

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 23, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Minister of Welfare

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) introduced Bill No. 85, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 99, an Act to validate By-law No. 3916 of The City of Portage la Prairie and other matters.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the resolutions standing on the Order Paper in my name, and in the name of the Minister of Education.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Motive Fuel Tax Act to provide, among other matters, for the payment of the tax imposed thereunder at the time the motive fuel is received.

MR. EVANS: This legislation provides for the exemption from taxation of marked or coloured motive fuel and limits it to authorized uses. In addition, it provides for fixing the time of payment of tax at the time the gasoline is received rather than the time it is purchased. There is a technical correction to the subsection which limits the offence to such instances where a person has been lawfully called upon to make a return and makes a false return.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, do I understand under this that the tax will have to be paid and even though if a given business extended credit that once the farmer receives the fuel that he would have to pay the tax immediately. Is that the intent?

MR. EVANS: I wonder if my honourable friend would be good enough to repeat the question. I'm sorry I haven't understood it.

MR. FROESE: Maybe I'm wrong in this because this is a removal of the tax is it?

MR. EVANS: Yes, this is eliminating the tax on coloured gasoline for specified - not gasoline, motive fuel - allowing coloured motive fuel to be sold without tax, but for limited uses. So I think my honourable friend is right in saying it's a removal rather than the imposition of a tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Gasoline Tax Act to provide, among other matters,

(a) for the payment of the tax imposed thereunder at the time the gasoline is received; and

(b) to permit the use of coloured gasoline, in respect of which tax is not required to be paid, in farm trucks.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this legislation provides for the extension to operators of all farm trucks as defined in The Highway Traffic Act carrying a farm truck licence of the right to use coloured tax-exempt gasoline in those trucks. This follows from the intention announced in the budget address to provide a further restraint on the rising cost of food by helping to reduce the farm production costs. The exemption of food under the Sales Tax Act has already been confirmed. The farmers' dilemma of constantly increasing costs on the one

(MR. EVANS, cont'd)hand and the narrowing price opportunity on the other is one which has serious implications for the entire community. The new exemption for farm trucks will have effect from the 1st day of May, 1967. The new provision for the use of coloured gas will apply throughout the year. It is felt that the measure will have benefit for farm families and consumers alike and it reduces farm production costs.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the question that has been in the mind of many people was what the farm truck was going to mean particularly did it include the half-ton truck or not. I gather from the Minister's statement and from reading the definition of a farm truck in the Highway Traffic Act that it refers to any kind of a truck, any size of a truck; presumably that is what he's proposing.

MR. EVANS: a farm truck licence.

MR. MOLGAT: If it has a farm truck licence, right. I wonder if the Minister could now table, Mr. Chairman, the Gilson report. I had asked the First Minister for this report some time ago and he indicated the government had received it. This was commissioned by the government about a year ago now I think. We had requested on two occasions on this side of the House that the law be changed in Manitoba to make it the same as Saskatchewan and the government finally did appoint Dr. Gilson to study this. Now we are faced with legislation coming up but this side of the House has not seen the Gilson report. Could we expect it now?

MR. EVANS: I know copies are being prepared not only for tabling but for all members and my understanding is that they're - I was going to say soon or immediately. I expect by the next time we consider this I'll be able to distribute the report.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I've been questioned on many times and I am sure other members have been questioned on this very matter over the last month or two - will there be any restrictions placed on farm trucks as to the distance they can be away from their home place, is there any radius in which they will be able to operate under a farm truck licence? Then too, I'm not sure whether the bill will be distributed today so that we can inform ourselves, otherwise some of these questions might not be necessary, but I am sure now that the thing is out, we will be questioned at home over the weekend and I'd sure appreciate more information on this.

MR. EVANS: I think my honourable friend will be better able to answer the question when he sees the bill. There is no intention to place any distance limit on the - as my honourable friend puts it - the radius within which a truck may operate from the home base - no, there is not intention to put such a limit on them. Distribution of the bill, I'm not quite sure whether the copies are ready for distribution now. If they receive first reading I think they should be distributed as soon as they are available. I wonder if - I think there are indications the bill is ready and will be distributed right away.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I did understand my honourable friend correctly I believe when he said there would be no restriction on the amount of coloured gas that any one farmer could use.

MR. EVANS: I didn't say so, but there is no such limit.

MR. SHOEMAKER: No limit at all? Well, that's very encouraging news indeed for me because when the Gilson report - or when it was suggested last year that Gilson was going to table his report my honourable friend indicated that there could be restrictions and limitations. Now, a question that I would be interested in: what is the estimated saving to agriculture by virtue of bringing in the bill - what is the total estimated amount that the farmers will save?

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend is asking me for what I would term as a guesstimate. Obviously I don't know what the consumption will be. I've made some estimates for budgeting purposes - I can tell my honourable friend it may be on towards \$3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1 standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Education:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Affiliated Colleges Grants Act to provide for the payment of grants to affiliated colleges in respect of the fiscal year of the government ending on the thirty-first day of March, 1968.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, this Bill, as we know The Affiliated Colleges Grants Act that was passed in 1963 provided that the interest earned from the School Land Trust Fund in any year should be applied to the support of affiliated colleges in the province according to a formula spelled out in that Act. The full interest earnings of the fund, the interest monies that were not used were accumulated to the capital of this fund. This Act will be amended, it will be before you, calls for the amendment in the first instance to

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) that Act to provide for the distribution of all of the interest monies from that fund in the current year; this was recommended to the government by the Council of Higher Learning and accepted. It makes that provision and then it - does that for the current year; and in addition as you know to the monies received by the affiliated colleges through this Act. The colleges in the past received monies directly from the Federal Government and under the new post-secondary arrangements proposed by the Federal authorities its former grants will be replaced by a new form of assistance to be paid through the province in respect of all forms of post-secondary education.

The Federal regulations under which this new assistance will be paid has not been published, and we propose in the current year as we said during my estimates to provide support to the affiliated colleges by making grants to the colleges in the sum of 1.9 million which was included in those estimates and as I said at that time it is an interim measure to assist the colleges during the current year until the exact effect of the new Federal-Provincial arrangements can be determined.

The method of distribution of support of the interest monies under that Act were determined in concert with the affiliated colleges concerned and it's proposed in the current year that the same method of apportionment would be applied except that of course Brandon College now being a university is not included. And then as these new measures come into effect, this new support policy of the Affiliated Colleges Act is being withdrawn. So in short the Act requires a money resolution because it deals with these several matters, each of which I'll be happy to go into in depth on second reading if there's any information required.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us exactly what the affiliated colleges got from the interest payments on the Fund that was used for this.

Then the other question relates to - we're now dealing with two matters here - one is the interest payments back some years ago, I'd like to know how much that is. Then the other one is of course the new federal arrangement. Now according to a table in Hansard, Friday, March 3, 1967 - this is the Federal Hansard - the estimates there are that this year, under the previous program, that is if the original program of \$5.00 per capita had continued, Manitoba would have received 5.1 million. I wonder if the Minister agrees with that calculation and how much is going to be paid of that portion, if the figure is correct, to the Affiliated Colleges and how much to the University of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON: The interest earnings from the Fund last year were 270,000; the full interest earnings which will be distributed under this Act this year are 440,000; then the Act will be repealed.

The 5.1 million is meaningless unless you know what's on the negative side of the ledger plus what's on the positive side of the ledger and as those arrangements have not been completed nor the formulas determined, I cannot make a further statement at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what he expects the affiliated colleges to get under the program; 1.9 million, is the statement he made. Now what is, when he says what's on the positive side or the negative side, surely the previous program was a clear program, was it not? It was \$5.00 per capita. Then it's easy to determine what we received in the past, fairly easy to determine on the basis of our present population what we could have expected this year. Now the new program is not going to give any less. The new program is going actually to give more. Admittedly there are some other responsibilities that the government undertakes in the other post-secondary fields but this same table indicates that compared to the 5.1 million received last year, or expected to be received, and the technical school program of 4.8 million, we could have expected 9.9. The new formula taking in both technical and university, this table indicates we will receive 22.8, so it will be an increase of some \$13 million on this basis.

What I am questioning, Mr. Chairman, is, is the government in fact going to put all of this into university and technical and how is it going to be shared because the new program gives the province the right to collect that income tax, The Federal Government has vacated the field, but in order that it will go for education purposes. So it seems to me that the Minister should be in a position to give us an estimate of what the breakdown will be.

