

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 6th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first Interim Report of the Special Committee reconstituted April 5th, 1965, to consider Dental Services.

Madam Speaker, I don't think it will be necessary for the Clerk of the House to read the report because it will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings and in Hansard, and at the request of the committee I am having my office prepare copies of the report for distribution to the Legislature and it is not our intention to move concurrence at this time.

(The following is the report referred to)

INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DENTAL SERVICES

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fourth Session of the Twenty-seventh Legislature, on the fifth day of April, 1965, reconstituted a Special Committee of the House to examine, investigate, inquire into, study and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians and denturists in the provision of dental service consistent with sound public health policy, and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto. In carrying out its duties, the previous Committee held hearings in Regina, Edmonton, Vancouver, Winnipeg and Toronto.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the various people who appeared before it, for their time and willingness to give information. A list of these people, and the organizations they represented, appears at the back of this interim report as Appendix A. Members of the Committee also visited the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology Dental Laboratory and Dental Mechanics Laboratories in Edmonton and Vancouver.

To avoid any misunderstanding, the following terms and definitions are used in this interim report:

Dentist - means a dentist duly registered under The Dental Association Act.

Dental Technician - means a person who fabricates dentures upon the prescription or order of a dentist, or medical practitioner. The term includes an owner, or employee, of a Dental Laboratory.

Dental Mechanic - means a person other than a dentist, who fabricates or fits dentures directly for the public under legislation provided in the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia.

Dental Hygienist - means a person who performs all duties currently assigned to the dental hygienist in Manitoba.

Denturist - means a person who fabricates and fits dentures directly for the public contrary to Manitoba law.

The representations, discussions, and on-the-spot visits gave the Committee an opportunity to delve deeply into the problem. The Committee learned that the problem was not simply provincial in scope, but nation-wide and, indeed, world-wide! The Committee noted that only the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia have existing legislation providing for Dental Mechanics to deal directly with the public, and the Committee came to the conclusion that these systems are not working well. For instance, the Certificate of Oral Health, as defined by Alberta and British Columbia legislation, has not proved satisfactory. In British Columbia, the Government Committee established to administer the legislation, removed the requirement for the Certificate of Oral Health. In Alberta, the Act, since the Committee's visit, has been changed, removing the requirement.

In reviewing the background to the present problem, the Committee noted that in the early years the fabrication of dentures was done only by the Dentist. To accommodate convenience and economics, and to make better use of his own more highly skilled ability, the Dentist encouraged others to fabricate the dentures for him. Thus, the role of the Dental Technician was created. Because of the economic control of the Dentists collectively over all the various Dental Technicians' laboratories, the prices paid to the laboratories were controlled. The Associations of Dental Technicians which met with the Committee revealed that they were predominantly associations of owners of Dental Technicians' laboratories. It was also revealed

May 6th, 1965

(DENTAL SERVICES REPORT cont'd).....that no effective organizations exist to deal with the wages and working conditions of the laboratory employees.

The skills acquired by Dental Technicians have often been used by them to fabricate and supply dentures, in their spare time, directly to friends and family to supplement low income. The assumption that high prices were charged by dentists to the public for dentures and the delayed service, due to difficulty in obtaining early appointments and quick repairs, caused some of the public to seek out the lower cost, illegal dentures which were offered them by the Denturists. It has been suggested to the Committee that a number of the Dental Technicians fabricate and supply dentures to the public in their spare time but do not admit this fact because they and their employers depend upon the Dentist for their business.

The Committee noted that where Provincial Dental Associations have effective licensing and control legislation over the Dental Technicians and utilize it, as in Ontario and Quebec, the Denturists operate underground, functioning out of home and suitcase. In British Columbia and Alberta, legislation to legalize Dental Mechanics (British Columbia, 1962; Alberta, 1961) was passed permitting them to fabricate and supply dentures directly to the public under certain controls. In 1959 the Province of Saskatchewan enacted a law which permitted anyone to engage in the practice of fitting and making of dentures subject only to the simple condition that the person seeking these services must first obtain a Certificate of Oral Health from a licensed Physician or Dentist. In 1960, the Saskatchewan law was amended to permit non-dentists to repair dentures only when impressions are not required in order to complete the repair services. In the same year the Saskatchewan Legislature rejected a bill to legalize Denturists.

The problem was quite evident in Manitoba in 1956, for in that year, a report commissioned by the Government of the Province of Manitoba was submitted by K. J. Paynter, D.D.S., Ph.D., entitled, "Concerning the Establishment of a School of Dentistry in Manitoba". Essentially, it called for - (a) the establishment of a school of dentistry, as a Faculty of the University of Manitoba, capable of graduating Dentists and 15 Dental Hygienists per year; and (b) the initiation of planning to organize training programs for further types of ancillary personnel for dentistry in the fields of both operative and prosthetic dentistry.

All of these recommendations have been acted upon. The Faculty of Dentistry graduates Dentists from facilities envied in several provinces and with qualifications of the highest in Canada. Dental Hygienists are now being graduated in addition to the Dentists. In its submission to the Committee, the Faculty of Dentistry revealed it was ready to begin training of further dental auxiliaries. The Faculty of Dentistry made recommendations, in part, as follows:

- "(A) That the immediate issue be considered as only one part of the larger and more important problem of determining the policies that should govern the education and the employment of dental auxiliaries as a means of making available to the public, better dental services of all types.
- (B) That consideration be given to the establishment of a new and expanded curriculum in Dental Hygiene, which would be more than the current two academic years in length, and which would include instruction in the following areas:-
 - (i) all duties currently assigned to the Dental Hygienist in Manitoba:
 - (a) cleaning and polishing teeth;
 - (b) giving of instructions and demonstrations in oral hygiene in mouth care;
 - (c) taking x-rays of the teeth and jaw;
 - (d) taking of impressions of the mouth from which artificial dentures can be made;
 - (e) determining and recording the relationship of one jaw to another; and
 - (f) repairing minor cracks in artificial dentures and replacement of broken or lost teeth in artificial dentures.
 - (ii) all duties in the area of complete denture prosthesis, excluding:
 - (a) diagnosis, treatment planning and mouth preparation;
 - (b) overall responsibility to the patient for the service. (to be assumed by the dentist)
 - (iii) certain additional duties related to the placing of filling material in teeth; and on completion of this course, such personnel would operate under the supervision of a dentist.
- (C) That an adequate training program for Dental Technicians be developed."

The Committee subscribes to these recommendations and adds the further qualification to recommendation (C): - 'by the Faculty of Dentistry of the University of Manitoba in

(DENTAL SERVICES REPORT cont'd).....consultation with the Society of Dental Technicians." In its final report the Committee will itemize the means whereby these recommendations may be implemented.

The Committee proposes to explore in detail the offer of the Faculty of Dentistry, University of Manitoba, viz: "As its contribution to the long-range solution of making not only dentures, but other dental services more available to a broader spectrum of the citizens of Manitoba, the Faculty of Dentistry is prepared to give serious consideration to the establishment of an expanded and extended course at University level for dental hygienists, provided adequate financial support is forthcoming. The Faculty encourages a course not shorter than the current two academic years, and not longer than two calendar years."

The recommendations of the Faculty of Dentistry to which the Committee subscribes, provide for positive steps toward better dental health of the people of this Province. To augment these, the Committee plans to develop a program in its final report based upon the following general principles:

1. The main purpose of Dentistry is the preservation of live teeth and not the sale of a dental appliance. People must be encouraged to save teeth as long as possible. It must be realized also that the dental appliance is not just a mechanical device that can be installed by unqualified persons; nor can the dental appliance be separated from the diagnostic and curative talents of professional people. The dental appliance is for many people a necessary aid to life and health; as with all other matters relating to the life and health of a person it must be right, correctly administered and available at a cost within the means of the general public.
2. Dentists must retain full control of and be fully responsible for the oral health of the public. The responsibility for prescribing and fitting of dentures must remain with the Dentist.
3. The Dental Technician and Denturist have developed limited skills which should be used to the maximum advantage of the public. These limited skills should be utilized as an auxiliary arm for the Dentist to permit him to provide a greater, more knowledgeable and highly skilled service to the people of Manitoba. To aid in accomplishing this there should be only two classes of dental auxiliaries - Dental Hygienists and Dental Technicians - both with prescribed qualifications and training. In its final report the Committee will make recommendations concerning a Dental Technician Act governing qualifications, training, responsibilities and licensing. The Department of Health should be made responsible for administration and enforcement of such an Act.
4. While no positive evidence was adduced that the supply of dentures directly to the public illegally has created a general public health hazard, ample evidence has been provided to indicate that there are definite individual health factors involved and that it is in the public interest that only a qualified person work in the patient's mouth. This is especially so since the practice of fitting dentures immediately after extraction has increased. The Committee is considering the feasibility of the following procedure:

Impressions will be taken only by a dentist, or a properly qualified dental auxiliary under his direct supervision and control. If the patient then wishes, he may determine that the complete upper and/or lower dentures be fabricated by a Dental Technician of the patient's choice on prescription, or, work order, from the Dentist. In such cases the dentures would be returned to the Dentist for fitting and adjustment. At no time would the Dental Technician fit or adjust dentures or work in the mouth.

5. It is not essential that minor repairs be supervised by a Dentist. Duly licensed Dental Technicians could be permitted to repair dentures directly for the public provided they do not work in the patient's mouth. The Dental Technician would then charge the patient directly and be solely responsible for his work.
6. The Committee noted that there are people who assume incorrectly that the term "Denturist" means a specialist in the making and fitting of dentures and implies a status, skill and knowledge in the denture field higher than, or at least equal to, that possessed by the Dentist. The Committee is of the opinion that the use of the word "Denturist" as describing any form of occupation, is misleading and should be prohibited.
7. The Committee is considering recommendations whereby the Faculty of Dentistry of the University of Manitoba would be responsible for the development of training programs in all fields of oral health although not necessarily in University facilities. The Faculty of Dentistry would thus assure the maintenance of a high standard of dentistry to the benefit

- (DENTAL SERVICES REPORT cont'd). of all. Every program to provide an increase of Dental Hygienists and Dental Technicians will aid the Dentist by relieving him of much of his routine work except direct supervision, thus permitting more patients per dentist. The Committee is considering recommendations providing for the utilization of the experience of the Denturist through the training programs for Dental Hygienists and Dental Technicians and through a Dental Technicians Act. It is hoped that the services of present Denturists (who number approximately 15 in Manitoba as opposed to over 100 Dental Technicians) could be absorbed as auxiliaries into the field of dental health.
8. The relationship between the public and the Dentist could, in the Committee's opinion, be improved. In the final report, recommendations toward this end will be made. As an example, the Committee is considering proposals that the Dental Association: -
- (a) prepare and publish a schedule of fees;
 - (b) advise patients of the dentists' existing grievance committee if a dispute arises over fees; and
 - (c) require the Dentist who works with a patient desiring dentures to submit to the patient the complete bill showing the Dental Technician's charges and his own professional fee separately.
9. The Committee noted that since 1960 one of the most significant areas of progress in the supplying of low-cost dentures has been the operation of the Manitoba Denture Clinic. This Clinic, operated by the Dentists, recorded in their Brief to the Committee, 9,436 patients as having been treated in the Clinic. Full dentures are supplied at a price of \$85.00 to any Manitoban without any means test and with time payments, if required. This price is comparable to the minimum charges of present-day Denturists. The Committee considers that the operations of the Manitoba Denture Clinic, if expanded throughout Manitoba, could be a major factor in maintaining denture costs within the means of the general public and thereby relieving the problem under study. The Committee is considering recommendations providing for the continued operation, expansion and wider advertisement of the services of the Manitoba Denture Clinic.
- In its final report the Committee will document its findings and recommendations in detail.

