

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, October 9, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Eleventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Eleventh Report:

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 40, The Manitoba Centennial Lottery Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee recommends that the fee paid in connection with Bill No. 43, an Act to incorporate St. Anthony's General Hospital, be refunded less the cost of printing.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I also beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the fee paid in connection with Bill No. 43, an Act to incorporate St. Anthony's General Hospital, be refunded less the cost of printing.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

STATEMENTS

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to make a statement in reply to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, a question that he asked on October 7th, dealing with what he called a wholesaling of power by Manitoba Hydro. The question relates to the metering of power to trailer parks and then the metering or sub-metering by the owner of the trailer parks to the occupants thereof, and the report I've received from Hydro, firstly does state that the corporation may engage in any development, generation, transformation, distribution, supply and use of power upon such terms and conditions as the board deems proper; or contract with any person engaged in distributing power for the supply of power to that person upon such terms and conditions as the board deems proper.

I am informed that to meet the requests of trailer parks' tenants, after consultation with existing trailer park owners, Hydro adopted a policy effective May 1, 1969, whereby each tenant of any new trailer park and the owner of the trailer park would be served directly by Hydro in accordance with regulations governing the supply of residential, general purpose, commercial and power services. Prior to May 1, 1969, trailer parks served by Manitoba Hydro were provided with central service. In the event the trailer park owner had elected to install his own meters for each trailer stall for the purpose of charging the tenants separately in accordance with his consumption of energy, the rate that may be applied after May 1, 1969, shall not exceed Manitoba Hydro's standard residential rate for the area in which the trailer park is located. In some cases, a trailer park owner includes the supply of electricity in the rentals, in which case the energy is unmetered at the tenant's premises. Manitoba Hydro has advised all trailer park owners who are presently being supplied with central service, that Manitoba Hydro on request is prepared to negotiate a purchase of the owner's distribution system so that all service may be supplied directly to the individual tenants by Manitoba Hydro, and I have a letter from Hydro stating that it would be happy to have one of its representatives visit with any person to review with him the rates that are being applied in trailer parks.

I would also like to reply to another question which was asked by the Honourable Member for River Heights, and dealing with the expectation as to the needs of Hydro in this current fiscal year, and I have received the following precise information from Hydro. I say "precise"; I suppose it is approximate but it is Hydro's information. — (Interjection) — These are the figures supplied to me by Hydro which I believe are correct according to their latest calculations. The capital budget set up by Hydro for the fiscal year, current fiscal year, is \$111,900,000. There would be net refundings after withdrawals from sinking funds of \$17,600,000, making a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... requirement for this fiscal year of \$129,500,000. Funds generated -- I would not share the honourable member for River Heights' comment that that sounds like Hydro unless he means that this is the kind of money that Hydro is involved in. Less funds generated internally 9 1/2 million, and the amount estimated to be borrowed during the current fiscal year is therefore set at 120 million. To date Hydro, through the Provincial Treasurer, has borrowed on a U.S. issue in April 1969, \$35 million, and again in June of 1969 by unit of account issue that was negotiated in Luxemburg on the European market, some 15 million, making a total of \$50 million already borrowed. This leaves an estimated amount to be borrowed in the remainder of this fiscal year of \$70 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to make a statement regarding the question of minimum wages.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne it was indicated to the House that the government intended to reconstitute the Minimum Wage Board with instructions to make at least an interim report before the completion of this Legislative Session. The Board has been reconstituted and has been conducting hearings. The chairman of the board has made a report to me which says as follows: "It is the unanimous view of the members of the board, and the writer as chairman, that the board does not have at present sufficient information and statistical data on which it can arrive at any intelligent conclusions."

The government is satisfied that the board has diligently applied itself to its responsibilities and appreciates that the pressures of time necessitate the nature of the report which has been submitted. Despite the fact that the Minimum Wage Board has not been able to make a definitive recommendation, the government is possessed of sufficient basic information as would lead it to the conclusion that the existing minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour is not adequate even in terms of the purchasing power which is represented at the time it was so fixed. While still adhering to the principle that a Minimum Wage Board should study the matter and make a meaningful recommendation, the government is of the opinion that the minimum wage should at least be adjusted so as to represent the status quo in terms of its value today. Our information is to the effect that taking into account the increased cost of living and the relative increases in other wages during the past year, a sum of \$1.35 would approximate the equivalent wages to the minimum wage which was fixed at \$1.25 on December 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the government wishes to make it abundantly clear that it does not hereby come to the conclusion that \$1.35 per hour is a satisfactory, adequate or even temporarily satisfactory minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba. The government intends to increase the minimum wage to \$1.35 merely in order to provide some amelioration of the existing situation and for the temporary period which is anticipated will elapse until a definitive report is made by the Minimum Wage Board.

In making this conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the government has also directed the Minimum Wage Board to bring forward a definitive report on or before December 31, 1969. In the event that a definitive report is not brought forward before December 31, 1969, the government would again consider the possibility of itself acting on the question of minimum wages. In taking this action, the government wishes to express its confidence in the mechanism of a Minimum Wage Board which will conduct in-depth studies in support of its recommendation. It intends -- I regret the interruption of my honourable friend for Lakeside -- the government intends to continue this procedure with the knowledge that in the final analysis the government itself will be required to assume the responsibility for any decision -- (Interjection) -- which is different than they were previously. The decision of the government will be of course guided by many considerations and it is expected that the recommendation of the Minimum Wage Board will be a most cogent force in determining the government's action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I assume by leave that I have a right to answer the Honourable Minister who has just given us some rather unusual information at this time. In listening to...

MR. PAULLEY: May I remind my honourable friend of the opening remarks which were contained in the Speech from the Throne which instituted this Assembly, that this was a promise and which the government is now fulfilling.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Honourable Minister of Labour and House Leader, all I could think of was "colour him red"; colour him red for the embarrassment which

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)... has been caused, because the Minimum Wage Board has not yet responded to the dictates and to the wishes of the government. No-one here questions the right of the government....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and on behalf of the Minimum Wage Board, they were not under any dictates and I indicated in my statement that I have received a communication from the board.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Honourable House Leader and I hope that he'll listen with interest to me. You know, Mr. Speaker, the government has the right to raise the minimum wage. When they were in opposition they suggested that they would, and the figures of \$1.50 and \$2.00 based on the statistical information they had then -- (Interjection) -- they had it then, \$1.50 and \$2.00 -- Oh never? The Honourable Minister of Transportation said \$2.00 and he's shaking his head in agreement, and he did, and they had the information then to be able to make that determination, and they told those who were on the government on the other side, "We have the information; we know what the situation is; and if we were in a position we would do it." Well, that's a fact; that's a fact. Well, the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare may be embarrassed by this but it happens to be true.

Now we have a very strange situation. We now have the Minimum Wage Board -- (Interjection) -- yes, I'll permit a question after I'm completed -- yes, after I've completed. We have a Minimum Wage Board which has been condemned by the members on the opposite side when they were in opposition, who have now not yet come to an agreement, and who have unanimously indicated to the Minister of Labour they're not yet ready to make a decision, and the government says, "No, no. We are going to make a decision. Why? Because we made a commitment in the Speech from the Throne." Well, if you're worried about commitments that you've made, live up to the commitments that you've made to the people of Manitoba. Yes -- well it's your commitment, it's not mine. Live up to your commitments that you made to the people of Manitoba, which was not \$1.35.... -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order.

MR. SPIVAK: Why would I cry blue-ruin? -- (Interjections) -- Oh, you may be very sensitive about this because we're now talking about the....

MR. SPEAKER: Order. May the Honourable Member for River Heights proceed.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): In view of what you have -- By the Lord Harry!

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for River Heights proceed.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there is a commitment by the honourable members on the opposite side and they're not living up to that commitment, and at this period -- (Interjection) -- What was the commitment? Well, I'm not sure because the Honourable First Minister has made a lot of commitments and has talked through both sides of his mouth so much that I'm not sure what the last one was, but I heard a program, on a commentary with John Harvard, in which \$1.50 was mentioned. I heard a program with Bill Trebilco in which \$1.50 was mentioned, no question about that.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the Honourable Member for River Heights is in the slightest way trying to imply that I said we were committed to \$1.50 an hour, I challenge him on that because I recall exactly my words. I said that it was my hope that we would be able to proceed to \$1.50 by the end of this calendar year. That remains my hope.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, if this is your hope, declare it. Declare it as your policy, but don't suggest to the other side here that we have to take this sort of ruse that's being presented to us that if the Minimum Wage Board do not come to the consideration that in fact it should be raised because they have not the statistical information, that we are still going to live up to the commitments we've made. Then that's fine, live up to them, but don't start to try and suggest at this time that in effect the Minimum Wage Board is really acting independent of you, because all you really are suggesting to us that if they do not respond to what the government wants, then the government's going to act, and you have a perfect right to do that, but at least have the courage to stand up and do it.