MR. JOHNSON: The total monies given to the affiliated colleges last year, excluding Brandon, through direct grants from the Federal Government was \$1 million - 1 million, and then the Affiliated Grants Fund was 268 thousand, and as we said this year we not only placed that through the provincial coffers but we are adding to the 1.9 million; as we said, until we get our final breakdown, this is the amount that was passed in the estimates this year, and the

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) proposal is that in replacing the money that has been withdrawn - the million, replacing that - and adding more provincial monies to the affiliated grants, we would as an interim measure, as will be described in the Act that will come before us, it shows that we're going to use the same formula as we agreed to previously re enrollment and break-down for that money this year and hopefully as we complete our arrangements we will come to a new understanding as we work our way through this.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister whether up to the present the Federal Government has given grants for community colleges, whether there's been a ratio or a certain kind of grant given for institutions of that nature.

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Education: Resolve that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the establishment of the Public Schools Finance Board and to provide among other matters for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund of amounts for the purpose of providing the Board with working capital.

MR. JOHNSON: This requires a money resolution of the Public School Finance Board Act which will be before us, Mr. Chairman; because it will permit the Provincial Treasurer to provide the Board with working capital from the Consolidated Revenue with moneys authorized by the Legislature. I think this will become evident and self-explanatory when the Bill is before the Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 82, An Act to amend the Motive Fuel Tax Act.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 84 An Act to amend The Affiliated Colleges Grants Act, and Bill No. 96, An Act, to provide for the establishment of The Public Schools Finance Board Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked yesterday if advance polls could be arranged for the election of trustees on the 31st. No provision was made for advance polls and it would be impossible to do so at this time. It wasn't contemplated. It was hoped that - and the polls close at 8:00 o'clock on March 31st -- hopefully the people would be able to vote. I thought I should say that it would not be possible to amend that at this time.

While I'm on my feet I would also like to say that also a question was asked: "Can a candidate withdraw to be nominated." I hope good men will not withdraw but they can always withdraw up to 9:00 a.m. of March 31st.

And with respect to voters' lists, these are the same lists that were compiled by the Divisional Returning Officers for the Referendum, which was the latest list made from the Municipal list plus any lists the divisions already had, so the voters' lists are quite complete in that regard.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education, or perhaps the First Minister. In view of the affidavit tabled before the House by the Member for Gladstone the other day, could the Minister advise the House what action they contemplate taking?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Being the Minister responsible for the Boundaries Commission, I would like to tell the honourable member that I have it under consideration.

MR. MILLER: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister perhaps tell us when we might have a report on this.

MRS. FORBES: I couldn't answer that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. There is some concern on the part of the Winnipeg School Board as to when they will learn what monies they will get under the Foundation Program. Can the Minister indicate within what period of time they will learn of this.

MR. JOHNSON: I think the Board are aware that we have an Act before the House. As soon as it's passed, regulations will be made and they'll be given every consideration.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture but I see he isn't there. Well, someone else probably can answer it. But it's simply this: If I have a farm at Neepawa and a farm at Stonewall, we'll say, both insured under The Crop Insurance, and one suffers a loss, are the yields combined to determine the amount payable under The Crop Insurance Plan?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, and see that the Honourable Minister gets it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an acting Minister of Agriculture is there not?

MR. LYON: We'll take the matter as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates second reading. Bill No. 38.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to reply to a question asked of me by the Honourable Member for Inkster on March 21st, before the Orders of the Day.

The question was: Could the Minister determine whether it was or was not unanimous and could the Minister also advise whether any labour members of the Board resigned from the Board or refused to sit on the Board after they had commenced sittings and give the information to the House. The answer to the first part of the question: Yes, the Minister could, but it has not been the practice to demand of the Board how they arrived at their determination. I don't think it would serve a useful purpose at this time for me to do it this year. There have been members of the Board resign since its inception in 1964, both of labour and management and they have been replaced by nominations of labour organizations and management organizations and I am not aware of any member of the Board refusing to sit at any time.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister find out - and I don't want an answer now - whether one of the members resigned and gave the reason that his continued participation on the Board would not be of service to organized labour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill 38. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if you will, Sir, we should like to call on the government business, Bill No. 56 and then the Committee of Supply. Those would be the only two items we would propose to call.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Bill, we have had numerous petitions all the way around this Chamber on this Bill, in protest against it, from the dry cleaners in particular and the shoemakers. Now we ask for improvements for the people but not as a sales tax. There are numerous ways of bringing in revenue without a sales tax. We feel that there has to be taxes in Manitoba here but to bring the taxes in in this way is going to hurt the very people we are trying to protect. In my estimation the Premier - I wouldn't say the Premier I can't blame him personally - the Government of Manitoba is trying to force a sales tax on the people of Manitoba. A sales tax is an unjust tax. It violates the principle of taxation, to be fair should be based on the ability to pay. To the wealthy a sales tax may be a petty nuisance but to the working people, a pensioner, on those on low and fixed incomes, it means hardship and troubles. For small merchants it would mean a nuisance and a headache just to collect the tax. A sales tax will mean to most wage earning families a drop in their standard of living of about 5 percent. This comes at a time when millions of Canadians are protesting the high cost of food and housing. It is sheer arrogance for the government to introduce such an audacious tax when working people are finding it difficult to pay for the necessities. The government plans to take away about \$30 million from the people by a sales tax but has given away \$25 million and more to foreign-owned corporations in the form of grants, tax concessions and other favours.

I would like to say this, that I can't see myself why we in Manitoba can't put our house in order and sell the goods we have in Manitoba. They belong to the Manitobans. And if we do this thing we wouldn't want to bring any such tax as this in. Tax the whole population with the

(MR. HARRIS, cont'd) ability to pay and that is all you need to do and that is all I'm going to say this morning. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to complete the debate at this time on this amendment if I may, if there are no other speakers.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if I could rise on a point of order. I don't believe my honourable friend has the right to close the debate on an amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think that if you will check on precedents in this House you will find that it has been done on previous occasions. I am sorry I don't have my Hansards with me here but I'm sure it has been done on previous times.

MR. LYON: It may have been done, Mr. Speaker, but if so I think it would be - subject to your ruling of course, Sir - I think it would be in contravention of Rule 46 which says that "subject to sub-rule 2 a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a Bill may reply, but not a member who has moved on Order of the Day, not being the second reading of a Bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate or an instruction to a committee." It is under this same rule, Sir, that we are prohibited, I believe, from replies on third readings of bills. It is not as clear perhaps as we would like it to be but I believe this is the effect of it. However, I leave that for your consideration.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would just like to call your attention the fact that we have it on very high authority in this House, namely, the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Speaker's rulings become precedent and my honourable friend the Leader of this Party is quite correct in saying that we had such a Speaker's ruling some time ago. Not while you were in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, but one of your immediate predecessors, and on the basis of the dictum laid down in the House by my honourable friend the Attorney-General that Speakers don't make mistakes, they make precedents and that precedent I suggest to you has become our rule. Could I quote a higher authority?

MR. LYON: He probably could, Mr. Speaker, but on the point of order unless a distinct ruling was made on this the fact that a speech was permitted is not a precedent in itself. There must be a ruling to override the rule.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would frankly have to check back in my Hansards because it is my practice that when a ruling is made to so mark my Hansard at that date. I don't have it here. I could do so.

Mr. Speaker, if you wish to take the matter under consideration I will be certainly prepared to check through my records and get the time and place where it was allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opinion of the honourable gentleman but I do feel that on an important question of this kind that I might take the matter under advisement for consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill No. 65. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Oh, I beg your pardon.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the next Order I believe would be the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion that the House now resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. 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.

MR. 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 Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Department No. 13. Public Works. Resolution 86. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, in previous times I used to quote a portion of the Anglican Church Order of Service. I am not certain whether there is anything in the Anglican Order of Service that would apply to the Department of Public Works. I'm sure there must be something in Shakespeare but it escapes me at the moment. But I would just say, Mr. Chairman, briefly a word of thanks and appreciation to the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mr. Veitch, and all of the members of the staff

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) in the various branches, a word of appreciation to them for their splendid devotion to duty. The Deputy Minister, Mr. Veitch, and I both started in this Department at the same time and we have been learning together although his own knowledge exceeds my own very greatly at the moment. I have been most interested in the variety of functions which the Department of Public Works has to carry out and I'll be reminded of some of them no doubt in the succeeding time as we consider the estimates. But I did want to say this word of thanks and appreciation to the staff for their very fine work and the co-operation they have given to me during the time that I have had this responsibility.

It will be noticed that the total requirements of the Department, \$4,552, 305 are not very much in excess of the monies that were voted for the Department in the current year which is just coming to a close and by and large the increase represents primarily the salary increments and related matters.

