

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Friday, October 10, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable First Minister. I wonder -- I'm sorry, really for the new Minister of Railways. I wonder if he can indicate now whether the government would be prepared to change the decision in connection with the discontinuation of the Great Northern Railway service from Winnipeg to St. Paul and Minneapolis in view of the fact that the Attorney-General from the State of Minnesota has already requested a meeting with the City Council of Winnipeg to join in opposition to such a discontinuation.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'll answer that question, simply to indicate to the Member for River Heights that the Railway Commissioner, I believe is the proper designation, will be involving himself with any and all meetings that may be held between officials of government in the United States and officials of the City of Winnipeg or government of Manitoba in connection with this application by Great Northern for curtailment of passenger service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable House Leader. Could the Honourable House Leader tell us if there is any more additional legislation to be presented at this Session?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): My answer is, with the exception of the Supply Bills, no, unless my honourable friend digs up another bill at the last moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Tourism whom we note has returned from his trip to Ottawa. I wonder if he could tell the House whether he has any words of encouragement for the people of western Manitoba who regard the facilities at Clear Lake with such great interest.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a statement on this subject this afternoon. Will that be okay?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm just wondering at this stage of the Session whether the Minister could inform me or give me any information as to the situation on Rock Lake, a question that I had asked of him several weeks ago; as far as the dam is concerned.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I have nothing to add at this time, but as in the case of similar enquiries, I will be in touch with the honourable member as soon as I have some information that may be of use to him. In other words, I'll be prepared to send you a letter on the matter if the information is forthcoming after the House has adjourned.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before the Orders of the Day I may have permission to introduce two resolutions dealing with sittings of committees that I think would be acceptable to the House.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature, pursuant to Rule 68 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, appointed a Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections on Thursday, the 14th day of August, 1969; and

WHEREAS it is considered advisable that said Standing Committee study and review the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . provisions of The Election Act with a view to making such recommendations respecting amendments thereto or improvements in the law relating to the elections of members of the House as may seem to the Committee to be appropriate;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections appointed by the House on Thursday, the 14th day of August, have the power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation and report to this House on matters referred to at the next Session.

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

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature on Tuesday, the 7th day of October, 1969, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas it is desirable to develop better public understanding of the province's economic situation and of the extent to which economic growth is providing adequate opportunities for employment, rising incomes and a better distribution of the amenities of life; and

Whereas it is desirable to provide a basis for appropriate action by the Government and the Legislature towards creating and maintaining the best possible climate for business and industry compatible with the interests of the people of the province; and

Whereas better basic information leads directly to better policy decisions for the promoting of economic growth;

Therefore Be It Resolved that a Standing Committee of the House call on Economic Development be established at this Session and that such Committee be appointed annually by the Special Committee of seven members referred to in Section 68 (1) of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly; and

Be It Further Resolved that for this Session the following be appointed members of this Committee: Honourable Messrs. Schreyer, Evans, Uskiw, Toupin; Messrs. Doern, Gonick, Fox, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, Froese, McBryde, McGill, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Turnbull; and

Be It Further Resolved that this Committee on Economic Development consider its terms of reference to be to maintain continuous surveillance of the progress of Manitoba's economic development and the activities of the Government affecting achievement of provincial economic goals as suggested in the TED Report to the Legislature.

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient that the said Committee should be authorized to hold such public meetings as they may consider advisable;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee have power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation to hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable and report to this House on matters referred to it at the next Session.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just a question to the House Leader. I assume that this is the same resolution with the exception of the operative section at the end. The personnel is exactly the same, is that correct?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . passed by the House, Mr. Speaker, it gives the Committee the right to sit in recess. If my honourable friend recalls, a few days ago he asked me whether this Committee would be called at the present Session and I believe my answer was in the affirmative. It is possible that it may not if the Session concludes, and that is the reason for the provision in order that the Committee, if called, can meet.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: Another question. Is it not the government's intention to possibly hold an organizational meeting very soon?

MR. PAULLEY: We're going to do that as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD CONT'D.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question I would direct to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. It concerns the proposed encroachment of the 1970 dates of the Red River Exhibition upon the traditional dates of the Manitoba

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.).... Provincial Exhibition. As the Minister knows, the Manitoba Provincial Exhibition has for 46 years had the week of July 1st, that week which includes the date July 1st, and it is now proposed that the Red River Exhibition move its dates so that it would conflict. We did ask a question about this some time before and I know the Minister is concerned. Has he any further information to give us at this time?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): My information, Mr. Speaker, is that it seems there is no way out of the impasse. This department has tried to negotiate with the various interests and it appears that there's just no way of compromise on this particular situation.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question. If the Manitoba Provincial Exhibition has to move, it will conflict with the Portage la Prairie Exhibition which would be very serious. Is it true that the carnival dates as established by the carnival operator are in fact dictating the dates of the Red River Exhibition?

MR. USKIW: If I may, Mr. Speaker. Are you referring to the Royal American Shows by any chance? I think it's quite broader than that, Mr. Speaker. The changes at the Calgary Fair or Stampede, whatever they call it, they have broadened their program to take in a great more number of days - they've added about four or five days to their program - which means that there is a chain reaction all the way back as I understand it. It seems that that is really what has started the whole thing and Winnipeg had to adjust accordingly.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I rise because I've just received now the copy of the proposal presented by the House Leader, and it is not in accordance with the resolution that the House passed because the House passed the two amendments that were proposed, one by myself and one by my colleague the Member for LaVerendrye constituency, and these are not embodied in this resolution as I read it now.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, and I must say in the hurry -- if I omitted them I apologize to my honourable friend, there was no intention. We can bring them in by another resolution or have the amendments added. If it's agreeable unanimously I'd withdraw even though it's passed - I don't know if that's possible or not - my friend the Clerk says "no". I'd be prepared to bring in an amending motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister in charge of Centennial for 1970 as to whether any approach has been made to the Hudson Bay Company to move their records covering the history of the early development of our country back to Canada. I understand that if this was done the University of Manitoba could develop an important historical department if these archives were moved back.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): There have been newspaper reports, and perhaps some others, of the possibility of the Hudson's Bay Company doing this. If they were to move their records from where they now repose in the British Isles to Winnipeg, it would be one of the greatest acquisitions that Manitoba has had and of tremendous importance to the story of the province, because the story of the province is to a great extent the story of the Hudson's Bay Company -- or the Hudson's Bay Company story is very much that of the province. Nothing has been done officially so far in that connection but it is being kept in mind and everything that can be done will be done to have these records brought here and provision made for their keeping.

