increasing Pharmacare deductibles by some 50 percent. Personal Care Home rates increased by some 20 percent. University fees increased by some 20 percent since they formed office. The Minister of Education is not present. Bus fares increased from 25 cents to 40 cents due to the lack of initiative by the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. Park and Campground fees increased. Property taxes increased in Winnipeg School Division since they came to office by some \$120 a loan for the average home in this city. And Mr. Speaker, in addition there has been significant increases in land taxes throughout the Province of Manitoba during the term of their stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, we also observed during this Session that with great fanfare and chest beating, this government indicated its intention to freeze Hydro rates in this province for a five-year period, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, more and more information has come to light, particularly reaching its peak this past Saturday when we discovered, as a result of evidence submitted at the Public Utilities Committee, that in fact Hydro rates would not have been increased anyway, and I believe that that hoax was well exposed for all Manitobans to observe.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but note that this announcement was made within days of the Federal Election on May 22nd, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to note that Manitobans realized this when they delivered a rebuke to the Conservatives of this province which was contrary to the trend throughout the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on the very vital matter of health care, we found that federal funds, which were provided for health care in this province, were not matched by the Provincial Government. It's our view, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a substantial cut in health services in Manitoba, health services to our aged and to our ill, in our hospitals and our Personal Care Homes, community health clinics, in home care, and in many other important areas of this province.

Mr. Speaker, recent revelations have been unfolded of the government's neglect, and this Minister of Health's neglect in ensuring proper standards for Manitoba Guest Homes, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, more and more of our elderly are continuing to run into difficulty in obtaining admittance to Personal Care Homes throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, we also observed other cutbacks in other social and economic programs, particularly those affecting northerners, native people, Metis people, forcing these groups to have no alternative but to seek Welfare and Unemployment Insurance rather than productive work.

Mr. Speaker, during the Session also we were able to expose the fact that the Minister of Education had permitted some \$2,300 of funds to be channeled from the Summer Employment Program into the coffers of the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

In Opposition, we were increasingly concerned, and I believe Manitobans are becoming increasingly concerned by the incompetence and the indifference of this government. I believe that Manitobans are increasingly concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the arrogance and the hard-heartedness of this government, a government which I believe, Mr. Speaker, is blinded by its own ideology. Mr. Speaker, I believe that from our side we can say to this House and to all Manitobans, as well as to the government across the way, that we will look forward to the months, to the years that lie ahead in presenting a program for Manitobans, a program which will involve a vision, a sense of optimism, into the 1980s.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, there is a curious element of *deja vu* about the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Here it is the 15th or 16th of June. Four months ago on the 15th of February, it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, this is where we came in. To paraphrase T. S. Elliot, "This is the way the Session ends for that opposition and for that Opposition Leader. This is the way the Session ends, not with a bang, but a distortion; not with a bang, but a whimper, and a whimper of a distortion; again and again and again the same myths, the same distortions. The Leader of the Opposition did not succeed with them on February 15th; he is no more successful on June 15th, and he will not be successful in October and November, whether it be the 15th or whatever. He persists in trying to spread those distortions; we will persist in repudiating them on the basis of the record, and I just want the record to show that he goes out the way he came in, spreading myths, spreading untruths, spreading distortions.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 70 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT**

**MR. JORGENSON** presented Bill No. 70, an Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, again, just for the record, and I spoke on this on Second Reading and indicated some problems with sincere differences on both sides. I also indicated that the part of the bill that makes no sense whatsoever is the retroactive part. I want it on the record, Mr. Speaker, that we went into Committee, that I asked that the retroactive part be deleted, that this was refused. I think it is a very peculiar section. I will leave members in the House to speculate on the reasons that it is there, why this is particularly peculiar section, which permits people who were in the House for the last four years to re-establish their wages as at four years ago with regard to pensions was put in this section, I leave members to speculate on. I wanted it out. Members on this side voted to have it out. It was insisted to be put in by members on the opposite side.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**BILL NO. 68 was read a third time and passed.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I assume that we're going to be waiting for a few minutes—(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I assume that we have to wait a few minutes for the Clerk and for the material to be brought in, and waiting for the Lieutenant-Governor. While we are, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate and congratulate the House Leader on the stewardship of the House, the manner in which he has proceeded. It never goes with congratulations flowing to and fro everyday but the fact is that at the end of the Session, and it looks like it's going to end, it I think is incumbent upon me on the part of our group to say that we recognize his difficulties; we recognize his responsibilities; we won't always agree with him, but we want to wish him well in the pursuit of getting the business of the House done expeditiously.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** May I offer my thanks to an honourable friend and to thank the honourable members of the House for the co-operation that I've enjoyed during the course of this Session in expediting the business of the House, and I appreciate it very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

