



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



# I N D E X

Thursday, June 25, 1959 - 2:30 P.M.

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Report of Standing Committee, Law Amendments</u> .....	253
<u>Introduction of Bill, No. 59, re M.H.S.A. (Mr. Johnson)</u> .....	253
<u>Questions:</u> .....	253
Mr. Molgat (Mr. Johnson, Gimli). Mr. Hillhouse (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Guttormson (Mr. Roblin). Mr. Molgat (Mr. Carroll). Mr. Desjardins (Mr. Carroll, Mr. Roblin). Mr. Campbell (Mr. Roblin).	
<u>Bill No. 2, re Economic Development, Second Reading, Mr. Evans</u> .....	255
Division .....	261
<u>Adjourned Debate, re Committee of Supply: Mr. Molgat</u> .....	262
Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin .....	263
<u>Committee of Supply</u>	
Mr. Roblin .....	265
<u>Legislation, Assembly</u> .....	269
Comptroller-General's Office .....	270
Legislative Printing and Binding .....	273
Operation of Recording Equipment .....	279
First Session of 26th Legislature .....	279
<u>Executive Council, Administration</u> .....	279
Federal Provincial Conference .....	280
Grants and Miscellaneous .....	281

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, June 25th, 1959

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg me to present the following as their first report. Your committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as chairman. The committee recommends that for the remainder of the session the quorum of this committee shall consist of 10 members. Your committee has considered bills, Number 7, an Act to amend the Old Age Assistance Act; Bill No. 10, an Act to validate orders-in-council 1443-58; and the guaranteeing of a debenture bond issued by the Co-op Prairie Cannery Ltd; No. 15, an Act to amend the Interpretation Act; No. 16, an Act to amend the Summary Convictions Act; No. 19, an Act respecting the provisions of group life insurance for public servants of the province; No. 25, an Act to amend the Hospital Act; No. 28, an Act to amend the Blind Persons Allowances Act; No. 29, an Act to amend the Disabled Persons Allowances Act; No. 31, an Act to amend the licensed Practical Nurses Act; No. 33, an Act to amend the Insurance Corporation Tax Act; No. 34, an Act to amend the Public Schools Act No. 2; No. 36, an Act to amend the reserve for War and Post-war Emergencies Act; No. 46, an Act to validate Bylaw No. 608 of the School District of Winnipeg #1; No. 47, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the sinking fund trustees of the School District of Winnipeg #1; No. 48, an Act to amend the Winnipeg Charter 1956; No. 50, an Act to amend the Public Works Act; No. 60, an Act to amend the Greater Winnipeg Water District Act, and is agreed to report the same without amendments.

Your committee has also considered Bill No. 18, an Act to amend the Companies' Act and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the report be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Hon. George Johnson (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 59, an Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the "Manitoba Hospital Service Association".

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I wish to correct an item which appeared in the June 24th, 1959 Tribune on Page 14. I was alleged to have said that, "commenting on agriculture Mr. Shoemaker said he does not favour deficiency payments for agriculture under the present system".

Now in Hansard, Volume III, No. 11, Page 210, I stated this, " Since it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that all industry except agriculture is protected by tariffs to ensure profits for the various industries and to assure the fact that they will continue to operate, I for one do not mind going on record as favouring deficiency payments", and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request that the Tribune correct the error.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Has he had time yet to read the very excellent discourse given us the other evening by the Honourable Member for Osborne on the subject of chiropractic in Manitoba? And supplementary question, coming out of the last sentence in that same speech - is it the intention of the government to make some changes insofar as the use of chiropractic services for example, with regard to admission to hospital under the hospital plan or in any other phase in that field?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have just received the Hansard on my desk and I have just opened it to this page -- therefore I have not read it. Secondly... say at this time the government has no plans to permit the chiropractic profession to include them under the

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd)....Manitoba Hospital Services Plan. Is that the answer to the two questions, Sir?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, Mr. Minister. One more question. Are there other contemplated changes in that case with regard to any health services and the chiropractic services?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No, there are no changes at the present time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. In last night's issue of the Winnipeg Tribune there was a news item to the effect that it was not the intention of the government to introduce the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, the bill covering which was presented to us last March. Is that statement true, Mr. Attorney-General?

MR. LYON: This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that comes within the purview of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities but I feel safe in speaking on his behalf in saying that it is not the intention of the government to introduce the overall amendments including rules of the road which were presented at the last session.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. If the Honourable the Attorney-General would answer on behalf of the Minister of Public Utilities. Is it the intention of the government at the first session in 1960 to revise completely the Highway Traffic Act and incorporate in the revision the amendments that the bill which was presented to us last March contemplated?

MR. LYON: I am sure Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member realizes that he is asking me to answer a question on what the policy of the government is, and of course I couldn't answer looking so far ahead. I couldn't answer that question at this time at all.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Honourable Minister take the matter under consideration and advisement because I am sure such a step would meet with the general approval of the legal profession, of the judiciary, and of all administrative offices entrusted with the enforcement of that Act?

MR. LYON: Now that the Honourable Member, Mr. Speaker, has changed his question from a question to a recommendation, we will be quite happy to consider the recommendation.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Could he indicate at this time whether he intends to have the House sit tomorrow night?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I was expecting that the House would sit tomorrow night, Mr. Speaker. We haven't commenced our estimates. With any luck - I'm not sure - we might get on them this afternoon; but in view of the general circumstances of the past few months and a necessity to get these matters settled as expeditiously as possible, I would hope that the House would sit on Friday night.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to present a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. First, what is the statutory membership of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, and secondly, who are the members at present?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): I'm sorry, I didn't get the first part of your question.

MR. MOLGAT: What is the statutory number of members on the board?

MR. CARROLL: The numbers on the board are four, exclusive of the chairman, and the members of the board at the present time are: Stewart Anderson, Dan Sprague, Bill Fallis and Don Thompson; the chairman is the same - Don Stevens.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. A few days ago I asked a question of the Honourable the First Minister, in regard to the television station - French language - for Manitoba, and the First Minister told me that the Minister of Public Utilities was going to Ottawa to discuss those things. I wonder if he could give us any information at this time, or at least tell us if it has been discussed?

MR. CARROLL: Well Mr. Speaker, I did go east the night before last to discuss with the C.B.C. the government's view with respect to the extension of television in the Province of Manitoba. We didn't in that meeting discuss the second television station for the City of Winnipeg, or the Greater Winnipeg area I should say. However, I do understand that certain recommendations have been made by the C.B.C. and concurred in by the board of broadcast governors and a decision will be made by the government with respect to that second station.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd).... This morning I wrote a letter to the Minister of Transport to get firsthand his views on this subject, and we hope of course that an announcement will be made shortly.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Minister for this information, but my question is directed to the French Language television station for Manitoba. I would like to ask this question, "Did he bring this up at any time at this meeting in Ottawa?"

MR. CARROLL: The answer to that question is, no.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think I should add a supplementary answer to the one that has been given because the House might have the impression that the government has not taken up the question of the French television station in St. Boniface with the Government of Canada as suggested and discussed yesterday in the House. Although the minister may not have done so at that particular meeting, which was the question that he was asked, it has been taken up with the Government of Canada in an effort to insure that a decision has been reached in respect to this matter favourable to the application at the earliest time.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): . . . . . that supplementary answer, however, I would like to ask the First Minister a supplementary question. Is it not a fact that in answer to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface yesterday, that he said that he had every reason to believe that the Minister of Public Utilities would be discussing the matter in Ottawa?

MR. ROBLIN: That is perfectly true, Mr. Speaker. That is what I said and that is what I believed. I thought that he had the matter with him on his agenda when he went down there, but when leaving the House I took the precaution of making sure that that was the case, and I found that it was not, so we took other steps to see that the matter was attended to.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Adjourned debate on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce for second reading of Bill No. 2, an Act to facilitate the economic development of the province. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to all who have taken part in this debate and particularly to say that the job of any minister is made very much easier if he has the kind of support that I have enjoyed, or enjoyed yesterday, in the speeches by the Honourable Member from Flin Flon and the Honourable Member from River Heights. They dealt with two aspects of this question and each of them, I would remind the House, has experience of the north and speaks with personal experience that adds that much more weight to his words.

Incidentally, there is one general impression that I would like to correct at the outset, and that is that this bill is not intended to apply and will not apply exclusively to the north. I recognize, of course, that many of the opportunities and many of the matters referred to in the House and in the debates, and much of the information that I have given to the House have referred to northern developments and the many prospects that are held out there, but it should be clearly in the minds of the members I think, Mr. Speaker, that this development authority will have many matters under their concern in the southern part of the province, as well as in the north.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks asked me two questions during the course of the debate - one was whether the development authority would report to the Legislature and I think that matter was well handled by my Honourable Friend from River Heights yesterday when it was explained that the responsibility to report to the House still remains with the ministers themselves, and the authority itself will not report direct to the House in the ordinary way that a minister does. But, all of the matters that are concerned with any of the departments will, of course, be the responsibility of the ministers concerned, to report. Then my honourable friend asked me a general question as to what planning will be done and I found that a most difficult question to answer except to refer in general to the purposes of the bill which of course is, the purpose of the bill is, to encourage the development and use of our natural resources and the encouragement of industry within the province. Now I hope my honourable friend won't think I'm trying to slight his question when I say that it would be most difficult in any short compass to give an outline of the planning which might follow in those very large

(Mr. Evans, cont'd) . . . matters. I hope he will not think that I'm being discourteous to the question, but I can answer it no more except to say that all of the planning that will be necessary to put forward those main and large objectives will, so far as we can and as quickly as we can, be undertaken in a very practical sense.

Then I would like to refer to the remarks and the questions of my Honourable Friend the Leader of the C. C. F., whose questions I thought were to the point and dealt with matters in the bill. I think it was pointed out to him by my Honourable Friend from River Heights that he was perhaps acting on a misconception in some of these regards with respect to the powers that are contained in the bill. As I understood my honourable friend, he asked three questions and I propose to deal with each of them. First that I took it as a criticism of the principle of the bill, that the government might well be paying for surveys, valuations, and services of engineers and architects and that these services would then be made available to private interests to establish industries and carry on their business. The second was that authority is too much delegated under this bill to a small group or a smaller group than the cabinet, and the third was that it will be difficult to trace the expenditures or the cost under this plan through the estimates as they might indeed be scattered under the various different departments. I recognize the Honourable Member's intention here to give a very serious and sincere criticism of the bill. Nevertheless I think he has some slight misunderstanding of the bill and I would like to deal with the various points. We must, as my Honourable Friend from Flin Flon pointed out, sell Manitoba and the development of Manitoba's resources in competition with ten other provinces and with other countries of the world. We have a choice before us -- a clear one. Either to make these preliminary studies to discover the opportunities and try to promote them and secure this development for Manitoba or, in my opinion, not to do those things and to lose the opportunities of making those developments and gaining that additional wealth. Our policy is to make those expenditures which will be small and if well conceived, and I hope they will be, then to look for returns very many times, the expenditures that would be involved.

With regard to his second point, it seems to me that there has been a complete misinterpretation of the intention of the bill with regard to delegating powers to a smaller board. The only independent powers that are conferred upon this board are limited to the acquisition of staff, to hiring such people as he did refer to - engineers, surveyors and so on - and to enter into negotiations, - perhaps that word itself might bear just a word of explanation. My understanding of the word "negotiation" would be to carry on discussions up to a point where the agreement must be signed but any commitment on the part of the government must be made under the existing acts. Now in each department there are the acts which define the powers of the Minister taking such acts as the Mines Act and the Forestry Act or the Industry and Commerce Act, or others, and they do set out in those acts what the Minister may do, what requires the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or, as the ultimate authority, what matters and so on must be referred to the Legislature. Those acts are not interfered with in any way and none of those powers that are contained in those acts that I have just enumerated are in any way delegated from the Cabinet down to the Manitoba Development Authority. So I think the main points of criticisms my honourable friend had in mind, he may find will be cleared up re-reading the bill in the light of those comments.

Now with respect to my honourable friends across the way in the Liberal party. It seems to me that we have here a very different kettle of fish indeed. We are accused of mere window dressing, mere words, that they provide nothing new, that the same people very largely as far as the permanent civil service is concerned and the same offices as far as the elected members of the cabinet are concerned, will be doing exactly the same things that the other administration was doing under the old arrangement. The main point here is however, that those same people and particularly the members of the Executive Council weren't doing these things and this legislation is required for facilitating that operation. The second point was that this new Manitoba Development Authority would merely duplicate the staff and the arrangements and the organization that are already existing within the public service. Those two points perhaps bear on the subject matter and the principle of the bill, but my honourable friend's third points do not. In this regard my friend from St. Rose and my friend from Lakeside made very largely the same speech, but my honourable friend from Lakeside went further. He did something that is quite improper but I overlooked that particular point; he attributed motives or

(Mr. Evans, cont'd). . . . intentions to the administration, I think perhaps he had not intended to do so in a serious vein and so I'll overlook that particular point. But he did say that this measure was intended to mislead the people into believing that something would be done and that in fact as far as he could see, nothing new would be done by this bill. He said it was propagandizing, that we were still running the election, leaving the clearest implication, of course, that this measure was intended to put forward the interests of this particular party and not the interests of the people of Manitoba as a whole.