MR. BEARD: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Does he think the University of Manitoba would be prepared to stand behind a move such as this to expand their Department of History?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): I can't say for sure, Mr. Speaker, however I'll take the question as notice and inform the honourable member.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): I would like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Transport. Could he inform the House as to when the Portage la Prairie by-pass will be open for traffic?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on further perusing this document, I find as well that I think there are two names -- (Interjection) -- Yes, so that will also have to be added.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Just for a point of information. They are by way of amendment in this resolution or agreed to prior. I'm sorry. Are the two additional names that have been added that were not added before? This is the first question that was asked of the House Leader by me.

MR. PAULLEY: There are two amendments as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, that were adopted by the House that are not contained. As the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose points out, there was an addition of two names, and if I recall correctly the other amendment had to do with the Chairman. Is that right?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would call third reading on Bill No. 46.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading Bill No. 46, the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

BILL NO. 46 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable House Leader further direction to give to the House?

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now then, Mr. Speaker, whether you would call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 45.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to register my disappointment that the southern boundary was not the Assiniboine River, and this was all I had to say on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on third reading of Bill No. 45, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Would you now call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 41, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe he's just outside.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if you would call Bill No. 38 and...

MR. PAULLEY: I'm in the same position my honourable friend, I believe.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, on the other hand...

MR. PAULLEY: They're both just outside.

MR. SPIVAK: No, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is not here and the Honourable Member for Riel will be talking in the debate.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable Member for River Heights indicate what his proposal is that we do at this point?

MR. SPIVAK: ... call Bill No. 38. Although the Honourable Member from Lakeside is here, he has waived his rights and the Honourable Member for Riel will be speaking.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine, Mr. Speaker. Call Bill No. 38.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, if I could just pass on the comments that I understand there's been discussion of this in which I wasn't a part of last night, and in essence, all I would suggest is that we now proceed with the bill.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I guess now we can call Bill No. 41.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, Bill No. 41. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take the time of the House to any extent in addressing myself to this measure at the moment, I just want to put one or two comments on the record to underline and underscore what my colleague the Member for River Heights has already said in connection with this legislation.

Our view, Sir, is that there should not be political implications or overtones or undertones where the Manitoba Development Fund is concerned, and I think that position has been defined and articulated thoroughly by my colleague. We feel that the particular section involved here is one that is concerned with an area of grievance that would justifiably and

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.)... reasonably come into the purview of the responsibility of the Ombudsman. Now I know that the attitude of the government to that position is one bordering on derision. The government feels that any suggestion that this particular section really would logically come under the purview of the Ombudsman is an illogical suggestion to say the least, and possibly a suggestion that is not worthy of consideration.

However, if one examines the reasoning behind the establishment of the office of Ombudsman, I think it becomes eminently logical that the type of problem contemplated here in Section 30, subsection (3) of Bill 41, that type of problem and difficulty and grievance does fall under the logical purview of an Ombudsman, for we're dealing here with the matter of fair treatment; we're dealing here with the matter of justice and of the spirit of the law as much as the letter of the law; and surely this is the area of our affairs in which the Ombudsman is going to be most fully occupied and concerned.

So I would only like at this juncture to underline and reinforce that argument, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a person, a party who has made a request for aid from the Manitoba Development Fund, made a request for consideration and has been unsuccessful in that position, and if that person or party feels that the treatment of his appeal, the treatment of his request has been unfair and unreasonable, then it seems the logical thing, if an office of Ombudsman exists in the Province of Manitoba and a qualified officer is occupying that office, that the person or the party with this grievance would take it to the Ombudsman for solution. As a consequence, we see no justification for that particular section of the Act as it's proposed and presented to us in the Chamber at this time, and we reiterate our fears about the political implications and the political undertones and the possible political dangers of enabling a member of the Legislature from the government caucus to serve in the capacity contemplated where the Fund is concerned.

Those are the only remarks I'd make at this time, and as I say, Mr. Speaker, they have been articulated very thoroughly by my colleague for River Heights, but we feel at this stage of the Session it's important to underline and underscore that attitude for the record.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we would go into Committee of the Whole House and have the Honourable Member for Kildonan take the Chair, due to the fact that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has a bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 40 was read section by section and passed.) Bill be reported? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): I was going to move that the bill be not reported, but you seemed to not accept motions of that type so I call for a vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the Member for Rhineland's motion that the bill not...

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): No, Mr. Chairman, the motion, the vote now is that the bill be reported. You ask for a voice vote and "aye" would be in favour of the bill being reported.

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

MR. FROESE: Could we have a division - yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 36; Nays, 10.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the motion is carried; the bill will be reported. (Bill No. 48 was read page by page and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills No. 40 and 48 and has directed me to report the same without amendments.