MR. PAULLEY: We're doing it.

MR. SPIVAK: Then, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I was listening. Believe me, I was listening. Let me suggest to the Honourable Minister of Labour and to the other members on the other side, then why have a Minimum Wage Board? You didn't want one in the first place. Throw it out. Oh, you didn't? Well, I'll tell the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.).... Honourable Minister of Education I haven't the speeches in front of me today, but in the weeks to come, because I would suggest by this course of action we're going to be here for a little while, in the weeks to come I will produce speeches of the honourable members on the other side dealing with the minimum wage and the Minimum Wage Board and the amount, and then we'll see whether the people who I am referring to will be as red in the face as the Honourable Minister of Labour is when he suggests this now. Now you either do one of two things. You either leave it with the Minimum Wage Board and let them make a decision based on the statistical information and whose judgment we'll then rely on, or you act as a government in your own right and say we're going to raise it no matter what happens. But you cannot have it both ways.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I regret my honourable friend has taken the line of reasoning or unreasoning that he has. If my honourable friend would only be truthful and factual. In this House I have said on numerous occasions, indeed it was contained, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech of His Honour at the opening of this Assembly, that we would refer the matter of minimum wages to the Minimum Wage Board and that we would ask them to bring in an interim report during this session, and that following this session that they would be requested to bring in a final report by December 31st.

Mr. Speaker, the statement that I have made tonight respecting minimum wages has been based on an interim report which I have received from the Minimum Wage Board, and if my honourable friend wants to construe my remarks and my statement tonight into the area that I have not received an interim report, then I suggest to my honourable friend that he is in error, that he knows nothing at all as to the contents of the report that I have received, but I want to assure my honourable friend - the Member for River Heights is still crying the blues because he's not on this side of the House - that the contents of my statement tonight are based on an interim report from the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board and they have fulfilled my request, as Minister of Labour to them, and I have fulfilled the obligation, Mr. Speaker, that this government undertook as announced in the Speech of His Honour at the opening of this Assembly. This is the truth, the facts, and nothing but the facts, and I suggest to my honourable friend, cry as he might, that we have fulfilled our obligation, we are very appreciative of the co-operation that we have received from the Minimum Wage Board, and that we have not delayed action in respect of minimum wages; we have not procrastinated as my friends opposite did for many a year during their term of office. We are taking action and it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the action that we are taking may not be satisfactory to my honourable friends, but action we are taking; and we are not dictating to the Minimum Wage Board. This was an undertaking that they accepted, and we accept as well.

A MEMBER: Where'd you get the tiger in your tank?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the honourable member to rebut or make a second speech?

MR. SPIVAK: Beg pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the honourable member to rebut or to make a second speech?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be in a position at least to answer the Honourable Minister of Labour. Well, I'm sorry he — well again, by leave, Mr. Speaker, and leave won't be granted and this is fine, but by leave, I'd like the opportunity to be able to answer my honourable friend who has just made a very impassioned speech. Well I think we might as well debate it now. We're going to be debating it obviously in any case, and you have now taken this opportunity to make this presentation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't quite understand the logic of the Honourable Minister.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: I still don't have leave? Leave not granted?

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding is that upon the making of a statement by a Minister, a statement in reply is allowed by each of the political parties in opposition, and the Honourable Member for River Heights has made his statement. Now he's on his feet again proceeding — and this is the reason why I had asked him is it his intention to rebut or make a second speech, either of which is out of order.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, on the point of order you will recall, of course, that the Minister of Labour made a second statement, and if he hadn't done that then it would have not been necessary for my honourable friend from

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.)... River Heights to get up. But having made a second statement, then I think that the House or the rules would provide that the Honourable Member for River Heights be allowed to reply to that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding was that the Honourable Minister of Labour rose on a matter of privilege. He had explained a point which, in his opinion, was misinterpreted by the Honourable Minister of River Heights. Reading Citation 91 subsection (1) of Beuchesne, it does not allow any debate on a statement by a Minister. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I rise on a point of order. I would like your consideration of the fact that I feel that the Honourable the Minister of Labour has made a statement of policy tonight, to which are we to be allowed the opportunity to debate that point tonight?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, surely a former Speaker of the House knows very well that this is not the occasion for debate, and I, on a point of order, would point out to the Honourable Member from Swan River that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was given the floor.

MR. BILTON: I beg your pardon. Whether I was former Speaker or not, it seems to me that a most unusual situation has developed where a statement of policy has been delivered tonight by one of the Ministers in the dying moments of the session, which I feel that maybe members of this side would want to debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. May I suggest to the honourable member that when a decision is made by government, a policy decision, all members normally expect that that decision will be announced in the House - not necessarily debated in the House but announced in the House. And had the Honourable Minister for Labour made that announcement outside of the House, he would have been criticized; and frankly, the criticism would have been correct, in my opinion. But this was still a statement and I still think the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the honourable member speaks may I ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if he'd table the report of the Minimum Wage Board with the House.

MR. PAULLEY: I have no objections at all, Mr. Speaker, to so doing in order that my honourable friend is fully aware of the report on which I made my statement, and I also would like to have the page boys give to my honourable friend opposite, the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House, the Member for Churchill, and the Member for Rhineland a copy of the statement that I have just made to the House in order that there be no mistakes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable the House Leader, please?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering if we could allow statements from the...

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it would be too late for my question after that even if the last member that spoke, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: I have called the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Labour if he would table the report of the Minimum Wage Board.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister has answered the question.

MR. SPIVAK: No, he has given me a copy of his statement.

MR. PAULLEY: You see, Mr. Speaker, that is the difficulty that I have with my honourable friend the Member for River Heights. He doesn't listen but he talks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't think I'd get a chance to make my remarks on the Minister's statement. I do have a few questions to ask the Minister and my first regrets would be probably, has the Minister acted wisely in probably acting on the interim report, on the interim report of the Minimum Wage Board, because I'm not certain, the Minister has not told us, if the Minimum Wage Board has completed all its hearings, and if it hasn't then perhaps he's just acting at the present time on the interim report. Now I would like to point out to the House that for the last two years I have been very consistent in this House and I've stated at all times that I thought the minimum wage should have been increased to \$1.50 an hour, while at the same time the members of his party have indicated that it should have been \$1.75 or \$2.00. It was higher than what I indicated to the House at the time.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.).... Now I think that really the Minister should have seen, too, that the Minimum Wage Board had completed its report and then I think he could have brought in a minimum wage to this House that's more realistic than \$1.35.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, just on a point of privilege. I know that in the last two years the New Democratic Party introduced a motion with no figure, setting out criteria in the last two years -- just let me continue. Last year when the government refused to accept criteria which we presented, we then moved, in view of their refusal to accept it, the sum of \$1.50. The first year, 1966-67, and this is my recollection, the highest figure ever moved by the group in the last three years was \$1.50, not \$1.75.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Minister is correct in this instance because I can point out, maybe not by way of resolution, by speeches during the estimates, the Labour estimates, I'm certain, and I stand to correct it but I can prove it to him tomorrow morning if he doesn't believe me, that the figure that was used by the New Democratic Party at that time was higher than \$1.50. I believe it was \$1.75. The doesn't matter but really I feel that \$1.35 is not realistic. I would like to see, the Honourable Minister of Labour -- I understand there is all indications that the Federal Government will increase the minimum wage as far as the federal minimum wage is concerned, and I would like to see that the Minister would act and bring it in line to whatever the Federal Government increase their minimum wage.

MR. GREEN: Oh we're ahead of them.

MR. PATRICK: I know.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member will agree that right now we're ahead of them.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister would have been listening, I told him there's debate or indications that the minimum wage will be raised by the Federal Government. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if it's increased to \$1.50 I would like to see the Honourable Minister act, and I would like to point out to the Minister because when the Federal Government introduced its labour code a few years ago it was intended that all the provinces in Canada would follow it, and

MR. PAULLEY: No.