Well, I should be interested, Mr. Speaker, to watch the vote. If my honourable friends across the way vote for the bill they're endorsing the expenditure of public funds for the very purposes that they criticize. First of all to put forward a scheme that is mere window dressing, they had a misconception as to how much money this would cost or how little money this would cost - that's a separate point that I'll come to later. Nevertheless they are endorsing the expenditure of public money for mere window dressing, mere words for an Act which will clutter up the statute books and do no good. They will vote for that according to their indication; they have said that they will vote also for a measure which provides for the duplication of machinery which already exists in the Government and for further waste of public funds. They have said that they will vote for a measure which is designed according to their words - which is designed to hood-wink the public and to make them believe that something is being done that is not being done in fact. I'm interested in passing as to why this criticism begins now. This bill was printed in exactly the same form for the last session of the House. It's been in the honourable members' possession certainly since well before the last election. I have not been able to discover in the Press any word or criticism of this bill or the principle behind it or the objects for which it is introduced into the House, during the election campaign, by any members of the House for that matter, and certainly not by my Honourable Friend from Lakeside or my Honourable Friend from St. Rose or any of the other members of that group across the House. It seems odd to me now that with that opportunity when they should have brought to the public any criticism that they had of as important and far-reaching a bill as this, the public wasn't informed then. They should have asked them for their verdict; they should have tried to persuade the public that this matter of window dressing and duplication and hood-winking of the public itself was an important matter and should indeed have won them support, if there was any substance to it. Well they didn't dare to criticize this measure - they realized it was making good a deficiency in their own operation; they realized it was something the public wanted and I suggest to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, that the public did want it, that the public voted against their point of view in not having this kind of organization and administration, and in favour of this party's policy of having a forward-looking and aggressive and well-organized effort to develop the province economically.

I suggest to the honourable members that this is real political bad faith. I suggest that when they say in this House that there is nothing good about a bill and can find nothing good in it - the closest thing they came to find anything good in it was that there was no harm, and I think those two phrases appear in both of these speeches - to say that there is nothing to it and then vote for it is in my opinion an astonishing example. And I ask my honourable friends where is their sense of responsibility in this matter? If this thing is bad, if it is wasting money, if it is hood-winking the public, if it is merely put forward in the interests of a political party and not of the people of Canada, I say to them, "Where is your sense of responsibility? Where is your sense of responsibility in the important office which the honourable member holds?"

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, since the honourable gentleman has asked a question of me, I would like to correct what he's been saying up until now because I did make this very plain to the electors - I even used the name of my honourable friend who is sponsoring the bill, using this as an example of the kind of thing that my honourable friend does. I gave him credit for having no wrong motives but at the same time I said that he was a big planner and I used this as an example of the kind of things that my honourable friend and the administration would do and the reason that I said that we were quite prepared to vote for it was because I had put that before the public - I had done my best to convince the public of that and the public did not believe or else they wanted it done.

MR. EVANS: I suggest Mr. Speaker that the Honourable Member doesn't have the strength of his conviction if he proposes to vote for it in the House on this particular occasion.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd). . . . . The report of any such speeches he made escaped me if it appeared in the Press. I suggest, however, that as public servants, if these serious charges are really sincerely held on the other side of the House, they should seriously consider in the service to the public, their duty to vote against any such hope. Well what has been said touching on the substance of the bill, by the Liberal party opposite is simply not correct. They charge that this is a mere shadow and has no substance but I ask them "have they had a chance to look at the estimates?" - and this will partly answer the question that was raised by my honourable friend the Leader of the C.C.F. party that the estimates covering the Manitoba Development Authority will be found toward the end under the Department of Industry and Commerce. I'm sorry that I neglected to touch on that point when I was trying to answer the Honourable Member's question before. The expenditures in this regard will not be scattered through the estimates but will be found under the Department of Industry and Commerce, very clearly labelled to show that they are the expenditures for the Manitoba Development Authority. My honourable friend seemed to be very keen to get the estimates of expenditure at the start of the last session and when he got them he didn't appear to have read them because if he had read them it could hardly have escaped his notice - this rather substantial item that had been put in under the Department of Industry and Commerce to carry forward the matters which will come under charge of the Manitoba Development Authority. As to the question of duplication, this Manitoba Development Authority, by organizing and co-ordinating the efforts that are now carried on or are capable of being carried on under the various departments will have far more effect in eliminating duplication than they will by creating duplication of any kind. This is the function of co-ordination. Now my honourable friend obviously doesn't agree with that - he shakes his head at it. Oh, I can well understand my honourable friend's point of view. If my honourable friend had realized the value of organization, if he had realized the value of co-ordination and the value of team work, and the value of getting things done in time to be of any use, he obviously would have adopted those tactics himself and he would probably have been listening to me from the other side of the House. Nevertheless having failed to realize those cardinal principles of getting something done and the value of organization and of co-ordination and co-operation in the broadest sense of that word, then I say he has reaped the crop that he sowed.

This bill is needed Mr. Speaker, and needed in a very practical way. The Province of Manitoba has lagged behind in development. We probably know in this province less about our natural resources than any other province in Canada, certainly with regard to the potential development of those resources. We have within the Province of Manitoba perhaps 150,000 square miles of precambrian shield, a precambrian shield of course being the rock formations in which our mineral deposits are discovered. Of this amount some 63% has received only what is called the reconnaissance survey. A further 10% has been explored up to an acceptable standard by the Federal Government; a further 10% has been explored up to an acceptable standard by the Provincial Government, and 17% has been ignored altogether. So of the 150,000 square miles that we have of this precambrian shield, the province has explored 10% and we are indebted to the Federal Government for another 10% or 20% in all, up to an acceptable standard.

With regard to our replaceable resources such as forestry, they are undeveloped and they are wasting. They are wasting in two ways; in the first place they are being burned by forest fires to some extent and a very large amount of wood each year is getting to an age where it will no longer be satisfactory for timber or pulp wood purposes. There is a natural wastage in these forests and it is going on. We don't know the location and extent of these two factors that I talk about and we don't know in sufficient detail the extent of the still useable forest resources which would be tributary to any of the new industries which might well be established in the north.

With regard to fisheries, I outlined the other day and won't repeat some of the respects in which we lack information regarding the biological factors which affect the fish or indeed of the marketing situation which requires its own special investigation. There is urgent need of land classification in the northern part of the province - not only to discover such areas as might be useful for agriculture in the north but to find out where the forest areas are, where any areas may be that might be reforested and what areas should in fact be left out of those two classifications.

With regard to wildlife resources. We haven't the information to go on to develop a

(Mr. Evans, cont'd). . . . policy which will enable the country to be opened up and developed and settlement secured at the same time seeing to the maximum preservation of the game resources that we have in the north part of the country. In short there is a tremendous lack of scientific and engineering information which must be obtained and then studied and assessed by economists and others before a development policy can be brought forward which will be effective and which will be supported by the kind of data it must have. I would point out a special situation that exists with regard to recreational development. There is perhaps one of the largest opportunities facing the province in the recreation and tourist business. It's a very large business now - there were 1,126,000 people visited us last year, and they spent \$33,000,000.00 here. In my opinion that is only a beginning and is capable of very considerable development. To give some indication and perhaps only a vague one, of the potential development that is possible, I would indicate that we have some 39,000 square miles of lakes and rivers within the province, much of that area being well suited to recreational development. But there are special problems also in conjunction with those special opportunities. The first is that we want tourists but there is the fire hazard when the tourist goes in and two departments are involved in that. We want pulp mill reservations and pulp mill developments within the province but we want to retain as far as possible opportunities to fish and hunt, and two departments are involved there. We want holiday makers but they must have adequate protection in the way of health services and safety regulations, and two departments are involved there. We want hunters but there must be law enforcement. We want permanent resorts which will bring forward their own set of problems with regard to education, municipal problems, health and welfare, and all the other matters that go with settlement in any part of the province.

A mine is not just a mine. A mine is a factory as well as being a mine and brings with it all the matters which come under labour and management, and labour and management relationships, transportation, power, mining townsites and others. And it seems to me that my Honourable Friend from Flin Flon yesterday made that situation come quite real and gave evidence on the point concerning the difficulties that they have had in the past of coming from the north to discuss in Winnipeg their various problems and to find any one table, as he put it, to find any one table around which they could gather and have a concerted consideration of the problems that they brought.

I put another fundamental problem to the House Mr. Speaker, and it's this. With regard to transportation and power particularly, because of their very large financial implications and other difficulties connected with them, there must be a simultaneous development of the utility and the market for that utility at the same time. It does little good to build a huge power station out in a wilderness without some idea of the market it is going to serve and without being reasonably assured that the market is going to be developed at about the same time to take up the load. It does little good to start building roads off into the wilderness without planning ahead what traffic it will serve, what resources it will help to develop and what further economic wealth can be wrested from the province by the development of that transportation facilities, and so there must be simultaneous development of the market and the use of the utility while the utility itself is being brought into being.

With regard to water storage and water basins for a power utility itself. There must be consideration given well in advance, I suggest, to the water storage basins that will be used to service that hydro-electric power utility when it comes into being so that agricultural lands and settlements and other things will not be flooded after they have been established and when the dams and other structures are built.

Now these and other things are complex in the first place and in the second place they're inter-departmental. This can be tackled in two ways - it can be tackled as in the past - which policy in my opinion failed and the people said so; it can be tackled by allowing anyone with an interest in these things to come and - I was going to say wander, I don't mean to be rude about this - but find his way from department to department and from one commission to another, in many cases finding that any matter that he wishes to raise at any one time has implications for two departments or a department and a utility at the same time and be unable to secure a final settlement as described by my honourable friend from Flin Flon. Or it can be done in the other way by organization. Around one table - that phrase I want to thank my honourable colleague for - around one table, the matters can be considered, technical

(Mr. Evans, cont'd). . . . assistance can be provided, continuity of effort can be assured, a point that bears emphasis, that is to say that if matters are considered all at one time, a well-integrated program can be launched to solve any difficulties there may be and a continuity of effort can be applied to it which cannot be done in a scattered fashion as has been attempted in the past.

I think here is the clearest illustration of the difference in attitude between the late administration and the new one. In the first place we believe in the efficiency of organization - my honourable friends across the way do not. We believe in promotion activities; we believe that in competition with our rival provinces and other countries we must determine the opportunities that exist in Manitoba and take and, as it were, sell them to the capital and development people of the country and of other countries as well. And we must be careful indeed of a matter which I mentioned in introducing this measure, and that is we must be careful of the public interest. Any one of these large developments whether it be a mine or a large pulp mill or even some of the smaller woodwork factories, it's a large and complex undertaking, and it takes the very greatest care to insure that the public interest is protected. We are well aware, Mr. Speaker, and keep before us constantly the fact that we are the trustees of the people for the care of these natural resources which must be developed to their advantage, and so this Authority will be charged with an over-riding responsibility and perhaps their most important one, to see that the public interest is protected and that these resources return to the people of the province as much as can possibly be secured.

Well in establishing this form of administration, this Manitoba Development Authority, we're following the established pattern. The Arthur D. Little Report, the economic report on northern Manitoba by the Arthur D. Little Company, recommended a northern board. The Manitoba Development Authority does not take exactly the same form as recommended by the Arthur Little Company but in essence it is the same thing. Their board was intended to look only in northern Manitoba - we broadened the concept because we thought this form of organization was needed in the south as well. But I would point out to my honourable friends that the Government of Canada has its responsibilities in the Yukon and North West Territories as well and they have set up an entire department with a Minister responsible for these matters among others, but these matters form a very important part of the responsibilities of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources at Ottawa. They have a permanent inter-departmental committee - this is a permanent inter-departmental committee - representing the Departments of Transport, Public Works, Mines and Technical Surveys, Agriculture and various other agencies of the government. The parallel between that and the organization of the Manitoba Development Authority is pretty clear, Mr. Speaker. It was not patterned exactly on it but by our own path we found our way to the same end. I would point out that this committee that I have just described under that department, this permanent inter-departmental committee at Ottawa, has its own permanent secretariat and they carry on the necessary functions which are contemplated also under this Authority. One of the important things that the Manitoba Development Authority will do, will be to form liaison with this organization in Ottawa so that our plans may be co-ordinated, although my honourable friends across will not see any significance in this, but this Manitoba Development Authority will make it one of its principal responsibilities to be in close touch with developments at Ottawa and the plans there and to take full advantage of the developments under the geological survey, under transportation, under power and navigable waters and many other matters that are the concern of that department and that organization in Ottawa.