IN SESSION - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood) presented Bill No. 40, The Manitoba Centennial Lottery Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering, according to the last vote, if this is an indication that the mafia has already stepped in and bought off some of those that changed their minds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make a concluding comment. We had...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Committee we did get a considerable amount of information. However, before the bill is passed I would appeal to the Minister without Portfolio, who is in charge of the Centennial Corporation, that we be provided as members of this House with the projected statement of the needs of this organization and how they intend to be met under this particular bill, whether it will be on a percentage basis that the distribution will be made or on what basis, and also how these various organizations will be affected, because from the representation that we heard, apparently the sports organizations are one group that feel that they will participate much more so in the whole matter and probably feel that they deserve as a result a greater portion of the funds that will be made available through grants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Member for Rhineland a question? Now that the Centennial Lottery Act has been passed and a lottery is to be operational in our Centennial year, in the event that the Centennial Corporation decides to hold one of the draws, say around next August, would the Honourable Member for Rhineland be agreeable to drawing the lucky ticket at the Sunflower Festival in Altona?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'll reserve my decision on that till a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I find myself with some people thinking that there is a contradiction and therefore I'd like to try to briefly express my views in this connection. I have voted against this bill on second reading, and I voted to report the bill to the House. I didn't consider that that vote was approval of the bill. Some people may have regarded that it is. Therefore, I want to make it clear that I believe that we should vote on this bill on third reading in the House, and I intend to vote against the bill. I intend to vote against it because the reasons which I gave on second reading were confirmed at Law Amendments Committee when the main proponent of the bill, that is the Chairman of the Centennial Corporation said that it's an excellent form of taxation and as a matter of fact he would like to raise the entire \$380 million of the provincial budget in this way if this was as painless as he thought it would be. Mr. Speaker, my view is that if this lottery does indeed raise money, it will be impossible in the future to refuse or to avoid what people will say is a easy way of taxing people, and that opinion was expressed by almost everybody who appeared before the committee.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I have nothing against lotteries. As far as I'm concerned, it's not an immoral activity, it's not something that can be stamped out by government, but I do believe that taxation should be based on ability-to-pay. I believe that this kind of taxation will give people to believe that there is an easy way of conducting a democratic organization and that one doesn't really have to face the fact of taxation, and for that reason I intend to oppose the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to speak at length on this bill. I have spoken on it; I think I've made my position quite clear and I haven't changed my position. I indicated when I spoke on the bill on second reading that I was not against the bill because of moral reasons, but simply that I'm against the principle of supplementary revenue for the provincial treasurer to pay lottery, a form of gambling. I still take that position and I intend to vote against the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, my reasons for voting against the bill have not been changed from listening to the representations that were made at committee. I still am convinced that the main purpose of any representation at the committee was to condone the gambling aspect of

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.)... it rather than the centennial portion, with the exception of the chairman of the Centennial Corporation, but by and large the principle of the lottery system as being a method of taxation and it's inconsistent with the taxing principle of the New Democratic Party in that it is not based on the ability-to-pay as stated previously by the Member from Pembina, and on those grounds I feel that I have to vote against this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as the person responsible for the collection of the revenue for providing services of the government to the people of Manitoba, I want to make it clear that I reject any thought that monies raised by lottery or other forms of that type should be used for the proper and normal provision of services to the people of Manitoba. I think that should be raised by taxation in the proper way. I didn't hear the chairman of the corporation make the statement referred to by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services but I certainly would reject -- (Interjection) -- no, I didn't hear it because I wasn't there, that's the only reason I didn't hear it. I certainly reject any such thought, and the one suggested by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that this is revenue to the province. It's not part of the budget; I have nothing whatsoever to do with the collection of this kind of money for this kind of purpose. On the other hand, to me this is a fun and games kind of an idea, it's a birthday party, I know that people will want to participate and I hope that this will limit all other forms of lotteries for this coming year, and that satisfies me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River. The Honourable Member for Arthur has a question.

MR. WATT: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Does he agree then with Mr. Steinkopf's statement in committee yesterday, that any surplus revenues that might be derived from lotteries would go direct into the Consolidated Fund of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear it, I don't agree with it; I think it should stay for the purpose for which it's intended.

MR. WATT: Could the Minister then indicate where any surplus revenue might go to?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't think that there's any limit to the amount of money that can be spent for the benefit of the people in celebration of centennial and other commemorative and cultural activities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word, just a word at this particular time, and I do hope I don't have a crash of thunder to accompany my words at this moment. However, my attempt in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, was to do my little bit to alert the public generally that this bill was before the House. One of the most disappointing things to me was that, if it might be a disappointment, was the fact that there was no-one, or no group of people came to the committee to hear what was said and object or otherwise. I was quite impressed with the recitation we had by those that were interested in promoting the lottery, and in particular, I thought that Mr. Steinkopf gave us a full and complete picture as to what might be expected. In listening to everything that had been said, Mr. Speaker, I am now voting in favour of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I want to remind the members of the Chamber that in the next day or so we're going to vote the sum of \$1,759,672 to the Centennial Corporation, which is practically \$2.00 a head. I consider this is the right way to handle this. I don't think lotteries are necessary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to make a short statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance about his position in the event of a deficit -- (Interjection) -- in the position of a deficit.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the rules are that once someone else has spoken in between and -- I can't answer it. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CRAIK: Oh come on. I mean, after all this is an important point. Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted the honourable member. -- (Interjection) --

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.).... The honourable member may participate in the debate.

MR. WATT: on a point of order - I don't want to start a hassle on a point of order here but this is a rather -- it's the oddest ruling that I've heard in this House in ten years, because Mr. Speaker, I've got the floor right now.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder whether my honourable friend is in order while he's talking.

A MEMBER: You're out of order to start with.

MR. WATT: I'm speaking on the point of order. The Honourable Member for Riel wants to ask a question and I want to -- (Interjection) -- If the ruling is out that you can't ask a question unless it's directly after a member has spoken, it is the Speaker's prerogative then to choose one out of three or four people that are on their feet and he could conceivably just by the Speaker's choice of a speaker, put an end to all questioning -- (Interjection) -- That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, I would be glad to answer the question if it is permitted but the rules of the House are different. I would be glad to answer it, I would -- you know.... I'm ready to but the rules.... If there is leave - I would give leave but I don't know about others. -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order - now it's a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I indicated that I felt that I couldn't answer in accordance with the rules. Let me say this is a private members' resolution with a free vote. I would be prepared to answer the question. I personally would give leave, but I can't speak for anyone else. That's the point I want to make it clear.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I recall now that the Honourable Member for Riel was on his feet at the time somebody else was recognized and it could have been that at that particular time it was his desire to ask a question rather than participate in the debate. I think in order to resolve the matter we could allow the member to ask his question, as far as I'm personally concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Since the question has already been asked, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the Minister of Finance heard it? I was asking what -- he made a statement about his position in relation to any monies that are gained from the lottery. Can he also indicate his position with relation to anything that happens if there is a deficit?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if there were a deficit on the lottery alone I would certainly get after the chairman of the corporation and the members and make sure that they contribute in the proper way. I think the law is that the deficit would have to be covered but I hope to have enough to do with the planning of the project to ensure that there is no deficit. But the answer is, if there is a deficit then I think by law we would have to protect it.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared it wasn't definite to him whether the ayes or the nays had it.