APPENDIX A

The following is the list of persons who appeared before the Committee:

Regina, Saskatchewan, October 29, 1964.

Mr. Douglas McLeod,
President of the Dental Technicians' Association;

Dr. Smith, Dr. Hancock, Dr. Martin and Mr. Gates, Executive Members
and Counsel of the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan;

Mr. Claire Halsteadt and Mr. Grant Barrich
of the Denturists' Society of Saskatchewan;

Dr. J. G. Clarkson, Deputy Minister of Health, and
Mr. Willis, Solicitor for the Department of Health,
Saskatchewan.

Edmonton, Alberta, October 27, 28, 1964.

Mr. Edward Thompson,
President of the Certified Dental Mechanics' Association of
Alberta, and

Mr. K. Katz, Member of the Board of Examiners, and Vice-
President of the Dental Mechanics' Association of Alberta;

Mr. W. A. B. Saunders,
Principal of the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, and
Mr. M. F. Kelsey,
Supervisor of Courses at the Northern Alberta Institute of
Technology;

Mr. Arthur Johnston, Chairman of the Board of Registered
Dental Technicians for the Province of Alberta;

(DENTAL SERVICES REPORT cont'd).....

Dr. George Decker, Secretary, Alberta Dental Association;

Honourable J. G. Ross, M.D., Minister of Health, Alberta;

Dr. McCallum, Deputy Minister of Health, Alberta, and
Drs. Salter and Rose, Department of Health, Alberta;

Dr. H. R. MacLean,
Dean, Faculty of Dentistry of the University of Alberta;

Dr. C. W. B. McPhail,
Head of Preventive and Public Health Dentistry, and
Dr. S. G. Geldart, Clinical Director of the Faculty of Dentistry.

Vancouver, British Columbia, October 29, 30, 1964.

Mr. William Wallace and Mr. W. Elder,
Members of the Executive of the Dental Technicians' Board
(Government Board);

Mr. Alex Porteous,
Administrative Assistant to the Minister of Health of British
Columbia;

Dr. S. Wah Leung, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, University
of B.C.

Mr. E. Hossack,
President of the Public Denturists' Society of British Columbia,
and

Mr. Wilfrid La Pointe, Former Vice-President of the Public
Denturists' Society of British Columbia, and representative of
Public Denturists on the Government Technician Board of British
Columbia;

Dr. W. P. Munsie, President, College of Dental Surgeons of
British Columbia.

Winnipeg, Manitoba, November 16, 17, 1964.

Dr. A. D. McKee, President, Manitoba Dental Association;

Dr. W. G. Campbell, Secretary, Manitoba Dental Association;

Dr. J. W. Neilson, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry, University of
Manitoba;

Dr. T. L. Marsh, Associate Professor, Oral Biology, Faculty
of Dentistry;

Dr. Harold Hart, Professor of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry,
and

Mrs. Marjorie Forgay, Directress, Dental Hygiene, Faculty of Dentistry;

Mrs. Mary Andree, Private citizen;

Mr. D'Arcy Pagan, Vice-President of Association of Dental Technicians
(Denturists in Manitoba);

Mr. Gordon Smith, Advisor to the Dental Technicians;

Mr. Peter Ross, who operated dental laboratory until 1958; member of
Association of Dental Technicians (Denturists in Manitoba);

Mr. A. H. Thorndycraft, Chairman of the Manitoba Denture Clinic;

Mr. A. C. Froude, representing Senior Citizens' Federation Assoc. of
Manitoba;

May 6th, 1965

(DENTAL SERVICES REPORT cont'd).....

Mr. Bruce Thompson, spokesman for the Provincial Society of Dental Technicians;

Mr. Anthony Simpson, Salesman (private citizen);

Mr. Edwyn Dalgleish, Vice-President, Manitoba Farmers' Union.

Toronto, Ontario, December 6, 1964.

Dr. W. Dunn, Registrar, Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario;

Dr. D. W. Gullett, Immediate Past Secretary, Canadian Dental Association, and

Dr. W. McIntosh, Secretary, Canadian Dental Association;

Dr. Roy Ellis, Dean, Dental College, University of Toronto, and

Dr. K. J. Paynter, Department of Dental Research, University of Toronto;

Mr. E. Vowles, Chairman of Board of Dental Technicians of Ontario;

Dr. Herbert Mercer and Mr. J. Wyatt, Members of the Board of Dental Technicians of Ontario;

Mr. Charles Goodall, Secretary, and

Mr. J. D. Ley, Treasurer, of the Board of Dental Technicians of Ontario.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the report of the committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the question is put, I notice that the Minister said that it's not the intention to move concurrence at this time. Is it the intention to vote concurrence at this session? Will this committee be sitting after this session or is it now terminated?

MR. WITNEY: We will not move concurrence during this session and it will be the intention of the committee to sit again to bring out its final report.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, may I make an announcement which I trust will interest the Honourable Member for Inkster with respect to Savings Bonds. I have pleasure in announcing that the fifth issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds will go on sale to the public through the usual outlets, investment dealers, banks and trust companies on Tuesday next, April 18th - that's not Tuesday next, that's a week this coming Tuesday - April 18th. I'm in the wrong month? Sorry, May, May 18th. These bonds which are fully redeemable at par on demand after the first six months, will be issued on identical conditions with those of last year with a yield of 5.11 percent to maturity. They will bear interest as follows: 4-3/4 percent for the first two years; 5 percent for the next four years; and 5-1/2 for the last four years. They will be dated June 1st, 1965, and mature June 1st, 1975. The bonds may be purchased by residents of Manitoba, including companies with registered offices in the province. No purchaser may hold more than \$25,000 of the issue.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, as a child of a prophetic people, I welcome the announcement. I always tried hard to see that the money loaned or borrowed from the United States and Canadian financiers could be transferred - at least part of it - to Manitoba, which we have the best security in the world and this is the one million population in the Province of Manitoba with all its public assets and being considered as I said, the breadbasket of the world. So I'd like to see all it's possible, to lend the money to the people of Manitoba, pay them whatever interest is necessary and even a higher interest - that still will be paid because the people of the Province of Manitoba will get the benefit.

And while I'm on my feet, I want to inform the House that in 1934 while I was a member of council, I advocated a private bank, a municipal bank, and it carried in council - I wasn't

(MR. GRAY cont'd).....in the House - it carried first and second reading here. But the father of our Minister of Industry and Commerce Department was probably wiser than I am - I don't know. I didn't consider him at that time, but the third reading in committee, he said, "I don't want to argue anymore; I am not in favour of public enterprise." Thank you.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. I'm advised that he's had some correspondence with one gentleman, Bill Henderson, who has offered him an invention which would result in the saving to the province of some half a million dollars in five years. Could he indicate why this offer was turned down?

MR. ROBLIN: He had some doubts as to whether the proposed saving will in fact be realized. If my recollection of the thing is correct -- and this is subject to confirmation because the thing was studied by the department officials -- the proposal had to do with the colouring of gasoline. It involved the collection of the tax, as far as we're concerned, from the retail dispenser rather than through the sub-collector system that we use now which would certainly not save us any money. I had correspondence a few weeks ago with the gentleman and I wrote him a reply. He since sent a second letter, of which my honourable friend received a copy, in which he makes his statement about saving half a million dollars. That too is being looked into but we have no real information that the saving could actually be effected at the present time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words, at the minute the Premier is still looking into it... then -- the offer?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, if there's any prospect of a saving of that nature, you can be sure we're going to look at it very carefully. But our advice so far is that it does not appear to be the case.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, maybe I missed it but did the Honourable First Minister mention the total amount that would be available for subscription under the parity bonds?

MR. ROBLIN: A \$25,000 maximum to residents of Manitoba.

MR. FROESE:the total amount that would be issued.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, I'll tell you afterwards when the issue is closed.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the Table of the House, the return to an Order of the House No. 54, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. This is actually in his capacity as Provincial Secretary. On the 26th of April I asked him regarding Stall Lake Mines, if he had received the request under Section 359 of The Companies Act, for action in this particular case. The Minister replied to me at that time that that did not come under The Securities Act but under The Companies Act. So my question to him now is did he receive a request for an investigation or action under Section 359 of The Companies Act, relative to Stall Lake Mines at approximately the 3rd of February 1964?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I'll take that as notice and get a reply today if I can.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. During the estimates last night, I asked him a question about the names of those persons who have made land settlements -- that the government inspect the land taken in the Portage Diversion, and he undertook to give me that information. Is he able to give it to me now?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, unfortunately I had that information with me this morning and I - it's back in the office again but I can make it available.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There was some question some days ago; as a matter of fact it was about the time of the discussion of his estimates, regarding the clearing out of the Forebay area at Grand Rapids, of wild game and in particular of the moose population. There is considerable concern in northern Manitoba. Could the Minister indicate to the House whether or not the movement of these animals has been completed successfully or otherwise?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, without up-to-date confirmation, the last report that I had on this

May 6th, 1965

(MR. LYON cont'd)..... matter, some time last week, was that the herding by helicopters had been more successful than was originally anticipated by the wildlife people. And at that time I believe - and I'm quoting only from memory - the figure that was mentioned, there were still 15 moose that they wanted to get closer to shore but they felt that even if they couldn't get them closer to shore, that they would be in no danger of loss of life unless of course a wolf got them or some such thing, but that they could swim the distance that was left.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Are there any firms who are allowed, under The Workmen's Compensation Act, not to be covered under that Act, but to elect for other type of insurance coverage?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I take that question as notice. I'm sure the honourable member is aware that there are self-insurers but I don't think that is what he is referring to.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I'm referring to private firms.

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes, I'll take it as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. ROBLIN: I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, estimates of sums required for the service of the province for capital expenditure and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply, and I might add, I would be glad to have the Clerk distribute this to the Members of the House.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution before the committee is: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures, \$7,086,500 for Schedule A, Requirements of (1) The Manitoba Telephone System, \$6 million; (2) The Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$1,086,500; Total, 7,086,500.