Well the prize is rich, Mr. Speaker. What price another Thompson? I believe the figures with regard to Thompson are that they expected to invest some \$175,000,000.00 and then recently announced that they were erecting a refinery for a further \$25,000,000.00, meaning an expenditure in that northern country of \$200,000,000.00 for that project. What price another Thompson? There are many opportunities outlined in this Arthur Little Report on northern Manitoba. Some items which appear there under the forest industry's classification are a pulp mill which would call for the investment of \$40,000,000.00 or more and they point out opportunity for two further pulp mills in northern Manitoba without putting prices on them. There's an opportunity for a hardboard mill at a capital investment of \$6,000,000.00; a plywood factory at \$667,000.00, and others. Mere illustrations of the kind of thing that can

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)....be done if we search out the opportunities as the Arthur D. Little people did, and why the honourable member across didn't believe in the pattern which he himself set, I don't know; nevertheless if he doesn't, I do. We are progressing with it as fast as we can and there are further opportunities in fisheries and secondary industries.

My own experience in the short time that I have been in the two portfolios which I have the honour to hold, through my own personal contacts which I have made so far as time has permitted, and I've made a good many, with people in the capital markets and people in development groups, both natural resource and industrial, tells me and I tell the House my experience, that we still lack, even with the advantage of occupying both portfolios at the same time, I was still lacking a co-ordination though I enjoyed the support of both staffs and two excellent staffs, I found that in many of my operations I lacked a co-ordinated approach to those interested which I had been accustomed to in business, and which any business is accustomed to using when putting forward their propositions. And so I simply tell you of my experience which is the reason that I believe this bill should be put forward. The need is real, the profit will be handsome, the results will speak for themselves, and the Government asks the House for this necessary tool to get on with this responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, could we have the yeas and nays please?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House - second reading of Bill No. 2 - an Act to facilitate the economic development of the Province.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: - Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Johnson, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Weir, Willis, Witney, Wright.

NAYS: - Desjardins.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 49, Nays 1.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

.....(Continued on next page)

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the next order of business we're going into will maybe not receive quite the same approval as the motion on which we just voted. I do want to assure the First Minister however, in view of a comment he made earlier today, that it wasn't my purpose when I adjourned this debate yesterday to delay going into estimates. That is not the point at all. On the contrary, it was simply to give us time for further consideration of the estimates themselves which we had just received the night before, as well as to consider the statement that the First Minister made yesterday to the House on the subject of estimates. After all the passing of estimates here is probably the main job of the Legislature, that is the main purpose for which Her Majesty calls us together. If it were not for the annual need of money, the Legislature could go along for quite some time without meeting. But fortunately in view of the fact that the Government needs the money to proceed with, the Legislature must be called and the estimates passed. It's important, therefore, for all of us to give full consideration to the estimates. Now, the present estimates that are before us, I see some difficulties facing the House in going through them this year and I'm referring to the considerable change in the presentation of the estimates and in the form in which they are given to us. I want to assure the First Minister that it is not objection on my part to the change; if the change is there for a good purpose, if the new presentation will facilitate the understanding of the estimates and facilitate the complete information being given to all the members of the House, then I say, 'well and good, the changes are excellent.' I hope, however, that the changes are not made merely to confuse the issue and to make it more difficult to have a full consideration of the estimates. Most of the members who have been here before were accustomed to the form that we previously had, and probably will be referring back to previous copies of estimates to be getting the full picture of each departmental break-down. As it stands now, we find that there is a very considerable grouping of figures. And you take for example the estimates of the Department of Education, which previously covered a full three pages, we now find them concentrated into a little less than two pages and I think there is a danger in that, that certain items which previously were separated and set out, may not get full consideration of the members of the House. I hope that that will not be the case and that when the Chairman of the Committee is proceeding with the calling of the figures that he will not be too hasty and permit members an ample opportunity to have their questions prepared and considered. In that regard I might suggest, for the consideration of the government, that possibly when we come up to each departmental estimate, instead of passing the minister's salary figure we should leave that matter open until such time as the departmental estimates are completely considered and passed. Now it has been our custom in the House previously that on the minister's salary, we had a complete discussion of any item that we wish to have discussed under that particular department and it gave the members a complete scope for discussion. Once we passed the minister's salary and we're on specific items, then it's a different question, you would have to stay on the item. Now in view of the grouping, the consolidation and the stream-lining, I think it would be to the benefit of the House and of the public of Manitoba, if ministers' salaries were left open so that as we go through the detailed estimates, should we happen to forget some item, skip some item, not be aware that it is involved in another group figure, that we could go back after at the time of the passage of the minister's salary and complete our questioning. I think that would provide for a more thorough understanding of the estimates. Next year, once we are accustomed to the new form, once we're fully aware of what the changes cover, then that procedure would not be necessary, but for this year, in view of the new development, I would suggest that to the consideration of the government.

There are some figures in these estimates, Mr. Speaker, which I am frankly wondering about, in particular, two that were mentioned by the First Minister yesterday. The election costs, \$320,000., which are included in this present estimate and the Winter Works project of \$275,000. Both those cover expenditures that have already been made surely. The municipalities are not waiting for the Provincial Government's share of the Winter Works project, and I certainly don't think that the election costs have all been waiting. I would imagine that the Returning Officers and Deputy Returning Officers and everyone else has been paid or in process of being paid, and I wonder therefore, why these should be in the estimates this year. If they have been paid already, how have they been paid? Presumably by special warrants. Should they then be included once again in these estimates, or should they be out of these estimates and

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . merely gone through as already spent under Lieutenant-Governor's warrant. It seems to me that if any of the other items like that, in view of our circumstances, that we have already had certain expenditures, not previously considered when we had our interim supply discussion earlier this year which should not therefore appear in the estimates as such for 1960. These are expenditures that we know or should know by now the total of, and which surely have been paid, and I would suggest that possibly their proper place is not in the present estimates.

Another point which I merely wish to pass on, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the interim supply which we passed at our earlier session this year. At that time we passed a total of 16 million dollars, almost 17 million, and of course these figures are repeated again in the present estimates. Now I assume that it is correct, I unfortunately did not get a chance to check the actual bill which we considered at the last session, but I presume that that previous 17 million is merely merged in this present total which we are being presented with, and not that we have passed 17 million, and now passing an additional complete amount. I note that has been previously the case and I'm sure it is the case again, but merely would like to have the assurance from the First Minister. So those are merely the points I want to bring up, Mr. Speaker, and I realize that the government is anxious to have a full consideration of estimates themselves but as well to get them passed. They want to get on with the business and until they get the money, they cannot proceed to do so. We do not intend to unnecessarily delay the passage, but we do intend to have a very complete and full discussion because this is a basic problem for all Manitobans; the amount of money that the government is going to spend affects everyone of us and we want to know why the money is going to be spent, where and how. We intend to ask many questions and I would ask again, as I stated earlier, for the consideration of the government in view of the changes that they've made in this accounting that they are now making to us that they give us the freedom of the minister's salary discussion after the departmental estimates in each case.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other contributions to the debate, I'd like to deal with the points raised and answer the questions that have been placed before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I might point out that when the Honourable the First Minister speaks, he closes the debate.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, that's the point of order that I was going to raise. I cannot believe that the Honourable the First Minister has the right to close the debate on this motion. I am sure it's in the memory of a good many of the members who are in the House now, that we go into this supply committee almost as a matter of course, but of course by motion, for several days in an ordinary session.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I see the point that my honourable friend is getting at, and I must confess it's one that has puzzled me, and that is when I spoke about closing the debate, I was speaking of the debate on this motion that is before us now. Because as honourable members will know we will make the same motion on other days and I do not by any means wish to say that because I speak now, it precludes people from speaking on the same motion on other occasions, because we do it daily. Now, I don't know whether this is the time or place to elucidate this matter, perhaps it requires some further study, but I've always been curious myself to know as to whether or not the motion that we have now is a one-time-only proposition, or whether it is revived afresh and available for debate afresh, on each occasion that it was submitted to the House.

Now, in the past I have always taken the view that it was revived again on each day's sitting and put to the House again and subject to debate again, but when I was on the opposition benches and attempted to speak on such occasions or to make amendments to the supply motion as is sometimes done, I got into a rather violent hassle with the Speaker of the day, who I think allowed me to do it once. And I never was clear whether his ruling was, that one member may speak to the supply debate and move an amendment if he wishes or otherwise take part in it once only on any particular occasion, but that some other member could do the same thing on other days when the same motion was before us, so that it is not a motion -- so that my speaking now does not preclude further debate on supply later on in the session. I've always been under the impression that a member had at least the opportunity of speaking once on that motion on each -- if it should come up on more than one occasion, as of course it does. The Speaker of

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . the day told me that if I had spoken once on any particular occasion, I, as a person, was not allowed to take part in that debate subsequently but it must be some other member who would do that. Now, I was never clear whether that ruling was parliamentary at all but nevertheless that's the one we had. I know that in Ottawa they have a convention there, I believe, of having six occasions on which the motion is considered as a separate motion, and on which debate can be conducted and two? -- two days. There's some convention down there at any rate that while making it possible to speak on this motion more than once, does not allow it to be debated indefinitely day by day as it comes up. We, as far as I am aware, have never had a convention of that sort for the simple reason that we usually don't debate it that frequently and subject to your ruling, Sir, I think that it would be not at all out of the way if perhaps the previous custom, as far as I know it in this House, were adhered to, and that is that if a member speaks on the Supply motion once that exhausts his right to speak on that motion for the session, but that some other member, if he wishes to speak on it on another day is free to do so. Now I must confess that this point is obscure and I would welcome any light that can be shed on it, but I don't wish anyone to think that by saying I am closing the debate on this occasion, that I am attempting to stop anyone from speaking on this motion at a subsequent time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I agree quite largely with what the Honourable the First Minister has said on this matter and I do not pose as an expert on the rules. However, I've always tried to understand them and my understanding of them is as the Honourable the First Minister intimated, that every member in the House has an opportunity to speak once, and I think that has never been in any way abused in this House because the Honourable the First Minister has said, even when his group and he were in opposition, though they embarrassed our government at many times, they never took advantage of that particular opportunity. There were speeches delivered, of course, and I think that's the way it should be but I believe that it should be limited to one speech by one person as being one motion. But on the other hand if we go in perhaps every day or if we're having separate sessions towards the end of the House, more than once a day, and the point that I was going to raise though goes a little further than that because I really feel that the Honourable the First Minister has not the opportunity on any of those days of, so to speak, replying to what has been said. Because if he had, then we would have the opportunity of making 56 speeches, or 55, whatever the number happened to be. And I think that perhaps a further discussion at this point should be delayed until we get into committee, but the only point that I was making was that I think it is a rule, Mr. Speaker, and you will have time to check this up because as time passes along the speaker tends to become the expert on these matters. I think you will find that a reply, according to our own rule, is permitted only on a substantive motion. A substantive motion, as I understand it is one that is independent or depends upon itself. It's an originating resolution or a motion and that it is not allowed - a reply is not allowed - to an Order of the Day. But then there's immediately an exception made to that, "Orders of the Day except second reading." And I understand from Bouronot and May and these authorities, that that practice grew up because it was found - we had a very good exemplification of it today - where a minister in particular felt that he needed to reply to criticisms that had been raised and so gradually a reply was granted to the mover of a second reading even though that is an 'Order of the Day' and then also, perhaps even before that, the other exception was made of the budget debate and of course the Honourable the First Minister in his position as Provincial Treasurer has a reply on the budget debate. Now, I would suggest that the place for the Honourable the First Minister to make his reply is after we go into Committee, which we no doubt will be doing very, very soon, and then I think we keep the procedure on all fours.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I've arrived at the same conclusion as my honourable friend as respect to reply on this matter, because we would get into the question of somebody replying on many occasions and speaking in effect more than once which would obviously be unfair. So I think there must be some point in the observation that was made. Probably the only case where a reply would be allowed was if the Supply Motion was amended, then it wouldn't be a reply, it would just be participation in the debate. All I want to say is, however, that in the past I'm afraid we have broken the rule because I remember that when I have been speaking on the other side on an occasion such as this, I certainly got a reply. However, that's something that we can look into at our leisure, but I certainly think that anything that I want to say in reply to the questions that have been raised can very well be dealt with in Committee; that seems like a perfectly reasonable thing to do.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take the suggestions under advisement and I will now put the question.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House do resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supplies to be granted to Her Majesty, and would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews take the chair?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before your consideration of the estimates, perhaps I would take this opportunity then to answer some of the points raised. Speaking to the questions of the Honourable the Leader of the C. C. F. Party, I presume that he's talking about interim supply and not supplementary supply. That's probably just a slip of the tongue. I expect we will be bringing in a supplementary -- an interim supply bill, let me get it straight, we're both now in the same boat -- we'll be bringing in an interim supply bill in very short order because as has been stated the money in some sections certainly is running a little bit low. I want to make a word of explanation on the interim supply bill now. It probably should be done when I bring the bill in but in view of the fact that both the Leader of the C. C. F. and the Honourable Member for St. Rose raised substantially the same point, I had better satisfy their curiosity at the present time. We intend to bring in a supply bill which will ask for some, oh, I think 29 or 30 million dollars being one third, I believe, of our total estimate that is before us now. Now if you will examine the wording of that bill very closely, you will see that it supersedes and takes over from the first interim supply bill of the last session. The reason for that is largely an accounting matter which doesn't really bother us much here, but the first interim supply bill was based on the estimates of last year, and consequently is causing the accountants a lot of heart-burnings with a view to getting things straight. So in order to facilitate their job we are providing that the new interim supply bill that will come in will supersede any money that is spent under the first one, and of course, will not be additional to the main estimates but will merely be an advance allocation of them and that certainly the House - the committee - can rest assured that there will not be duplicate voting of funds in this particular respect. Now another important point was raised that perhaps could be cleared right now in connection with the election costs and the winter works program and several other items that we will see as we go through. I think that I referred to most of them yesterday. Now it's perfectly true that the money that had been required for these expenditures was voted by special warrant, but it was voted by special warrant under very peculiar circumstances, and that is if a government having been defeated and facing the electorate and having no proper money to go on and I must say that we were very uneasy about the correct accounting to this Legislature of the money that might be spent by special warrant under those circumstances. And it seemed to us that it would be best in order that the Legislature should be fully informed as to what we had done in that interval with monies that they had not voted, that we should include those monies in this set of estimates even though they had been covered by special warrant. And you will see the Supply Bill itself, when it is before the House and Committee, contains a clause which provides that this vote over-rides and supersedes the special warrant so that there will not be a duplicate vote. But it will place in a very direct manner before the House the fact that the money was spent or it needed to be spent and we will be asking your approval of it because we feel that under the special circumstances when the special warrants were raised that it is advisable in the public interests to have the fullest possible discussion on these matters. Ordinarily special warrants would not appear for two years or a year when they turn up in the public accounts and you might wish to ask questions about them then. Normally, that procedure, I think, is acceptable - it has been the procedure for many years. But in view, to repeat myself, in view of our peculiar situation, we thought it well to bring those directly before the House in this particular way to make sure that they were given the considered opinion of the Committee, but I emphasize that the Supply Bill, when it comes in, will indicate that these matters are not being voted twice. This is merely confirmation of what was done. Now I want to hasten to say to the member for St. Rose, that I'm sorry if he took any implied criticism from me of the fact that he adjourned the debate yesterday because none is intended. I fully recognize the very important responsibilities of members of the House in connection with estimates and have no desire to unduly hurry them any way, no objection to his adjourning the debate as he did, consider it quite proper that he should have done so.