MR. PATRICK: Yes it was.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I remind my honourable friend, suggest to my honourable friend he cannot be in possession of the facts because I have recently attended a meeting of all Ministers of Labour, including the federal Minister of Labour, and the statement of my honourable friend does not conform with the deliberations that took place at that conference.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out all the indications - and I spoke to the federal Minister at that time - it was his intention when he introduced the labour legislation, the labour code, and he hoped that all the provinces would follow suit and introduce it. -- (Interjection) -- Well this is just exactly what I said. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see what the Minister will gain in a matter of two months. This is my question: He's saying that -- what's going to change in two months that you will change the minimum wage from -- (Interjection) -- Yes. What will change?

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend wants to know what the change will be. It will be for that three or four months that those on the minimum wage in Manitoba will receive at least the benefits of a ten cent increase while awaiting possible action by the Federal Government, which we don't know whether or not it will happen.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would agree it's going to be an improvement. I'm not satisfied. If there's no improvement within two months as the Minister stated, I would say that he's waffling and I'll be very disappointed, and I think many people in Manitoba will be disappointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for the statement that he gave us. If I am correct, I don't think he gave us any effective date of....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, and I apologize to my honourable friend. I should have said that in accordance with the Act itself, that one month after this is presented - which has to be by Order-in-Council, the effective date - the closest effective date, Mr. Speaker, appears to be the first of December of this year.

MR. FROESE: So we now have the effective date, then, as December 1st. I think this is

(MR. FROESE cont'd.).... what was the previous time too when an increase was made so that — (Interjection) — Yes. It seems to me that this is rather a minimal amount in accordance to what we were led to believe when they were sitting on this side of the House. I think it makes a difference where you sit; at least that's the way it appears to me now; that probably more consideration is given to statements that are being made if you are in a responsible position. I only wish that the government would have come along and set up another board of a group of farmers to set the price of wheat, so that the farmers would also be able to pay more to their farmers, where it would have the wherewith to do just that, because I'm sure we then would have no objection of raising the minimum wage probably to double the amount if we only had the wherewithal to pay. This is the serious situation that we are facing, that the farmers are facing in this province. While no one begrudges anyone the minimum wage that is called for through this increase, I'm sure that if sales are not being made, if the farmer can't deliver his crops, that this could be a difficulty on his part. Mind you, this probably doesn't apply across the board to farmers on all occasions, but I think they are guided by this anyway and that many farmers are paying much more than what is required under the minimum wage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased that an increase is being made but I feel that it is rather minimal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, at least the Honourable Member from Rhineland seems fairly consistent. He was always a little leery....

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I'm doing like the others. I'm making a statement; I'm answering on his statement.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): The Liberal Democrat.

MR. DESJARDINS: He's one and I'm one. Remember that. Mr. Speaker, as I say, the Honourable Member from Rhineland was always fairly careful in advocating the increase in minimum wages and at least he's consistent today. I can't follow through on this business of the setting up the price of wheat because he knows quite well, I guess he's just using this to put in a good word for the farmer again, but he knows that this would be done in, the Federal Government is in charge of this or the Wheat Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a step in the right direction. It's certainly not as much as the members of the New Democratic Party would wish, nor members of the Liberal Party, nor my friend the Independent and myself, but at least it's consistent and it augurs well for the future, and we have close to a promise from the Minister of Labour and the Premier that they're going to do everything possible to see that this will increase fairly soon.

But I think that we should take notice of what has happened here this evening where an irresponsible person, who has always been crying the blues, what you're doing to chase people away from this province, who has been part of a government who has done practically nothing in this field, and who tonight is challenging the government, is laughing at the government because there was an increase only of 10 cents an hour. And I think that it is about time that these people realized what the role of the opposition is. You have a government party in office, and another party who is supposed to be ready, willing and able to take charge if the party in power falters. And this is not the case because every member on that side this evening shared with glee — they were listening to the words of the Honourable Member for River Heights — (Interjection) — You weren't cheering? Well, congratulations; at least you're steady and we know that you're not interested in an increase in minimum wage, and at least you're steady.

But the honourable member behind the Member from Spivak — not from Spivak but from River Heights — and the member who is not present in his seat now — I'm referring to the Member from Fort Garry and the one from Sturgeon Creek — said just a few weeks ago: "Implore the people of this House to be very very careful when you decide in the minimum wage." The Member from Fort Garry and the Member from Sturgeon Creek. Because they felt that you have to be very careful, it was so close to chasing these small businesses out of power. And now tonight, these same — well I know in all justice, the Member from Sturgeon Creek isn't here, but the Member from Fort Garry is cheering like the others. And I could find out — (Interjection) — What did I say — the Liberal? Oh, no, I'm very sorry, they're still Conservatives. But my honourable friend, after his remark, was cheered by all the backbenchers including the Member from Fort Garry. — (Interjection) — No, I'm sorry. He says that he's not interested in increasing the rate. But the Member from Fort Garry has cheered these

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.).... words, is chastising the government because it's only 10 cents more, and just a week or so — he's trying to pretend he's not listening because this is pretty tough.

MR. PAULLEY: May I interrupt my honourable friend? I believe, Sir, that it is not the occasion for a debate on the statement, and I wonder if my honourable friend is not getting a little argumentative insofar as the statement is concerned. I would suggest in all — (Interjection) — Yes, and then we might even have to put up with you for a little while if we did, here for an hour.

So, I would suggest, may I in all due respect of my friend whom I have the greatest admiration for, as indeed I have for all of the members of the House, may I come back to what you said a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, that on a statement by a Minister it is not proper to be argumentative but to make contributions on the basis of that statement. This has been the past practice. This has been the past practice in the House and I respectfully suggest — I'm prepared and willing to accept any criticism of my statement, but I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is the occasion for a proper debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister's point is well taken. Would the honourable member confine his remarks to the statement made by the Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm nearly finished, I just....

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): On a point of privilege here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May I hear your point of privilege?

MR. MCKENZIE: I don't digest the remarks of the Honourable House Leader at this moment.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I have some gelusil if you want to.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MCKENZIE: It just irks me, it just makes me firing mad, Mr. Speaker, that I have sat here and appealed to the Minister of Agriculture to call the committee. Now he moves up here tonight and moves a minimum wage. I'm going to have to lay some people off in my store.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to know what the relationship is with the Department of Agriculture and my statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: I had the floor a while ago. Where do I stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very short because they're all jumping up, but I cannot let this evening go without making sure that this is on the record that the Honourable Member from Fort Garry....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: That the Honourable Member from Fort Garry tonight is not satisfied with the statement, as is his colleague, with the statement. He feels that it's too little, but I want him to remember that just a few weeks ago he was asking, imploring the House to be very careful, because it would be very dangerous and he would chase out the middle businessman out of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I again appeal to you, at the late hours of this session the Minister of Labour has the....

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes, I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Would he please state his question?

MR. MCKENZIE: the gall to bring this legislation before this House at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please state his question.

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes. I asked the Minister how many employees am I going to lay off with that bill. With that legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend needs a lesson as to the procedure of government. If he will meet me after, he possibly will be aware that I'm not introducing a bill but making a statement as to the future course of the minimum wage in the province of Manitoba, which does not require any bill.

MR. MCKENZIE: On a point of privilege, can I ask one question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. McKENZIE: Why was not this bill brought in a month ago?

MEMBERS: It's not a bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): On a further point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry I missed the initial remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I'll have to wait until Hansard comes out 'til I can read them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Missing an honourable member's remarks is not a point of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: But I caught the last of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I am rising on a point of privilege and a point of order both. The Member for St. Boniface actually is a functioning, working member of the government caucus. Now if he has a right to speak on this particular matter and this particular item, why don't our members have a right to speak on it? Why don't I have a right to speak on it? That's point No. 1, Mr. Speaker.

And point No. 2, with respect to the -- and I don't want to take what the honourable member said out of context, but with respect to what I heard, with respect....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If, in the opinion of any honourable member, they felt that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface ought to have been denied the right to speak as a Liberal-Democrat, as he chooses to describe himself, then the point ought to have been raised at the time that he rose in his seat to speak.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't question my honourable friend's right to be a Liberal-Democrat, or any kind of a Democrat he wants - that isn't the point. The point is, Sir, that he actually functions as a member of the government caucus. Now if that's the case, then we should have the right on this side of the Chamber to participate in debate on this issue, and as far as his comments are concerned with respect to the support that I showed the Member from River Heights, I did so because the Member for River Heights raises a legitimate objection to an indefensible position which has been rationalized here by the Minister of Labour, which is indefensible in the light of the business on the Order Paper and the direction in which this Chamber was moving. That is why I support the position of the Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. I'm sorry that I was late. I apologize. I was visiting friends from my constituency. But I come here with a bill on the minimum wage....