The Department of Public Works is in a sense a service department and is responsible for the construction, the supervision of construction of new buildings, the care and maintenance of existing buildings, the renting of premises and generally the housekeeping functions that relate to the multitude of things that are carried on within government, and because government is expanding of course the functions of the Department are expanding and the work is increasing and has many interesting and complex aspects, but we do our best to carry them out and hopefully there will be many suggestions during the consideration of the estimates which will help us in that regard.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle--Russell): Mr. Chairman, I would once again care to say a few brief words about Public Works. It is not a large Department. The Minister has already given us a very comprehensive story about what Public Works do, and the only comments that I could have are as usual each department seems to have a slight rise: \$130,000 in one department, \$20,000 up in another one and there is one department, \$300,000, in item 87 - Improvements to Grounds, Alterations, Repairs, Incidental Expenses and Unemployment Insurance. Well now there is one, I think it has been an improvement and would come under Public Works, to the Legislative Assembly itself, and I refer to the convenient front doors we have in the Legislature. Now I know, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very controversial - a very difficult setup to do and they've been working at it since some time before Christmas and I notice that it still isn't completed and for that reason I can easily understand why we have this item of \$300,000. Talk about the Golden Boy on the roof -- I think perhaps we've got a couple of 'golden doors' at the front end.

So with those few brief remarks, I do not intend to go through item by item because I'm very conscious that we're now well into the 60 hours of the estimates and I'm sure there's some other estimates that deserve to use up this time. With those few remarks I will take my seat. But I still do think we should call those the 'golden doors'.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): If I might, Mr. Chairman, make reference to the front doors, I don't know whether we should call them golden doors or not, but I only wish that my former colleague, Morris Gray was here today because I think that the proper name for the doors should be the "Morris Gray Doors" because of the fact that my colleague so often raised this question in the Assembly and spoke of how hard it was for an elderly gentleman such as himself to get into the building. I don't know what he would think now of the regulations which prevent him from getting into the buildings that have been introduced by the Minister of Public Works, but however there are really two monuments to Morris Gary at the front of the building: one is the bronze railing leading down to the driveway. I think it was after the efforts of Mr. Gray that that was put in; and now belatedly we have the swinging doors. So I'm sure that if my former colleague could only but hear me today He would agree with me that the doors should be called 'the Morris Gray Doors'.

Now, I too do not intend to spend a great deal of time with the estimates of the Public Works Department. It is one of those departments of course that are necessary and they have a pretty good Minister, except that now and again he in my opinion doesn't adhere to proper direction, or give proper directives insofar as the operation of the building and the complex is concerned. Back last October - I believe it was in October or September - I wanted to come into my office one evening to do a little homework and I was confronted at that particular time by the guard at the door who said, "Who are you" - in effect, "Who are you, would you please sign this document in order that you may have permission to enter into the inner sanctum" This had been by way of a letter of directive from the Minister and his Deputy to the effect that every-one coming into this building would have to sign on the dotted line. I wrote to my friend the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) Minister, he may recall, and I wondered whether this was so that they would have a record of how many times the members of the Assembly came into the building, or how many times I came in so that they could have a sort of a real fifth column working politically and so they would be able to tell the people of Manitoba, "Well, the Leader of the New Democratic Party came into his office on such and such a day and he stayed here for half an hour or ten minutes, went out with a load of ammunition" - that was one thought that I had of the reason for signing the book and then I wondered whether or not that with the approaching of the 5th of November whether the Minister and his Deputy might have figured that I might be pulling off a Guy Fawks, put a bomb under the Assembly, and they wanted it recorded that I was here at that particular time.

However, I must say in all fairness that after I had written to the Minister the regulation was changed, or at least the context of the letter was changed to make it permissive for me to enter and to leave without having to sign on the dotted line; and I appreciated that very very much. I must say that the guard on duty was very very courteous and he said - well, one of the features was that the Cabinet Ministers of course they could come and go as they liked because they were known and the guard said, that was on duty, "You're not known you know, Mr. Paulley", and I said, "Gee, that's tough". However, that was changed. But now of course the Minister has come up with the prize of the whole works, no longer do we have to sign the book, but no longer, unless I ask my honourable friend specifically on each and every occasion, "Can I get in here after midnight", so I'm going to have to do my, or if I do get in as I understand it I won't be able to get out until the following morning, according to the regulations of my honourable friend. Now, I don't know whether he's trying to impose too much work on me or not by making me stick around here. And even if it's others as we have discussed in this House wish to take advantage of the seats on the park, or in the park, across the other side of Broadway, well we can sit down there until the bewitching hour of midnight and then up you go, Buster, and out; and it doesn't matter if you're a Buster or a Busteress, but you certainly have to go - out, at midnight - unless my honourable friend, unless my honourable friend the Minister does what he intimated that he might possibly do, and that is to reconsider the regulations.

Now, the other day I asked him if he had given any thought to reconsideration and he indicated to me that well when my estimates are before the committee you may hear something in this regard. Well that bewitching hour has arrived, the bewitching hour of around about 11:00 o'clock in the morning when we are considering the estimates of the Department of Public Works, so I ask my honourable friend the Minister, what has he done in respect of the representations made to him in the House in respect of the regulation placing a curfew - although my honourable friend disclaims the fact, that it is not a curfew; it is a curfew because it sets a time limit when people must get in off the streets. They can go down in their automobiles in accordance with the regulations but lo and behold they're not going to be able to walk around according to the regulations.

So I now ask my honourable friend the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what is he doing in respect of these regulations, and while I'm asking him that question I again want to express my appreciation that I was taken off of the "security risk" list insofar as entering into the Assembly by having to sign the book.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief. My main reason in rising is that I want to thank the government, and the Minister in particular, for renovating those front doors. I think this is a very good improvement and I only have regrets that it wasn't done earlier since the former Member for Inkster had great difficulties always in getting through those doors during the winter months. But I want to place this on record as really appreciating what the government has done in this respect.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, brevity seems to be the order of the day, so I shall be likewise, but I think we'd be somewhat remiss if we didn't mention the fact that so many times each day and so often during a session we - I think we would very much miss some of those smiles that are given to us every time we go up to these golden, so-called golden doors - I think a special mention should be made the way the guards - or guides, whichever you wish to call them - treat the people that come down here to visit the Legislative Buildings, especially the students and so on, and I am sure that we feel unanimous the way the people or guards treat us down there is something that is worthwhile mentioning.

I also wanted to bring up one little incident, and in my case I'm not so concerned what happens after 12:00 o'clock as the Leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned, but in this

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd) case I feel that somehow there should be some kind of a protection or possibly have a guard outside on the grounds at least till a certain hour. I have to relate an incident of a young fellow about 22, 23 years old, he worked at the local bank in Steinbach, came down one night to visit the grounds and the buildings and when he went back there was two fellows approaching him - and this happened last June or July, I don't just have the date - and here two young fellows with a big, about a two-foot piece of iron or, I think it was a pipe actually, and wham, right over his head, he nearly lost his eye afterwards and he was the type of fellow that certainly wasn't built to fight back or what have you. This could have landed up in real serious repercussions because it was just 'so-so' for some weeks that the boy didn't lose his eye, and I'm wondering if possibly, seeing these are public grounds, and public buildings, I am wondering if somehow we shouldn't consider having some kind of protection for these people that are serious and appreciate coming down to visit these buildings, and I thought I should mention it to the Minister.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Item (a), Ministers Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance of \$18,000 be reduced to the level of the 1966-67 appropriation of \$12,500.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I just would like to say a word or two in connection with the motion that we're considering at the present time. We now will have a bill before us shortly, it was introduced yesterday, whereby the salaries of the Cabinet Ministers will be lowered as a result of the other increases if they do take place, and I would just like to mention in connection with that, the motion that is before us I think has more to do with the method and the way the increases in the first instance took place, and I think the reason I mentioned at that time why I was supporting these motions is still valid and I still intend to vote for it.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. A counted vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 14; Nays, 38.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the words, "and representation allowance" be struck out of Item 13 No. 1. (a)

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, will you call the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish me to call the motion?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'd like to say just a word on it, if I may. I think that yesterday the First Minister made it quite clear, proved our point that the way this was done was not right that it was just looking after the interests of the Cabinet because now he's saying that he can back down in the salary and the expense accounts. If the Minister needed \$3,000 expense account yesterday, it's quite odd that if the members should receive more well then they will be satisfied with a little less, so I think that if nothing else, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are gaining. I think the government is seeing the error of its ways and I would ask the members to go all the way and do away with this ridiculous expense account that makes a favorite group out of the Cabinet Ministers.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Well of course, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend couldn't be more mistaken. The position of the Cabinet Ministers will remain unchanged if the proposals regarding allowances and expenses go through. Their position remains quite unchanged. My honourable friend couldn't be more mistaken.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is not right because the Minister said yesterday that the \$3,000 will be reduced. It is not the case at all.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I repeat: the Minister's positions will remain unchanged if the new proposals go through. Their total allowances remain unchanged.