Now as for the changes in form, I think that when they are considered by the Committee, they will be found to be insubstantial in most particulars. That is, we have not tampered to any

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . great extent, if at all - there might be one or two small items that had separate votes that now disappear, I wouldn't like to say there haven't - I believe there are none but it is possible there might be one or two. It's quite a time since I last went over them in that detail. But I would like to tell the House that the important votes, and after all these items are approved of by votes, the important votes are still there and what has happened is that some break-down of the various particulars or details under those votes which appear to be redundant in some cases, have been put together so that one figure appears.

On the other hand, the government is perfectly willing, more than willing, to take all the time that is required in order to elucidate any of those changes, or in order to answer any questions that members may have. And we're going to have pleasure, Sir, in doing our best to make sure that any particular detail that is required by a member will be provided for to the very best of our ability.

Now in connection with the minister's salary, we've had conflicting customs here with respect to minister's salary. It has not been the custom, as has been intimated, that the minister makes a speech on his salary on every occasion. I can remember a number of occasions when ministers declined to make statements on their salaries and for my mind it was perfectly in order that they should do so. I'm not being critical of that. And on some occasions, no explanation on that point was given, but rather we proceeded at once to a blow by blow account, so to speak, of the items in the estimates. On the other hand, a good many ministers wish to make explanations on their salaries and I think that, as far as I know, most of the ministers, if not all, will be looking forward to making a general statement on their salaries. One of the difficulties, of course, is to avoid double debate and we must ask the co-operation of the members of the House and I'm sure we will have it, that we don't get double debate by reason of that system because some matters may be dealt with pretty thoroughly on the question of the minister's salary and be revived almost in total when the particular item itself comes along. Now I will admit that there's a certain amount of that sort of thing, which is perhaps unavoidable, but I do hope that we will not make it a practice - it's bad procedure - and I think that by and large none of us really favour that kind of thing. I would suggest though that the way to proceed would be to have the minister make a statement on his salary if he wishes to do so or if it is the kind of a department that lends itself to that sort of thing, and not all of them do, and if any other member wishes to speak generally at that point, I'm sure we would have no objection. But then I think we should pass that item and go on with the others. If we come to any point where a member is not satisfied with the information that the minister can provide, we think that item should be held to enable the minister to get the information that the honourable member wants and then, having satisfied him and having satisfied the Committee, we can pass on. And I have the impression, that in view of our previous experience in the House that that will probably work out all right. We're not interested in making it difficult for members to find out what's going on. We're not interested in trying to hide any fact from them that they would like to know. I merely make these suggestions in the interests of having a thoroughly orderly procedure so that we can deal with our business in an efficient way, but I assure the House that all the ministers of the Crown will do their best to see that full explanations are given.

Now going back to the matter of form, I must say that from my way of looking at it that there are some advantages to the present form of the estimates over the previous ones. Opinions will differ. But I think this form which sets out the current and capital together even though we don't debate capital at this present moment, does give members a better bird's eye view of the total financial implications in each department's activities. And while you may say that information could be obtained in another way, and I suppose it can, I think it really does no harm to set it out in this way as we have done in these estimates. Now, Mr. Chairman, I claim no perfection for them. We're always looking for ways and means of improving them and to provide the House with all proper information without getting down to that very minute examination of items which members who had some experience in office will know - would bog us down here for a very long time. I think these estimates do set out a reasonable picture of what's going on and if any figures seems to be obscure or that further detail is required, we'll do our best to provide it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable the First Minister has made a very fair and proper statement, and I think, as far as we're concerned, we appreciate

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . the co-operative attitude that he's taken toward the consideration of these estimates because they are extremely important - they're very important to me -- I still consider this to be one of the main jobs that we have to do -- and they're not too easy to understand. The most of us, and certainly I am one of this group, are not too familiar with intricate financial statements - that's what this is - a financial statement and at best fairly intricate. And I think the ones of us who have been here for some length of time to the extent that we understand them, should try and make them as intelligible as possible to the newer members and others who haven't had that same opportunity, and eventually they certainly will get to be just as familiar with them as we.

But, while I agree in general with what the Honourable the First Minister has said with regard to the double debate, I must confess that when I had the pleasure of sitting in the seat that he now occupies, that I was sometimes concerned over the fact that from this side of the House we would hear particular matters debated on the Minister's salary, when the item was very, very plainly staring them in the face just a few lines down the page. And I think that it is for the advantage of the expedition of the work that we should try and keep to the point as far as possible. So I support the Honourable the First Minister in that as far as I'm concerned, with the exception of this first general discussion which I'm taking the advantage of indulging in - the same as the Honourable the First Minister has - with this exception, and perhaps at very odd times general remarks on the minister's salary, I shall try to keep to that program myself.

With regard to the form the Honourable the First Minister said that he doesn't claim perfection for it and I guess that I'm so old-fashioned anyway that I get rather used to the form of the estimates that we used through the years -- and I certainly don't suggest that there couldn't be improvements made in it. But I think that in general there is no point in changing just for the sake of change, and I must confess that I was critical during the election campaign - very critical - of one of the changes and that's the one on the public debt page. I think it would be not in order to discuss it at the present time because that's not before us and these are just general introductory remarks that I'm making, but when that time comes, I shall try and say the same things that I said to the electorate - I expect it to have no more - carry no more weight here than it did with the electorate -- but it's sincerely said, just the same. And I think that unless there's an evident advantage in changing, then the same form should be preserved because we tend to become used to the set-up. And I was unkind enough to charge - I make this statement because of what the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said a little while ago when he seemed to be displeased over the fact that even with the careful reading that he evidently gave to my speeches while the campaign was on, that he had missed any mention of the fact that I had criticized that particular Bill that was under discussion. Well, I criticized it and the same attitude that we're talking about, and I criticized some of the things in the form of the estimates that had been presented to us last spring. Because I think that unless a real good reason can be shown for the change that the form should be adhered to through the years so as to make them as easy as possible to compare, with one another. And my major complaint here is that these are not easy to compare with one another, and with all the interest that I take in the financial matters of government, and with all the attempts that I have made to try and understand the set-up here, I am still wondering about page 1 and where it carries over onto page 2. I assume that these are two sessions that we're talking about. I'm right in that I suppose. I'm assuming that they're two sessions. I'm still not certain whether they're the session that is passed - certainly I know of the one that we're in now. But whether the other one is the session that is passed or the one to come later in this fiscal year, I'm still not certain. And there are quite a few general changes in the estimates that we may have to comment on as we go through them, but, as far as the overall position is concerned, I agree almost entirely with what the First Minister is concerned with - certainly we shall try to deal with them expeditiously and never to hold them up.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't wish to prolong this discussion too far, Mr. Speaker, because there's not any real point of argument between us, I don't think, just to say that the figure for last year that is shown in this book has been -- were necessary -- made so that it is strictly comparable with the figure for this year. So that if you are looking for a comparison between the two years, the figure on the left hand side is to the best of our accountant's technique, and I'm sure it's

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . accurate, an exact comparison with the similar item as labelled for last year. So I think that will help in the comparisons although I know that the honourable member had another point in mind when he spoke. But I do wish to point out that the figures on the left hand side are on all fours with the figures on the right hand side, and there's not an attempt there to juggle those around. The other thing on the question of the indemnities, I'm sure the appropriate Minister will explain when we reach those points.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . .hear possibly of the Ministers . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I know what you mean, you mean the indemnity of the members.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right!

MR. ROBLIN: But the point is that you will notice there's no comparison between this current year and the last one for the item on the bottom of the page, for the simple reason that this is the first time in the history of the province, I'm aware of, that we've had this kind of a situation with three legislatures in one year. Now legislative appropriations are statutory insofar as one session per year is concerned, and the appropriation at the top of the page is the statutory one for next spring which is the usual way of showing those in the estimates. The new item is the item at the bottom that the honourable member made reference to and that is the vote that will be necessary to pay themembers for this session. It's not statutory; it has to be voted specially. As far as I know we've never had an occasion to do this before, but on account of the two sessions, that's the way it happens to - our legal people tell us it has to be done in order to be legal to pay.

And while I'm on that very interesting topic perhaps I should say that until we get the interim supply bill, we're unable to make any advances to members on their salaries. I've made a few enquiries about that and I'm afraid that my technical advisors who give me the word on this kind of thing, say that we've got to get the interim supply through to give you your instalment.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sure that nothing my honourable friend could have said would have expedited the consideration of the estimates as much as that one remark. But I know he gave me an answer to this --- I didn't catch it -- the first one's on page 1. Are they for the session that has been held. . . . . the one . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: 1960.

MR. CAMPBELL: I rather thought that but my only point in that case is that, shouldn't they have come after the others in that case?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, you might argue that - the only thing is that I can say that custom so far has decreed that when an item is not voted but statutory as this one is, that it's at the top of the page here - now that's the way its been done in the past, but obviously there's no reason why it can't be arranged in some other order if it's considered desirable.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have no complaints.

MR. PAULLEY (Leader of the C. C. F. Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, just before we start, possibly I may say a word or two on the changing of the format. I appreciate the fact that those of us that were fortunate enough to have been in this legislature prior to June 16th of last year will find a considerable difference in them in that, many of the departments the sums are lumped whereas previously they were broken down in greater detail. I don't think though, Mr. Chairman, that's going to bother too many in this House because as I look around, and particularly on the other side of the House, there are only four or five there that were here before June 16th of last year. It certainly only applies to three of us in our group and not too many of the Liberals either.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . .larger percentage but still not too many.

MR. PAULLEY: So anyway on that I think it will be somewhat confusing to us that were here previously, but as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned that years of custom and that, you get ingrained or indoctrinated into how things are being done or are being done. And as far as the new members are concerned, of course, they're starting out from scratch.