MR. PAULLEY: It's not a bill.

MR. McKENZIE: All right, call it what you want and I'm sorry I was late, but I....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, again may I tell my honourable friend, whether he was out in Birtle-Russell or Roblin, I am not introducing a bill. I made a statement, and I'm glad that the honourable former Speaker is now trying to simmer down my honourable friend.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm agreed now, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, it's a ministerial statement to increase the minimum wage, and do you know what my accounts receivable are in my store today? Do you know that I have customers in my store that have patronized me for 30 years and can't pay their bills?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): I just rise to make a correction. The Member for Assiniboia stated that he has in the past three years supported the minimum wage at \$1.50. I simply want to correct him for the record, that in 1967 when the present House Leader introduced a resolution to increase the minimum wage to \$1.50, the Member for Assiniboia amended it to \$1.25.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, after this most interesting interchange, we may have third readings.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Election Act. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill No. 38 for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak briefly to the motion for third reading

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)... of this bill, I would like to simply make the offer, and the suggestion at the same time to my friends opposite that if they would be in any way inclined, we on this side would be agreeable as well to refer this bill back to a Committee of the Whole House to make one change in the bill. The change I'm referring to has to do with the amendment that was proposed in Law Amendments Committee by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, which in effect - and it's in the bill now - in effect will give to people of 18 years and over the right to run and hold office - to run for office and hold office.

I understand that subsequently some members on both sides of the House have had some second thoughts and would rather that this particular question - not of the voting age but of the age at which one may hold office in Manitoba - that this should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for further study and to be pondered somewhat longer. If the honourable members opposite would be at all inclined to have this kind of reassessment made, then I would propose to withdraw the motion to give third reading to this bill and to propose instead that the bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole so that the clause relating to the age of holding office would not be proclaimed. We would amend the bill so that that clause would not be proclaimed. The rest of the bill would be proclaimed or come into force upon date of receiving Royal Assent, but that particular clause would be held up until such time as the proclamation were actually issued, which might not be - I suggest would not be until after we have heard from the Committee on Privileges and Elections which would study that matter and allied electoral matters.

If my honourable friends are not in agreement with that, then we'll proceed with normal third reading and it becomes law. But I would hope that we could have some time to pause and reflect a few months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd be quite happy to agree to that because after all this was what I had in mind, that I felt that the age, the 18 year age for candidacy was too low. I expressed my feelings on this, I moved an amendment and I certainly stand on what I said earlier, and I would be very much in agreement with what the Minister suggests at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, our party has been on record for some years as favouring the voting age of 18. However, there has been a difference of opinion about the matter of running for office and other qualifications, and we are quite willing to go along with the suggestion made by the First Minister, namely that this part of the bill be referred back to Committee for further study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly the subject matter of this particular bill has been the subject and the object of considerable soul-searching in this party in recent weeks. There's no question that there's a consensus in my party, Sir, that 18-year-olds today fulfill and discharge the responsibilities of citizenship in many fields, in many areas, with conscience and distinction and we have seen no reason to obstruct the passage of legislation that would enable citizens of that age to enjoy the franchise. We also took it upon ourselves to improve the bill in our view to take steps that we felt would improve the bill in the interests of conformity, in the interests of logic and in the interests of justice.

We must admit, or I at least must admit for myself, and for some colleagues of mine at least, that it has been a subject of continuing soul-searching, continuing conscientious study. The First Minister has now made a very interesting suggestion. However, for my part, Sir - and I will defer to other speakers in my party on this subject - but for my part I must say that I'm still convinced that the interest of conformity, of logic and of justice are served by the addition of the amendment which was moved by my Leader and which received support, sufficient support of the Assembly at the time to accomplish passage. So my response to the First Minister on his suggestion would be that it's a very interesting one, but we would say, "after you Alphonse."

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): I would like to ask a question of the First Minister at this time. Did I not understand him correctly to indicate that the mover of the original idea was now prepared to reconsider, and that mover is the - was that not the understanding?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to embarrass anyone but it's my distinct impression that at least one member of the benches opposite was quite prepared to have this matter either referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges or to have this

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)... particular clause of the bill having to do with the right to hold office, the age in which one may hold office, simply held back and not proclaimed. Not the mover, the mover was the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition — well, I'll be blunt about it, the suggestion was made to me — and I don't mean this in any offensive way — by the Honourable the Member for Riel, so we've been discussing this back and forth. However, if honourable members opposite, through the medium of the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry, have indicated that they would rather proceed with the amendment as is in the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'll give the time for the Conservatives to have a caucus for a few minutes and give you some of my reflections if you want. I think I — I forget what I said a while back when I spoke on this. I asked whether they would be considering bringing in legislation to allow 18-year-olds to hold office and I believe at that time I said they should. And I really haven't changed my mind, but I would be willing to let the Elections Committee make a decision on this because in my mind there shouldn't be an election, I don't presume there's going to be an election called before the Election Committee sits, and if others want to reconsider this then we can certainly do it. But I do feel at this time if we're going to go as far as allowing people to vote for office then they should be mature enough to hold office. But again I'll go along with the rest of them if they wish to wait and let the Elections Committee make a decision — I presume that would be during the next sitting of this House — well, I'll go along with that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise because of a rather unusual circumstance that's developing here, the suggestion by the First Minister that someone from the conservative caucus may have indicated a particular position — and I'm sure that that's accurate, I'm not questioning that at all — but the suggestion that that in any way was a determination of conservative policy, I think is not correct. — (Interjection) — Well, I know you're not suggesting it, but on the other hand there has been indication that maybe there was a possibility of this. The government has the obligation and the right to make a decision as to what they are prepared to do, and they have a perfect right if they want to, because they do have a majority, to take the action as proposed by the First Minister.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): What is your opinion?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, let me tell you what my opinion is, and I think this is very important. One of the things that's bothered me while sitting on this side is the great inconsistency that comes from the other side on almost every matter that we deal with.

MR. DOERN: You're getting off the track.

MR. SPIVAK: No, I'm not getting off the track. The truth of the matter is that the legislation was introduced to allow those of 18 to vote for provincial elections. When the suggestion was made, well why not make this, you know, make this apply to all elections in Manitoba, to the municipal elections, that matter hadn't been considered. The question then was raised, well why don't we allow the people, whom we're going to now give the right at 18, to run for office, because surely if we feel an obligation to lower the arbitrary figure, or the arbitrary age level which was 21 to 18, surely we must be consistent though to suggest that they have the right to hold office — (Interjection) — In one second, yes.

Now, the position that the conservative party took is the only logical one, that if you're going to be prepared to lower it to 18 you've got to give them the same right to run. And there's no question of that. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition proposed an amendment that was accepted. Now if for any reason the government is embarrassed by that, then they can take whatever action they want. It's up to them to determine the course of action they want to take, but there's no thought on our side of changing the will, as it was expressed in the committee and in the amendment that was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, because there's only one consistent principle that you have to deal with now and nothing else. If you are going to allow people to vote at 18 you have to give the same young people, whom you're giving the right to vote, to give them the right to be able to hold elective office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is a motion before us is there at this time? Did I not understand correctly that the First Minister merely made....

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the point of order being that it's being asked now whether there is a motion before the House, Sir, and there is a motion. I moved third reading of the bill.

MR. MOLGAT: You have moved it?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I have moved it, Sir, so there is a motion.

MR. SPEAKER: For the information. . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I should indicate that in so moving this motion I. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. For the information of the honourable members there is a motion before us moved by the Honourable First Minister, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bill No. 38 be now read a third time and passed. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm moving the motion to adjourn the debate on this matter, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. In doing so, if there are any members who wish to speak I have no objections of course.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not quite certain whether I should accept a motion of this, a conditional adjournment motion of this type. I would prefer that debate continue, and at an opportune moment, if one should arise, the honourable member then -- (interjection) --

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

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 41. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill No. 41, an Act to amend The Development Fund Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the third reading of the Manitoba Development Fund Act, I think it's necessary to repeat again some of the arguments that have been presented by this side in connection with this matter.