MR. DESJARDINS: The total allowance remains unchanged but the position doesn't remain unchanged, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend would like perhaps to ask the question how many angels can dance on the point of a pin it's the same kind of argument.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not talking about the angels; I'm talking about the devils in the Cabinet. I'm talking about these people that felt that they should have had \$3,000 regardless of the other members. We always said that the tax-free part that the member was getting was enough but this was supposed to be something apart from this. This was the Cabinet Ministers that had so many expenses and they needed \$3,000, and now they don't need \$3,000; they need more as members but they need less as Ministers and that is certainly changing the position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is certainly one angel that can't dance on the point of a pin.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Same Division? Agreed: For the resolution, 14, and against, 38. I declare the motion lost.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, having survived that harrowing experience, I just want to say a word or two about some of the comments.

I think that the front doors don't really need to be called 'golden doors' yet because the expense hasn't been quite that substantial. One of the problems I imagine has been the fitting of the doors which are quite heavy, to this automatic opening. In modern buildings when new doors are installed they have lighter material and perhaps it's less difficult, this has been one of the things which, I believe, has given some time to get the new system working because of the fact that the doors are the original doors and they are quite heavy.

As the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has said, I think about the late Morris Gray every time I go through them because he had spoken of the problem of opening them.

Perhaps I might just say a word about the regulations to which the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party made reference - and when I say it's not a curfew, I'm being very technical of course because a curfew is a bell or a whistle, and we don't really do that - when I said the other day, I think he misunderstood me, I wasn't thinking that I would be saying anything about the regulations. I was expecting to hear from him and perhaps some others as to what changes ought to be made. This is a difficult problem, and I want to say at once that we have no desire to do anything improper, I think if one considers the regulations for example in comparison to the regulations that pertain to the House of Commons or certainly practically all of the other Legislative Buildings, the Deputy Minister obtained copies of their respective regulations and even now ours are not as rigorous or as vigorous as some of them are, which doesn't prove anything, but it emphasizes the problem. The Honourable the Member for Carillon put his finger right on it for example, when he was asking for some protection with respect to the grounds. In other words, what we are trying to do as best we can, is to provide for safety and the orderly care of our buildings, while at the same time of course, not wishing to restrict people in their proper use.

For example, one of the problems that occurred last summer and led to the matter of signing in, was the amount of vandalism that was found to be in the building. Folks were coming in and even taking the numbers off some of the doors, and that kind of thing, and so we thought that by a signing-in system we might perhaps have it under some control, that perhaps people who had signed a book as they came in, would be more reluctant to perhaps do anything improper when they were in the building. I have to confess that it escaped our attention that there were members that might be affected by that, and I extended my apologies. I want to make it quite clear that we have no desire, even in the new regulations, to restrict or inhibit the proper use of the building and it is with that in mind that we are looking at the regulations and I can assure the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that we will make changes that we believe will meet this situation.

I also confess that I hadn't considered the problem, and this is no doubt due to my own age, I hadn't considered the problem of the park on a summer night. I'll consult my daughter, who is perhaps better able to advise me on that matter and again will perhaps have some recommendations to make to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with regard to changes.

I wanted just to say to the Honourable Member for Carillon that this matter of the grounds is one that tends to worry us. We have the Corps of Commissionaires do certain work for us and in the summertime we increase the staff of commissionaires who patrol the grounds and of course we have available to us the City Police and the RCMP but of course they're not here all the time and would only be called in after some unfortunate matter had occurred. But this is a very important point and it is one that we are concerned about.

One of the things that we're proposing to do this coming year, if we have approval for this money, is to put in some lights, additional lights which we think will go to some extent at least in helping with that problem. It's one we recognize and we will be happy to do whatever we can. I'm sure that during the summer months this year, when it is expected there will be a much larger number of people in Winnipeg, we will have even more commissionaires on duty than we have had previously.

MR. PAULLEY: Just on the point of the regulations and then I'd like to - if you don't mind, Mr. Molgat? Just on the question of the regulations, I want my honourable friend to understand that when we raised the objections to the regulations we realize and appreciate the fact that the buildings themselves have to be protected from vandalism. Our main objection was the regulations being so broad to include the park and the streets around and the general area but we appreciate and realize that we must protect our public buildings and that is the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and the Minister himself, so I'm sure there's no misunderstanding insofar as that part is concerned. I'm glad to know that it appears as though my honourable friend is going to review the regulations as they may pertain to other areas other than the buildings themselves.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask a couple of questions regarding the provincial lands around the buildings here. I think the government had been proceeding to purchase lands east of the buildings on the streets adjoining. Have they purchased more land in the past year and have they plans for development in that area?

Secondly, right across from us on the north side of the buildings we have the Land Titles Building. Are there any plans for the removal of that building in the near future or is it the intention to continue using it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is the time to ask this question or not but we'll soon find out. The Macdonald Airport, I believe the government bought the entire airport there two or three years ago for - I forget the figure - but what has developed, if anything, at that particular point now. I believe that when the announcement was made that the government had in fact bought the airport that the government had great plans for an industrial park and it would be interesting to know what is in the offing out at Macdonald because everyone is certainly interested in regional development.

A great deal, Mr. Chairman, has been said about the 'golden doors' or call them what you like. What was the cost or estimated cost? This might be interesting - of making the alterations down there? And when I'm talking about them it seems to me that facing north as they do, and you can't help that, but they do operate quite slowly in the winter time and boy, when you walk in there some days there's a 40 mile an hour wind coming in, and you can feel the draft right up to the top of the stairs. It seems to me that in former years when you came in the side doors and then in, breaking the angle like that, there was not nearly as much draft and perhaps some consideration might be given to just changing that, putting the angle back again if it's going to prevent the draft that we have experienced in the last two or three months.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter of regulations have been fairly well canvassed but the Minister did ask for some suggestions with regard to changes and I want to try and be brief and say what I feel about what I consider the most objectionable regulation of them all and that is Section 8, subsection (1): "The Minister may require a person to leave a building or any part of or appendage to a building or to leave the grounds or a part of the grounds and any person so required shall immediately comply with the requirement." Mr. Chairman, I suggest if that regulation is left in then you almost don't need anything else, because at any time the Minister can ask anybody to leave for any reason at all and the person so required shall leave. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has no intention of running around arbitrarily requiring people to leave the building, or leave the grounds, which is still more important, and I think that the Minister should be satisfied that I have no intention of there being a situation where people are able to come here and do wrongful things in the building or on the grounds, that that's not intended by either myself or the Minister.

What I object to is the notion that when I am on the Legislative complex, let's say in Memorial Park, I am there, not because I have a right to be there, but because the Minister doesn't ask me to leave and I think that this particular section is unnecessary; that the Minister probably wants that power so he can ask people who are doing objectionable things to leave. And I say that you have that power provided those objectionable things fall into categories of things which are against the law. For instance, if somebody is committing violence on the property, I know the Minister isn't physically going to eject them. He's going to get a policeman to eject them and he will be able to without this regulation. If somebody is defacing the property he doesn't need this regulation to get a law officer to remove that person, or any other wrongful act which can be identified as a wrongful act. Now to put it specifically, a person walking with a sign in Memorial Park is someone who I know the Minister has no desire to eject and a person walking with a sign on the Legislative steps is a person who I'm almost certain the Minister has no desire to eject, but this section gives him the right to do it and I

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) say that that person doing nothing wrong, walking with a sign, shouldn't be there by leave of the Minister; he should be there as of right and he is there as of right as of now. But I think that this section would give the Minister the power to do things which he I'm sure, has no intention of doing and I am always concerned with having our rights in society flow from individuals rather than from law. I believe that I believe in the rule of law and not in the rule of Ministers of Public Works and if the rule of law says that I can be removed, fine, but not a Minister who says, "I don't like what's on your sign." I hasten to say I know that's not what the Minister wants but that's what he's got according to this regulation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister rises to reply, I have one matter I'd like to draw to his attention and that is the use or should I say the lack of use of our national flag and our provincial flag in this Chamber. I know some of the historic background to the Union Jack and I presume that is the Queen's household flag and the reason for them being in this Chamber and I would certainly not wish to disturb or speak against a custom such as that that we hold in such high regard, but I sincerely believe when we have thousands of school children and tourists and Manitobans and foreign tourists coming through this House and being taken on tours that our national flag should be in this Chamber and perhaps even a provincial flag. I think that we are a Canadian nation and we should display our Canadian flag. I don't think this is being over-nationalistic but I think that an American tourist coming in here and looking does not know the significance of the Union Jack as related to Canada and they can hardly be criticized sometimes for being mistaken in saying that we are a colony or we are an appendage of another country. At one time this was so but to remove some of the thoughts that our American friends may have and also to show our own school children and our own people that we are truly a Canadian nation, I think a provincial House should display the national flag inside it.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister gets up I wonder, just a matter of interest, if he has the figure, the number of visitors that pass through these grounds or buildings each year. I heard of it one time and I thought they were fantastic. I wonder if they are available?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, just going in reverse order, I think that figure is somewhere in the material I have, the number of visitors, and I will try and have it or perhaps some of the angels who are in the gallery will send a note down to me if they have it more readily than I can.