MR. ROBLIN:these items have been discussed in the current estimates but if there are any questions that members would like to ask with respect to them, I'll do my best to answer.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, isn't it usual that copies of these be...--(Interjection)--We haven't got the copies yet.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sorry - I've received mine, I thought that others had. I think we should wait until they're in front of the members--(Interjection)--I know, it's a human failing. I hope to be forgiven.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, on this occasion maybe.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures,

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, just a minute now. We haven't passed (1) yet. I would like to know from the Minister in the case of (1), the unused amounts carried over from the previous years.

MR. ROBLIN: In the case of the Telephone System, Mr. Chairman, the entire program for the year is valued at \$15,000,759. The money is being provided from the following sources surplus, 750,000; replacement reserve 3,553,000; transfer from unappropriated reserve, 3,455,000; carry-over of unused authorization, \$2 million; that comes to \$9,759,000 and leave an amount of \$6 million new money to be voted.

And with respect to the Water Supply Board, the entire program will total \$1,828,000;

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd).....the unused carry forward is \$741,500 leaving an additional \$1,086,500 to be appropriated now.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, how many towns will that cover or how many projects under the Water Supply Board?

MR. ROBLIN: The projects that are scheduled, although they may not depend on a local vote in some cases as to whether they proceed, are St. Jean, Teulon, Benito, Baldur, Oak River, Rapid City, Minita, Rathwell, Grandview, Winnipegosis and Stonewall - some 11 towns.

MR. MOLGAT: Did I understand the Minister correctly to say that it was six hundred and some thousand of unused.....?

MR. ROBLIN: Seven thousand and forty-one thousand, five hundred.

MR. MOLGAT: Seven hundred and forty-one. Well did we not then proceed with the majority of the projects we had in mind? Because the total planned for last year was a million six. If we carried over three-quarters of a million, then we barely went through half the program that we planned on.

MR. ROBLIN: Well in some cases the vote doesn't carry or the projects are not proceeded with in the year that was anticipated. They may be carried forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1, Schedule A, Item 1 -- passed: 2 -- passed. Second Resolution: Resolved there shall be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures, \$22,724,250 for other requirements: 1. Red River Valley, Assiniboine River, Seine River and Lake Manitoba Flood Protection, Soil Erosion, Water Control and Drainage Projects, \$4,124,250.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the members would like to know the program here. This is basically for the Assiniboine River Diversion and the Shellmouth Dam. The total estimated gross expenditure for the year will be \$8,601,250. The share from the Federal Government is \$3,707,500; the carry-over of unexpended authorization is \$769,000, leaving us with this balance of \$4,124,250 of new money that is required.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in this reference is made to the Seine River. Has this project been completed and, if it has, it might be time to knock out of the listing of the subject matter, the reference to the Seine River.

MR. ROBLIN: I think this may be done next year. There's a small expenditure still to be made there I see.

MR. PAULLEY: For what purpose?

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, just finishing up some odds and ends.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that this is mainly for the Assiniboine River Diversion and the Shellmouth Reservoir. Could he indicate what proportion is expected to proceed on each at this time?

MR. ROBLIN: I haven't got that, Mr. Chairman, but I expect the most of it will be spent on the Shellmouth because it's at a further stage of engineering than the other but they will both be going ahead, roughly pari passu.

MR. MOLGAT: There were some indication, Mr. Chairman, that the government had not been proceeding recently with further work insofar as the Assiniboine - they had stopped buying further land. Is this so? Is there some change in plans that was indicated by reduction in their activity in that area?

MR. ROBLIN: No change of plan, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, is the Hespeler property under this item and if so how much is going to be spent on that as far as federal moneys are concerned.

MR. ROBLIN: Hespeler is covered under the current estimates - not under this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 -- passed. Item 2. Agricultural Research, \$600,000.00.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this is a further investment in capital facilities at the Glenlea Agricultural Station which honourable members will know has just been recently established south of St. Norbert--(Interjection)--No, no carry-over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 2 -- passed. Item No. 3. Highways, Roads and Related Projects Structures and Facilities -- Construction and Reconstruction, and all works incidental thereto including acquisition of Rights-of-way, \$18,000,000.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the proposed program for this year, as members know is valued at \$20 million. We're only appropriating 18 because we will have a carry-over of \$16 million. We use this to finance our pre-season bidding.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite follow that. It's \$16 million carry-over?

May 6th, 1965

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well did the Minister say there's a total of \$20 million being spent? I mean I don't get the arithmetic.

MR. ROBLIN: After the \$20 million has been -- yes, if you add the \$18 million being appropriated here to what is available in the fund, there is a sum of \$36 million; \$20 million will be spent this year leaving a carry-forward of \$16 million.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, thank you. I understand that now, Mr. Chairman. Could I get some understanding of the nature of this Item No. 3, as related to the current estimates which have some \$12 million in what seems to be similar wording - Highway Maintenance, Construction, etc.

MR. ROBLIN: This money is an additional sum to the one contained in the current estimates.

MR. CHERNIACK: But it's for the same type of work, then. It's just a supplementary sum. There's no \$5 million in this figure then?

MR. ROBLIN: No, not in here.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we are proceeding then to borrow here 18 million; we carried over 16, the total is 34; we're going to spend 20, so our carry-over at the end of the year should be 14. Correct?

MR. ROBLIN: No, 16.

MR. MOLGAT: Well how? That's what I thought the Minister said - that's why I proceeded with the arithmetic. How do we get 16? We're going to spend 20?

MR. ROBLIN: If we take the 18 that's available here and add it to the carry-forward that's available at the present moment.....

MR. MOLGAT: Which you gave as 16.

MR. ROBLIN: No, that's 18. We get 36--(Interjection)--Take 20 off 36, you get 16. That's the arithmetic.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, well I had understood the carry-over to be 16. That will be the carry-over at the end of the year.

MR. MOLGAT: At the end of the year. Fine. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate to us how much pre-season bidding is done and how much of that carry-over is actually used in the course of the fall on the following season's contracts.

MR. ROBLIN: I couldn't give that figure. I know it's a very large sum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 -- passed. Resolution No. 3: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures \$5,066,577 for Schedule C for the purposes of the following institutions or corporations: 1. University of Manitoba, \$3,066,577.00.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll just give the buildings that are involved in the University of Manitoba investment here. There's the Music and Arts Building; a Teaching Building for Arts, Science and Engineering; an addition to the Medical Building; the final investment in the University College; a small investment in athletic facilities; additional to the Educational Building and miscellaneous various small amounts. The net authorization required will be just over \$3 million--(Interjection)--No carry-over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 -- passed; 2. The Liquor Control Commission, \$2 million.

MR. ROBLIN: This is the capital sum for their new warehouse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 -- passed. Resolution No. 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures \$4,650,000 for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation - \$4,650,000.00.

MR. ROBLIN: This is self-explanatory, Mr. Chairman. It is the extra capital money we're making available for lending at the Agricultural Credit Fund.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just in case it should not suffice, what happens? Do you allocate additional amounts?

MR. ROBLIN: No, we have to live within this appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave - this is the conclusion I believe of the estimates then. I see no figure here insofar the Art Centre.

MR. ROBLIN: The which?

MR. MOLGAT: The Art Centre. Has all the money for the Art Centre been raised and allocated already and are no further sums required, because as I recall it over the course of the year there seems to have been an increase in the figures that have been mentioned insofar as the total construction costs of the Centre and I don't know how we're going to cover them

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....because I don't think that we originally put that much up in capital.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I explained that earlier on in the current estimates, Mr. Chairman, that we were going to dedicate the interest earning on the Post-War Reserve Fund which, for my honourable friend's edification I will explain is even larger now than when we inherited it in 1958. The interest that's being earned on that money is being used for the purposes of the Art Centre and no tax money will be required.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, all through the present session the Honourable Member for St. John's has been looking for a sum of four to five million dollars and I think he has questioned every Minister on every department as...--(Interjection)--Well, that's fine. Is it hidden.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll probably be able to satisfy my honourable friend if I tell him that I expect to deal with that matter in the same way in which it was raised; namely, in the budget address.

MR. PAULLEY:one point though, Mr. Chairman, if I may. When the Honourable the First Minister closes the debate, no matter what he says it finishes the discussion on that particular aspect.

MR. ROBLIN: No, because I can't close the debate - I only take part in it.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not so sure of that.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: But nobody else then can speak after the First Minister as I recall.

MR. ROBLIN: They can if they want to. Nothing to prevent it. The only one who can't is my honourable friend and the honourable member for -- I was going to say "Auntie Nels" but that wouldn't be right -- the Honourable Member for Gladstone is going to speak in that debate and he would be barred, but any other member of the House could.

MR. PAULLEY: Then you don't close the debate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report the same.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. CLERK: 1. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$74,925 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$373,447 for legislation - Comptroller-General's Office, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 3. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$43,000 for Legislative printing and binding - Legislation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 4. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$62,900 for Executive Council - Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 5. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$174,400 for Grants and Miscellaneous - Executive Council, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 6. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$330,707 for Libraries and Historical Research - Executive Council, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 7. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$250,000 for Grants - Executive Council, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 8. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$202,820 for Financial Administration Branch - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 9. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$84,675 for Treasury - Economy Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 10. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$51,260 for Organization and Methods Branch - Treasury,

(MR. CLERK cont'd).....for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that while concurring in Resolution No. 11, this House regrets the government has imposed a tax on heat which is discriminatory and causes a hardship on the residents of Manitoba, particularly those in the low income group.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 11. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$197,075 for Taxation Branch - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966.

12. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$34,590 for Insurance Branch - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966.

13. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,000 for Insurance Premiums - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 14. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$153,000 for Miscellaneous - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 15. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,730,000 for Grants, local areas - Treasury, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 16. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$129,075 for Administration - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 17. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,560 for Queen's Printer Office - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 18. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$34,285 for Manitoba Gazette - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 19. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$241,270 for Civil Service Commission - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 20. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$397,000 for Civil Service Superannuation Act - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 21. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$66,000 for Civil Service Group Life Insurance - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 22. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$81,905 for Purchasing Bureau - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 23. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$60,000 for Workmen's Compensation Board - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 24. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$34,690 for Information Services - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 25. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$71,450 for Emergency Measures - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 26. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,020,000 for Manitoba Centennial Corporation - Provincial Secretary, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 27. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$715,275 for Administration - Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 28. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$52,044,872 for Education Grants - Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 29. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$347,495 for Teacher Training - Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 30. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,445,804 for Student Instruction - Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 31. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum

(MR. CLERK cont'd).....not exceeding \$200,000 for Provincial Buildings and Other Projects - Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 32. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding.....

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that while concurring in Resolution No. 32 this House regrets that this government which promised the farmers in Manitoba a solution to the cost-price squeeze has failed to do so after being in office seven years.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Division, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: I think it would be much safer to say "on division." If my honourable friends want a recorded vote they should ask for it, but on division would be quite satisfactory with me.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed on Division?

MR. ROBLIN: On Division.