The government always had a perfect right to investigate the matters of the Fund and had a perfect right to deal and to look at any particular loan that had been questioned. The members who are now seated on the other side, when in opposition, criticized The Manitoba Development Fund's operation, and in turn questioned some of the loans that the Fund had made and some of the issues that developed around those loans. It was suggested by this side on many occasions that when they came to power and when they took their Cabinet positions, that the Cabinet had a perfect right to call for the files, to examine them and to determine for themselves whether the questions that they had raised when in opposition were correct or not. If the questions that had been raised by them were correct, they then could propose to the House and to the people of Manitoba the action that they would undertake. If on their investigation the issues that had been raised by them were incorrect or were not found to be in the manner as presented to this House by them, then they could have then stood up in this House and declared that upon examination and review they have now satisfied themselves that the particular loans that were in question in this House, they are satisfied and they believe that the Fund has acted properly. In this way they would have then been able to deal with all those issues that have been the subject of contention over the past few years in this House and outside of this House. They then had a vehicle, a mechanism set up to deal with the future loans that could possibly be questioned.

We have passed this session an Ombudsman Act, and in passing the Ombudsman Act we have given the Ombudsman the right to review the operations of the Fund and we've given the Ombudsman the right to have anyone who claims that he has not been handled correctly, either in the application of a loan or in the carrying out of a loan by the Fund or the procedures of the Fund as undertaken by its Board of Directors or its officers, that the Ombudsman would have a right to make a serious investigation of the facts, and that on the basis of his impartial hearing into the facts and examination of the files and records, he then could make the recommendation as to what government action should be undertaken.

In this way, had the government undertaken this specific, this specific suggestion, they would have had the opportunity first, of reviewing those issues that have been in dispute in the past; and secondly, they would have had the right to allow someone who would have a claim for redress in the future the right to be able to go to the Ombudsman who would be able to give the impartial hearing. And for the life of me I cannot understand why the government did not take this course of action.

What the government has now suggested is that they are now going to appoint an Economic Advisory Board whose main object is to advise the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Premier on economic policy matters. They are going to form this Economic Advisory Board; they are going to allow a member of the Legislature, or members of the Legislature to sit on that board - and it must be assumed that they will be their caucus members; and that board will then have the right to review the issues that have been raised in the House in the past and will have the right to deal with the issues that will possibly be raised in the future. In doing this they are giving to the Economic Advisory Board in effect the same powers that the Ombudsman has, except that they are putting it in a context in which there is a degree of political influence, and the degree of political influence has to do with the fact that members of the Legislature can be appointed to review it, to be on the Economic Advisory Board which will review the matters that are questioned.

Now if the First Minister had suggested that the committee would consist of a committee of this House in which all parties would be represented, then I believe that the issue would have been a little different than the one we have before us and the logic of the argument of handing it over to the Ombudsman would not be as valid. But the government has taken the position that we may appoint members of the Legislature. They have made the comparison to the Manitoba Hydro Board, the Manitoba Telephone Board, to the Water Board, and in all of those cases those are government caucus members who are appointed, so we can assume that

October 9, 1969

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) their practice will be to appoint government caucus members to review boards who are going to deal with matters that have been in such contention in this House. And I must say at this time, how can I or anyone else believe that there really is going to be the impartial hearing that must be undertaken in order to be able to at least not only be just in what they're doing but have justice deemed to be done.

It would seem to me that the wisest course, and the course that has been suggested consistently by members on this side, would have been to have taken the Ombudsman Act and to have recognized that in the Ombudsman Act we have given the Ombudsman the right to do the review, and for the government to have taken the — for the government to have had the courage, because I think it would have taken courage, Mr. Speaker, to have reviewed the matters and it would have taken great courage to have stood up and said that maybe we were wrong, because I think this is what the result would have been although I can't be sure. I've had an opportunity of reviewing the files when I was Minister of Industry and Commerce and I have come to my conclusion on this — they may come to a different conclusion — and the government stood up and said this was our conclusion. What they now have done is they have now set up an Economic Advisory Board, whose composition we do not know, but we do know that it is intended that there will be members of the government caucus on that board.

Now I'm not quarreling with the concept of an Economic Advisory Board — after all, the bible TED has indicated that it should come — but I do quarrel with the change that is being proposed by the honourable members on the other side because this was not visualized. What was visualized was an independent appraisal from the private sector, and now we have a mixed advisory board, to use the Premier's expression, and I would suggest, as I suggested earlier, that it's a little bit of a mixed up idea that has given him this concept, because . . .

MR. SCHREYER: . . . two sectors, the private sector and the public sector.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I know, private sector and public sector.

MR. SCHREYER: Anything wrong with that?

MR. SPIVAK: One of the things that has disturbed me through all the years that I've been in the House, when I've heard the honourable members on the opposite side talk about the Manitoba Development Fund, was the way in which they basically challenged the propriety, the propriety of what was undertaken by those citizens who served on the Development Fund Board and served Manitoba very well. We are now going to have another board which is going to have the opportunity of reviewing their past actions, of making a determination on their past activities and will be constantly supervising them. And that board is not responsible to this Legislature, it is responsible to the Minister . . .

MR. SCHREYER: I believe the honourable member has some of his facts rearranged slightly and incorrectly. When he suggested — the Honourable Member for River Heights — that some member of the government caucus in the days when they were in the opposition had made speeches in the House questioning the propriety of certain members of the Development Fund Board also being at the same time in their own private business, I believe he was really referring to the member who is now the Federal Member for Provencher making that speech, but not a member of the government caucus, the New Democratic caucus at that time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I just rephrase what I said so there won't be any misunderstanding. I suggested the honourable members on the opposite side have for years questioned the board, the board's activities; questioned the government's judgment in appointing the people who have been appointed, not the individual — (Interjection) — now let me finish, Mr. Speaker, so before I am interrupted — (Interjection) — No, let me finish — questioned the government's judgment in appointing the board and giving the board the authority that it had, and not assuming the responsibility that they felt should be assumed by government. And now what do we have? We have the government appointing another board who is now going to review the activities of this board, and I suggest in a very real way that they are now going to have another board who is going to sit on judgment on activities that have been undertaken by the previous board and the discretionary judgment that has been made by them in carrying out their function, and they're still going to have an Economic Advisory Board which will be able to review the activities of the future. And there's no doubt in my mind that this must affect the government's activity. Now if I'm incorrect on this, because the First Minister seems to indicate that I am, I would be very happy to sit down and hear an answer to that before I continue.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the honourable member's question

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) correctly, I answer in the following way, that it is the intention that - more than the intention, it is the provision that the Economic Development Advisory and Review Board shall only review such transactions as are referred to it for review by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and except for those specific instances of a review function, this board will be an advisory board just as my honourable friend's Bible recommends that there be. We've just changed it slightly. Now, it's a guideline, it's not holy scripture that we have to follow it word for word.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, but what has the First Minister actually said. We are now going to set up an Economic Advisory Review Board and they may look at particular situations which the government may recommend that they look at -- (Interjection) -- or Ministers may recommend that they look at -- well, that's the government. Now, we have a -- yes, we have a Board of Directors, who are operating mainly independent of government but under a general umbrella of government policy, whose integrity we're not questioning now, and they now will be operating in the future subject to a review that may occur if the government so decides at their discretion by a review board. Now I say that you are now impinging on their activities, because the government at all times had the right, as government, to review those matters themselves. Why do you find it necessary to set up another review board rather than review it yourself? You are the government; you have the responsibility and you have to answer in this House. You also have enacted an Act which allows the Ombudsman to be able to review those matters. So now you are allowing a duplication of it and you are impinging, I suggest, on the ability, on the ability of that board to operate properly. The First Minister wants to say something?