A MEMBER: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING COUNTED vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Ferguson, Gonick, Gottfried, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), McBryde, Mackling, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Einarson, Fox, Froese, Graham, Green, Hardy, Henderson, McGill, McKellar, Paulley, Pawley and Watt.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 14.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion carried.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder.... the vote of the Honourable Member from Crescentwood really changed the lottery on this lottery?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a point of order here which you may want to deal with in some way. I understand that one member has voted in a way other than he intended to vote. If this be so I believe that the rule of procedure is that the vote cannot be changed, but I believe that the honourable member should be allowed the opportunity to express what his intent was. In fact, I believe in 1926 or so a government was defeated because a member voted in a way other than he intended to vote but nevertheless the vote had to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is any such member in the House in that position, the Chair will allow him to make a statement.

A MEMBER: With respect. . . if my mind was not somewhere else - against the Lottery Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that Bill No. 48, an Act to Validate By-law No. 801 of the Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake be now read a third time and passed.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd mind calling the adjourned debate on the resolution standing in my name, the top of Page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this motion is listed in the Order Paper as being in my name, but I think there's probably some error; it was actually adjourned by the Member for Fort Garry and I'd like to turn it over to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Votes and Proceedings shows the debate as being adjourned in my name. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have felt that Bill 47 is partisan and discriminatory and the reason why I adjourned the debate two evenings ago was I wanted time overnight to marshal my arguments. I still believe that as it stands before us, in print, Bill 47 is partisan and selective and discriminatory against certain members and certain constituencies represented here in this Chamber.

However, I think Sir, that it can be said that the First Minister of this province has repeatedly expressed a desire during this Session to maintain a fairness and equity in the administration of the affairs of this province, and I give him credit for his adherence to the principles that he's espoused in that area. I believe that if an extra hardship indemnity is to be paid the members for Flin Flon and The Pas, that there are other members of this Chamber, such as the Member for Swan River, to mention only one, who is equally entitled special consideration in the area of additional expense and hardship from the point of view of properly serving and servicing his constituency.

I also question whether, under the criterion that was referred to by the First Minister the other evening, the constituency of Rupertsland should qualify at all, and whether it's representative in this Chamber should qualify at all, because the First Minister specifically made reference to the problems encountered by those members of this Chamber who serve constituencies north of 53. And unless my eyes and my map both deceive me, the vast majority of the constituency of Rupertsland is located south of 53, and in fact it extends along way south of 53 - right down very close to the fiftieth parallel in fact. So, on those grounds, I suggest that there is an unfair selectivity and an unfair discrimination implicit in the bill itself, and it's really for these reasons that I have risen in objection to it.

But to refer to my second point, I do give the First Minister credit for his intention and his follow through in the fields of equity and justice in the administration of the affairs of this province. And so at this juncture, because I am convinced that he is convinced that the whole question of hardship indemnity, of special consideration in the area of unusual expenses should be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and reviewed by that committee in the light of the problems faced by a great many of the members of this Chamber from rural constituencies, because I believe that that's the case, and I believe that he also appreciates that that would be a fair and equitable stand to take, I intend to say no more on this measure at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry asks for some undertaking or indication of intent, and I want to say to him that we certainly do agree to hand over to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections the whole subject area concerning members of the Legislative Assembly's indemnities, expense allowances, telephone call rights during sessions, between sessions, transportation expenses, living allowances while away from home, which is accorded presently at the present time to all rural members or out of town members of this Assembly; and including northern allowances, the extra cost of moving about in the northland. All of this I do believe, should be referred to a Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that some time next year we can come up with a comprehensive updating of practice relating to MLA's indemnities and expenses.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)

I think the reason for doing so is pretty obvious. We can look at other provinces and see that they have been doing some updating and some adjustment upward of MLAs expense allowances for those living out of the capital city and so on. For example, I realize full well that the Member for Swan River does have additional transportation costs to meet; as an MLA he does have additional long distance telephone call charges to meet because his riding is quite a distance removed from the capital city.

On the other hand, the Member for Rupertsland, he has all of these to meet too. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Fort Garry amused me a little when he said that Rupertsland since most of it is south of 53 it should not really be included as eligible for this northern allowance. I want to tell my honourable friend that it's Duff Roblin, the Honourable Duff Roblin who first moved to have Rupertsland included as a northern riding for purposes of the extra indemnities. The reason - and I didn't fault the Honourable Duff Roblin for that because there is a good reason why Rupertsland should be regarded as a far flung northern constituency, because there are so many communities in the riding of Rupertsland that are not accessible by road, nor even by rail for that matter, which must be flown into or which you have to go by boat, and water transport is not that easily available and it's very slow, and I doubt that any member of the Assembly were he to be MLA for Rupertsland, would want to service his constituency by canoe. For that reason, it's obvious why Rupertsland should be regarded - because it is on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, communities inaccessible by road - it should be regarded as comparable in terms of expense of servicing for an MLA as Churchill or The Pas.

So, with the support of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and his colleagues, we certainly agree to hand this entire field of MLA's telephone and transportation expense, and living allowance expense matters, to a committee for thorough review.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the First Minister permit one question?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: On the basis of the case that he has made for Rupertsland, would he still insist that the existence north of 53 should be the criterion. My position is that should not be the criterion, the fact that a constituency is north of 53.

MR. SCHREYER: No, my honourable friend, I would say to him that the best criteria, the most non-partisan and dispassionate criteria is our own Manitoba Electoral Boundaries Division. They have published a number of maps, metro constituencies, rural Manitoba constituencies, and there is one map which purports to be a map of all northern ridings in Manitoba, and here they are, here's the map. There are five ridings that are singled out for special demarcation and naming, and here they are, there are five: Churchill, Flin Flon, Thompson, The Pas, and Rupertsland; and I think that this should be our guide. So in the meantime while this Committee on Privileges and Elections is studying all these matters relating to MLA's expenses, I would hope that my honourable friend will see fit - not on the basis of my argument, but on the basis of this map, official map from a dispassionate source - as being sufficient reason to proceed with the bill before us, and I invite him to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I want to at this time thank the First Minister for his assurance to this House that this whole matter will go to the study of a committee. I feel quite strongly about this because I have looked back in the history of Manitoba since its inception as a province and the very fact that by law we have to have redistribution every ten years. I think if you will go back through the history of our legislation that the changing of electoral boundaries has had an affect on the costs and the remuneration paid to the various members of the Assembly.