MR. CLERK: 32. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$215,800 for Administration - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 33. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000 for Assistance re Seed and Fodder - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 34. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,164,063 for Agriculture - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 35. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$182,300 for Agricultural and Horticultural Societies - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 36. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$87,980 for Co-Operative and Credit Union Services - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 37. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$606,540 for Economic Research - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 38. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$198,265 for Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 39. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$508,474 for Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 40. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$38,000 for Predator Control and Grasshopper Control - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 41. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,007,880 for Water Control and Conservation - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 42. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,241,000 for Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement - Chargeable to Capital Division - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 43. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,548,000 for Red River Valley, etc. - Agriculture and Conservation, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 44. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$330,775 for Administration - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 45. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$613,332 for Land Titles Offices - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 46. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$507,974 for Law Courts - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 47. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$48,885 for Legislative Counsel - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 48. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,375,160 for Administration of Justice - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 49. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,440 for Miscellaneous - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 50. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$473,422 for Juvenile and Family Courts, Probation and Parole - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 51. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$895,950 for Detention Homes - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 52. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$107,160 for Administration of Estates of the Mentally Imcompetent - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending

May 6th, 1965

(MR. CLERK cont'd).....the 31st day of March, 1966. 53. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$596,800 for Provincial Buildings and Other Projects - Chargeable to Capital Division - Attorney-General, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 54. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,120,399 for Executive Division - Health, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 55. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty.....

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that while concurring in Resolution No. 55, this House regrets that the government has failed to promote and initiate a universal and comprehensive health scheme in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Schreyer and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttomson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 6; Nays, 46.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 55. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,179,204 for Health Division - Health for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 56. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$155,100 for Provincial Buildings and Other Projects - Health, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 57. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$342,010 for Administration - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 58. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,495,492 for Forestry - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 59. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$413,527 for Wildlife Branch - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 60. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$378,010 for Fisheries Branch - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 61. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,468,595 for Field Operations - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 62. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$291,940 for Surveys Branch - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 63. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$543,685 for Mines Branch - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 64. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$289,790 for Air Service - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 65. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$244,680 for Lands Branch - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 66. Resolved that there be granted to Her.....

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that while concurring in Resolution No. 66, this House regrets the land buying practices of this government with respect to land purchases for the Arts Centre, from the Bain Estate and for the Birds Hill Park, which reflects the policy of negotiating with the influential and expropriating from the others.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, in the case of land needed for the Arts Centre, speculators made \$137,000 in a few months. In the case of the Bain Estate, speculators made \$125,000 in a few months. With respect to the Birds Hill proposition, owners of homes and small holdings were expropriated.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paultey, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannette, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 66. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,036,975 for Acquisition of Land, Land Settlement Projects, etc. - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 67. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$175,000 for Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement - Mines and Natural Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 68. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$67,445 for Administration - Public Utilities, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 69. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$109,270 for the Public Utilities Board - Public Utilities, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 70. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,780 for Censor Board of Manitoba - Public Utilities, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 71. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding.....

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that while concurring in Resolution No. 71, this House regrets that the government has not taken the initiative for the establishment of a public auto insurance program.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paultey, Schreyer and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hutton, Jeannette, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 6; Nays, 45.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 71. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,018,205 for Motor Vehicle Branch - Public Utilities, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 72. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$623,230 for Administration - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 73. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,655,253 for Operation and Maintenance of Government Buildings - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 74. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,729,600 for Highways, Planning - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 75. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,342,000 for Highway Maintenance and Construction - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 76. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,000,000 for Construction of Provincial Roads and Construction of Streets in the Established Metropolitan Street System - Capital Division - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 77. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$150,000 for Automobile Garage - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 78. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$436,000 for Provincial Buildings and other Projects - Public Works, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 79. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,652,430 for Administration - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending

(MR. CLERK cont'd).....the 31st day of March, 1966. 80. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$61,140 for Municipal Board - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 81. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,000 for Local Government Districts - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 82. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$81,010 for Municipal Services and Research - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 83. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$138,175 for Municipal Planning Service - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 84. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$239,885 for Municipal Budget and Finance - Municipal Affairs, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 85. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that while concurring in this Resolution, this House condemns the Minister of Labour for informing this House, in respect of a Private Member's Resolution, that he had ordered members of his government not to speak on said resolution but simply to vote it down.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, when the Honourable Minister spoke as he did, he was deserving of condemnation as doing something which was harmful to the democratic process. We believe, however, that he made amends subsequent to that. He accepted some suggestions that we made and he agreed to consider others. We think he is entitled to a reprieve, and with compassion for his errors, we will withdraw our condemnation.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 41.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 85. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$202,260 for Administration - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 86. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$197,210 for Mechanical and Engineering Division - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 87. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$171,225 for Employment Standards Division - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 88. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$52,500 for Apprenticeship and Industrial Training Division - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 89. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$84,075 for Labour Relations Division - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 90. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$57,750 for Research Division - Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 91. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$266,280 for Administration - Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 92. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$641,680 for Business Development Branch - Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 93. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$115,700 for Trade Development and Market Branch - Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 94. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$102,705 for Engineering and Technical Services Branch, Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 95. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$326,605 for Economic and Business Research Branch - Industry

(MR. CLERK cont'd).....and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 96. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$113,870 for Regional Development Branch - Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 97. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$416,900 for Tourist Development Branch - Industry and Commerce for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 98. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$98,045 for Manitoba Economic Consultative Board - Industry and Commerce for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 99. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$59,410 for Manitoba Research Council - Industry and Commerce for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 100. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$287,500 for Manitoba Development Fund - Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 101. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$396,755 for Executive Division - Welfare, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 102. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$18,392,864 for Welfare Services - Welfare, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 103. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,362,425 for The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Board and Disability Allowances - Welfare, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 104. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$128,600 for Fitness and Amateur Sport - Welfare, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 105. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$750,000 for Homes for the Elderly and Infirm - Chargeable to Capital Division - Welfare, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966. 106. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 for Salary Increases for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966.

Capital Supply: 1. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum for Capital Expenditures, \$7,086,500. 2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditure, \$22,724,250. 3. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditures, \$5,066,577. 4. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditures, \$4,650,000

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if I could now have the supply bills we'll give them first reading, second reading and committee stage and the rest, if I have the leave of the House to do so.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider -- no, that's Ways and Means. Are we ready for that one? Resolutions concurred in. I think we're on bills.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 72, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1966.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 76, an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Various Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Raising of the same by way of Loan (1).

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 77, an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Raising of the same by way of Loan (2).

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 72, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 76, an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Various Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Raising of the same by way of Loan (1), for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I think "by leave" should be added in the case of both 72 and 76. We are proceeding with second reading are we not?

MR. ROBLIN: That may be so, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: We don't have a copy of 76 yet, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sorry. Again it's being distributed if members would like to wait for it. It's the same material that was in the estimates that we just considered in the Committee

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN, by leave of the House, presented Bill No. 77, an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Raising of the same by way of Loan (2), for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 72, 76 and 77.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills Nos. 72, 76 and 77 were read section by section and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, did you call the schedule to Bill 72, Schedule A? I may not have heard it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't. Bill No. 72, Schedule A -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that concludes the Bills, does it? We're prepared to proceed with these, Mr. Chairman, and by leave through first, second and committee stage, but I think we would be prepared to suggest that third readings be left over until tomorrow.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could inquire of the government on another subject. My notes indicate that there are still some bills that apparently are not before us. Bill No. 1, I think, is a routine bill and no problem there, but Nos. 2, 40 and 66, I have no record of having received and I wonder if we are to receive further bills and what these cover.

MR. ROBLIN: These are bills that will follow the completion of the budget debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the committee has considered Bills 72, 76 and 77, and has adopted these bills without amendment.

MR. COWAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think we better now proceed with the bills that stand on the Order Paper. I suggest we deal with the adjourned debates and the second readings of the public bills shown on Page 3, and then proceed to the three private bills on Page 12.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 112. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think Bill No. 110 should come first, Madam Speaker, if we may.

MADAM SPEAKER: Sorry. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 110. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam, after listening to Metro News on Channel 6 last night I didn't know whether I was going to have an opportunity of speaking on this bill, but now that I have that opportunity I'll make my remarks as briefly as possible.

This bill, Madam, is a rather unusual bill, unusual in the sense that there was no mention made of it in the Throne Speech. It's also unusual in the sense too, Madam, that I think its introduction in this House has been very badly timed, badly timed in the sense that the people of Manitoba have been loaded down with additional taxes in the special session held last summer and with further taxes this year. It is also unusual in the sense, Madam, that a bill of this nature is usually passed from party to party for the purpose of obtaining the reactions of the other parties to its introduction, and this did not take place in this particular instance.

As a matter of fact, Madam, I feel that this bill is in a sense panic legislation, and my belief that it is panic legislation is induced by the fact that this bill seems to be tailored especially for the members of the front bench. Take my case, Madam. If this bill were enacted and I should elect to adopt an eight-year period which is the minimum, I would be entitled at the end of this Parliament to a pension of \$51.00 a month. Now on the basis of my life expectancy I would receive approximately a total of \$6,120, at a cost to me of \$1,224. In other words, Madam, I would have a net gain of about \$4,896.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface yesterday quoted certain figures in respect of the amount that Cabinet Ministers would receive, and it is true that he took some extreme cases of men much younger than me retiring after a period of ten years with a greater life expectancy than I have, but I think, Madam, that the figures that the honourable member gave to us yesterday, contrasted with a figure which I am giving you now, shows the disparity which exists between what would be payable to an ordinary member and what is payable to a Cabinet Minister. This is the reason, Madam, I conclude that there is an element of panic in this legislation, and it would appear to me as if this legislation were introduced to take care of certain Cabinet Ministers in this government in the event of their not being returned after the next election.

Apart from that, Madam, I cannot support this legislation because I feel that any pension legislation worthy of support must be based on an element of quid pro quo, and that element is completely lacking in this particular instance. I cannot support it on another ground, Madam, and that is that it differentiates and discriminates against members of this Assembly. I don't think that a pension bill applicable to members of the Legislative Assembly, or to the House of Commons or any other legislative body, should discriminate between an ordinary member and a Cabinet Minister, because if the argument used in the introduction of this legislation is correct, an ordinary member does to a certain extent make the same sacrifices, maybe not as great, but he does make sacrifices that are also made by a Cabinet Minister.

Now the Honourable Member for St. Matthews when speaking on this resolution referred to the fact, in justification of the Cabinet Minister being treated differently to a private member, that a Cabinet Minister did not receive a salary which was commensurate with the responsibilities of the duties of his office. He also tried to compare the responsibilities of a Cabinet Minister with an executive in the business world, and showed that as far as an executive in the business world was concerned, that a business executive with responsibilities akin to or similar to a Cabinet Minister would receive a much larger salary.

Now it is perfectly true, Madam, but a business executive has got to produce, otherwise he's out. As far as a Cabinet Minister is concerned, there is no such - other than what is placed upon him by the First Minister - he doesn't have to produce; he's not running a profit institution; he is only running an institution which must be run efficiently. But my answer to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews is this, that if the amount of salary that we are paying Cabinet Ministers in this province is not commensurate with the responsibilities of their

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) office, well the answer does not lie in giving that Cabinet Minister a pension; it lies in increasing that Cabinet Minister's salaries.