Now as far as our group, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the First Minister that it will not be our intention to delay unnecessarily the passing of the estimates. Certainly we consider it one of our duties to scrutinize as closely as we are capable of doing the expenditures proposed by the government. I think I can say with reasonable certainty at the present time that the present Ministers of the Crown will not be faced with a motion of reduction of their

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . salary to a dollar, as happened to a very honourable friend of mine on one or two occasions -- unless he's the proposer of that particular motion, Mr. Chairman. But I appreciate very much the replies to my questions from the Honourable the First Minister, and again say that while we of our C. C. F. group are going to scrutinize these estimates and ask many questions in connection with them, it will only be an endeavour to render a service to the people of Manitoba who have chosen us as their representatives.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a few questions and make a short comment: Is it the intention of the government to follow in the sequence with the various departments as it appears in the estimates?

MR. ROBLIN: As far as possible, Mr. Chairman. Some of us may have to be away from Winnipeg at various times according to our calendar, and it may be that our estimates will be up at that time, in which case we will ask the indulgence of the committee to proceed with the next Minister and come back -- but so far as we can we'd like to go through them in the order in which they stand.

MR. MILLER: And, of course, we will receive as much notice as possible?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I thought I might be able to give you some information on that very point now, but I can't really at the moment.

MR. MILLER: With much that the First Minister said, I'm in complete accord, particularly the desirability of avoiding duplication, and as he will remember, I endeavour to avoid duplication on all occasion -- without success. I also agree that, in general, it might be much better if the Minister gave a not too lengthy resume of everything that is happening in his department. The First Minister correctly pointed out that on previous occasions some ministers used either method. I might say too, Mr. Chairman, that I used both -- in some instances I made a statement, and in some instances I asked that the committee proceed with the proper estimates. I might make an observation that that too even if I didn't speak, the Opposition always spoke on the Minister's salary with some effect and there was considerable duplication.

Now as to the grouping, I can't agree with the First Minister, because in one department, at least, of which I have some knowledge, it will be practically impossible for the new members to thoroughly understand the main groupings. And that will mean that questions will have to be asked by the Minister for an explanation, or a break-down and we will have to take notes because some of us may have old estimates, but the majority of this House won't have access to them. And so I suggest that this streamlining will not expedite the business of the House, and it will mean considerable work on the part of the Minister. However, I can assure him that I have no intention of moving any reduction on any Minister's salary; I will co-operate to the fullest extent, always reserving the right to demand a full explanation on each item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to proceed? Department of Legislation 1. Assembly 1 (a) has been stated is just statutory and is not an item on which we vote. 1 (b) a. Travelling Expenses - \$1,300. - b. Opposition Leader - \$2,500. c. Salaries: Deputy Speaker or Chairman of the Committee of the Whole - \$750.; Other Salaries - \$31,165.; sub-total - \$31,950. d. Supplies, Expenses, Equipment . . . . .

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on other salaries there seems to be quite a considerable increase. Will the Minister explain that?

HON. MARCEL BOULIC (Provincial-Secretary) (Cypress): You've gone so fast, Mr. Chairman, that I haven't quite followed you. Where are we?

A MEMBER: We want to know what the other salaries are now.

MR. BOULIC: Other salaries. . .

MR. MILLER: In the previous year they were \$18,740. Does it represent an increase in staff?

MR. BOULIC: This represents 12 transcribers and 3 supervisors for Hansard. The increase there is the Hansard.

MR. MILLER: It does not apply to two sessions?

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, could you go back an item. Just a question. I was looking in the public accounts at appropos to travelling expenses. I wonder if somebody could explain how they are calculated? Is it one trip a session for the members from home to the session.

MR. ROBLIN: It's a question of mileage, Mr. Chairman, and this is something that some

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . of the Committee of Cabinet have been giving some consideration to changing the basis of this expenditure, particularly for those members who are in Northern areas that have such an enormous territory to cover. The way it works out now, it doesn't seem to quite do them justice, and we are searching for a formula which would still not be excessive insofar as members in Winnipeg or close to Winnipeg are concerned and yet would give a fairer arrangement to the members in the northern constituencies. Perhaps by next session we'll have a suggestion to make in that respect but right now I believe it's on a mileage basis.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, and it's statutory too actually. It's a mileage basis and it's just from the edge of your constituency and by the shortest mail route and 10¢ a mile (A Member: as the crow flies. . . .) once a session.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the matter of other salaries, I have to refer here back further, that is in the estimates under the next page, where we again have other salaries. Now this first page I understand is for the session next January or March, or January and February. Is that correct? This second page is for the present session that we are in now. (Item 5, yes) Well, there's no number on mine.

MR. ROBLIN: Either the appropriation or the resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, well 4 a). Now, why is it that salaries are different for this session than what you intend to have them for the next session? What change do you intend to do?

MR. BOULIC: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think we should explain the item 1 b)-c) - Salaries. I can give you the complete details - The Clerk of the House - \$4,500: Mr. Snider of the Internal Economy - \$720: Sergeant-at-Arms - \$600: and then there's \$11,100 for the five clerks, assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, six group room stenos, and for 12 transcribers and 3 supervisors for Hansard - \$14,245: which makes a total of \$31,165.

MR. MILLER: 18 bodies isn't there?

MR. BOULIC: 18 bodies. Are we up to No. 5 now or . . . .

A MEMBER: No, not yet.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, am I in place now to ask what salaries the casual help, what wages the casual help, and the pages get?

MR. BOULIC: Do you mean the messengers?

MR. GRAY: Oh! no. The casual help that we have here - messengers and the pages.

MR. BOULIC: Messengers, yes. Well, messengers - 3 at \$7.00 a day; and 2 at \$8.00 a day. They also have \$3.00 per night when there is evening sessions.

MR. GRAY: Pages?

MR. BOULIC: Pages - \$175.00 per session -- and their clothing, of course.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on the same item - the earlier part of that, the Deputy Speaker or Chairman of the Committee of the Whole - it's not important but I would think why wouldn't we have stayed with the designation we had before -- simply Deputy Speaker -- or if we were going to change, why don't we put in the correct title. The new correct title I believe Mr. Chairman, is: Chairman of Committees - not Chairman of Committee of the Whole -- and the 'distributive' surely is not the right word to us, it's the connective - your Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. Now that's not a very important point, but it's an exemplification of the thing that I mentioned a minute ago. Why make changes just for the sake of changes? If we do make changes, let's make them better than that one. I prefer to call the Chairman here, the Deputy Speaker. I think there is some advantage in doing that, but actually I believe his title is: Chairman of Committees.

MR. ROBLIN: We could take that into consideration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . rather infer that it may be \$750. for each.

MR. CAMPBELL: That would be a good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals and total vote for the Other Assembly Expenditures - \$43,750.00. 2. Comptroller - General's office a) Salaries: Comptroller-General - \$12,000. Other Salaries - \$272,395.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a point that I can make later on but I give notice of it now because here we have the salary of the Comptroller-General -- it is mentioned - it's put right in the estimates, and I think that's proper; I think the senior officials, at least, that it's right that we should put them in because it's been in in the past so I think that when we come to the others, we should also show the Deputy Minister. I think there is some point in doing

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . that. Now we do show here the Comptroller-General -- by the way, I presume this is his present salary. Is it?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is his present salary.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll raise the point when we come to some department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other salaries - \$272,395. . . . .

MR. MILLER: This represents an increase of four I take it in the department.

MR. ROBLIN: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: What are their duties?

MR. ROBLIN: There has been one new accountant III added who will be used in addition to his other functions to audit the Manitoba Development Fund and the Agricultural Credit Corporation. We are also filling three other established posts, which were previously established but evidently not filled. They are now being filled due to the pressure of work.

MR. MILLER: What are the salaries, Mr. Chairman? The average is. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Well the Comptroller-General gets \$12,000: the Chief Auditor gets \$8,400: Auditor of Disbursements gets \$8,040: Provincial Accountant - \$6,780: there's auditors under him - 17 audit clerks at \$94,320. Are you any good at mental long division? I'm not.

MR. MILLER: I'm nearly as good as themember for Burrows.

MR. ROBLIN: Students - \$23,610 - 12 of them. Stenographers and machine operators - 26 at \$70,530; and 8 clerks at \$29,924. being their salary.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . is this the item under which if the government undertakes greater responsibility in municipal audits that this will come? . . . Some mention of that before.

MR. ROBLIN: I doubt it. I perhaps would have to check this point but it's a combination of responsibilities between the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Comptroller-General. I think the Comptroller-General keeps a very close supervisory eye on this -- the calibre of the men under the accounts, etc., -- but my understanding is that it is the municipal department that actually selects these men and makes the arrangements with the municipalities.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, does the Comptroller-General's office take in students going for chartered accountants?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think the Comptroller-General's office does take in students, of that nature.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what are the three positions that were not previously filled and are now being filled?

MR. ROBLIN: The actual positions that were not filled were audit clerks and they undertake the duties that their name describes. They were previously on the establishment and no provision was made for filling them. We are making provision to fill them at the present time though the people, I believe, have not actually been employed yet -- but we are making provision in case they should be.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, do you want to pursue your question?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, just an explanation. I was actually searching, Mr. Chairman, for the inner junta of my Honourable friend from Rhineland and I was wondering if this is where it is to be found or elsewhere? (A Member: Treasury Board).

MR. ROBLIN: Oh! we're going to lay a pretty good trail so we'll lead him right up to that one without any trouble.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, when we're talking of establishment, that is the established staff in any department; and we have the figures of the number such as we have here in the Comptroller-General's office of 74, I am wondering if it would be possible for whoever is in charge when we come to that to inform us as to whether that is the complete establishment or those at presently engaged in the respective departments.

Continued on Next Page

MR. ROBLIN: That figure is the number of persons for whom provision is made in this estimate. It does not mean that those people are actually working at the present time . . . . .

A MEMBER: That's my point.

MR. ROBLIN: In fact, it was our policy to refrain from making a good many of new engagements until we knew that we were re-elected and would have the approval of the public for so doing and so -- even with that consideration in mind not all those posts are yet filled.

I would like to say on that particular matter that some erroneous conclusions were drawn as to increases in the strength of the civil service by members opposite in the course of the last little contest on the platform. They apparently added up the number of civil servants reported in the last estimates and compared it with this and came out with a very large increase in staff. Actually that conclusion cannot properly be made because we are reporting in these estimates persons who were previously employed by the government but not shown for some reason, as civil servants in these numbers that were shown here. So that the charge that was made that we had increased the civil servants by some 700 people -- or we're going to -- was pretty well wide of the mark -- and when we come to the proper item here I will be glad to bring in some figures and tell the House what the facts are.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite sure the Honourable the First Minister doesn't want to accuse the opposition for figuring out that number, because as I recall it -- that number -- that figure of 700 was contained in the Return asked by a member of the C.C.F. Party, and naturally we assumed that it was correct.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, my honourable friend makes a lot of assumptions some of which are not all correct.

MR. MILLER: Well, in this case you can't accuse me of it. If your government furnishes the information.

MR. ROBLIN: I'd be happy to exonerate you from any misrepresentation.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: As a matter of fact, I believe in confessing my sins, especially after the lecture I got from the Honourable the Minister this afternoon. I must confess that I used that. Once again it didn't make anything like the impact that I expected it to do. It would have carried a lot of weight with me; I thought it would have with a lot of other people. But when I made it I always made it plain, and I think this was a proper qualification, I always made it plain that that was an estimate, that 700, that had been given by the Honourable Member, former member, for Assiniboia, Mr. Swailes, and I always gave the qualification. I always told that it was Mr. Swailes who had made that computation and I always said I don't vouch for it -- but I must say that I have more confidence in Mr. Swailes' arithmetic than I would have in his policies. Now that I've heard the Honourable Member for Burrows, I think maybe I'd withdraw that remark. I don't think they're very good on arithmetic either. But I did use that and I think in that connection -- I think the Honourable the First Minister is perfectly justified if it's wide of the mark in telling us at the appropriate time what it is because, certainly, I wouldn't want to be in the position of being misquoted on it. I always gave the source.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I agree with my honourable friend that his statement made very little impact at the time. If it had we'd have answered it then.

MR. J.M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable First Minister mentioned some time ago, or a few minutes ago, that he intended to give us a complete report of the number of civil servants working for this government. Now, is it possible that we can have that breakdown for each department? Because I'm interested in those figures because from time to time the figure was given to us unfortunately, probably it wasn't true, but I think it's only fair that the government should justify its position. Not only to us but to the public as well, as to actually how many civil servants are actually working for the Manitoba Government.