Furthermore, we also have changing conditions - the ever rising cost of living which is a problem at the present time. It may not be a problem ten years from now. These constant changing factors make it more important than ever that this question be referred to such a committee as the First Minister proposes.

So I rise at this time to thank the First Minister for his consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I rather tend to go along with the amendment that is being proposed here, that this whole matter be referred. It seems to me that if you are just going to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... pass the Bill, you are already setting a precedent in that you're going for whatever the Bill calls for in giving special allowances to certain members under the Act.

MR. SCHREYER: Will the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Does he regard the Manitoba Electoral Boundaries Commission as being a partisan body. And if he doesn't, then what comment does he have about this map which shows the northern constituencies? If he wants, I'll send him the map; the northern constituencies are clearly named there.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't consider the commission that was set up at that time, that brought in the report, as a political one or one that would not give a just and fair report. I'm not saying that at all. My point is that just by passing this Bill we are setting a precedent in this case. That's my only concern in this matter. I'm just wondering if the committee that's going to consider it later on, they'll be guided by whatever is done already and action taken by this House at this time. Other than that, it's not that I have anything against allowing members travelling expenses. Certainly not. I feel where additional expenses are involved that they should be paid for. I have no objection to that. There's other matters that I feel should be referred to this particular committee. As members well know, that other members have secretarial help; I don't have it. I would like to see that this matter be referred to this committee too. This probably doesn't involve this particular Bill; I know that too. But right now we are dealing with the amendment that is before us and this is why I thought I should mention it at this time.

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

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Does he realize that at the present time, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Churchill and Rupertsland, by law, are entitled to this northern allowance? They are now. What I am asking for here is that the law be amended so that the Member for The Pas, who is really in the same kind of situation, who represents in a sense the same kind of area, one of large size, which according to our official boundaries map is also a northern constituency — he is not entitled to this northern allowance under the present law, but the Members for Rupertsland and Churchill are. So my question is, would he really want to object to amending the law now so that members who are in the same kind of situation, representing essentially the same kind of northern area, would receive the same kind of allowance and that, having done this, all matters relating to MLAs' indemnities and expenses relating to areas served will be considered by this committee?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the First Minister's question, my contention is that by giving the same allowances to these members now, whether by that we are not setting a precedent that I feel later on we might feel that's not quite in order, that some should have larger amounts and others smaller amounts, and that there should be distinction later on it that is what is proposed. Other than that I certainly have no objection to the principle of indemnifying these members for their expenses.

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

MR. BEARD: Would the member agree to another question? I do have the feeling that he thinks, Mr. Speaker, that probably this is an allowance rather than expenses. Would he be in agreement with the northern members giving up this privilege of extra allowance in lieu of being able to submit accounts for expenses?

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is the very thing that I feel should be — we should rather go on that principle and reimburse them for whatever expenses they have. It might be much more, it might be less.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may close the debate. — (Interjection) — Yes, I think I can on amendment. Yes. — (Interjection) — I think we have previously on amendments in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite willing to give my honourable friend the leave that he denied me when I tried to close debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Carry on. We're prepared to give leave on this occasion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I believe that my amendment has achieved what I intended it to achieve and which I stated in my comments at the beginning, that it was not in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... any way geared to the two particular members mentioned that are mentioned here, but to the principle which I felt frankly did not solve the -- the bill does not solve the problem by dealing only with two constituencies because when you look at the map, just by itself the map doesn't give the answer either because there are problems of where a population is located. You can have a very very large area but all your population in one spot and you can't assess it I think merely by looking at the map. When you look at the size of the constituencies - Churchill for example from my calculation is about 120,000 square miles; Thompson is about 14,000 square miles; Flin Flon is about 17,000 square miles; The Pas about 16,000 square miles; Rupertsland about 27,000 square miles. So you see that even in there the Honourable Member for Churchill represents virtually half the Province of Manitoba on a square mile basis. So to merely take action on two constituencies I don't think is the sound approach. That was the purpose of my amendment.

Now the First Minister has clearly indicated that he is going to refer this to the Privileges and Elections Committee, that the Committee will be empowered to look at the whole picture and look at new methods which may not be necessarily by a flat allowance, which may be expense accounts or may be something else, which would go to solve the problem that faces us. On that basis -- (Interjection) -- Yes. On the basis of the First Minister's commitment in that regard then, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to ask leave of the House to withdraw my amendment, let the bill carry through, indicate that there is no, as I said in my original speech, that there is no personality matters here, it's the principle; on that basis I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.)