Now apart from these considerations, Madam, I feel that every member of this Legislature in accepting nomination to run for office, accepted that nomination without any illusions as to whether or no he was going to make sacrifices. We all make sacrifices. We make sacrifice of our time; we make sacrifice of our ability to earn more money; we even sacrifice our family life; and we even sacrifice our own life; because any member that runs for this Assembly must accept the fact that from the moment he accepts public office he is living in a glass house, his life is not his own, his life belongs to the public.

Now I feel that the element of sacrifice is something which is characteristic, or should be attached to the office held by a member in this Chamber. I feel that one of the most essential things that a member of this Chamber should recognize is the fact that he is entering this Chamber, not for the purpose of making money but for the purpose in his own way of doing something for his fellow man, and I very much resent this invasion of this Legislative Assembly of the tentacles of a welfare state. I feel that if we make a member of this Assembly believe that he is in this Assembly for the purpose of the money that he will receive and for the purpose of the pension that he will be receiving, we are destroying something which we should try to retain.

Now, Madam, I don't believe that this bill gives to a Cabinet Minister a pension, I believe that this Bill gives to a Cabinet Minister a gift; and I believe that that gift is being made under circumstances which in my opinion amount to an unconscionable transaction. I would suggest, Madam, to the Honourable Provincial Secretary who introduced this bill, that he either withdraw it or that the government reconstruct the Tallin Commission and refer to this bill to that Commission as an unconscionable transaction, because quite frankly, Madam, that's what I consider it to be.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this particular legislation. I've said often that I take it upon myself to give advice to this government, and at this point I think perhaps they would welcome some advice. Insofar as I am concerned, I think that this government should seriously consider withdrawing this legislation in order to save itself from political capital being made of it at their expense. That's one possibility. The other possibility is to proceed with it on the basis that pension legislation, that is to say pension legislation dealing with members of this Assembly, is something which has been enacted in other jurisdictions for a variety of good reasons.

I take the position that people who enter public life do so because they like doing this kind of work, that they really should expect some amount of financial sacrifice to ensue; but I also take the position that there is a limit to this sacrifice and, as I see it, some members in this Assembly, some members in particular, have suffered financially because of the fact that the sessions and the duties of his office encroach upon his usual livelihood.

I wasn't really sure, Madam Speaker, how many provinces did have pension legislation on the statute books, but apparently there are eight. It is a fact, of course, that the Federal Parliament passed legislation such as this back in 1952, and had modified it on three occasions since - modified it upward. For my part, that is to say speaking for myself entirely, I would much have preferred - and I say this without any equivocation at all - I would much have preferred an increase in the indemnity. I think that an increase in the indemnity of the members here could be justified for several reasons - reasons which stand on their own and then reasons which are relative to the practice in other provinces.

Just six weeks ago the Assembly in Ontario passed an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act which increased the indemnity of the members there to \$11,000, and if the member happens to live outside the Metropolitan Toronto area, the indemnity is \$12,000. In addition to that - and I have the legislation right here, Madam Speaker, - but on reflection I have decided not to make reference to it.

In addition to that, provision is made for considerable secretarial and stenographic assistance for members, not just during the session but in the interval between sessions. More money is available for research assistance. All of these things, I think, that we should have here in greater measure. I am not suggesting that the indemnity should be raised to \$11,000, but at \$4,800 - I make no bones about it - I think it is simply too low.

However, this government has seen fit not to deal with the indemnity nor with the matter of research assistance, and I would particularly like to emphasize the latter. I think that a government is only as good as its opposition and I think that an opposition is only as good as

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)the amount of research that is done by the opposition. Now of course the opposition members can rely on their own research techniques, on their own research resourcefulness, and this is what has been done up to now, but with growing complexity, growing volume of regulations and statutory orders, I make no apology for making a frank call for more research assistance and stenographic assistance, not just on a sessional but on an inter-sessional basis, relative work compared to a pension plan. I think that should have received priority.

Well whatever the reasons for proceeding with this pension legislation, I am not going to condemn the government for it. The aspect of Cabinet Ministers' pensions has been singled out for attack. It may be - it may be that it does appear to be unduly high, but how does this compare? How does this compare with the salary and pensions paid in other provinces? I think that this is a factor that should be considered.

It is my understanding that in British Columbia, just two months ago the salary of Cabinet Ministers has been increased to 20 or 22 thousand dollars and the indemnity of members proportionately. Then when you consider the indemnities paid across the line - perhaps that isn't too good a comparison, Madam Speaker - but consider the indemnities paid in some of the state Legislatures. All of these things should be taken into account so that we may have a better understanding of the thinking of people involved in government in all of the jurisdictions with which we associate either as provinces or as neighbours - international neighbours.

I think that while certainly one can embrace the principle that one goes into public life because of his feeling or his idealism, or because he wishes to see a particular set of principles advanced or because he wishes to serve his people, these are all admirable, but I insist that it must also be said that these days people are coming to look upon politicians as being too full of equivocation, as being too hungry for money and so on. I have no regret that this matter is getting the full light of discussion and analysis because many people don't really know what indemnities are paid, and if or not there is a pension plan. I hazard to say that in my own area it is assumed by many people that our salaries are approaching those of the federal member and that we have always had a pension plan, or at least for the past ten years, but none of these things of course are the fact. I don't mind that this business get publicity so that people will know that the indemnity is \$4,800, and that there is no pension plan and that one is now being considered.

I do not intend to oppose pension legislation for members. However, before I take my place, I think I should say a word or two about my own particular position. It's not my fault you know, Madam Speaker, that I was elected here to this Assembly when I was relatively young and it's not my fault that I was elected here on three occasions for a total of eight or nine sessions. According to the legislation that is before us, it would seem to make me eligible for a pension, and I believe some member took it upon himself to conveniently single me out as a focus for attention in this matter. I'm not sure if it was the Member for St. Boniface that mentioned me by name or the

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, unless my honourable friend is a member of the Cabinet, I don't think that he can say I mentioned him at all.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm told it was the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and I thank him really because it gives me an excuse or reason for stating my own position in this matter. I do not intend to oppose the legislation, however I wish to make it equally clear that as for myself I don't anticipate having to collect that pension for a number of years to come. If in the event I am defeated - assuming that the legislation stays as it is - in the event that I am defeated, I intend to emulate the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I intend to -- if I were to be in receipt of this pension, I would give it to some worthwhile and charitable cause for a period of 10 to 15 years, and I think that that should obviate any necessity for harping on this question of age.

However, if members here see fit to insert a clause stipulating that the pension shall not be payable until the age of 60, I'll vote for that too, although it should be pointed out that in none of the other pension legislation in any of the other provinces is such a clause present, at least not in the Ontario legislation nor in the federal legislation, and as far as I know not in the Saskatchewan legislation.

I don't intend to get drawn into this dispute and it seems to be becoming a political one. I merely wish to say that I do not condemn the government for this legislation. If it is felt necessary to scale it down - fine; if it's felt necessary to insert a saving age clause - fine too. If it's proceeded with without any major amendments which would seem to make me eligible for

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)..... a pension at the age of 29, I will donate it to the same sort of worthwhile institution as the Honourable Member for Lakeside does -- or did.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker.....

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster has spoken on this.

MR. GRAY: I have more real arguments now.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. LYON: Along with the late President Kennedy, I am one of those people who believe that politics is perhaps the highest calling to which a person can aspire. Now that may be a naive concept in this Year of our Lord 1965, I hope it isn't, because politics today in this province, in all provincial legislatures, in the federal sphere need more and more than was ever the case in our history for the best people that we can possibly get into the political arena. One of the great crying needs of democracy as I see it on this North American continent today is that we have our best brains coming into this what I call the highest calling that can face man in Canada or the States.

Government today, even at the comparatively simple level that we have here in the province, government today is encountering and manifesting its actions upon more and more people as each year goes by. Gone is the day when according to the 19th Century political philosophers and so on, government could only do those things that people couldn't do for themselves. That day has now gone by, whether we like it or not - and there may be many in this chamber who don't like it too well - and government today is called upon to do many things that 50 years ago it would have been wild to think of government doing. We see in the federal sphere today a department for instance of External Affairs. Fifty years we didn't have any responsibility to speak of for external affairs and we have to build up within that department as one small example a cadre of very important people, civil service and staff working under what we hope will be in all cases an outstanding Canadian who heads the department. As you can go through each of the departments of government at the federal sphere and see that you must have people of outstanding capability getting into this field if indeed our country is to be governed in the way we would want it to be governed. And to a somewhat lesser extent, but I think without doing prejudice to the principle, the same need manifests itself in each of the provinces.

Canada today is in a situation where we have a great power conflict going on between the Federal and the Provincial spheres. There are great forces moving in this country today. Some of these great political forces in our country today say that more and more jurisdiction and authority must be given over to the provinces and that the Federal Government must divest itself more and more particularly of its financial controls over provinces, and give these areas of taxation and so on back to the provinces in order that the provinces may exercise their own jurisdiction in fields that they feel should peculiarly belong to the province. So one doesn't know how this trend is going to work out, but one does know here in this May of 1965, that this province and all other provinces in kind with it, is being called upon, or its government is being called upon, to enter into new fields of administration, new fields of responsibility, that were unheard of I would say even twenty years ago, and this demands more and more in this province and in all other provinces that we attract the best possible people that we can get into the political field in Manitoba.

Now, Madam Speaker, in the relatively short time that I have been in the political field, that is actively in the political field as a member, I have had some occasion from time to time to contact people, to talk to them about running for the Legislature of Manitoba, most in this Legislature have had the same experience, I'm sure. Some of the people that I have gone to have been outstanding men, if whether in their own professions, their own communities, their own business, and the story that I relate to you is this - and it's a sad story. Too often have I heard the reply - and how many times have other members heard the same reply when a person is asked to come into the active political field, the answer, I can't afford to do it, after all you know I have a wife and family. How do you fellows get along on what you earn, how do you fellows - what sort of a pension plan have you got and so on. Now you can say that's selfish, you can say it's wrong, you can say that people should have higher motivation, because if indeed politics is the highest field to which man can aspire, these people are wrong-thinking people. But I don't think that they are all wrong-thinking people. I think these are people who have a modern concept of security. Heaven knows that we spend hour after hour, day after day, week after week, in this House trying to improve the security of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. What are we aiming for, what are the good things in life that we want to give the

(MR. LYON cont'd.) people in Manitoba. -- all of us in this Assembly? We want to give them employment, we want to give them security of employment. We want to give them better schools for their children to attend so they in turn can have better employment and better security and higher incomes, and all that goes with what J. K. Galbraith has called the "affluent society," because that's the type of society that we live in here on the Northern part of the North American continent in 1965. And so is it so foreign to take a look for a moment at some question of security for the 57 members who are charged with the responsibility for giving and developing this kind of a society for the other 980,000 people in Manitoba. Is this a wrong thing to do? Madam Speaker, I think you can answer the question quite simply, of course it isn't. It is not wrong, in any way at all. I think that it is important that the principle of pensions for members of a provincial legislature should be established by this Legislature at this session. It's not a unique principle.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead has just mentioned, repeated what the Provincial Secretary said on introducing the bill, every other province in Canada - with the exception of Prince Edward Island, which has a population somewhat less than the City of Winnipeg - every other province in Canada has some form of pension legislation for the members of its assembly. Madam Speaker, when he said, the Provincial Secretary, on introducing this bill, that the proposals before the House were somewhat less generous than some of the other provinces, he was telling the truth, and as I hope to show to you in a few minutes, considerably less generous, than that that is provided for members of the House of Commons today in Canada.