MR. ROBLIN: We'd be glad to give the information. Give it to -- give you the whole works.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (D) The Supplies Expenses, Equipment and Renewals - \$19,800. Comptroller-General's office total - \$304,195. 3. Legislative . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask in connection with supplies, equipment and renewals, if I recall correctly, a number of years ago the honourable the -- present Honourable Minister of

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . Industry and Commerce suggested new IBM machines and the likes of that in various departments -- I am wondering whether this would be the proper item to ask the government how the modernization, shall I call it, of our equipment in the various offices are -- is progressing.

MR. ROBLIN: This is shown -- I don't mind referring to this matter under the Comptroller-General provided that we have our debate now on the IBM and not on some other item later on. If the committee would be willing we can discuss it now and get it out of the way.

A MEMBER: It would be hard to . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: It's as good a place as any. Now, the government has been giving serious consideration to extending the IBM system in various departments where it can be shown to us that the extra money that we'll spend in capital investment in such equipment or in rentals, as the case may be, will more than offset -- will be more than offset by the saving that will be made in the introduction of such a system. Now, we have taken some tentative steps in this direction, although our plans are by no means complete. For example, in the Department of Education arrangements have been made to bring in IBM systems in connection with marking of papers and getting answers out -- getting the records out for the students in the province and other people who want to know. That is very, I understand, we're advised, and I believe it to be correct, that that is a process that lends itself very well to an IBM application. -- (Interjection) -- Well, probably that some of the examiners don't like some of the answers that they get themselves. That seems to be the cause of the trouble. I don't know whether we can put them through the machine or not, but I think the Minister will agree, if I say that we are introducing that for this spring.

Now, there is also an extensive application of the IBM principal in the Motor Vehicle Control Branch that has been in effect for some time and we are extending it. A study is being made of all the bits and pieces of paper that float around in the administrative machine -- and believe me there is plenty of it -- with a view to trying to reduce this thing to a greater degree of order and to make it possible to process it by the IBM system. The Hospital Service Plan is very well adapted to that kind of thing and extensive IBM installations are being made -- or use will be made of those installations there.

We are considering whether it will be possible to install a central IBM office, you might say, in the new office building that's being built down the street. Naturally one doesn't put this equipment in each department, but rather one puts in a central bank of this equipment and the departments bring in their work so that you get maximum use of the machinery in question. Now, those are matters which have yet not been decided because we want to be thoroughly satisfied that in bringing those matters under IBM we're going to save money. There's no sense doing it just for fun. And the information we have is that it will save money. There are some unanswered questions about it which have not yet been settled. There is, of course, the matter of whether you use IBM or some other manufacturers' equipment. And those things are all being studied. Now, the Comptroller-General is a man who has a lot to say about this because he is interested in the results from the audit point of view, and also from his Comptroller-General's function. And he is working -- and dare I say it -- with members of the Treasury Board with this -- the "Junta" or whatever it is -- are busily engaged with the Comptroller-General in getting us the answers we need to make decisions on some of these matters. Progress has been made and we believe more progress will be made, and we think there are a good many of our paper procedures which can be handled cheaper this way. But we're going to be sure that in putting in or making these extensive changes, it's done for a good reason, namely to save the taxpayers a little money.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . one of the machines and put it in. Should we get an IBM?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 3 - Legislative printing and binding.

MR. HAWRYLUK: I presume that it's the customary thing to have this open for bids, and how many different companies received contracts for the legislative printing and binding?

MR. BOULIC: I could supply the information. I haven't got it here. But every December these -- for this work, tenders are called and the job is awarded to the lowest tender.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Could you give us the names of the people that got the contracts?

MR. BOULIC: We could do that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I hate to go back an item, but if I may, back to supplies

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . expenses, equipment, renewals. I noticed in last year's estimates it was broken down between standard and then purchase of equipment non-recurring. Now, this year we show a reduction there. I presume there is no purchase of equipment this year in that figure?

MR. BOULIC: That's item 2B is it?

MR. MOLGAT: 2B, right.

MR. BOULIC: Let me just find my place here.

MR. ROBLIN: The reduction is mainly in microfilming.

MR. BOULIC: That's where it is.

MR. MOLGAT: Is there purchase of equipment included in that though?

MR. ROBLIN: If it's of a minor nature, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Last year the figure showed 3,100 in purchase of equipment non-recurring, which is what built up the total to twenty-two seven. Other than that the figure last year was nineteen six.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I'm afraid I can't tell you what was done last year, because, as the committee will appreciate, that wasn't my responsibility then; but I can give the committee a breakdown of what the present figure comprises. Perhaps that would answer the honourable member. The figure of 19,800 is the one you're looking at. Now, this is your breakdown: Automobiles - 1,000; advertising exhibits - \$50; books, newspapers and periodicals - \$50; fees - \$250. Last year there was freight, express and cartage, and machinery and equipment which is not in this year because we're not buying any. Microfilming - \$1,700; postage, telephone and telegraph - \$250; printing, stationery and office maintenance - \$12,100; travelling expenses - \$4,400; Total - \$19,800.

MR. MILLER: In connection with microfilming. My understanding was that this is a very useful method of doing away with a lot of obsolete government documents, and I'm just wondering whether you're decreasing the use of microfilming or whether the report of the inter-departmental committee, which I understand control microfilming, brought in the report that necessitates a reduction in that amount?

MR. ROBLIN: You will find votes for microfilming, Mr. Chairman, scattered throughout the various departments where the work is to be done. But I think I can give a general answer to the question that has been raised and that is that microfilming is very valuable and we are using it to the maximum possible extent; because it enables us to make great savings in space, and space costs money. So we are following that energetically. It might be a matter of interest to note that we're centralizing our microfilming activities even though the appropriations are scattered through the departments that pay for it. It's a similar situation to the Queen's Printer. And when we got the total requirement for microfilming for the current year, we put it out to bid. Several bids came in and when they were examined we thought they were rather high, and the matter was submitted to our experts on the Treasury Board -- which I apologize for mentioning -- and they were able to make changes in the specifications, and changes in the procedures which were suggested by the microfilming experts themselves, which is going to save the province over the course of the years, that this thing will take place, \$78,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Isn't it a fact that the -- Mr. Chairman, that the microfilming, so far as the backlog is concerned, is pretty well caught up now? Isn't that where the real saving is?

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Speaker -- Mr. Chairman, not at all. There's a great deal of microfilming to be done. There's a great deal to be done still in the library and in places like that, and it was in consideration of this backlog as well as with our current procedures that this great saving was effected. Suggestions were made as to better, cheaper ways to do it by our own people which is saving us this large sum of money.

MR. MILLER: That only applies to the Comptroller-General's Department. And it might be said that the Comptroller-General's Department is pretty well caught up with its backlog.

MR. ROBLIN: I would say that's a logical deduction but I can't vouch for its accuracy.

MR. MOLGAT: Will that figure include the printing of the Throne Speech? Is that where it is included?

MR. ROBLIN: No, that will not include the printing of the Throne Speech. I really can't tell, my honourable friend, exactly what item that comes under. It probably comes under this item that we passed here of the Assembly expenses, supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals under Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislative printing and binding - \$39,850; 4. Operation of recording equipment: (a) salaries - \$1,050; (b) supplies -

MR. CAMPBELL: I have some remarks to make here. I am going to suggest that perhaps the designation of this group No. 4 should be changed, because ...

MR. ROBLIN: Careful, that's the way it was last year.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right, but there wasn't a Hansard last year and, not in a way that it is now, and I think the estimates should reflect changes of that kind that are made and that we should group the Hansard expenses, so far as possible, together. For instance, a good many of the people whose salaries are shown back in an item that we've already passed -- according to the statement of the Minister, and I'm sure that would be right -- are Hansard staff. Now I would think it's only proper that we should group all of the Hansard operation together because this one shows only the operation of the recording equipment, and surely that should be tied in with Hansard itself. I have a personal interest in this matter, I admit, because years ago when it was first discussed in the House that we should perhaps have a Hansard in this House, I was one of the ones, as honourable members would expect, that protested about what it would cost, and I said that I was very sure -- I can't recall just how many years ago this occurred -- probably one of the other honourable members present at that time will be able to recall the year -- quite a while ago since we started the recording equipment -- and I remember that the protestations were loud and long that this would never lead on to a full recording system. And I prophesied, at that time, that it would and that eventually the cost would grow. And I'm not protesting about the fact that there is a Hansard now; even I change my mind sometimes, and while I still don't think that it's worth the money, yet I must say that I think those who are responsible for doing it have been doing a very creditable job. Certainly the young man who has been operating the recording equipment here through some years, has done an excellent job, and I think considering how new this is that the staff themselves are doing well -- even if they find me very hard to take down -- they still, I think, have done a good job. But I would like it that the public knows how much this particular innovation is costing; I would like to see all the expenditures under that heading grouped in one place. Because I think it's only fair that it should be and that the word "Hansard", if that's a good word to use for ours -- it's generally used, should be applied so that it can be picked out in that way.

Then I was going to ask, as well, that the Honourable the Minister would furnish us, not necessarily now, that he made available to us and put it on the record sometime -- perhaps he has it with him -- the numbers that there are on the courtesy list, and then the numbers of subscribers; and I want to know the numbers of subscribers who pay for it, not the ones who get it because they're members of the Legislative Assembly, or who get it because they're in a library or university or municipal officials or other governments. I want to know how many people pay for it. How many are interested enough to get it in that way. And I would like to know whether the government itself distributes to any people besides this courtesy list of institutions -- do they extend the courtesy list to any individuals? And quite frankly what I'm wanting to find out is if the wide-spread interest in Hansard is as great as people had led us to believe. Now if it is, and there are a lot of people that are subscribing to it, then that's the best evidence that we can get that it is appreciated.

And the point that I got up to make first of all is that I would suggest that we get all of the expenses in connection with it, grouped in one place with something that designates it as "Hansard", appearing in the item.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up what the Leader of the Opposition has just said about the Hansard. I would just like to recall and remind the members of this House that it was the C. C. F. group that first put in a resolution about this Hansard about eight or ten years ago. -- (Interjection - Naturally!) -- Naturally! And at the time it was voted down unanimously by the Liberals - time and time again, because of the cost -- the good old Scottish blood coming to the fore all the time. But all of a sudden I see a change of light, ever since the Conservatives were willing to take a gamble and a chance to produce this Hansard.

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . I think that the publication of this Hansard is definitely an asset; an asset to the members of the House, and particularly those people who ought to know what's going on in the House, especially in detailed information. Because as much as the Press is doing, and we've got to give them a great deal of credit, they cannot in detail, put everything down what is being discussed in the House. And there are people who are interested in the general procedures that take place in the House during the session, and I'm sure that possibly at the present time, there might be very few subscribers, but I think it's just a matter of time before more and more people will be interested.

So I just want to bring to the attention that we, the C. C. F., were the people that wanted the Hansard away back, time and time again. Now I know that the Liberals on the hustings and the Conservative members made very good use of Hansard before May 14th -- very good use. Time and time again they made reference to the remarks that were made in the House, so therefore it did have some effect -- it did help the Conservatives, I can say that. (Interjection) The only thing that I would like to find out, and that is important I think, because the question of cost, I think, is of prime importance, but I think if we can get that information from you, Sir, we would like to get the actual cost of what it costs to say produce the Hansard daily, and on the basis of what it costs during the regular session. Have you any figure what it costs daily?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in the remarks on the question of recording and Hansard, because while the C. C. F. claim that they were the first to introduce a resolution in connection with Hansard, I must confess that I was the first to introduce the resolution in connection with the recording machine, and that was one of the rare occasions when I didn't agree with the present Leader of the Opposition. I might say that strange as it may seem on that occasion, I had the wholehearted support of the present Minister of Agriculture. As I recall it, there are only two members in this House left who sat on that Committee. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the vote didn't show it. That's right -- just the two of us, and I think quite frankly that it has a very definite bearing -- I'm not talking too much about Hansard, I'd like to know like my leader what the distribution is -- whether the public interest is such that it warrants the quite considerable expenditures. But, I do think that the most important part is the recording of the speeches, so that we have a permanent record of what each honourable member says. And another thing too, I think as happened today, sometimes my good friends in the Press gallery don't hear the members' remarks properly, or correctly, and the member in question can always refer to the recording machine or to Hansard and ask for a correction -- which I'm sure our friends in the gallery will be only too glad to give. So I must confess that while I generally agree with my leader, on that occasion we were at loggerheads and he led the campaign against the recording machine, and on that occasion at least, I was successful.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of Hansard, I think now that it is in operation there are certain items that we should look at. One in particular is this question of corrections. Now I notice that certain of the members get up on occasion and ask that Hansard be corrected because of a certain statement that they made. Many other members do not get up. Many corrections go by -- or are not made I should say -- that should be made. Partly because some of the members, such as myself -- probably prefer not to reread our speeches -- also on a number of occasions -- (Interjection) -- we haven't got the time to reread all our speeches. And if we had to sit down every day and reread Hansard for the sake of making corrections, it could take up a great deal of time of the House before the Orders of the Day regularly now. If some members do it and others don't, then it puts those who do not make the corrections under difficulties at times because that could be used against them in the future if they had not made a correction. So could we not establish a policy, either not to make any corrections at all, or to make all of them or something of the sort so that all the members would be on an equal footing?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, if we start making corrections I think they will have to change my speech every time.