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): I agree that northern members should get extra allowance. However, I do not think that Cabinet Ministers should be included and when this thing is looked at some time in the future I think a provision should be put in the bill that should a Cabinet Minister represent any of those constituencies he would be excluded from the extra allowance. I think Cabinet Ministers get paid sufficient.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe leave was granted for the honourable member to withdraw his amendment.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then in view of that might I have leave to have the bill considered in Committee of the Whole House now so that we can dispose of the last remaining bill, as I understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) Committee of the Whole House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 47, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2). (Bill No. 47 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your Committee has passed Bill No. 47 and wishes to report same without amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. PAULLEY: May I have leave now for the passing for the third time of Bill No. 47. BILL NO. 47 was read a third time and passed. (By leave.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, will you now kindly call the adjourned debate on the resolution standing in my name, at the bottom of Page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.).... Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, the action of the government in establishing a task force on northern affairs is always a very commendable one. We have had this happen in the past; we've had task force appointments on numerous occasions; we've had federal studies made; we've had provincial studies made. The last one I refer to is the Royal Commission Inquiry into Northern Affairs, commonly known as the Mauro Report. This report was just presented at this Session of the Legislature; it was discussed very briefly. I'm sure that the government hasn't had time yet to digest everything that is in that report and yet today we are facing a resolution establishing another commission on northern transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I also have here a report by Mr. Morton, "A History of Manitoba". I have here a TED Commission Report which was brought in to this House in the last session which also deals with northern development. It delves very deeply into it; it's the considered opinion of 400 or 300 people. This report has not yet received action from government and we are now facing another task force. And, Mr. Speaker, I can go on to no end. I have here the report of Mr. Campbell on northern Manitoba, "Resources and Characteristics", which I received from the library. I have another one here, "Manitoba's Northland". All these reports are valuable. Here's another one, The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce Report. Here's another one, The Churchill Development Plan, Phase 1. The Jones Report. Here is another one, here's another one, here's one "Northern Survival". Here's another one, The Cost Benefit Analysis, The Armstrong and Freeman Report. Here's the Northern Mineral Exploration Assistance Program, The Oil and Gas Intercom. Here's one that deals with the whole Yukon area. Annual reports, Department of Indian Affairs, Northern Development, an Economic Survey of Northern Manitoba, the Little Report, Sessional Papers, Annual Reports of Department of Indian Affairs and National Resources. Here's another one, "Resources for Tomorrow". Mr. Speaker, I bring these in merely to illustrate to the government that if they want to study northern development they need go no further than the library over here. There is ample material there. All these things cost money, many of them -- most of them in fact were prepared at government expense.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Certainly.

MR. BEARD: Wouldn't you have to agree that some of those are very obsolete, they're not up-to-date and they're really of no relevance to modern day technologies?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Churchill, I asked in the library that only reports dealing with the last ten years be brought in. None of these reports go more than ten years back. There may be one exception. But we have just received the Mauro Report.....

MR. BEARD: that you referred to.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it may take me quite some time to go through it here but if the member wants to come over and look them all over he can find the date on it.

MR. BEARD: 1920.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that these studies are very valuable. Much time and much money has been spent in making these reports and I often wonder whether government really considers and digests thoroughly the work that has gone into the presentation of these reports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with another portion of this proposed resolution that's in front of us. So far I've just concerned myself with the reports. But we go on further and the resolution says "Therefore be it resolved that a Special Committee of the Legislative Assembly comprised of Messrs. Allard, Beard and McBryde, be established to consider and report on the requirements for the economic, cultural and the industrial well-being, growth and development of Northern Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen represent northern constituencies. No doubt they should be quite familiar with the affairs of their particular constituencies. There has been much said in the past by some of these members that southern Manitoba doesn't understand the north. And I'm not going to argue that point. But, Mr. Speaker, if southern Manitoba is ever going to understand the north probably the best way that can be accomplished is by other members being on this Committee. So therefore, Mr. Speaker,....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell will allow me an interjection.

MR. GRAHAM: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Well the purpose of my rising, Mr. Speaker, is that if the honourable member is going to move an amendment that it might expedite matters if I were to indicate to him that I was prepared to move an amendment to this resolution which might accommodate him. Would he allow me to read it -- without moving it, to read it first.

MR. GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: I would propose to amend the resolution so as to add the names of Messrs. Barrow, Bilton and Johnston (Portage la Prairie) to this task force committee, and the Minister of Health as Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the First Minister. (That can now go over there.) However, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say this to those members that have been appointed to this task force. We have a library next door; we have reports; we have federal reports, we have provincial reports and I would urge each and every one of these members of this task force to avail themselves of the material that is in that library, to study it and digest it thoroughly and in the light of the existing reports they might be better enabled to present a comprehensive report when they report at the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to extend it too long but I would like to point out to the member that while you can gather together many reports as he has and you can go back still further and there are more reports available than he has accumulated from this local library, I would point out to him that really he is off the track when he says go back and read these reports. They're obsolete. In most cases the reports are obsolete before they are tabled in any House and today with the fast moving development in the north I don't think the action can be gained from studying reports of the past. I think they have to be from people, not only politicians, but business people and people that are in control of government services going into these areas and seeing just what can be done about government keeping up with the demands that industry and the people of northern Manitoba are making or are doing without as it is at present day standards.

The Mauro Commission, I might say, has only been tabled in the last month or so and yet in many respects some of that is behind times. The Manhattan hadn't decided to make the trial run through the northwest passage. This makes a new concept altogether in the development of the north. It's brought up the discussion on the sovereignty of the north. This the honourable member must realize was not really discussed in respect to the northwest passage as far as any of those reports are concerned. So to study something that has been reported a few months or a year or ten years or twenty years ago is not the answer. The answer is to go in there and see what is needed for today and tomorrow because the services are the thing that is necessary and the establishment of not only services but the areas in which those services should be looked into.

All the honourable member has to do is try and phone Churchill now, Ilford, some of those areas where it takes hours. If you want to go to Ilford and phone there's a pay phone in the hotel and you discuss your business in front of everybody that's walking back and forward. Now I understand there's two phones; it's a party line, there's one in the other store. But these are lines where you're discussing -- sometimes contractors in Ilford are discussing business for an hour at a time or two hours at a time when they were trying to build the Hydro road between Ilford and Gillam and this was holding up the line for an hour or two hours at a time. These are the real nuts and bolts of the problems that are in northern Manitoba; the things that are not in reports, the tangible things where business people are trying to conduct business in a modern way, in fact they have to keep up to the demands of the growth and the demands of the contractors even that go into northern Manitoba. These are the things that are on the direct site, not the things that one person, whether he be lawyer or commissioner, some type or other goes up for one day and sits in each community and says, this is the problems I think there are. I think it has to be a group of people that are not only interested in doing business in the north, but are interested in the political advantages and the industrial advantages of the north. They're the ones that are going to be able to bring back recommendations -- not reports, because reports are obsolete -- it's recommendations that can bring about the changes that are very necessary; because far too often it's the government services that have been allowed to fall behind. I don't think, to be quite truthful, that we have the money available right now to bring the government services up to the requirements that are needed to open these new frontiers of the north, and it bothers me, Mr. Speaker, that we don't seem to be able to get

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... the message through to Ottawa that if they're going to do this in an orderly fashion that they have to go back to their responsibilities of helping to open up these new frontiers from the central northern part of Canada and then work out to the Northwest Territories and the rest of those areas. We only have Churchill to look at and the things that go on in those areas.