But before I get on to that subject, let me just mention a word or two, refer to a word or two that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead spoke a moment ago. He talked about an increase in indemnities, which probably would be a desirable thing, and he talked about an increase in salaries for Cabinet Ministers. I think we hold the unique distinction in this legislature today of paying our members less than any other major province in Canada. Now I don't say that by way of complaint or anything else, I just say that is the fact. We seem to have a funny idea in this province that even if politics is the highest calling to which you can devote yourself in 1965 you don't dare pay them; the people who choose to enter the political field, don't pay them a reasonable salary because somehow or other it appears to be sinful. Well I don't hold to that view at all. And, Madam Speaker, I want to say that this generation of Manitobans doesn't hold to that view.

How many people would say that it's right that the person who polishes the desk of the Legislator should get a pension but the Legislator should not get a pension. If the Legislator had the same security of tenure that the person who polishes the desk has, then there might be an arguable question. But the legislator hasn't got that security of tenure, ergo you must compensate for it in some way. Really, should it be necessary in 1965 to argue this point that has already been accepted in every other Legislature, except Prince Edward Island, and the House of Commons in Canada. Should we really be arguing about the principle, the desirability of pension legislation for members of a Legislature? I hardly think it's worth the while. I hardly think it is.

Madam Speaker, we all know when we come in here, that's true, what the salaries are; we all know when we come in here, what some of the disadvantages are. I don't think too many of us know when we come in here what my honourable friend from Selkirk talked about, the question of living in a glass house, the question of being away from your family, the question of not being able to do the things that you want to do when you want to do them because public service comes first - and it does. In the case I would say of every member of this Legislature, without question, public service comes first. I can make that statement without fear of contradiction because I know that every person in this House is here because he's dedicated to public service, everyone of us, Tory, Grit, NDP, Social Credit or whatever. That's why we're here. Certainly that's the proof of the pudding's in the eating, because we're not here for the money, and we're certainly not here for the pension, because we're getting neither at the present time. So, Madam Speaker, I don't think that too much time should be wasted on discussing either the desirability or the necessity in this age for pensions for people who devote themselves to public life - and I say again and I make the point, I hope, clearly that if there were security of tenure for office then a different argument might arise, but my Honourable friend from Selkirk seems to think that once you're in the Cabinet or in the House you're there forever. Well now what sort of a doctrine is that? You live from election to election, as he knows quite well, and he's been through more of them than I have.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

If he worked in the Civil Service of the Province he would have security of tenure. He wouldn't have to worry about every four years whether or not he was going to be able to pay the grocery bill that comes in at the end of the month. He wouldn't have that worry. But what security has any member in this House got in that regard? He hasn't the security and that's one of the risks that he undertakes; but is it wrong to compensate for that risk in order to try to get the best people that you can. I don't want to continue hearing over the next five, ten or fifteen years, because I know we can't afford to continue hearing good people say "I can't afford to come in." Gone is the day in the 19th Century when only the rich could afford to govern. That was a great society in those days for the rich and for those who have the vote, the few of them, and for those that got into the House of Commons. But my heavens, Madam Speaker, we passed that bar generations ago. It never even existed in Canada, and today we believe that a man regardless of his worldly wealth, we believe in this country that a man is entitled to present himself for public service; and having presented himself for public service, to be able to serve his people whether he is a professional working in a profession, whether he has his own business, whether he is a farmer, a labourer, whether he works for a railway, for a Hudson Bay Company or anybody else. We're not interested in where he comes from or how fat his pocketbook is. We're interested in what he's got between his chin and the top of his head and the devotion that he has to public service; and the heart that he has for public service. These are the things. These are the gauges by which we should judge the people who come into public life in Manitoba, not the size of their pocketbook or whether or not they can afford to do.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that so long as we continue to have what I will term a niggling attitude, a parsimonious attitude towards the way we treat the members of this House, we can't necessarily expect to get the best people that our society is going to produce in generations to come, because they won't be able to afford it if we continue this attitude in Manitoba.

I think these principles are accepted by most reasonable thinking members of the House, Madam Speaker, but I don't think it hurts to restate them every once in a while, because we tend to think in the tempest of political debate - and that's what this one is, it's a political debate - we tend in the tempest of this kind of a debate - I should say a partisan debate, not a political debate because I like to think of politics in a higher sense of that word. This is a partisan debate that we're in now, and I think it's time we got back to the bedrock of why we're here and what the service is that we're trying to do for the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to refer at any length to the speeches that were made yesterday by the Member from St. Boniface or the few remarks that were made today by the Member for Selkirk. When any legislature or parliament is discussing indemnities or pensions or whatever the matter may be with respect to its own members, certainly this is one of the delicate moments in the debate that occurs in these Houses - and every other parliament has gone through it, and we're going through it right now, and we go through it when we put through increases as we have done, slight increases for indemnities, or in Cabinet Ministers in years gone by. There's been a bit of niggling going on in that regard in the past and we expected the same kind of niggling would go on here today, and it has, it materialized, and pretty much from the same source. But, Madam Speaker, we can't afford in this day and age to worry about the nigglers and the quibblers, because what's much more important is the type and calibre of people we get in here, much more important. My honourable friend from Selkirk is pleased to call it "panic Legislation", and here we get into the aspect of what I call the partisan debate - partisan, because I don't know that if in - I ask him the open question, whether in conscience he really thinks this is the case or is he just saying it because it's the partisan thing to say.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It's tailor made for your front bench, and I still say that.

MR. LYON: I'm glad to hear him repeat that statement because I want to give him some instruction on that point. Madam Speaker, when we looked around at the different pension plans that were being offered in Canada and in the Federal Parliament, we tried to come up with something as a government that would be reasonable, not be regarded by reasonable people as being profligate and yet at the same time would offer some cushion against the insecurities of public office that each of us in this House and every elected person in Canada must face. And it may come as a surprise to the Member for Selkirk and the Member for St. Boniface that one of the plans we looked at quite carefully was the plan that is in effect in the House of Commons in Canada, a plan which was recently amended by the present Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Lester Pearson, hereinafter referred to as the Pearson Plan. This is one of the plans among the others that we looked at, and I just wonder how many honourable

(MR. LYON cont'd.) members are closely familiar with that plan, because remember my honourable friend from Selkirk has just repeated himself by saying that this is panic legislation designed for this Cabinet. The Member for Selkirk in his own inimitable fashion, or St. Boniface yesterday, described this as a matter of featherbedding, I think it was, for the Cabinet - feathering our own nests, or typical words to that effect that might be expected, might be expected from that source.

Madam Speaker, let's take a look at the federal plan just for a moment, while we're on the question of featherbedding or feathering one's nest, and see if that charge applies here in Manitoba against this government today, let us look logically at the other plans that are in force and see if they apply with equal application to the plan that we see in force in Ottawa. Under the present plan, the Pearson Plan, which was instituted in 1963, a modification of the 1952 plan that was put in I guess in the time of the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent, so at least one branch of the Liberal Party in Canada has been sold on the principle of pension legislation even though the dinosaur wing here in Manitoba may not yet have caught up, but at least one branch of the Liberal Party has seen and adopted this principle.

Well, Madam Speaker, what is the plan as we see it today. The federal members make a contribution to the Consolidated Fund of six percent of their indemnity. That figure is familiar because it's the same figure that we have in our bill here - and remember that today the indemnity under the federal plan is \$12,000; the other \$6,000 that the members down there get - and may I say which I think they get deservedly - the other \$6,000 comes under the caption of expenses and the pension is not accrued there or under this proposed plan on that basis. And so he contributes, the member of the House of Commons, he contributes six percent of this indemnity, six percent of \$12,000 or \$720.00 a year to this plan in order that he may gain a pension at a later date. And when does that later date come along? Well first of all, where a person has contributed under the Act in respect of sessions in more than two parliaments there shall be paid to him in his lifetime from that point on a pension. Now what does that mean? That means he's got to go through three elections. Here we say eight sessions which in most cases as it applies to this Legislature today is three elections. I for one have fought three elections and I came into this House in 1958 and many other members who came in at that time have fought the same number. The Honourable Member from St. George I think fought four elections, and he's only been in the House a year or two longer than me. So three elections is in effect really the qualification. And what does he get? After he is pre-qualified and has paid his six percent in for this period, which could work out to six, seven or eight years, or six, seven or eight sessions, same basically as this plan here, he then is entitled to a pension for the rest of his natural life, regardless of his age at the time he starts to take it, or five-twelfths of his contribution. And quickly, and I'm not a mathematician, I just worked out on a back of a piece of paper what that would work out to - if I can find the piece of paper - and it works out roughly, Madam Speaker, that a member in the House of Commons today would get a pension after ten years of \$5,400 a year for the rest of his life. Now let me add, there's a maximum placed on this pension in the Federal House. The maximum is \$9,000.00. Regardless of how long you contribute or what your age is, the maximum pension that you can get per annum is \$9,000.00. The minimum pension because the old plan had to be considered, is I believe \$5,400.00. I'll just get that figure accurate - \$5,400 - because when they brought in the new plan they had to make a differentiation between those who had been contributing under the old and those contributing under the new.

And by the way, even under the old Liberal Plan at Ottawa, the members were entitled to 75 percent of their contributions prior to the Pearson Plan coming in which entitled them to five-twelfths of their contribution. So, Madam Speaker, we find the situation where a member at Ottawa after ten years service, if he's defeated or resigns, is entitled for the rest of his life regardless of his age, even if he's as young and handsome as the Member for Brokenhead, to \$5,400 a year. Madam Speaker, a Cabinet Minister in Manitoba today under the plan that is presently before us, under this proposal, after ten years would get - and this is rough figuring - in the area of between 38 and \$3,900 according to my figures. Now I'm not going to spend a lot of time equating or trying to equate or trying to say that a member of a Cabinet in any Provincial Legislature is as good as a member of parliament, although I must admit in my heart I feel that he is, I feel that he does as much work, I feel that having executive responsibility he's got more responsibility than the average member of parliament - and in so saying I take nothing away from a member of parliament.