The use of the flags. I take it that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is suggesting that we might consider having the Canadian flag and the Manitoba flag somewhere in the Chamber in addition to the traditional flags that are here. That's a worthwhile suggestion. I would certainly say we'd be willing to look at that and consider what would be appropriate in that regard.

I'm assuming that the Honourable Member for Inkster - while he mentions section 8 subsection (1) of the regulations, that his comments would apply equally I'm assuming to subsection (2) of that section. I agree with him, it looks a little rough and we're more than happy to see what we can do to make it say the thing that we need and not appear to be more restrictive or at least more onerous than it ought to be under both his and my understanding of what is the proper thing in that regard.

The estimated cost of the doors, the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, the contract for the doors was \$4,714 and I might just point out that there is an auxiliary heating now installed inside between the two sets of doors which hopefully takes care of the problem. I noticed myself that the side doors that we used to open are now locked and perhaps some consideration ought to be given to the idea of unlocking those doors so that if one were prepared to open the side door himself that he would be able to do so. Now there may be some problems in relation to the operation of the automatic doors but we'll look at it.

Macdonald Airport - the government is still hopeful that it will be possible to have an important industry or industries established there and this matter is in the hands of the Department of Industry and Commerce. I am unable to report on it myself other than I know that they are working on it - and may I just say, so that the honourable member will know, that we are aware of the fact that there are farm people in that area who are interested in the farm lands. I understand their concern and their interest and would say that as soon as we know - and that will probably be reasonably soon - as soon as we know what may be developed in the way of an industrial enterprise there then the question of disposal of any land that may not be required, if there is any such, will be certainly given very careful consideration and a plan or

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) policy will be developed.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, as far as I'm aware there's no plan to take down or remove the Land Titles Office although - that is there's no specific plan to do that - although I'm aware that it has been discussed from time to time. It's an idea that has been sort of considered but not -- there has never been any decision to that effect. I, myself, think that it's a rather good looking building and I would not say that I was really one who was anxious to do anything any more than perhaps modernize it to some extent, perhaps extend it because they are short of space. But in any event certainly nothing is current at this moment.

I believe that during the past year - the government has not purchased any land in this general area other than the building now occupied by the Treasury Department at 270 Osborne Street which was formerly a building owned by an insurance company. There is the land across to the east of this building but there has been no additions to that during the past year.

Now I have the figure of the visitors. The total visitors - and we're now talking about the last fiscal year that's almost one year old now - was 89,300, which was an increase of 10,700 over the previous year and my guess would be that there would be a like increase in the year that is just coming to an end. The summer building guide staff was increased last year from 4 to 5. Of course an indication of the increased number of people coming to the building.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the regulation that was passed recently and I have one question that has been bothering me because -- would we, as members, be contravening the regulation, for instance if we attended hearings of a committee like we have the Municipal Affairs Committee having hearings in Brandon and Swan River where we left for a couple of days and we parked our cars on the grounds here. The meetings would not necessarily be in this building. Would we not be contravening the regulation under that condition?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I was interested in the Minister's remarks in respect to Macdonald Airport but it strikes me that there's quite a large acreage of land there. Is it being farmed presently or leased to some of the farmers in the area? It is very valuable land and would produce a great deal of grain. And if it is being farmed then what is the basis that it is let out to the farmer, by tender? And for what length of term? My impression, answering the question of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, is that the land is leased. I cannot inform him of the basis of the lease. I will try to inform myself on that. I have to be frank and say I don't know.

I think that, answering the question of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, I'll look at the regulations but I would say that the circumstances he describes would be authorized parking. I think that any member of the Legislature is entitled to park his car here on these grounds either while attending a meeting here or while he was absent from this building on business that pertained to the work of the Legislature. In fact I'd even be inclined to think that even if he were not engaged in some matter that pertained to the Legislature he would still be entitled. Now by that I don't want to issue any invitation to park your car the year round, anything of that sort, but I think that that would be proper parking. But we'll look at the regulations with that question in mind.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I am especially interested in the farming area of the Macdonald Airport property. The Honourable the Minister has said that he will get the information for my honourable friend from Gladstone with regard to whether it's leased or not and just what is being done with it. I would like to have a copy of that information as well. My recollection is that if it has been under grain farming that it's very recently and to me it's a mistake of considerable magnitude to not have that land revert to its former use. Now I realize that as long as there was a reasonably good chance of some industrial development there that would require any major amount of land that maybe there was a good idea for looking at the situation or holding it in abeyance but I would guess that any industrial development that might go on there -- and I'm not at all optimistic myself of the Department being successful in that regard -- but even if there is then I would think it would require a comparatively small portion of the land that is available. In the meantime the farmers who are wishing to get this land for use or for purchase I think should be dealt with.

I have personally spoken to two of the Ministers of the Government about this matter and I have put up to them the proposition which I believe to be the right, that where this land was forcibly taken from a farmer - every case where it was forcibly taken - then that farmer should get not only the first opportunity to repurchase it but he should get an opportunity to repurchase

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) it not just at its current value but at very little advance on the amount at which it was taken from him. Where the farmer was willing to sell, or offered it for sale at that time, then I make no such a qualification at all. But where the land was taken from the farmer either against his wishes or willingly because it was for a war purpose and that it was not offered for sale in any way then I think extra consideration should be given to him. Not only to assure that he gets the first opportunity to buy it but that he buys it without cost.

Mr. Chairman, he has lost all these years of farming that land. The Honourable Member for Gladstone has said it's among the very best land on the Portage Plains and I think it's a colossal mistake to leave it lying idle or only hay being grown on it as long as it was, but particularly to continue that practice and especially to continue to hold off the people who were the former owners and who didn't want to sell. I would urge an early decision on this matter and I would like to have the information up-to-date from the Minister when he's in a position to give it.

. continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed; (a) -- passed. Resolution 86 --passed. Oh, I beg your pardon. Section 1 (b) --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, have we yet been furnished with the list of the Deputy Ministers' salaries? Not while I have been in the Committee and I haven't been away very often. Could I renew the plea that I made a short time ago? I suppose it comes under one of my honourable friend's other departments rather than this one, but are they ready for presentation? Could we have them soon?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, after the Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke to me the other day we began the preparation of it. That is under the Provincial Secretary's Department but we won't delay. As soon as it's been just put into final form it will be distributed.

MR. CAMPBELL: It will include, will it, Mr. Chairman, the chairmen of boards and commissions that ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the same theme, I learned for the first time today that the Honourable Minister of Health is also the acting Minister of Agriculture. I think it would be helpful to the House if we were to know who the acting Minister is for all of the departments so that when we do ask questions before the Orders of the Day, if the Minister wasn't present we could direct the question to the acting Minister, and surely this isn't a big chore to let us know who the acting Minister for every department is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) (1) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when we speak of the post office here, just what is meant? Is it just the office here that we have in connection with the Chamber or is it the whole building here or just what is meant by this item?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this is not the post office that serves the members of the Legislature, but there is a post office which receives and dispatches all mail and under it we provide the postage and so on. All mail coming in is received and then sorted and distributes to the various offices and departments. It's connected by a tube over to the Norquay Building because that is a place where there are a lot of people and this business of the tube shoots the mail back and forth apparently between the two. But it's a post office which is located down in the northeast corner of the basement floor of the building, and to all intents and purposes it operates just like a normal post office except that it's our own internal post office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) -- passed; (2) --passed; (3) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) (1) --passed; (2) --passed; (c) --passed; Resolution 86 -- passed. Resolution 87 - 2. Operation and Maintenance of Provincial Buildings and Grounds. (1) (a) - Salaries -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed; Resolution 87 -- passed. Resolution 88 - 3. Manitoba Provincial Garage: (a) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with these garages, are employees able to use the services of these garages for their own vehicles or is it strictly limited to government vehicles?

MR. McLEAN: It's limited to government vehicles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; Resolution 88 -- passed. Resolution 89 - 4. Provincial Land Acquisition: (a) (1) --

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the Minister in a position to give us the names of the Land Acquisition Board? If not, would he furnish them to us?