So I say to members that while this looks to be a political little package, nice little package, it isn't, and the Premier has now suggested that it be opened up to all parties. But this is still not the answer if we are not able to find the funds available to complement the great strides forward that industry is making. I think that we have to make a strong appeal to not only widen this to the people that are involved in living in the north, but also to the people who can make the money available through the business industries and through the federal government. The Federal Government have wonderful programs for the far north; they've even contributed half or they've picked up over 40 percent of the exploration moneys that are being made available for exploration in the eastern arctic, and this is into somewhere around \$40 million I believe. This is just for looking for minerals and oils. These are the kind of jumps that they are taking. They are going to find it and then they are going to find that it is impossible to bring that material out unless they have the services available such as the development of Port Churchill, the development of air service fields and the facilities that the air services themselves require to be able to use northern airports, etcetera, before they're going to be able to develop the eastern arctic. So if there is one message we've got to come back with, it is that we have to have this federal assistance, whatever it may be and however, what ever form it has to be; but I would say probably it is the recognition of the fact that the Federal Government have to accept some of the responsibilities in the development of government services which are required to look into this.

I welcome the fact that there are members from the south coming up to see what the problems are from the political standpoint, but I say to the First Minister that I think further than that, we must introduce the business areas and industry and train them to help in this type of development so that we have moneys not only on government services but the faith, the industry must have faith that the government are going to be able to produce this money for services. If they can find that, then I'm sure that we can, if we can get the proper people up there, then they'll be ready to spread out and develop and help participate in the opening of these new frontiers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the debate that has taken place on -- Does the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell have a question?

MR. GRAHAM: I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Would the honourable member permit a question? Would he not say that the very fact that a person had read the reports of what had gone on in the past would not be beneficial to him....

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member -- order. Is the honourable member asking a question or is he simply stating his own opinion in interrogative form?

MR. GRAHAM: I ask the honourable member would it not be beneficial for people to read this?

MR. BEARD: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. Most of it's obsolete.

MR. SCHREYER: has taken place on this resolution, I think is a good example of how it can happen that the government side and the opposition side can argue with genuine conviction two very different points of view. The concept of the task force as originally conceived was of a group of men living in the north or representing the north intimately acquainted with the north and its special set of problems faced by the people resident there, and it was hoped that two or three MLAs could be designated to join with three or four or five people outside of the Legislature, residents of the north, and go to work. Go to work by means of holding hearings and discussions in different communities in the north and then after having done that, to convene at some centre either here in Winnipeg or at some northern centre and there draft a report providing certain recommendations for action to be presented to this House and to the government.

The opposition -- and I must say I have come to appreciate their point of view -- the opposition argues that all that notwithstanding, that whenever the government asks this Legislature to appoint a special committee that it should be a principle, always preserved and maintained, that if there is to be a committee of this House, then there should be representation from all

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)... official parties in the House, at least. And I must say that I believe this principle has to be respected even though it does make it somewhat more difficult, in my opinion, for this Task Force to function, slightly more difficult, because the task force being larger in number it will be somewhat more difficult, cumbersome, slightly more expensive for this task force to move around conducting its work, its hearings in the different communities that it may choose to visit. However, I don't think that these added problems are insurmountable by any means, nor do I think that they are all that major, and for that reason I would like to move, Sir, that the motion be amended by deleting the names shown in the 9th line thereof and substituting the following: "The Honourable Mr. Green, Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Johnston (Portage) and McBryde." Seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and put the question on the amendment.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, His Honour having been informed of the subject matter of this proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well Mr. Speaker, I talked on the amendment to this motion, previous amendment that has been voted on already, especially what I wanted to say is that I question the proportions that we now have on this. It is quite different than any other seven-man committee we have set up. — (Interjections) — Pardon?

MR. SCHREYER: ... may help to resolve this in his mind. That as originally conceived this special committee was to be a committee exclusively of members of the Legislative Assembly from northern constituencies and that these would join with four people named from outside the Chamber and together would constitute the Task Force. Now then, is the member aware that his colleagues, members of the other opposition group, said that the regionality quite apart, the fact that the House was being asked to establish a special committee required at least some representation from each of the official parties, otherwise it wasn't a special committee of the House; and we have accepted that argument. So I would like to ask the honourable member if he is not willing to consult with his own colleagues who will tell him that what is really involved here now is a special committee with representation from every official party. Proportionality has been sacrificed a little, but then so has the initial principle of regionality, only members from the north, so that it is a compromise, admittedly a compromise, which his colleagues felt was perhaps all right, acceptable.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that there have been some discussions proceeding to try and arrive at a — you know, we're at the position now of the old saying that a camel is actually a horse but it was designed by a committee, and this is exactly what we are at in this committee here. I'm not going to vote against it. I'm not telling you that. I think the make-up of the committee is not proportionate with the other make-ups, we've got something that is and isn't, but my one and only comment is, and it goes back to it, that the chances of this committee in light of the work that has been done and the information that the government has at hand, I would very much like to see this committee actually take action and give the taxpayers of Manitoba something for their money; but all the indications are at the moment is that the taxpayers are paying for this thing and they are placing a lot of money, or a significant amount of money, into this study and there is no indication, there is no proof of its absolute need.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . permit this one other question. Would the member be prepared to say that he is of the opinion that a task force made up of MLAs plus three or four others is a more expensive way or a cheaper way of conducting a study than to appoint a conventional type of Royal Commission? Because I happen to think that it will be much cheaper this way.