And in describing this plan, the Pearson Plan in Ottawa, I take nothing away from that

(MR. LYON cont'd.) plan because I think those people down there deserve it, because too often have I in my short lifetime seen some of the political wrecks that have been washed up on the shore of life, who after devoting their life, in some cases, to politics and to public service, have been turned out of office or have had to resign on account of illness and within a short time have been on welfare or been on some form of gift from their party organization to keep them going.

I think members opposite in the Liberal Party should know particularly what I mean because some of their members were defeated in 1958. Let them consult their own consciences and their own hearts and let them stand up and tell us whether all of those members, some of whom had served in executive responsibility, some of whom had been in the back bench it's true - whether all of them were able to fend for themselves immediately or whether or not -- or whether or yet - or whether or not some form of assistance would have been most welcome and deserved -- and deserved -- and that's the point.

Well, Madam Speaker, we're not going to get into personalities, at least I'm not going to get into personalities, but I say to honourable members of the Liberal Party, let them search their hearts, their consciences and their minds and see if they can't think of the cases that I know of, not only from their own party but from all parties in this House. I can think of some Conservatives, I can think of the odd NDP member, who should have had and who deserved because of his public service, a pension, a small pittance for the service that he had given to the people of this province and in previous years because we have not accepted the principle of this legislation, in previous years that was denied to him -- wrongly denied to him I say, Madam Speaker, and I don't think that that denial should continue any longer than it has to.

My honourable friend from St. Boniface says that we were feathering our nest. Well then I pointed out to him if we are feathering our nest then what are they doing under the Pearson Plan at Ottawa. Is he willing to say that his soulmate from St. Boniface, the Honourable Roger Teillet, is feathering his nest? I don't think Roger Teillet is feathering his nest. I think he is giving service to the people of Canada, but he's going to get after ten years, \$5,400 regardless of when he retires. I don't think any of the Liberal Members of Parliament in Ottawa are feathering their nests even though under that pension plan they will get a considerably larger - a considerably larger pension indemnity than any member of this Cabinet will get or have the expectation of getting. And they will get it at any age. And, Madam Speaker, they will deserve it at any age because they are giving service in the highest field to which I feel man can aspire in this age. They deserve it. Well one could go on.

One could enumerate the cases such as the Honourable the Leader of the NDP has mentioned - hard cases that we all know. One could enumerate all of the different sacrifices, small medium and large that Members of this House make from time to time, but we're not here to pat ourselves on the back or to tell the public what a grand bunch of fellows we are. But I think we are here to be realistic. I don't think the public of Manitoba want second-class citizens in their Legislature. I don't think the public of Manitoba want to feel that their Legislature can only attract in the future second-class citizens. Somebody said they wanted an election — there was some comment made that the Members of the Cabinet over here were concerned about getting a pension because they wouldn't be around after another election. Madam Speaker, I'm something like the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I think that as long as we have the same official opposition in Manitoba that we have today, we can be around here just about as long as anybody wants us to be and there won't be any problem at all. I've never heard of a government being defeated by no alternative. But that is a side issue. That couldn't matter less because what we are talking about here, whether or not honourable members in the Liberal Party appreciate it -- and I shouldn't say all honourable members, I just say those who have spoken - whether they appreciate it is the principle and I've tried to show here how the application of the same principle in certainly the senior jurisdiction in our country, cannot be described, and is not being described, certainly by the Member for St. Boniface as feathering their own nests. Did he stand up in this House or anywhere in Manitoba in 1963 and say that terrible Pearson government, they're feathering their own nests down there. What about it Honourable Minister of Veterans' Affairs -- you're feathering your own nest when you put in a plan like that. Did he say that? Of course he didn't because he didn't believe it. He doesn't believe it today but he says it.

MR. DESJARDINS: is my responsibility the federal field now?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I merely say that

MR. DESJARDINS: Smokescreen again, eh?

MR. LYON: I merely say to my honourable friend that if one is going to draw the kind of silly and illogical conclusion from a proposal that is before us, that my honourable friend does draw, then he deserves to have pointed out to him what the facts of life are in other jurisdictions in Canada.

MR. DESJARDINS: Let's worry about Manitoba.

MR. LYON: I want to tell the honourable member, Madam Speaker, that it is just not good enough in this age - and I hope he comes to realize this sooner or later - it's not just good enough to stand up in this House like a wild bull in a china shop going around goring at every straw man in sight. It's not good enough to do that. It's not good enough just to be inflammatory without any substance behind it. It's not good enough just to be flamboyant for a headline sake because you've got to, sooner or later, get some substance behind you -- (Interjection) -- and my honourable friend would do well to try and obtain substance if he intends to have any political career in this province.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not worried about Ottawa.

MR. LYON: But I take heart, Madam Speaker, because he spoke against the legislation and probably that is the greatest test to prove that it's right.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? And that has to do with his calculation insofar as the Ottawa pension. Did I understand him correctly to say that they get five -- first of all that the salary or the indemnity is \$12,000, they pay six percent and they're entitled to five-twelfths of their contribution after ten years?

MR. LYON: Well after

MR. MOLGAT: Yes. Because my honourable friend, I think, made the calculation of ten years to arrive at \$5,400? I don't see how you get that figure. -- (Interjection) --. Madam Speaker, I would like to have an answer to the question because the Minister spoke about \$5,400.00.

MR. LYON: I worked it out quickly here. I'll try to work it out.....

MR. MOLGAT: My calculation is that it comes to \$3,000.00 - in other words almost half the figure that my honourable friend quoted. Is that correct?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I can ask him a question also. That is where he gets the idea that we're responsible for what's going on at Ottawa. I fail to see that.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I have no hesitation in answering that question. It wasn't a question of responsibility, it's a question of whether or not we agree with it, and whether or not we apply the same flamboyant adjectives against the Ottawa plan that are applied against this plan.

MR. DESJARDINS: not our responsibility.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it correct then that the Ottawa pension would not be \$5,400 at the end of ten years?

MR. LYON: I'll have to work it out. My information is that it's five-twelfths -- five-twelfths of six percent of the total contribution.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, wouldn't it be correct to say if their indemnity is \$12,000 and they pay six percent, that would be \$720.00 per year? If they paid in for ten years the example my honourable friend used, it would be \$7,200; and five-twelfths of \$7,200 would be \$3,000?

MR. LYON: -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry. Madam Speaker, I computed that on the basis of the first eight years under the old plan which was three-quarters and the last two years under the new plan which is five-twelfths.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the honourable member closes the debate, the Minister who introduced this, I would like to add a few words on this subject. We've had the usual speech from my friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the normal declarations that we get from the honourable gentleman and the normal action on the part of the government whenever they're in hot water. They bring in my honourable friend with his undoubtedly gift and talent for bringing in a great deal of material that has nothing to do whatever with the subject at hand.

My honourable friend has had considerable to do with actions in court and so on, and he seems to think that the same sort of an approach will work here. He flays right and left and brings in by comments a lot of issues that have nothing to do at all with what is before us. And

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . if there is one prime example of that, my honourable friend's great affinity in this session to bring in Ottawa. Whenever this government is in some difficulty, it comes Ottawa. Immediately we're expected over here to come to the defence of Ottawa and we're supposed to — well you would almost think that we're the conscience of Ottawa insofar as the Liberal Party of this province is concerned, and if Ottawa does wrong, we should be correcting them and we should certainly be watching them all the time. Madam Speaker, what Ottawa does, has no bearing on the responsibilities of the Government of the Province of Manitoba nor on mine as Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba. In those spheres where Ottawa action has to do with provincial matters I will take the position that I think is right for the Province of Manitoba. In those spheres that have nothing to do with provincial action then they can take care of their own affairs. I suggest to my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that he find some other argument and he better get back to what's being discussed here.

My honourable friend said that the government looked for something reasonable and that this pension plan is less than what is being done elsewhere. Madam Speaker, one of my objections to this bill is the way in which it was brought in; the fact that it comes before us at the very end of the Session; the fact that we're asked now, very quickly to make a decision on this, when it's not that easy to get all the information. Surely the bill could have been presented to the members long before this. It's number, I note, is 110, but it certainly didn't come in in the numbered sequence that one might expect. Judging from the number it must have been printed some time ago. It came on our desks on Monday the 3rd of May at 8:45 at night. At a time when this House is sitting three sessions per day, the members do not have time to make the research that is necessary. However, I did attempt to get the information that I could on what was being done in other provinces and I find that I cannot agree with the Minister who has just spoken when he says that this is substantially less than what is being done elsewhere.

In one particular phase, Madam Speaker, the plans that I have looked at in the other provinces, and I readily admit that I have not had the time to look at all of them, but in those that I've been able to look at, the pension does not start at the time that the member ceases to be a member of this House. It starts by and large at age 55 or 60. And the Member of Brokenhead, when he spoke, unless he had a different Ontario Act than the one I have, and I admit that this is possible, that I may have made a mistake in getting the information, but my information is that in the Ontario Act, to be eligible a member must have 10 or more years of service and be age 55. If he should become eligible before age 55, then he can only receive the pension on a reduced amount, but he does not get full pension until he reaches age 55. And I think that in other jurisdictions — I think this is the case in Saskatchewan — they do not get any pension until they reach age 55. So for my honourable friend the Minister to say in his very flamboyant manner, isn't it terrible that the person who comes in here and polishes the desks of the legislator can get a pension but the legislator cannot get a pension is a completely erroneous argument, because the individual who comes in here and polishes the desks after we leave here late at night does not get a pension at age 30 as my colleague from Brokenhead, or at age 40 as the member who has just spoken can get or as I could obtain myself at age 37.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise on a point of privilege, I said specifically that I did not think it was a good idea to have someone eligible for a pension at the age of 30, and that I would support an amendment, or if no amendment were presented, I gave an undertaking here that I would donate it to some charitable institution for a period of ten to fifteen or twenty years. I don't need that pension, the Member for Ste. Rose can have it.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I don't know why my honourable friend is so touchy. I have used merely because he mentioned himself that because of the age at which he came in this House under the present bill he could be eligible for pension at that age, I really don't know what he understood in my comment, because that is all I was saying. In the same way as I believe that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who has just spoken would himself be eligible for a pension under this plan under age 40, and as in my own case I too would be eligible for a pension now at age 38 under the present Act. Well surely that isn't the case for the person who comes in here and polishes the desks. That person waits until age 65 before they get a pension — and that is truly then a pension, Madam Speaker — but to start paying immediately on leaving this House is not a pension, this is merely an extension of income. This isn't a pension plan, this is an extension of income; you're paid for the time that you're here and then you're paid forever thereafter, if you're here for eight years. Now, surely, Madam Speaker, there is no relationship between that type of a pension plan and what we

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) normally consider to be a pension plan as we have for the staff of this province and to attempt to compare the two as the Honourable member has done is just one more red herring. There is no relationship at all between them.