MR. McLEAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside refers to the Land Acquisition Board. I'm assuming he means the Commission that holds the hearings. Mr. Price Rattray is the Chairman, Mr. Victor Driver and Mr. Harvey O'dell. They are the three; they have not changed; it is the same members.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are they permanently employed, Mr. Chairman? And the same question with regard to the secretary, who is the secretary and is he permanently employed?

MR. McLEAN: The secretary is a permanent employee. The others are paid on a -- I think it's a per diem basis. They're not full-time employees; they're paid on a per diem basis.

MR. CAMPBELL: Have you the secretary's name at hand, Mr. Chairman?

MR. McLEAN: The Secretary is Harold Nelson, if I -- I'll check that. I think that's the name of the secretary but I'll check it.

MR. CAMPBELL: And would you include the salary please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (a) -- passed; (b) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (b), could we have some information on this? Just what type of work does this Commission do? What appraisals are being made? Does this have

(MR. FROESE cont'd) to do with the expropriations and so on where appraisals have to be made? Is this the Commission for that purpose?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, members will remember that - I think it was in 1965 - a Land Acquisition Act was passed and under it a Land Value Appraisal Commission is provided for, and in any instance where the government itself is wishing to acquire land, the Commission is given the task of determining the value of the land and there are certain rules that apply as to the rights and privileges of the owner from whom land is being acquired after that has been done. They hold public hearings; they give notice of these matters so that persons interested may be heard - that is even people who may not be directly involved in the sense of having land expropriated. This was a method designed to ensure that the utmost fairness and equity was extended to people who were having their land expropriated, and the type of thing that you encounter of course is primarily roads, because as the highway system is extended, additional land is necessary; drainage, as for example the Portage diversion, the Red River Floodway, Shellmouth Reservoir and that type of thing. This is the job of the Land Value Appraisal Commission.

This does not in any way -- the operation of this Commission does not in any way limit the legal rights of the persons from whom land is being acquired, because if he's not satisfied he is not compelled in any way to accept their view of the value and has a right to have the matter go to Court in the regular way and establish, if he can, some different evaluation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) -- passed; Resolution 89 -- passed. Resolution 90 - Buildings and other Products.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I note that in Winnipeg our Provincial Government offices are housed in several buildings - in a number of building throughout the city. I wish to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Public Works Department and the government feel that it is advisable and necessary to have these various offices scattered throughout the city. In other words, is there specific and particular need for some of these offices being located where they are or should some consideration be given to eventually consolidating these offices into one complex of buildings, or perhaps is the government already giving consideration to doing that very sort of thing if it is desirable. I note that the Department of Education offices for example are found in at least three buildings that I know of: in this building, on Edmonton Street and another on Portage Avenue. There are other departments too that are broken down into several offices scattered about the city. I would appreciate hearing the Minister's comments on that matter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not certain that one could say that the present situation is one that has been deliberately or consciously designed because I think that always there has been a tendency for the need for space to out-run or exceed the availability or indeed the capacity to plan it, so that to some extent it has grown up, perhaps to a degree at least, topsy-turvy.

Some years ago the Government of Manitoba made the decision to build the Norquay Building which I think would set the pattern that would be desirable, namely of having within easy access of this building as many of the functions of government as could be conveniently arranged. However, that is limited by the facts of life and by the situation as it is. The province has, however, acquired land over to the east of this building just across the street, across from Government House, and undoubtedly may acquire additional land and one could foresee the possibility that an office building will be put on that property. In fact, I think one could predict it with almost a certainty and that indicates the idea that we would like to have offices located here.

The building on Portage Avenue, 1181 Portage Avenue, which was formerly the technical school, became available after the construction of the new Manitoba Institute of Technology. We are moving toward the idea that that will become a building devoted almost exclusively to education and more and more of the offices of the Department of Education will be placed in that building, both moving from 116 Edmonton, some of the folks that are still in this building will move over there, and it will become to quite an extent the Education Building. The building at 116 Edmonton, we hope, will probably by and large become the center for the Department of Municipal Affairs and we'll be getting some people there although it will not be exclusively for that purpose for some time.

You are familiar with the Highway Services Building in which the Motor Vehicle Branch is located and other functions which are central to the operation of the Highway Services and the highways, that is the Highways Department itself as well as our own Motor Vehicle Branch

(MR. McLEAN cont'd). . . . which is part of the Public Utilities Department. Now in that case as well, that was a fortuitous acquisition because of the change with regard to the former Manitoba Hydro and the Hydro Electric Board combining, and that made that building, which was formerly the Hydro Building, available to the province and we've been making use of it. So that to some extent you can see the general pattern.

Now I would think that other than the fact that the Highways Department wish perhaps some of their district offices to be -- I think perhaps they may have an office located in St. Vital because that's handier to the area which is served. And also the Department of Welfare, during the past year we have acquired premises for them in two different locations because that would be handier to the people that they wish to serve. That sort of thing does take place in Winnipeg. It's fairly limited because basically all of the services are services that are central to all government activities, and if we had unlimited land in this area around here undoubtedly we'd have them all here - and unlimited money as the Honourable the First Premier points out - but that probably gives some indication of how we're operating. It would be sometimes difficult to really pin down a clear-cut policy at any one moment because we are always a little bit behind the requirements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I have two further questions. I understand that there is a tunnel system connecting the buildings in this complex for I suppose service purposes. Has the department given any consideration to making that tunnel available to people, to staff, and people on government business going from the Law Courts to this building or over to the Norquay Building? Traffic is quite heavy on Broadway Avenue. It is true there's a traffic light at the intersection of Broadway and Kennedy, but no doubt at many times there are people in the vicinity of the Land Titles Office, they have to cross Broadway and the yield of right-of-way to pedestrians is not always as effective as we would like it to be, plus the fact that no doubt there is considerable traffic during the winter season from one building to the other and there is the matter of getting clothed for the outdoors and getting the outer garments off when you reach your destination, repeating the same operation on your way back and that sort of thing.

The second matter: is the government considering air conditioning those office buildings which presently are not air conditioned?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there is a tunnel -- I think the only tunnel is one leading from this building to the Law Courts Building. I have the impression that it's perhaps an old style tunnel and it is not used really for people going back and forth. I think it's not considered suitable and it's more of a service tunnel. There is no tunnel to the Norquay Building or any of the other buildings.

Air conditioning is being considered, yes. We have on different occasions got price estimates of, for example, air conditioning this building and some of the others. I would not be prepared to say when it might be done and certainly there is no money in our requests for next year that would include air conditioning.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): I don't know how many people in the Legislature have been through that tunnel. I have been many years ago and I know that it would be quite impossible to use it for the purposes that my honourable colleague suggests. He might have difficulty in getting through it. Only the slimmer types of us - and there are a few of us around here - could navigate that, but the taller individuals also would have to go almost on bended knee through that tunnel. It is, as the Honourable Minister suggests, purely a service tunnel. It leads into the power house on the other side of Broadway and is a - what do you call it? - a conduit for the steam pipes that come through to keep us comfortable here. In the early days, without the need of spreading polluted air over the buildings, it helped to keep the building clean during those years that they burned soft coal and it kept it over in the other direction, but now in the days of gas that wouldn't enter into the picture.

But it is quite possible that many of us know much less about the buildings than we probably should, sitting in here as we do and being charged in a sense along with the government with the operation of the buildings. It might be an interesting adventure some noon hour to conduct a tour of half a dozen at a time perhaps through the tunnel just to let some of the members see what it is and to know that it is there and to know where they come out of at the other end. I had been thinking of some such thing. It is so many years since I went through that tunnel that it is part of the long-forgotten but nevertheless treasured memories of earlier days, and I thought it might be interesting if something of this sort could be done. Would we speak to

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd). . . . the Minister - if we wish to go through the tunnel would we get permission and have a guide to guide us because - a guide to lead us, as they say - which would be necessary in that instance?

MR. McLEAN: I would be happy to arrange that and if any of the members are interested, if they would mention the matter to me and we could try and arrange a suitable time, either now during the session or after it's over.

I can now answer the question asked by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside about the Land Value Appraisal Commission. The secretary is Mr. H. A. Nelson. He is a term employee not a permanent employee, although fully occupied, that is to say while he is on the job, at a salary of \$600.00 per month.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5 -- passed; Resolution 90 -- passed. That completes the Department of Public Works. Am I correct that we proceed now on Public Utilities? Department XII, - Public Utilities.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought it might be helpful, in fact it was very helpful to myself to have the situation with regard to the Department of Public Utilities put in a chart form, and if one of the pages wouldn't mind, I thought the members might like to see a chart of the department with the various functions. It would be helpful in keeping the different things that go on within the Public Utilities Department sort of clear. May I here, as I did in connection with the Department of Public Works, express my thanks and appreciation to the Deputy Minister of Public Utilities, Mr. Murray Peden, and all of the folks who are associated with the work of the department and there are many of them, the chairmen of the boards and commissions and the Crown corporations that are within that, to all of them they have been most courteous and kind and I find it is a most stimulating experience to become acquainted with them and to know the work that they do and their dedication to their duty and I would want you to know and them to know of our appreciation.