MR. SCHREYER: Well to ask a question, and this is the question. If the Honourable Member for River Heights is suggesting that the Cabinet has in any case the power and the authority to investigate any of the actions, former transactions of the Manitoba Development Fund, then I ask him this: how can it be any less an impingement on the independence and impartiality of the Development Fund's operation than if the Cabinet were to say, instead of having a Minister or two or three Ministers look into a specific transaction or number of transactions, we will have a committee which happens to include an MLA and other people from the private sector. There is no greater impingement there than if it were a case of two or three Ministers making an investigation.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to lecture the First Minister on the belief or the theory of responsible government or Cabinet responsibility. Is he suggesting that a member of the caucus is in the same position as a Cabinet Minister? Is he suggesting that members from the private sector are in the same position as a Cabinet Minister with respect to secrecy, with respect to right and confidentiality? Are you suggesting that?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, surely I would hope that any member of this Legislative Assembly elected by the people should be entrusted, if he takes the same oath, should be entrusted with the same kind of confidence as any gentleman of the private sector of the economy who sits on these economic advisory and review boards. And if we can trust somebody from private enterprise to make appraisal, analysis and give advice, then I suggest surely we can among them also trust someone who has been elected by the people.

MR. SPIVAK: Here we go again.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. Is he telling the House at this time that the government always had the right to look into loans that were being made by the Manitoba Development Fund? Is that what he's saying?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare will remember that the Act was either -- no, I'm sorry, it was amended by Order-in-Council, if I am correct, by regulation . . .

MR. GREEN: The Act was not amended?

MR. SPIVAK: No, but by regulation it was amended, if I'm correct, in 1967.

MR. GREEN: But by regulation. The statute has never been amended.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, it was amended by regulation and I'm saying . . .

MR. GREEN: May I read the honourable member a statement that was made by the former First Minister, Duff Roblin, in answer to a question posed by Mr. Paulley?

MR. SPIVAK: No objection, but would you mind telling us the date and the page in Hansard.

MR. GREEN: Yes, December 12th, 1966.

MR. SPIVAK: I just indicated -- but, Mr. Speaker, I just indicated to the Honourable Minister that in effect the Act was amended and the government policy was changed and

MR. GREEN: The Act was never amended.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'm sorry. By regulation the policy of the government was changed

MR. GREEN: But do you then agree that when you used this phrase, "that the government always had the right to do this," you're not referring to the period of December of 1966.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare has indicated that we changed it by regulation. It was very obvious that we could have changed it by regulation in 1966. The only difference was that the policy at that time was not to do it. The policy was changed and that's the very simple argument. And now . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the member then if he says - would he permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: I have very serious reservations in my mind as to the wisdom of this type of dialogue or exchange which has developed in recent times. I'm wondering if it would not be preferable if those members of the House that wish to participate in the debate do so at a proper time, unless there is need to interject on a point of order or point of privilege. But in the absence of that, allow an honourable member to commence, continue with and complete his contribution to the debate.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have really had no objection to the interruptions that have taken place. I think they've been very interesting and informative and I have no objection if they continue. I really have almost lost my place and I feel that I have to start all over again which I think would -- (Interjection) -- yes, which I know would sort of meet with some displeasure on the part of the other people.

Well, I'm sorry the Honourable First Minister is not present but I must repeat again -- (Interjection) -- No, the press is not here anyhow, but I still think that it has to be put in the record as we're going into third reading on this. I have a feeling that those on the other side who have been responsible for this may very well live to regret this change. As I said before - and this isn't doom and gloom - if we can make reference to comments of other members on the other side as the First Minister did earlier today when he was talking in connection with the Election Act, I may say I have heard remarks from other members, without specifically specifying them tonight, who have indicated that this sounded like a doom and gloom speech. And this is not the case. But I really believe that in doing what you are doing now that you are seriously going to impinge on the ability of the Fund to carry on its activities.

As I suggested over and over again - and I really don't think that there's much dispute by those who have some knowledge of the Fund's activities - the Fund has really done a tremendous job for Manitoba and the Fund must continue to do a job if our economic development is to progress at the rate we now have and if we are going to be able to accomplish the objectives and aims that we want in this province, that in carrying out the Fund's activities the freedom, the freedom of political control has no doubt assisted in the growth and development of the Fund, and that by doing what you're now doing, I suggest to the honourable members on the other side that you are going to be impinging on their activities; that you have put a degree of political control which is over and above the political control that should be exercised by Cabinet - and I'm not questioning the right of Cabinet to do what they want to do.

I suggest, because the issues that have occurred in the past are still with us today, that it would have been far wiser at this time in our history and at this moment in the Session for the Minister and the Premier to have been able to stand up and say: we've reviewed all these matters; some were wrong, all were right, or whatever determination he had come to, so that at least we had the matter clear and then we could get on to the next job. We now are going to have this matter hanging. I do not know the composition of the board; I'm not sure that the Premier has any idea of who the composition of the Board will be - he may. If he has he hasn't furnished us with any information. I do not know what members of the Legislature are going to be on and I think that's a great error. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, again that it's my belief that if in fact members of the Legislature were going to be put on the committee, that the review committee should have been made up of the members of this House.

As a matter of fact, the Standing Committee on Economic Development could well have been the committee to have reviewed the matters, and the Standing Committee on Economic Development could have been able to deal specifically with the board members and with the Chairman of the Fund and with the various files that may have been requested. And I believe,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) as well, that a procedure could have been evolved whereby the Ombudsman upon his preliminary investigation of these matters could have then suggested that the matter be turned over to the Standing Committee for a final review to make a determination if he in his judgment thought that. I think that there were a lot of variables that could have been worked out had there been an attempt to try and take this matter out of the political context in which it has developed because of the rash statements that some of the honourable members have made over the years, and the campaign statements that were made in the last election.

But here we are. We have the Development Fund Act before us; we have the change that's being proposed; and I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that many members on the other side who are really fundamentally interested in the continued development and progress in this province may by this Act hurt that development by the degree of control that is now going to be exercised and by the political structure that has been established.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? I want to make sure in my own mind, does the honourable member object to subsection (3) or does he agree with subsection (3)? I'm just not clear from all he said whether he agrees with subsection (3) and objects to the MLA possibility, or whether he disagrees with the committee itself.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make this clear. First, I should make this clear because -- (Interjection) -- Well because I think that this Act and the statement of the Honourable House Leader when he introduced it has confused -- not intentionally -- but has confused several things. One -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I know very well you can confuse several things. -- (Interjection) -- No, you are, not me.

First, there is going to be an Economic Advisory Board set up according to TED, following the TED guidelines. Now that's one thing. Secondly, that board is going to have the right to make recommendations in connection with policy to the First Minister on economic matters. It is also going to be given the right to be able to review those loans which the First Minister or the Ministers may refer to it that have been questioned, or of the Fund's activities. Now I say this: (a) I do not think that that has to be done. No quarrel with the Economic Advisory Board. I don't think they have to deal with the matters of the Fund's loans. I think the Ombudsman can.

The Standing Committee on Economic Development should be in a position to have the General Manager of the Fund and the members of the Board appear for it where over-all policy matters can be discussed, the manner of the operation of the Fund, the things that have to be done to make the Fund's operation better, can be done. And in the course of that, specific complaints, not on loans but on the manner in which the Fund operates, could be discussed. I do not think that if you're going to set up an Economic Advisory Board under any condition which is to be for the private sector, that there should be members from the government caucus on it. I just think that you make that a political economic advisory board and that's the only judgment I can make.

And in the event that you've now made a decision that you are going to put members of the government caucus on an advisory board to review the Fund's activities, then you would have been far better, I would think, to have at least made a committee of the House in which there would have been members from the House -- and probably the Standing Committee would have been the committee to use -- to then at least have the right to review those cases, because if you're going to take that principle then it should be for all members of the House, not just for the members of the government caucus.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? I hope I don't provoke a speech. I now understand that the honourable member does not agree with subsection (4). Would the honourable member make it clear to me whether he agrees or disagrees with what is proposed in subsection (3)?

MR. SPIVAK: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I haven't the Act right in front of me, so if the honourable member would just read that section I could tell him. I'll know just as he starts.

MR. CHERNIACK: The section is: The Minister may at such times and as often as he deems it necessary request an independent committee appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and designated for the purposes of this section by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to prepare a special report in respect of an individual loan where he has received a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . written request from a borrower who believes he has not been fairly treated, and the Fund shall provide, with the permission of the borrower in confidence to such committee, details of the loan transaction involved and the actions taken and the Minister shall lay the report of the committee before the Legislative Assembly if it is then in Session, and if it is not in Session at the next ensuing Session thereof.