Madam Speaker, the Minister spoke about the affluent society, said that wasn't it wonderful that the affluent society was here that we should be - at least we're striving always for the affluent society. Well I don't really know what his philosophy is, as to how we're going to get the affluent society in the Province of Manitoba by starting off by giving the 57 of us who are here pensions. I think there are many other places that we can start. My honourable friend is so concerned - and he has reason to be concerned about the people of the Province of Manitoba, because, Madam Speaker, the people of the Province of Manitoba are not well off and the information for this comes from my honourable friends themselves. Here is what, for example, their latest economic report dated March '65, second annual report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board says, "even now it is apparent that a significant proportion of the Manitoba Labour Force is so engaged that it's earnings are quite low" - and then they define what they mean by a note -- "Professor Firestone for example has estimated that 20 percent of our population in 1961 was at or below the poverty level." Twenty percent of our population at or below the poverty level according to the facts given by my honourable friends themselves.

We have facts, Madam Speaker, given to us by the ARDA studies that have been conducted in this province, studies that we've been discussing in this House, studies that my honourable friends have been participating in. What do the ARDA studies show for Manitobans? They show - and I refer here to indicators of rural poverty in Canada by province, some of the indices that they have taken - the percentage of all families that have low income - and what do they mean by low income, well people who make less or who sell, not make, who sell less than \$2,500 a year and where they have off-farm labour of less than 25 days a year. In other words people whose total sales from their farm operations are less than \$2,500 - and this obviously does not represent net income as the Minister of Agriculture tells us all the time, this represents strictly gross income - so gross of 25, the net is very much less. Well 25 percent of the rural population of Manitoba was in that category, Madam Speaker. Twenty-five percent of our rural population had total sales of farm products of less than \$2,500.00. They then took figures off on the rural non-farm families and they found that rural non-farm families with income below \$3,000, in Manitoba, 48 percent of them; in other words half of the population of rural Manitoba outside of farming earned less than \$3,000 - per family, Madam Speaker, not per person. They conducted studies for example on the male, rural, non-farm wage earners and they found that 31 percent of them in Manitoba earned less than \$2,000 per year. Studies were conducted on how our people lived. They found for example that in the Province of Manitoba at this time 70 percent of rural homes did not have hot or cold water; 80 percent of rural homes did not have indoor toilets; 50 percent of rural homes did not have furnaces.

These, Madam Speaker, are some of the studies that have been conducted by the Federal Government in conjunction with the government of this province when we were discussing those this morning. They are distressing figures. Extremely distressing figures. None of us are happy about those figures, Madam Speaker, and I will say in fairness that the government is doing something to correct this. I think that the government is doing something to correct this and I think that the work of ARDA, particularly in the areas where it is going, will be an assistance and we can hope to improve this. But, Madam Speaker, for the member who has spoken, for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to say that the way to get to the affluent society is to start off by paying pensions to members of this House, is in my opinion working in reverse.

Madam Speaker, the Minister who spoke made great todo about not getting good people in this House and about how this was necessary in order to get good people here. I can't agree more with the necessity of getting good men and women to stand for public office. It is unfortunate that not enough of our people are prepared to become active not just at this level but in our municipal and our schools fields as well, but, Madam Speaker, I am not one of those who believe that money is the main reason for preventing people from getting into politics. I think that there has to be reasonable return for the effort and for the time spent. I think that Cabinet Ministers are entitled to be paid adequate salaries for the responsibility that they have. The government of this province is one of the biggest businesses that we have and they should be paid adequate salaries. I think even more that the permanent civil service, the deputy ministers, who are the ones who come here as the experts in their field and on whom we must

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . rely by and large for the continuity of government, must be paid excellent salaries if we are to attract the type of men that we want.

But, Madam Speaker, for most of us in this House politics is not a full time occupation. I think most of the people who ran in the last election and the election before, and those before them, did not run on the basis that they were going to make politics their full life's work and devote all of their time to it. And that is how our system is based. Our system is based on those members in the House being in effect a legislative group who meet not on a full-time basis but on a part-time basis. The situation in Ottawa has developed differently and there it has become a full-time job and it has meant for these people that they must have in most cases, two homes. Madam Speaker, that is not the case at the provincial level. It is not the case for most of us. And when you look at what the indemnities are in this House, the time that is spent by the most of us, I'm not sure that in the light of circumstances in Manitoba, when you consider that our levels of income in this province are not the same as those in other provinces, I'm not prepared to accept the wagging finger of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he says "niggling and quibbling". My honourable friend had better have a look around the Province of Manitoba before he starts making that kind of speech in this House. What the members in this House get, Madam Speaker, whatever advantages they get from pension plans if the government is going to put this through, must be kept in relationship to our responsibilities; it must be kept in relationship to the over-all situation in the Province of Manitoba. It must be kept in relationship to what other people are contributing at the municipal level and at the school level and I can't agree, Madam Speaker, when speeches are made here feeling sorry for ourselves.

Madam Speaker, I cannot agree with the bill that is before us. In my opinion this bill was presented to the House as I said in an improper way. I don't believe that the information that should have been given on a bill of this type was fully given. When I asked questions as to what this would cost the treasury of this province I was told the figure of \$20,000.00. I don't know where that figure came from, Madam Speaker, but I cannot see, when I take the bill and I try and extend the figures relating to some of the individuals who are here now, how we can say that this will cost only \$20,000 per year. I think it will cost substantially more than that. But, Madam Speaker, I would be prepared to say well if that is a legitimate cost in the light of circumstances in Manitoba, that's a legitimate cost and it's going to do what is required to be done to improve the situation in this House, I would be prepared to give it second thoughts. But I really do not believe that this is going to make the difference that is claimed; and in any case, Madam Speaker, it is not going to make the difference so far as the members who are here now. If it is going to make a difference it will only be for those who will come in either after we leave here or after some of us leave here, and I would suggest to the government that they withdraw this bill. That they redraft it insofar as its applications; that it be presented as a true pension bill; one that can only take effect when people really reach what we consider pension age; and that this bill not be applicable until after the next election for those who will be coming. Then we will see whether or not this bill does in fact have the effect of getting better people to stand for public office.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Provincial Secretary. The honourable member is closing the debate.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would just like to give a few thoughts on Bill 110. I think as a rule, we as members are not opposed to pensions because we've subscribed to the principle in the past as far as our aged are concerned, as far as our blind people, and as far as our disabled people, we provide for them a pension. This is supposed to give them the necessary purchasing power to have a decent living and this is generally subscribed to all across Canada. I know the provinces to the west, on the west coast, they definitely do give more to these people than any other provinces in Canada. And I therefore say that we agree to the principle in general.

We also in this province as a government provide to the pensions of the teachers even though we're not employers, so that if we can justify the matter of contributing to the teachers pension, surely enough we could contribute to the members of this Assembly here. In the year 1963 this government contributed \$528,000 towards the teachers pensions, and we are not employers of teachers; so on that ground then during this same session that we are just, or will be completing shortly, we have passed a bill whereby we're giving pensions to the officers of our marketing boards, and while I have nothing against the people serving on these boards, but in many cases I don't subscribe to those boards and they're being there at this time.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) We are giving these people a pension so I see nothing wrong with giving a pension to members of this Assembly that will need it, that will probably, if they do not come back or if they decide otherwise not to run, will have to fall back on something.

But, in my opinion the bill that is before us is not equitable in that I think that the pensions should be equal to all members alike and that this should be based on the indemnity alone and for that reason I feel that there's too great a difference between the amounts that will be extended to the average member and to those of Cabinet. So while in principle I do not object to a pension, nevertheless, I don't think the bill is equitable and I will have to reject it on that ground. Probably later on if it should go to law amendments and amendments might be made to suit or would have the intentions of having it more equalized, I could then support it.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, in closing the debate my few remarks will seem very anticlimactic after the very complete debate that we've listened to this afternoon. I have already indicated my complete support for the principle underlined here in Bill 110 and the longer that I am here the more convinced I am that pensions for all that toil here are really just and fair. This bill when passed will remedy the present deficiency of no security and of no funds for the transition period from a servant of the public to the relocation of oneself and one's family.

I said earlier that I did not think there was any lengthy justification required to persuade the honourable members for the need of this legislation. I detected in the speeches that I've heard on this bill from the opposition that they are really in general agreement with the principle of the bill. Of course, I guess, it is too much to expect, and I really did not expect it, to be able to bring in a bill that could receive unanimous consent. This bill after all affects us all. Affects everyone in this House in a different way, and it is most difficult to separate one's own individual position from the welfare of the whole.

Suggestion has been made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that the bill be withdrawn and that a new bill be drawn up on an actuarial basis, on a typical pension plan basis, and I would like to repeat to him what I have said and what we have found out, originally, that we recognize as others have that due to the uncertainty of the contributory periods and the relatively small number of persons involved that the plan just cannot be placed on an actuarial basis. Contributions to this fund will be paid into the Consolidated Fund and payment of allowances made therefrom. It is not expected that the cost, as I said, to the Crown will be significant, and then when I was queried by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as to what I anticipated that cost would be, I said with due reservation that it could be in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 per year. I have since worked out a scheme where it wouldn't cost the Consolidated Fund or the taxpayers of this province a single penny, and that would be the simple process of re-electing to this House until their death all of the present 57 members, and in this way, which isn't a bad idea, we could save the public from any great expense.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? I thought that one of the purposes of the bill was to improve the quality of those

MR. STEINKOPF: I was just going to say "we improve with age". Some of us are still fairly young, or like to think that we're young, and we too will improve with age. But we did try in the first instance to pattern this bill as close to the average of those in other provinces and to the latest amendments to the federal bill and as we are living in a generation of pensions and the development and concept in pensions is a phenomena of our time. So it is only natural that we will suggest an amendment which I intend to do and I intend to support when this bill comes before committee, and in general that amendment will be to provide in cases where the contributor is eligible and is under the age of 55, the opportunity for him to elect, him or her, to elect to have the payments delayed until he reaches the age of 55 and then be continued until his death; or alternatively to receive the payments immediately upon becoming eligible and then for the next ensuing 12 years or until death. Now this in effect puts a 55 year ceiling or limit on the time that one can draw the pension. I think that I will have the amendment prepared and ready for committee and at that time be prepared to discuss it in detail.

I would not like to close the debate without making one specific reference to one of the remarks that was made and that sort of touched me in a very peculiar manner, and that was when the Honourable Member for Selkirk referred to me and again suggested, after he had suggested that the legislation was of a panic nature, that it was really an unconscionable transaction. Now I know that you have to have a rather vivid and wild imagination to relate this bill to anything of an unconscionable transaction but when that term is used in bills that I bring in - and particularly because I may be a little self-conscious of the fact that I brought in that bill,

May 6th, 1965

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) and the mere fact that it was also used by the member who sits beside him, the Honourable Member from Lakeside when he referred to the Art Gallery transactions - I resent it, and I feel that this bill, this pension bill, there is nothing personal, had nothing to do with an unconscionable transaction and that the bill has all the merit of being a good bill for all of the people in this House now and for a long time to come.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 110.

A standing vote was then taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paultey, Roblin, Schreyer, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Cowan, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8 o'clock Thursday evening.