As is indicated on the chart, there are the two important operations, the Manitoba Telephone System and the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, which reports to this Legislature through the Minister of Public Utilities. They are administered by a board in each case appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and have of course their staffs and carry out the important public functions on behalf of the people of the province. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion we are most fortunate in Manitoba in having well-managed utilities in these two utilities. Our telephone system, as was indicated during the time that they were before the committee, has, if not the lowest, one of the lowest rates for telephones, the lowest in Canada, and I am sure that our Hydro Electric costs to our customers and to our people are in the bottom of the range, if not in some instances at least at the bottom. So both of these utilities which have grown up over many years now in Manitoba, and under other administrations as well as the present, have given a good account of themselves in performing a most useful service.

One of the things that has occurred during the past year along with the introduction or the coming into force of the new Highway Traffic Act was a slight change in what used to be known as the Motor Carrier Board and is now known as the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board. They have some additional functions to those which the Motor Carrier Board formerly carried on, and I am pleased to report that they are well in operation and carrying on their work quite satisfactorily to the benefit of the people that they have to deal with.

Insofar as the estimates themselves are concerned, this is one of the small spending departments and it will be noted that there is a small increase from \$1.4 million a year ago to \$1.6 million that we are asking for approval at the present time. Undoubtedly this department, having a large number of activities, will give rise to some questions and observations that the members would wish to make.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for his remarks concerning our utilities, and while his remarks were quite limited I think it's certainly in order for us to mention the fact that, or I certainly agree, that we have some of the finest people of all departments employed in these utilities and I certainly agree that they deserve mentioning. In fact, public relations today are becoming very important, possibly more so to all of us than ever before, and when we mention the Manitoba Telephone and the Hydro and of course the Censor Board and the Motor Vehicle Branch - and I think this chart is appreciated, in fact I believe that possibly some of the other departments could take a lesson here and maybe do the same thing in their department - but I feel certain that these corporations or utilities are very much aware of the fact that public relations today are indeed very important and it is

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)... possibly well to remember that these relations must be kept up, and I think from the experience that most of the members have in this House, we know that there's an effort made by these departments to uphold these relations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also take this opportunity to thank the Minister or his department - and now I'm referring mainly to the Manitoba Telephone System - for the amalgamation of the Kleefeld-Chortitz -- by the way sometimes it's pronounced "Portage" - the last years when the Hansards came out - it's spelled C-h-o-r-t-i-t-z, so I hope it will be printed right this time -- and the Niverville and the Grunthal and the Steinbach Telephone exchanges. I realize that this will not commence until possibly around the 1st of July and I'm fully aware that I've mentioned this item from year to year, and I think it's only appropriate that I wish to let it be known that this is a big thing for the area concerned and it is very much appreciated. In fact, I'm glad that the government across agrees that the Manitoba Telephone System is not at all influenced by any political Party or else I'd be suspicious - I'd have to possibly in the next election run under another ticket - this is just how happy these people have been in the various groups. But sincerely speaking, while this may be partly an ethnic problem that's finally solved, it is very much indeed appreciated that these different towns and villages have finally been granted this amalgamation. Also in the St. Pierre and St. Malo area, the change-over - I think it was last March 16th or so - this is something that is worthwhile mentioning.

I intend to be brief, Mr. Chairman, but I think I should say a few things. While I realize that a lot has been said about party lines, I think the Minister would be disappointed if somebody didn't say something about party lines and mainly the reason of too many people being on one line. While I realize that thousands of phones have been installed over the last couple of years, the situation is still grim and I sincerely believe that we are not going fast enough. We continually still hear complaints, and while it has been cut down - and I think the intention is that eventually it shall be cut down to six subscribers to a line - complaints are heard continually from the telephone users and they are certainly justified in making these complaints. In fact in my constituency we still have so many that have from 10 to 12 on a line. I realize changes are coming in but I can't stress this enough, that I think these changes could even come in faster. I've informed the former Minister that if these people ever wished to complain to the Minister by phone, he doesn't have to worry about getting any complaints because I don't think they'll ever get through the line to make this call to the Minister.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am possibly belabouring this point but I do hope that the new Minister and his department will keep on taking this problem serious and continue to make more progress in regards to this matter.

Going over now to the direct telephone lines, I've said this before but I'm afraid I have to mention it again, it seems to me when we talk of these lines from urban centres to Winnipeg and if we take into consideration that most of these are owned by small businesses in the country, I sometimes wonder if it wouldn't be possible to make consideration by the telephone system to consider lower rates for the sake of encouraging industry in the country. I believe that Steinbach, for example, is a good example in this respect. We must have at least 30 or so direct lines possibly owned or bought by 10 or 12 people - I'm guessing, I don't know the exact figures - but it seems to me that they must be spending between sixty and seventy-five thousand dollars for these lines. I believe we could go on record as encouraging industry, and I'm not just talking about Steinbach, I'm referring to any towns that have these direct lines. I wish this could be taken into consideration.

I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I have to say a few words about some of the policies of advertising taken by some of these utilities - and I'm not referring or don't wish to be unduly hard on such utilities as Manitoba Hydro that operate in a field where competition actually exists, let's say in the field of heating or the like - but it seems to me to be a different situation in the field of Manitoba Telephone. And here I am wondering, with the Telephone System having so little competition - in fact I think an Order for Return was brought in the other day that possibly the only competition they have is maybe the 178 two-way radios and the like, although it has sometimes been said that auctioneers and cattle callers are in competition with the telephones but I don't think we can take that part too seriously - I for one cannot see the reason for spending as many dollars as is being spent today in regards to telling people to use the phone more. I am not against advertising at all, but I think till the day arrives where more people actually can use their telephones more freely and can in fact - a lot of them haven't even had the pleasure of having a telephone installed - I think we should be careful on just how far we go with advertising in regards to the Telephone System.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)....

When the Honourable Member of Hamiota had an Order in for a Return on self-addressed envelopes, I think the figure at that time was that these envelopes cost approximately \$16,000 or in that neighbourhood and possibly the Minister could look into this matter, because while in the city I understand that this is the proper procedure, when one takes a look at some of the rural post offices and sees these envelopes, so many of them laying around in the post office as soon as they're opened, I wonder if this \$16,000 may not be cut down, partly anyways.

I wish to be brief, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to say a few words in regards to the Motor Vehicle Branch. I guess there's no use complaining at this time that the price of licences have continually increased over the last couple of years. I believe the original intention was to basically register these units and not make this a matter - I'm talking of many years back - of making it one of our better revenue departments, and I can assure this Assembly that as far as the commission paid to the people selling these licences, I'm sure that the government knows that this is not very high and doesn't add very much to the cost matter of operating this department. I would like though to congratulate Mr. Dygala and some of the people down there who I believe are doing a sincere service to the people of Manitoba, because we all realize it isn't always easy to hold up the law and still remain popular.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, why we perhaps did not -- or should have had a Centennial licence this year, and while it is too late at this time, I do hope that sincere consideration will be made in time for the 1970 Manitoba Centennial year. I don't think we should have any excuse that we should not have a Centennial licence for that year. I also understand, and I'm sure the Minister will clarify this, I understand that quite a few people are concerned of what they're supposed to do with their present front licence when they buy their Centennial plate, but I understand it's all right to throw it away, that this will be legal, that this licence can be left on till the next new issue comes out. So with those few words, Mr. Chairman, I wish to hope that some of these points will be considered by the Minister.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Item 1 (a) - Minister's Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance of \$18,000 be reduced to the level of the 1966-67 appropriation of \$12,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the words of the First Minister a few minutes ago requires a little bit of debate on this item. I think that we said we did not like the way this had been done, we were told at the time that this had nothing to do with the Minister -- or with the Members, I should say. The Cabinet Ministers simply had to receive more money. In other words, the Cabinet Ministers were looking after themselves - the heck with everybody else - they had to make sure that they received what they wanted.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just rise on a point of order for a moment. I'm not sure and I don't want to curtail debate, but is this motion not on exactly the same subject that was moved previously? Isn't the same salary that's involved, and if it is the same salary, should we have another motion on it? It's a different department, but is it not the same Minister's salary? In other words, we are now moving a motion to reduce the same Minister's salary which was already moved on this particular question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not on the same Minister -- it is the same person but it is a different department.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is right that it is the same Minister for the time being, but it would seem that the Cabinet wants to make sure they keep this post. It might be open for somebody else if they toe the line you see, so I think we must provide the same amount at this time.