MR. PAULLEY: Now you've got it?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just can't understand why this section is necessary when you've just appointed an Ombudsman who can basically do the same thing. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I raised it five times because it happened to be a fairly legitimate position. You may not want to agree with that but I suggest to you it is.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member do me the courtesy of either telling me whether he agrees with subsection (3) or whether he'd rather not answer my question. I just don't know his answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll give the answer. No, I do not agree with subsection (3) for the simple reason - and I again repeat myself - you have just given the Ombudsman the same power exactly. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. You've heard that but you don't listen to it. You've given him the same power and the Ombudsman, I would suggest, is the impartial person who in fact can make this review and should make this review and should report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on Bill 41. First of all, I would like to suggest to this House that any bill that's going to be passed by this Assembly, if there are any complaints against the bill immediately the Ombudsman is going to be called upon. I think this is a ridiculous notion that if every time a bill was passed in this House and a group of citizens or a citizen of the province comes into conflict with the government or an agency and then he appeals to the Ombudsman to try and have the law changed, well this is not my concept of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is there to reconsider rulings made under the law where a citizen feels he has been aggrieved. That's my understanding of the Ombudsman.

But after having said that, I'd like to make a few points on this bill. It seems to me that a few years ago when the government of the day under Mr. Roblin decided to include MLAs on certain government boards, that the NDP group at that time objected. They objected to a member of the Legislature going on the Hydro Electric Board; they objected. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think my honourable friend is taking out of context the objections we raised at that time. It wasn't per se that it would be an MLA but that the onus was as to the selection. Now it could be that by negotiation it could be an MLA of either party, or any party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well as I recall, Mr. Speaker, there were strong objections from the New Democratic Party at that time to this -- (Interjection) -- Well as I recall - and the Member for Rhineland has reinforced my memory by saying that is so.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, because the Honourable Member for Rhineland wanted to be the MLA.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I strongly object to that statement. That is not fact.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a difference between an MLA being appointed to a Hydro Electric Board or the Manitoba Telephone Board. They were not appointed to boards who were going to hear appeals. They were appointed to boards that consisted of businessmen, technical experts in the field, whatever it was - we'll say hydro-electric - and they were complementary to the board and they did not hear appeals.

Now in the bill before us the government is proposing to appoint a committee which is going to in effect second guess any decisions made by the Manitoba Development Fund. And then as if that isn't bad enough, the government says in the second section of the bill, subsection (3), "the Minister may at such times and as often as he deems necessary request an independent committee" and Mr. Speaker, I won't go any further. I stress the word "an independent committee." Now how can the MLA who is appointed from the government caucus serve on an independent committee in an independent manner?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the legislation says that the MLA shall be a member of the government caucus. It says an MLA.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Have you been listening to your colleague the First Minister? He has said, he has suggested what is wrong with a member of the government caucus sitting on this committee.

MR. PAULLEY: There's nothing wrong with it. As a matter of fact they're the best MLAs we've got.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Are you suggesting they're the best independent MLAs you have?

MR. PAULLEY: You draw your own conclusions.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Now to compound the situation, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have an MLA from the government caucus sitting on -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, well it's understood here, it has been said by members on your side, it has been inferred and you're the first one to ever say that it's not going to be that way.

MR. PAULLEY: All I'm saying is..... the legislation.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a hypothetical question. What happens when -- and by the way, if there is an independent committee appointed to investigate a loan because a borrower feels that he's been badly done by, then the Minister responsible for that department under which the MDF comes and the MLA, the so-called independent MLA on the independent commission, what if there's a conflict between the two of them? Remember they're both in the same party and they're both in the same caucus. Now what independence is there? What independence is there with the backbencher who is serving on an independent committee, and if a conflict comes up and they're in the same caucus and he has to disagree with the Minister under whose department the MDF fund is? Now is this truly independent? I doubt it. I doubt it. It's not human nature. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, my honourable friend the First Minister is fair-minded enough to admit there's a problem, and this is exactly what we're talking about.

MR. SCHREYER: It's not insurmountable.

MR. PAULLEY: You might even accept the responsible Leader of the Liberal Party. I think he's insurmountable.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Now another point I make, Mr. Speaker. Whoever the MLA is, and he serves on this board, and bearing in mind that it will be a controversy whenever that committee is called together to make another judgment that has been made by the Manitoba Development Fund.....

MR. SCHREYER: Would the House Leader of the Liberal Party not agree that there is the same kind of problem latent here, present here as exists in the way in which the present Manitoba Hydro Board is constituted with an MLA on that board. It's conceivable that the MLA appointed at one time by the government to the board may have an entirely different opinion or policy position on South Indian Lake, for example, as the Minister might have. Now there's a problem possibility also which you've lived with.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, that the MLA in my opinion is a political appointment to a board and it's highly unlikely that you will find an MLA in a Legislature such as this -- and I say again with respect -- who is competent to judge in technical matters that come before the Hydro Electric Board. But after having said that, I do expect him to listen to others who are more knowledgeable in that field and to exercise some common sense, and if a vote is held on the board, to do the best that he can under the circumstances. But the gentleman was not appointed in the first place because of his technical competence. He may have been appointed because he was pretty good at winning elections and not good enough to get into Cabinet, so I don't know if that answers the First Minister's question or not.

But I'd like to return to the point I was beginning to develop. What happens after there has been a controversy about a judgment that has been made by the MDF and then it's been appealed to the committee appointed by the government? What happens when that controversy comes back to this House? Somewhere or sometime by members of the opposition, they are going to start to question the government. And under the rules of this House you can't question the MLA, there's no way that you can question a backbencher on government decisions or government policy, but you can question the Minister.

But we have on that side of the House two people who have an intimate knowledge of this situation. One is unable to answer because he's not a member of the Executive Council. Now is this not another conflict where the Cabinet Minister can decline to answer any questions in his judgment -- we've had it happen -- that should not be answered?

MR. SCHREYER: You're asking a question? I can answer it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yet the MLA who is directly involved is immune; he doesn't have to answer to anyone except his own political party. Is that not correct?

MR. SCHREYER: Do you want an answer?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, if you would care to speak. I welcome it.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, it's a useful exchange I think we're having. The member asks a question and I would answer as follows, that it is entirely the same situation as could have obtained in a situation having to do, for example, with South Indian Lake and the Hydro decision there, because the MLA that was sitting on the Hydro Board may have had a position quite different from the Cabinet of the day and the Minister reporting for Hydro, and yet no one seemed to be alarmed at that possibility. And I suggest that's just as real a possibility as having some divergence of opinion between the Minister of Industry and the MLA that was appointed to the Development Fund Board.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is quite persuasive and I'm inclined to go along with this reasonable approach, but it still doesn't answer the points I've made.

Now the final point is this. While I have disagreed with Mr. Roblin and his original concept of the MDF, the Manitoba Development Fund, I was inclined to give him credit for making the change referred to by my friend the Member for River Heights when by regulation they changed, they changed and made the responsibility with a Cabinet Minister where he had the right to examine and look into some aspects of - well all aspects of any loan made.

Now I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this new concept where a committee takes over that responsibility with an MLA of the government party involved in that, that this is no longer keeping the work of the MDF at arm's length.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Because I think it's very important, and if this is his principal objection it's certainly important and I think I can throw some light on it.

We are not - and I wouldn't blame him for opposing this change if we were - but we are not attempting to remove ourselves as a Cabinet from responsibility for the actions of the Fund. All that we are proposing here is that there be a committee, if you like, or a board of review and advice, and we as a Cabinet, and the Minister of Industry, would simply delegate and request this advisory and review board to make an analysis of a particular transaction which seems to have had some difficulties and around which there have been rumours and allegations. But the Minister would be responsible in this House for a decision then, and this review and advisory board would be delegated authority to make appraisal and investigation and report back to the Minister. The Minister would have responsibility then just as he does now and has for the last two years since that change was made. And in that case, I wonder if my honourable friend wouldn't agree that we are not really changing anything in substance or principle.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, while I have my reservations about the work of the Committee, I don't condemn the committee out-of-hand. There may be a reason come up whereby the committee can bring it to light and in a non-political, non-partisan way, bring out the answer. But my friends defeat this when they appoint a caucus member or a member of the House to a board that is going to second guess, or over-view a decision made by the MDF. And this is this whole point, the whole point. If the committee were that independent, then they would be completely at arm's length from this Legislature, and they're not at arm's length when there's an MLA sitting on this board.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is as follows. If we simply kept the present practice, then it would mean that the Minister would have the authority to request the Fund to provide it with all documents, etc., so that the Minister could make an investigation of a particular transaction.