MR. ROBLIN: I rather think our present system isn't too bad in this way that if somebody has a correction to make which -- on a point which seriously misrepresents what he says, then he makes it, and I think probably that's the right thing to do. But I share with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose a certain distaste for reading my own remarks over again, having

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . had to make them and listen to them in that way is usually punishment enough for me. But when on occasion I have looked them over, I found most of the mistakes are grammatical or perhaps some infelicity of phrase that one wouldn't really like to be quoted as having said, but which doesn't alter the substance. So I say let members rise if they feel that Hansard seriously misrepresents them, or otherwise let's just let it go along with the knowledge that people really don't expect us to be literally perfect in the remarks that we make here. If the sense is not distorted why I don't think anyone is hurt.

MR. MOLGAT: If the public assumes that Hansard is corrected and some member is wrongly reported in Hansard -- does not catch it because he has not read his speech -- then the public would assume that that is exactly what he has said. Now . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I have a solution for that. I think we'll put on the front page of Hansard the little motto "Unrevised and Unrepentant".

MR. MOLGAT: Very well.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, there's one other matter that I wanted to mention with regard to Hansard, and I think it is an extremely important matter. This question of revision is not so important and I'm pretty much inclined to agree with the Honourable the First Minister in that regard. I can understand that as busy as he is bound to be, that he hasn't much time to reread his speeches. It's possible that he could get someone to do it for him but anyone who did it for him wouldn't take quite the same interest and wouldn't know just what he had in mind in the way that he would. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well, it is a difficult matter to deal with. Some of us that now have a little more time than we used to have, maybe would have time for that, but it must be a problem for the Members of the Cabinet at least. And I think that is one reason that this has led to something that I also predicted -- and I wasn't going to mention that until this question of correction came up -- it has led to something that I predicted at the time these discussions were going on. I predicted that the introduction of a Hansard would result in more reading of speeches, and Mr. Chairman, it has. More reading of speeches. All you need to do, and to some extent that is done in self-defence, because the most of us find it pretty difficult to get exactly the phrasing that we want when we don't have pretty carefully drawn-out notes. And I think that if we're going to allow the reading of speeches to continue in the way that it has been developing here, and I hope that we'll find that the new members probably set we older folk a good example in this -- and by the way, one of them did yesterday. I would like to compliment the Honourable Member for Flin Flon on very little use of notes and a very, very good use of them in the way that he did it. But generally speaking, if we're not going to deal with this question of reading speeches, then we should change our rule about reading speeches, because our rule and the House of Commons rule says that it's out of order to read from a previously prepared text with certain exceptions for certain debates, and certain Cabinet Ministers making statements and things of that kind. Now, I'm quite serious about that because I think there's a real good reason behind the rule in the House of Commons, which we have copied, for not reading speeches. The argument runs something like this, that otherwise they could have been prepared by people outside the House, and don't necessarily represent the views or the thought of the member himself. And, I'm quite serious about this because I think that it's a matter that Mr. Speaker should take under advisement himself.

I got into a lot of trouble here, I didn't consider it any trouble, but I was criticized a lot here awhile ago because of what I said about Ottawa's Hansard. I used a phrase that was colloquial or slangy, but it was expressive, because I said that the average person did not realize the extent to which the Ottawa Hansard is "doctored". Well, "doctored" wasn't a very good frame -- use of the word, "doctored" -- could have got a better word than that but -- (Interjections) -- No, I won't get into that argument. (Laughter) But, a lot of people -- a lot of people took me to task for that in this House, some of the members, I think, of the C.C.F. Party of that time, and even went to the trouble to write down to Ottawa to try and prove that that Hansard is not edited down there to the extent that it is. And, just the other day, you'll notice in the papers, that the P.M. had to make some explanation about the fact that he had changed the sense to some extent.

Now, it's always been the fact -- always, from time immemorial, as far as Ottawa is concerned that the staff itself at Ottawa has corrected grammatical errors, and then they also round out the sentences. If the member forgets to come up -- doesn't come up from some

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . involved argument that he is giving or something of that kind -- the staff themselves have done that. And, it's always been the custom down there as well that within a certain length of time, the first edition is put before the member so that the member has an opportunity, it's sometimes done by his secretary, I know, of checking it over for obvious corrections, and it is taken as a sort of gentlemen's agreement that the sense will not be changed, but frequently the sense has been changed. And, all you need to know about whether the Ottawa Hansards are edited or not, is to hear, the most of the members -- not all of them, but the most of the members, make a speech and then read one of their speeches in Hansard, and the difference shows up immediately. And, the reason that I come back to this again is that I want to say in all sincerity to this House, that I think we are making a mistake -- I think the honourable members themselves are making a mistake if they disregard the rule that we have in this House about reading speeches. There are certain statements that the Ministers have to make that -- where they must be read. I understand that, and I do not object to the Ministers with important ministerial statements having them read. It's quite, quite right, but the rank and file, I think it's a mistake and I do think that Hansard has been to quite an extent responsible for that practice because a lot of us find that it reads pretty terribly when it comes off there, because we divert our attention from one thing to another, or we suffer an interruption, and an interruption can't be shown in there. So, I would plead with the honourable members for an attempt to be made to get away from breaking the rule about reading speeches or else -- or else, if we're going to do it -- if we're going to read them all on there, then let's change the rule.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as far as reading of speeches is concerned, but when we, the younger members of this House with little or no seniority see some of the older members with more experience getting away with obviously breaking the rules, and we ourselves have a desire to make a good impression and to make a letter perfect speech, or make as good a speech as possible, we have that desire. We see other members reading speeches and the natural reaction possibly is to feel that to make or keep up with the more experienced members, that you yourself are going to start reading a speech.

But, I do feel however, that we should be completely responsible in this House for every word that we say. I don't feel that any stenographer or any recording staff should change in any way the words that are spoken in this Assembly.

MR. CAMPBELL: I quite agree with that, and I was not advocating that. All I was pointing out was what Ottawa does. I quite agree with my honourable friend on that, unless -- unless it's an obvious error that has been made in the transcription and then I think they should go back to the record and if the record still says that that's the way it was said, I agree with my honourable friend -- put it down that way. I'm a believer in it coming out as is, but it's a lot of trouble to keep correcting it all the time.

MR. BOULIC: . . . . . what I gather by all the discussion on Hansard, it seems that the C.C.F. thought of it, the Liberals opposed it and we brought it in and everybody seems to be happy with it. (Applause)

MR. A.E. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, the matter of the cost of Hansard has been introduced in this discussion, and in all things that cost the government money, there's sometimes a distribution of the benefits derived from Hansard. So, I'd say if you ever get at the costs of Hansard you should distribute the costs according to what it is used. And, as the Opposition members spend about three-quarters of the time and use three-quarters of Hansard, they should be credited with the benefits from the Hansard, according to that.

MR. PAULLEY: Just before we leave that item, I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asks specific questions of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary in respect to the distribution, and I think before we leave that item -- we're also interested in it -- but before we do leave that item possibly we can have a reply.

MR. BOULIC: I have taken note of that.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, you will be submitting that?

MR. BOULIC: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4(a) - Salaries, \$1,050.00; (b) Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals, \$660.00; Total, \$1,710.00. Item 5 - First Session of the 26th Legislature (a) Members' Indemnity, \$112,000.00; Members' Expense Allowance, \$56,000.00; Speaker's Indemnity, \$4,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Speaker's Indemnity, I had made a suggestion earlier on that I thought there should be some further consideration given to this question of a debate on the so-called permanent Speakership, and I do not propose to spend any time on that now, but I am considering laying down a resolution so that the matter can be debated in that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) Speaker's Expense Allowance - \$2,000.00; (e) Travelling Expenses, \$1,300.00; (f) Opposition Leader - \$2,500.00; Deputy Speaker or Chairman of the Committee as a Whole - \$750.00; (h) Other Salaries, \$25,945.00.

MR. GRAY: Under the item (h) I think it was reported that the Sargent-at-Arms gets \$600.00, and he is -- he works here all year round, this is extra, it is not taken off of the other salary, is it?

MR. BOULIC: That \$600.00 is extra.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this item of other salaries, this comes back to the question I raised earlier under Item 1 (b) - (c). Now, this is for this special session, how many people are involved in that figure? It doesn't show it here.

MR. BOULIC: They are exactly the same as in No. 1-1 (c).

MR. MOLGAT: Then supplementary to that, Mr. Chairman, why is it that this time the item is \$25,900.00 and next time it shall be \$31,100.00, an increase of \$5,200.00? What is the reason for the difference?

MR. BOULIC: I'm afraid I'll have to check on that.

MR. ROBLIN: The reason is that the salaries of the Clerk of Internal Economy and the Clerk of Assembly are not shown twice. They're included in the first item only, but their salaries are not repeated for the second session. That is the explanation of the difference between the two sums. Except for the fact that the salaries of the Clerk of the Assembly and the Clerk of the Internal Economy are not included the second time the list is identical with the first one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals, \$7,435.00; (j) Legislative printing and binding - \$34,000.00; (k) Operation of Recording Instruments - \$1,710.00; Total for First Session of the 26th Legislature, \$247,640.00. Total sum to be voted for the Department - \$637,145.00.

MR. HAWRYLUK: What happened to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association that used to be under this Legislation section?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe that it's -- I will deal with that when we come to grants, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 2, Executive Council (1) Administration, (a) Salaries - Premier and President of the Council, \$10,000.00; Other Salaries, \$32,680.00; Sub-total, \$42,680.00.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, under other salaries, I note that there's an increase of 3, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister would give us a breakdown.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm particularly interested in the names of the senior people and their salaries.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I'll give you the whole works, Mr. Chairman. Myself, Premier and President - \$10,000.00; Minister without Portfolio - we haven't got one; D.R.C. Bedson, Clerk of the Executive Council, \$9,500.00.

MR. MILLER: Would you go a little slower?

MR. ROBLIN: Certainly. D.R.C. Bedson, Clerk of the Executive Council - \$9,500.00; M. May, Clerk IV - \$3,840.00; M. Constantini, Secretary to the Premier - \$3,660.00; I.D. McKenzie, Clerk-Typist II, \$2,640.00; Executive Assistant to the Premier, we haven't got, that was \$44,000.00 -- \$5,040.00 last time, we don't do that now; E. Fournier, Clerk - \$3,300.00; S.A. Gibbons, Secretary - \$3,660.00; C.L. Lavacque, Clerk-Typist III - \$2,580.00;

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . A. Simm, Clerk-Typist III - \$2,000.00; Holiday Relief - \$1,500.00; Total - \$42,680.00.

MR. PAULLEY: Thirty-two.

MR. ROBLIN: Including my salary, forty-two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals - \$6,800.00. Total Administration - \$49,480.00.

MR. MILLER: What is the increase, Mr. Chairman, of the \$2,800.00 over the last appropriation?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid I write more letters. Postage, telephone and telegraph is up from \$520.00 to \$1,000.00 on the estimate and travelling expenses is up \$900.00, from \$900.00 to \$1,800.00 and printing, stationery and office maintenance is up from \$1,400.00 to \$2,500.00. I think that will account for the differences - there may be a \$100.00 here or there someplace.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 - Federal Provincial Conference - \$2,750.00.

MR. PAULLEY: On this item, is there a Minister of Dominion-Provincial relations at this time?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: That is yourself, I presume Sir?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir. I'm thinking of abolishing the portfolio because I think its duties coincide with those of the Premier in any event. Anyway, I don't get paid for it separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.

MR. PAULLEY: Before we leave the Federal-Provincial Conference, there is a reduction in the amount in the appropriation, is that due to the fact that the Minister in charge of this department will not be requiring technical staff that normally goes along with the Minister on Federal-Provincial conferences or is it anticipated that the "do" that's going to be held in July will be shorter than usual and not quite as thorough?

MR. ROBLIN: I want to assure my honourable friend that I'm going to need all the expert help I can get at that conference, and we'll be sure to take those that we feel can assist in that way.

MR. PAULLEY: Will there be any representatives of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or the Urban Municipalities as observers -- I realize that it's just a Treasurer's conference, but I know in the past, or at least I understand in the past, that there was representation or observers from the municipalities, and even though this isn't a full-fledged conference, I appreciate that very much. I'm wondering whether or not there would be observers.