Now it was clear that the Cabinet did not discuss this with their backbenchers - their salary - with their backbenchers at all or they wouldn't have been faced with what they are faced with now. They wanted to make sure that they received a certain amount; this is what they wanted. They had not been too careful when they brought in this so well-merited deserved pension in 1965 and this time it is clear they wouldn't even take the chance, they would take care of themselves and then worry about the members, if they did at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we did in 1965, we apparently shamed the Cabinet Ministers because now they are ready to reduce their salary by \$1,600.00. Now of course the First Minister made it quite clear that they would still get the same amount; this was made quite clear. I was playing with words, because the thing that the Cabinet Minister wanted is get a certain amount and come what may, didn't matter what we did or anything else or who was

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . taken care of, the Cabinet Ministers have the top priority and they would receive \$18,200. Now I say that this is admitting -- for the Minister to get up and say if this is passed, but only if this is passed, we will reduce the salary.

Now I would say that this is an indication of proof that this was not the right way of doing this and I would say that this is proof that the Cabinet were looking after themselves and not worrying about anybody else, and I certainly think that this motion is valid. We haven't even had all these salaries approved and we're reducing them now. It is a clear indication that this was not done properly.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just a question. Under what department is the Minister being paid? Is it out of this department or another department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're discussing the salary of the Minister of Public Utilities - the salary.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, certainly he must be paid under a certain department. Is it this one or another one?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to inform, indeed I'm quite anxious to inform the House since there might be some misunderstanding, I only receive one salary and at the present time it comes from the Department of Public Works. However, there is the salary appropriation in the Public Utilities Department.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it the intention to have another Minister appointed during the course of the year?

MR. McLEAN: That might depend on what happens to this motion.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members.

A counted standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 14; Nays, 37.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the words "and Representation Allowance" be struck out of Item No. 1 (a) of the same Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I see that the First Minister is coming in to defend the action of the Cabinet on this. I think that he tried to muddle things up a while ago. I think that it is clear again that the members of the Cabinet had one thing in mind, just to set aside \$4,600 tax-free. This is not the intent I am sure of the people who set up these laws with the income tax with the ability-to-pay, but this is what this Cabinet intends to do.

Now it's true that there is a Bill and we're told that if this Bill is passed this amount will be reduced by \$800.00, that's providing they get another \$800.00 as tax-free money as members. Not too long ago the Minister, while arguing this, said that this had nothing to do with the members and that the Cabinet Ministers needed \$3,000 tax-free more than the others. This is only clear -- it is clear that they need \$3,000 more tax-free or that the part of what they get as members will go to pay some of the expenses that they have as a Cabinet Minister. This doesn't stand up; it doesn't make sense at all.

Now how they can explain to the members that they need this money - I think that there's only one explanation. I think again that they were shamed. They don't dare take this money - take more than that - but they're not ashamed enough as far as I'm concerned. But they will take this \$4,600 tax-free, and the First Minister can say as much as he wants that this is exactly the same thing, but it isn't because you will have to change this. It is providing the Cabinet Minister now with less as a Cabinet Minister, less the smaller amount as tax-free as expenses. All of a sudden the expenses of the Cabinet Minister has been reduced by \$800.00. I think that it should be clear to the backbenchers that the only reason that this is done is because you have a Cabinet that never wanted to discuss these things, at least, with you before. You have them in the corner and they wouldn't dare, even this Cabinet wouldn't dare take another - what is it, \$1,600 or so or \$800 tax-free.

I think we've got to be responsible in this instance and we've got to realize that with all the taxes that we have in this province and so on that we've got to show the example that there is no such a thing as a group of privileged people here in Manitoba, and if we're going to go with the ability-to-pay, these people should not be exceptions by providing an allowance that is quite a bit more than the average wages here in Manitoba and that this allowance should be tax-free to a few of them.

And this brings in -- apparently we will have a new Minister because the Minister, when

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... my Leader asked them if they will intend to have another Minister here, he says it will depend on what happens on this motion. The motion was passed so the salary is passed, and we are told that we will have a new Minister and I think that there's -- we will discuss the same Minister, because I think he holds another portfolio.

So I would say to the backbenchers maybe this is a carrot that's being dangled in front of you to be on the right side and maybe you'll have a chance to get this salary, but I think that you have a certain responsibility, and at least on this one, we want the salary to at least be fair and pay your taxes on whatever money you're going to receive.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I only rise to say my honourable friend is just as wrong on the second time as he was wrong on the first time, and I dare say he'll go quite happily on being wrong as many times as this particular matter comes up for a vote and there isn't much I can do about it. But I repeat that he is wrong. He was wrong then; he is wrong now; he will continue to be wrong. As for his being a member of a Cabinet, I should be rather surprised if that ever happens, and I shall also say that if there was as much unity in the ranks of my honourable friend's caucus as there is in the ranks of the government caucus, perhaps there'd be less concern.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister was dragging in a red herring before; he's pulling in the red herring again. This is not the same thing at all and he knows it isn't. If it was the same thing he wouldn't have had to explain yesterday that if this Bill is passed we will have to make some changes. It is clear ...

MR. ROBLIN: Admit it, you're wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will not admit it. I'll only admit one thing, that you want \$4,800 tax-free. You don't care how you get it but you're going to get it.

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: You lost out your pension in 1965 but you made up your mind you're not going to lose this at all.

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is the only thing you want.

MR. ROBLIN: You're just wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: And I would wish you'd get a few more words in your dictionary, or if you can prove that this is wrong, if you would prove that this is wrong, that you are now not reducing the amount of tax-free money to the Minister, if you can prove this then I will admit that I'm wrong, but you know that you did this without any concern for your backbenchers at all.

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: You've never discussed this, because if you had discussed this with the backbenchers they wouldn't have pushed you in a corner the way you are now. They wouldn't have done that. There they are. I see a few smiles from them. You can talk all you want. I know you don't like this. I know that you don't like this. Well if you want to be fair, why don't you withdraw this and why don't you pay taxes like everybody else does. You have a high priority here in Manitoba of things to do. Do you think that it's right that the people of the front bench should have \$4,800 or \$4,600 tax-free? Do you think that it's right, besides all your other expenses, a free car and everything else? Am I wrong on this? Do the backbenchers want to yell now and say I'm wrong? Do they want to go -- (Interjection)-- I say the backbenchers. You're so close to the First Minister it's a wonder you're not sitting in the same chair. You were a colleague a while ago. You were colleagues yesterday; he wasn't your boss. Yes, but you're pretty red, Duff. You don't like it Duff. You don't like it at all. You don't...

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend wishes to refer to me, let him do so in the appropriate manner.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I'm very sorry, Mr. Cabinet Minister, I'm very sorry. You've never forgotten you were one, not when you deal with your salary and wages, but I forgot for a minute. I'm very sorry and I apologize, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: I accept the apology.

MR. DESJARDINS: Very good. I'm glad he does. Now would he please accept my suggestion and the suggestion of the people of Manitoba and try not to think of himself as a privileged character and pay the taxes the way everybody else should.

MR. ROBLIN: I remind my honourable friend that I was the one man who said I earned my salary. I take it he really doesn't mean that at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, am I talking about salary? I'm talking now about

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... tax-free salary and it's not the same thing. I wish my honourable friend would listen a bit. This is not the same resolution. Of course he runs in and out of the House so often and so fast that he doesn't know what's going on. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, you should read this resolution again and my honourable friend would see that we're talking about this tax-free money that he puts aside for himself. He's the Legislature, he decides you people will pay the taxes, the five percent sales tax and all kinds of taxes, but at least my colleague and myself will have \$4,600 with no tax at all.

MR. ROBLIN: I find, Mr. Chairman, that I have no trouble in keeping up with my honourable friend. I'm usually a good deal ahead of him and he's still wrong. He was wrong; he is wrong now; and if he continues to repeat this argument, he will continue to be wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, would you give him his toy so he could go home and play?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Same division?

MR. MOLGAT: Same division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the motion, 14; against, 37. I declare the motion lost. (a) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments in connection with the Public Utilities. I have a complaint in that you're not putting the Manitoba Water Supply Board under the Utilities. I missed out in discussing the Board's report under Highways because there was no specific item listed under that department for that purpose, and while there were some comments made on the Water Supply Board under the first business when we commenced the Session, however, I feel that

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I wonder - it's 12:30 now - if the honourable member would like to continue after lunch. It is 12:30. I leave the Chair until 2:30 this afternoon.