Now the Minister, because of time and oftentimes because he doesn't have maybe specialized knowledge or experience in accountancy or whatever, you know what he's going to do? He's going to make the investigation; he is the authority under statute and practice; but he's going to call in - he's going to call in people on an ad hoc arrangement. He's going to call in an accountant, maybe a lawyer, maybe a second accountant, maybe just a good political advisor. Actually the only trouble we're in this evening is that we are trying to proceed by way of open government; we're telling you the arrangement that we would like to follow and we're putting it in statute. Now we could have saved ourselves a lot of trouble and my honourable friend a speech or two - one speech - if we'd have simply left it the way it was and operated, not secretly, but operated simply by hidden practice.

(MR. SCHREYER. cont'd.)

As Minister of Industry, I would make the investigation of these transactions about which there have been rumours and allegations, but I'd have called in - and no one probably would know about it - I would have called in a chartered accountant, maybe a lawyer, to do the actual physical perusal and appraisal of all the documents. My honourable friend wouldn't have objected then, but he's objecting now because we're simply proposing to do the same thing but we're putting it in writing, in law.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is very persuasive in his argument but I doubt if he could overcome my strong objection to an MLA being on this board even if he appointed an independent MLA like the Member for Rhineland or the Member for Churchill, or whatever other independents there are here. But even with that, I voice strong objection to the fact that an elected representative in this House, who may be called upon by the course of events to be critical of a happening in the MDF, is disarmed and put on to that board, and further disarmed because he's under a Cabinet Minister and bound by party discipline. And for that reason I object to that part of the act.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: He has been around for quite a number of years, as indeed some of us on this side of the House, politically. I wonder if my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, would answer this question. Has at any time since the change has been made in respect of the appointments of MLA to the Manitoba Hydro Board, the Manitoba Telephone Board, the Water Conservation Board, as an MLA, that that particular individual has been responsible to answer questions in this House? And I ask my honourable friend, on each and every occasion, dealing at least with these three jurisdictions which make provision for MLAs to be on the boards, has it not been, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister in charge of the department has been responsible in this House for the conduct of Manitoba Hydro, of Manitoba Telephones and the Water Conservation Board? And I ask my honourable friend, does he contemplate because of the fact that we suggest, insofar as the MDF is concerned, there will be any difference in the procedure in this instance as has been in the past.

Now if my honourable friend suggests that there will be because of the change of government, I respect his difference of opinion. But I know my honourable friend has been around here for a considerable number of years and he trusts that he will be around for a number of years to come, but I do not recall in any instance insofar as this House is concerned, Mr. Speaker, when the MLA who was a member of these boards has been called to answer. The Minister is the responsible person who has to answer to this Assembly.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I would suggest to you that the MLA on the Hydro Electric Board or the Manitoba Telephone System Board vis-a-vis the MLA on this committee, are entirely two different situations. This is an appeal - this board is the final appeal for a borrower who's dissatisfied with the treatment that he feels he has received. There's no comparison between the two.

Now as far as...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend, is there not an appeal under the Manitoba Hydro Board to the actions of the Hydro Commission which is comprised of a board, including an MLA? I think that I am perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying to my honourable friend that if memory serves me rightly, that there is an appeal to the Manitoba Hydro Board of any decision that that board has made which might affect people, because until and unless there is a change made as the result of the hearings before the Manitoba Utilities Board...

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Minister now asking or is the Minister answering?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm asking my honourable friend, is he not aware of the legislation dealing with the Manitoba Hydro Board, which is a board comprised of a member of the Legislature, that the individual concerned has the right of appeal to? I'm sure that there is an appeal to this board, of which a member of the Legislative Assembly is a member of.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's approach is so reasonable that it almost covers up the weak argument he's trying to present. There's no comparison between the Hydro Electric Board, whose prime function is not to hear appeals....

MR. PAULLEY: But it can hear appeals.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, when was the last one? And how many?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know, but the legislation, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is there.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this is a hypothetical argument. The prime function of the committee, under Bill 41, is to examine decisions made by the Manitoba Development Fund, is it not? I shouldn't ask a question.

MR. PAULLEY: On the request - on request.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: There's no comparison between an MLA sitting on the Hydro Electric Board and an MLA sitting on this committee to re-judge a careful decision made by the MDF. And that's what I base my objection to, Mr. Speaker, that there is no place, there's just no place for a political person on a board that the government tries to say they're keeping at arm's length within the MDF. Now the Minister has the right to enquire into and call for papers and officials. We don't deny that this isn't proper and right.

MR. SCHREYER: We're not changing that.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: And I have said before that I have my reservations about the committee, I don't really know, but I do have a strong feeling that the committee should not contain a political person from within this House.

MR. SCHREYER: Isn't the Minister a political person?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: The Minister stands in his place and risks his government and risks his

MR. SCHREYER: And that's exactly what I said.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . reputation and everything else when he decides to question, when he decides to reconsider a decision made by the MDF.

MR. SCHREYER: That's right.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: But the MLA does not.

MR. SCHREYER: No, but the Minister does on the MLA's behalf as well as on behalf of all the other members.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Okay, I will accept the fact that the Minister may want a buffer; he may want some time to reconsider and he may want some expert help, but he's not going to get the expert help and the impartial decisions from a member of the backbench of his party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief, I don't intend to speak at length. When the bill came up for second reading I endorsed it, especially the second part dealing with special reports where a committee was to be set up, because I, along with some of the other members who have been sitting in the opposition for a good many years, had been smarting for too long, and there were certain matters that came to us and that we felt should be investigated. Therefore, I took the position that a thing like this should be brought in.

But on the matter of members of the Legislative Assembly serving on such a committee, perhaps the idea, or the mention that was made by the Honourable Member for River Heights that it not be limited to one but that more than one member could serve and that probably the Committee on Economic Development might take the place of the suggested committee in Section 3, perhaps has merit. I would not discount it, in fact if we are going to put members of the Legislative Assembly on the committee I don't think that it need be limited to one member and I would have preferred that it would be more than one member. I already spoke on the bill this afternoon when it was in the Committee of the Whole and questioned the matter of the wisdom, and to what extent a member, a government member on the committee might influence such a committee. I didn't receive a reply at that time. I don't know whether it's worthy that a reply be given, because I said at that time both the former government and the present government will have some experience in that line and they might be able to consider this much better than I can.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable member but he has just stated that he asked a question to which no reply was given, and I don't quite understand what question it was he's referring to, if he'd care to just elaborate a bit.

MR. FROESE: I mentioned I questioned in the afternoon the wisdom of having a government member on this committee and to what extent such a member might influence the committee as far as government policy was concerned. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I can see his point now, that the report will be made and the Minister then accepts responsibility for that report. So this might answer the question. At least it does to a certain extent in my opinion, that there is still then room left as to what action will be taken, that consideration will be given to that report at that time, so that I will not take issue on that any longer at this time. My only

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... consideration is that if we are going to allow one member of the Legislature to serve, I think in this case it would be better to have more than one so that if there was divergence of opinion that this would be brought out.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: If no one else wishes to speak at this time, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you would now call third reading on Bill No. 43, in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

BILLS NOS. 43 and 44 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 45, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2), for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendments that have been prepared, and I believe they've been distributed this evening. Now these amendments....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is no amendment before the Assembly at the present time.

MRS. TRUEMAN: All right. I would just simply like to say that I would much have preferred to have seen the southerly boundary of this area located at the Assiniboine River. Now it seems to me that it's discriminatory to yield to the lane south of Broadway, and by drawing the line there we're actually cutting in half one of the large new developments taking place at the foot of the Donald Street Bridge, the Metropolitan Estates Development Corporation. Now I would like to move an amendment which -- (Interjection) -- Can't I move an amendment?

MR. CHERNIACK: No.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the only proper course of my honourable friend is that the bill be not now read a third time but referred back in order to consider certain matters.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there would be agreement we call it 10:00 o'clock and then we'll....

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPIVAK: If there was agreement that it would be called 10:00 o'clock now and....

MR. CHERNIACK: By leave possibly we could leave the debate in the name of the Honourable the Member for Fort Rouge to continue on the next occasion, but also possibly, by leave, we could present Bill 46 for third reading and possibly have it passed.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact in all probability Bill 46 will probably provide an extensive debate and I think we'd be better to....

MR. CHERNIACK: Call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend is saying to us that there is going to be another further and extended debate on a bill which we have debated for a long long time, I cannot do otherwise than to accede to his request under the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn.

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