MR. ROBLIN: My friend has answered his own question, Mr. Chairman, it is a Treasurers' Conference, and we have not had any intimation that we would be -- it would be desired to take municipal men from the federal authority. We ourselves, are also of the opinion that this is not the type of conference at which they might be expected to attend. However, I have taken advantage to consult informally with the municipal men on this matter, and I trust I am fully seized of their problems.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd like to say a word on this matter, and I can understand that my honourable friend, the First Minister, would be consulting with the municipal officials. I think there is a wide-spread idea because I've said so much about municipal representation at these conferences, I think there is a widespread idea that I tried in some way to get a whole army of municipal people to attend these conferences on the same basis as Premiers and Cabinet Ministers of the provinces and of course, the Prime Minister and Federal Cabinet Ministers. We never had that in mind -- that wasn't the thought. We had -- what I had urged was simply that one person representing the -- all of the municipalities, and I had thought the -- called President or Chairman of the -- I always find it difficult to remember the name, but the Union of Mayors and Municipalities. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. Not of local one here, the Canadian one. The Union of Mayors -- the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, or some such name as that. That, as I understand it, is the closest that we have to a Canadian -- all Canadian organization, in the municipal field.

What I had suggested was that the one person, whoever was President of that organization should sit in -- if I can again borrow the phrase that the Flin Flon member used, at the one table, sit in with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet Ministers, the various Premiers and their Cabinet Ministers, and that that one person, representing the municipalities would sit in in that

(Mr. Campbell cont'd.) . . . way and then that we should, as all governments were willing that we should, we should individually from the provinces, take along representatives chosen by themselves of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and the Manitoba Urban Association, and that they, while they were there, could keep one another in contact and meet with their own official representative we sent who sat in there. I had never thought that this conference should be widened to where a whole host of municipal people should sit in around the table with the Prime Minister and his colleagues and the various provinces. But, I did think that it was well worthwhile, and we were the first ones to take municipal representatives along with us as advisors, as it was worthwhile to have one from Canada sit in and then the rest go along with the provinces. So, anybody that tries to tell you that I advocated all -- practically all the municipal people of Canada going down, it just wasn't that kind of a proposal. (Hear! Hear!)

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4. Grants and Miscellaneous - \$65,000.00.

MR. ROBLIN: Now, I'd like to make an explanation here, Mr. Chairman, because this is not a large sum as sums go these days, in government estimates, but it's an important one.

It seemed to us that there might be some advantage in collecting the various sorts of grants that were made by the province and placing them under one head, rather than having them scattered through the estimates as they have been. Now, that's a good idea perhaps, but it can't be carried to its ultimate conclusion because there are a good many grants that are truly of a departmental nature. One can think of grants in the Department of Health and Education and other places which are really not general grants at all, but are special to the department with which they are concerned.

So, it has been our thought that we would leave that kind of grant in the department where it now lies and as you go through the estimates, you will see that that item appears in various other departments as well as here. But, we have tried to collect all the grants of a general nature; cultural grants, welfare grants that cover a wide range, public safety and conservation and grants of that sort under one head in the Executive Council estimates, because it is the custom with us, I presume it's been the custom with our predecessors that we should around the Council table discuss these grants of a general nature and deal with them there. And, that's what we have done, so that this item appears here.

It's also an item that appears to be a considerable increase over the previous period, and so it is. When preparing these estimates, we picked all the grants of the same nature that were scattered in the last set of estimates and collated them so that the figure of \$32,550.00 is on all fours with the figure of \$65,000.00 that appears here and so, you will see that we have just about doubled -- more than doubled, the grants that are being offered to those who we feel deserve some recognition or support from the Provincial Treasury.

I must say that we do, by no means, regard our efforts here as perfect, nor have we made what we consider to be a thorough and proper analysis of the propriety of all the claims that have been made. The ones that are in here have been approved, but there are many others that have not yet reached the stage where they come before the House.

We are, however, trying to establish some systematic way of being fair to all the people who come to us, and to recognize the function that we believe now rests with government to support cultural activities, in a way. That has not been the case in the past. Those who have had any experience in this matter, will know perhaps better than I, how difficult it is to weigh and appraise the various requests that you get. We have been having some communication with the Manitoba Arts Council to see whether there is any way in which we could use their good offices, their connections, their interest in this matter, to guide us perhaps as the Canada Council guides the Federal Government. Those negotiations are still in progress, and we have not reached any conclusion, I must say that the President of that Council, a gentleman well-known to us, Mr. R.D. Turner and I have engaged in a very interesting correspondence and it may be that something will come of this idea, although I have nothing to report of a definite nature at the present time.

However, in these estimates, we have increased the grants to -- for cultural purposes to \$28,500.00. This is an increase of 185% over the previous year. Grants in the field of welfare have been increased -- now total \$20,542.00, an increase of 55% over the previous year. Youth guidance grants are up to \$4,500.00, a 50% increase. Science, conservation and public safety, \$9,300.00, a 24.5% increase, and then there's a miscellaneous item of \$2,100.00.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . Now, if the house -- if the committee would like, I can give them the breakdown of those grants to let them know who received consideration and how much they got. Now, I don't know whether the committee wants to go into that detail, if they do it's -- they do? All right! Commonwealth Parliamentary Association . . . .

(Interjection by Mr. Molgat)

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I imagine there are about twenty different sorts, and if anyone would like to have this in documentary form afterwards, I'll give it to them. Commonwealth -- I take it that you'd like a couple of copies of this. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association: \$1,000.00, no change; Manitoba Drama League - \$500.00, no change; Manitoba League of the Blind - \$100.00, no change; Canadian Mental Health Association - \$2,000.00, increase of \$500.00; Canadian Welfare Council, that's the Canadian Welfare Council - \$3,000.00, no change; Salvation Army - \$900.00, no change; Last Post Fund - \$250.00, no change; Manitoba Heart Foundation - \$6,000.00, no change; Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg - \$2,000.00, up \$500.00; Canadian Highway Safety Conference - \$1,200.00, no change; Canadian Boy Scout Association - extension of work in rural areas - \$2,500.00, up by \$1,000.00; Canadian Girl Guide Association - extension of work in rural areas - up \$500.00 to \$2,000.00; Manitoba Museum - \$5,000.00, an increase of \$2,000.00; Historic Sites Advisory Board - \$3,000.00, no change; Royal Canadian Humane Society - \$100.00, no change; Men's Musical Club - \$2,000.00, this is a new grant, not previously given; Royal Winnipeg Ballet - \$5,000.00, this is a new grant, not previously given although there have been very substantial grants given on an ad hoc basis from time to time; -- (Interjection) -- once only eh? -- I think so, yes, that's right, \$7,600.00 was given then. It is intended that this will be an annual grant. International Botanical Conference, Manitoba's share - \$3,000.00, I should perhaps pause to say that this represents our recognition of the tremendous job that is done by botanical scientists in this country in connection with our agricultural enterprises. They had their international conference here in Canada - a very rare occurrence, a gentleman who just died recently, Dr. Kenneth Neathy of the federal department was in charge, and he was able to convince us that we should contribute to this cause along with other provinces and we did so - \$3,000.00; Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra - \$7,000.00, this is a new grant; Cercle-Moliere - \$500.00, that was last year's but by this administration; Winnipeg Art Gallery - \$6,000.00, an increase of \$300.00; Canadian Forestry Association - \$4,000.00, an increase of \$1,500.00; Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish - \$3,000.00, an increase of \$1,000.00. Now, there is an item here which says Khartum Temple, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine - \$6,294.85 and at first glance one would wonder about that particular item. Actually it represents a rebate of the amusement tax when the circus was here. Now, in years gone by the circus amusement tax has always been rebated by my predecessors, this is nothing new, but it shows in a different form, because we collected it and then rebated it, instead of rebating it in the first instance. So, this is no departure and I don't want to claim any credit for that over and above what was done on previous occasions.

I think that completes the list, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, are some of these grants conditional upon the membership doing something? I seem to recall that the \$3,000.00 item connected with the Historical Society . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: That's no change over the previous . . . .

MR. MILLER: No, No. But I mean the conditions.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, there has been no change in the conditions either.

MR. HAWRYLUK: I'd like to commend the First Minister for this excellent idea of pooling all these grants into the one department. I think the fact that you've itemized the various grants, the cultural welfare, youth guidance and all that will be approved not only by the members of the House, but also by the people. But, are these grants based on an annual basis -- in other words, do the same people come back every year for these grants? That's the first question, and I believe you say that you have some latitude where there is extra monies available for any other type of grant that you might see fit to give. I think you have a latitude there of a few thousand dollars in case any other organization comes along for any grant for that occasion, but what I'm referring to, the names that you mentioned, is it understood that most of these organizations get them every year from the government?

MR. ROBLIN: Most of the people whose names are listed, will, we feel sure, appear annually for their grant. There are one or two that don't, but very few. Most of them are annual, and we will be asked, I am sure, to reconsider the amounts each year, and they try to make the best case they can as to why the province, rather than somebody else, or their own membership should take a hand in helping them out, and I must say that as a rule they are most co-operative and give us the fullest information on each particular case. I wouldn't like the House to think that this represents the last word in grants, because when we came into office we received, and I suppose everybody that had thought of asking for a grant for the last little while, applied again, which is quite natural and we had a great many to consider. Not all of them, by any means, were accepted. They'll be back again and I rather anticipate that this amount will grow.

One can understand that in certain matters, certain of these institutions like the orchestra, museum and the ballet and others that are of a very important character, they will certainly be asking for money in future and in an ordinary case we didn't give them what they asked for this time, but they'll probably be asking for a little more as time goes by.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the House will realize that this is a legacy that we left to the government, because with my well-known generosity that actually people had to form the habit of coming to us for grants.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the individual departments in many cases still continue to make individual grants which are charged to the appropriation of the various departments. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: That is correct. As we come to the estimates you will see the item "grants" and Ministers can explain.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister would tell us whether or not these organizations that receive the grants mentioned, receive grants also from the Canada Arts Council, in which case the grants would be supplementary.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I can give that information, Mr. Chairman. The Royal Winnipeg Ballet received a grant in 1959 from the Canada Council of \$7,600.00. The Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra in 1958 received a grant of \$18,200.00. The Cercle-Moliere received a grant of \$6,000.00. The Winnipeg Art Gallery received a grant of \$12,000.00. The University of Manitoba Festival of Arts received a grant of \$1,000.00. The Manitoba Arts Council - Children's Festival received a grant of \$2,000.00. Those are the ones that applied to us, some of whom we gave money to and some of whom we didn't, who also got money from the Canada Council.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister could tell us if any discussions or any decisions, and I'm sure not decisions, that are not in the estimates, have been made with reference to some more permanent site for the Museum. Certainly the present site of the Museum is hardly satisfactory. I'm not suggesting for a moment that it is the sole responsibility or even the major responsibility of the Provincial Government. I just wonder, I know that the Museum Association has been giving a good deal of thought to what they should do and where they should go -- I wonder if the Minister could give us any further information, outside of the fact that they got a grant as I remember you said of \$5,000.00.

MR. ROBLIN: The honourable member has given me a chance to dilate on one of my favourite propositions which I haven't yet been able to convince those concerned, it's a good one. But I would like to say that the Manitoba Museum has been a regular correspondent of mine over the past little while and I received a letter just the other day which tells me that they are maturing their plans for a museum and that when they have them matured I can expect to see them. I believe that to be a correct statement. I've been trying to persuade the Manitoba Museum and the Art Gallery and the Ballet and possibly one or two others that what we really need is a Manitoba Arts Centre, that is provincial wide in its character, that isn't designed exclusively to serve the urban areas but which has important connections with all the interested centres in the Province of Manitoba and that these various people, like the Art Gallery, who think we should have a new Art Gallery, and the Ballet who would very much like to have a permanent headquarters, and the Museum which needs new quarters and I think you could go on through a list of half a dozen other cultural organizations, might consider whether they could co-operate in the establishment of the Manitoba Arts Centre, to which the Provincial

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . Government representing all the people of the province, might fairly be expected to make a contribution, as well as perhaps the national bodies and certainly those people who are interested in these particular arts. Now, I've been trying to plant that idea in the minds of those concerned in the various organizations. They have taken note of it, but I'm not sure whether it's going to sprout. However, I do think that it's something which bears investigation. It would probably be the most economical way of handling their legitimate requirements and while that's not the only consideration it's a very important one and I think it might also help the organizations and the arts themselves if such a thing would take place. Now I have to confess that this may come as a bit of news to my colleagues in the front bench — I haven't mentioned this to them or to any of my colleagues behind me here — it may be that I won't find many people that agree with me. I might be just as badly out of luck as that — as I was on Point Douglas, you never can tell. But I think the idea is worth exploring and I say no more for it than that -- that it's worth exploring and we certainly are going to do our bit to see that the people concerned have a chance to discuss these matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I now leave the Chair until eight o'clock.