### **BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. PETER FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to announce a number of changes. First on Privileges and Elections I would like to have the names of Boyce, Desjardins, Malinowski taken off and replaced by Walding, Jenkins, and Hanuschak.

On Statutory Regulations and Orders to have the names of Desjardins and Hanuschak removed, and replaced with Parasiuk and Cowan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the pleasure of the HOuse to adopt those changes? ' The Honourable Meer for Gladstone.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few changes also. On Statutory Regulations and Orders, Mr. Orchard will replace the Mr. Ransom; and the Member for Rock Lake will replace Mr. Domino; Mr. Wilson will replace Mr. Driedger; and on Privilegessand Elections, Mr. Cosens will replace Mr. Banman; Mr. McGill will replace Mr. Sherman; Mr. Domino will replace Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Brown will replace Mr. Hyde.

### **ROYAL ASSENT**

**DEPUTY-SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason):** His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

*120106His Honour, F. L. Jobin, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:*

**MR. SPEAKER:** May it please Your Honour,

The Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed several Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

No. 2 — An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

No. 3 — An Act to amend The Provincial Auditor's Act and Certain Other Provisions of the Statutes of Manitoba respecting the Duties of the Provincial Auditor.

No. 6 — An Act to amend The Condominium Act.

No. 7 — An Act to amend The Jury Act.

NOO. 1/8? — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

No. 13 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

No. 14 — An Act to amend The Planning Act.

- No. 17 — An Act to amend The Public Printing Act.  
No. 18 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.  
No. 19 — An Act respecting the Glenboro Hospital District No. 16B and The Rural Municipality of South Cypress.  
No. 24 — An Act to amend The Municipal Act.  
No. 25 — An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act.  
No. 27 — An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.  
No. 30 — An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.  
No. 31 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group.  
No. 32 — An Act to amend The Hospital Capital Financing Authority Act.  
No. 33 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club.  
No. 35 — An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act.  
No. 36 — An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.  
No. 37 — An Act to amend The Museum of Man and Nature Act.  
No. 38 — An Act to amend The Trustee Act. No. 39 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1979).  
No. 40 — An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Rossmere Golf and Country Club Limited.  
No. 41 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate United Health Services Corporation.  
No. 42 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).  
No. 45 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.  
No. 46 -- An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.  
No. 47 -- An Act to amend the Personal Property Security Act.  
No. 48 — An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.  
No. 50 — An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.  
No. 51 — An Act to amend The County Courts Act.  
No. 54 — The Manitoba Data Services Act.  
No. 55 — An Act to amend The Insurance Act.  
No. 56 — An Act to amend The Family Maintenance Act.  
No. 57 — An Act to amend The Metallic Minerals Royalty Act.  
No. 58 — An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act.  
No. 59 — An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Public Utilities Board Act.  
No. 60 — The Energy Rate Stabilization Act.  
No. 61 — An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act.  
No. 65 — An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act.  
No. 66 — An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Tax Act.  
No. 68 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1979)(2).  
No. 69 — An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act.  
No. 70 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

**MR. CLERK:** In Her Majesty's Name, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

Bill No. 62 — An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1980 and to Authorize the Commitment of Edditional Moneys for Expenditures in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for the Cash Requirements of the Government.

Bill No. 63 — An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same.

Bill No. 64 — An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1980 (2).

**MR. CLERK:** His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

**HIS HONOUR, FRANCIS L. JOBIN:** Please be seated.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

The work of the Third Session of the Thirty-first Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committee. I convey to you

Friday, June 15, 1979

---

my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Third Session of the Thirty-First Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

**MR. MERCIER:** It is the will and pleasure of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

*God Save the Queen was sung.*