MR. CRAIK: I'm just saying, Mr. Speaker, that we have plenty of information now; you have a department involved in this directly. I'm simply saying that adding this one more, the proof of its payout is very, very hard to see.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the First Minister on his second thoughts when he decided to make some changes in the make-up of the task force committee from this House. I think that a problem has been avoided which could have perhaps meant more trouble later on in that sectionalism has been avoided which may be a divisive force in the province. I think that the 57 members that sit in this House, while they are all

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) concerned with their own constituencies, -- of course their first loyalty should be to the country, Canada as a whole -- but their next loyalty should be to the Province of Manitoba as a whole, and to exclude members from the committee because they may not be living with a particular problem, for example, the Agricultural Committee doesn't necessarily all consist of farmers but perhaps some people are acquainted with the farm problems through being in the agrabusiness of some nature. So I think that this is a move in the right direction, where an all-party group are concerned with the problem of what may be termed "discontent" in the north, where their problems are so serious that there's a great frustration. I've sensed it myself on visiting with people in the north. I think this problem should be dealt with on the wide basis of true representation within the House and I say that I compliment the government on changing their mind. It's been said that only fools never change their mind and in this case the government have saved themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I note the change that has taken place in connection with this matter. Not too long ago when the resolution was introduced we heard charges of sending members up to the north, or members would be galling in the north at the expense of the government; now all of a sudden we find that everything is amicable and agreeable.

It has been said that all parties were represented on the committee now. I do not go along with that conception. I am not preaching for a call in this instance at all but I certainly would have some recommendation to make insofar as the outside members that will be appointed to that committee; and if the government is acceptable to that, I certainly will put forward a name of a very reputable young man with all the qualifications needed and I'm sure he would be a credit to that committee. -- (Interjection) -- No. I could name him now but I think I can do that later on to the First Minister when . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would he mind to just send a letter or a note? That would be fine.

MR. FROESE: Yes. Yes, I will do that so that -- (Interjection) -- No, this is not pork barrelling in any way, because if there was pork barrelling it was before, not now. Not with my recommendation, -- (Interjection) -- No.

If that is acceptable I certainly will have no opposition then to accepting the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion as amended.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that we've reached on my resolution a consensus of a spirit of co-operation and I wish the task force every success. I feel sure that it will help in bringing Manitoba together, south and north, and we'll understand more fully the problems that we have in this great province of ours.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, . . . of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970 and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHERNIACK: I would ask that the estimates attached to the message be distributed now and I propose, and will very soon, make a motion that we go into Supply. I would expect that when we go into Supply we will ask the Chairman to deal with these supplementary estimates, at which stage I would make a statement in connection with same, if that will be acceptable to the House. And hearing no protestations and cries of "No", I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House Resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a grievance on behalf of the people of Manitoba in terms of their freedom and of their dignity.

Monsieur le president, (Mr. Allard spoke a few words in French).

(MR. ALLARD cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, now that I have risen to address this Assembly, it will be apparent to all that I have made the choice for the moment between being tongue-tied or "necktied." However, I do feel confident that my actions of recent weeks reveal as much of my philosophy as the remarks which I have prepared.

A government backbencher is in many ways in a most difficult position. He cannot be privy to the decisions of Cabinet and does not find out in advance if his arguments have modified or influenced government policy. However, having approved of the general approach prior to the general election and having been in sympathy with the programs placed before the electorate at that time, I am pleased to continue as a thoughtful supporter of the government. You may rightly assume from my remarks that I believe even government backbenchers must use their offices critically and analytically in the hope of improving government policy and legislation.

Everyone who stands as a candidate for public office does so in the expectation that he will win the confidence of the people. A lesson of recent elections -- and that lesson has been most severely exemplified in the Liberal Party -- is that not only must you have the policies and ideas which the electorate desire, but most importantly you must have the personnel who can be trusted to implement whatever policy is articulated. Public confidence is the key to electoral success and therefore the 57 representatives in this Chamber have an obligation that is exceptionally more significant than running a corporation or a business. Needs must not be created by a sales pitch or clever packaging. The true needs of the people must be determined, and with equal importance, the representative of the people must have integrity. He must never betray his own views or opinions to attract support because if he betrays himself, he deprives the system of its most essential prop. Ideas may be the substance of our efforts here but the procedure we employ to gain admittance or remain in office is emphasized by trust and the obligation to do not a particular thing, but what we believe to be right and appropriate in the circumstances.

Now that I have given everyone the secret of how to remain permanently in office, correspondingly the method by which the electorate can exercise its franchise in terms of meaningful choice, I propose to say something about my philosophy of government. If my presentation lacks the insight and polish of my colleague from Crescentwood, it's maybe because he is the representative of one of the province's more sophisticated and surprisingly wealthier constituencies. I listened with interest to the fierce debate which raged here the other day between the two great protagonists of materialism: the Honourable Members for Crescentwood and River Heights. So keen were they to pursue the threat of how best to arrange the material things of society in which we live, that they seemed to express almost by omission that human beings and human values are only incidental to the life of the community. Human values as a general term has often been used to support philosophies and programs which, because they are monolithic and bureaucratic, deprive the individual of his self-worth, of a feeling of value as a human being. In the name of future freedom and justice and dignity, men are shorn of them. Herded into groups, pigeon-holed into slots, we lose our individual value by the actions of those who talk "human values". I think it was Arnold Toynbee who said that "at the end of time when the total of human suffering and indignities and injustice and oppression is made, that it will be found that the greater portion of them will have been done in the name of God."

From my colleague from Crescentwood's remarkable proposition that squalor and injustice can be beaten by a proliferation of Crown corporations, to the assertions of the Honourable Member from River Heights that we shall be all right if left to good old private enterprise, we learned that the old left and the new right are left right on the same wave length. "Man does live by bread alone." They quarrel only over how to produce and divide it.

I am here to represent people, not socialism, not bureaucracy, not capitalism. I do not feel that our job is to fight a battle between Capitalism and Socialism. This struggle is already irrelevant. Our task is to determine if a humane community is possible. The conflict today most readily observable in universities and in the forms of dramatic confrontation, is between the welfare of the people as seen by government and authority and the "will-fare" of the people as deemed by themselves. The problem becomes terribly acute when the gulf widens between what a particular individual wills or wants and what we feel he needs or should have. Therefore information becomes a most important tool of the legislator. However, as Malcolm Muggeridge has observed, "There is so much power and so little strength; so much wealth and so little ease; so much information and so little knowledge!" If we are to solve the

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) problems of the poor, the needy and the dispossessed, it will be necessary to adapt government and forget the irrelevant struggles.

It cannot be said today that freedom is based on private property when the state absorbs 35 percent of the gross national product. The state has become the single most powerful instrument, either to enhance or to restrict our freedom. Therefore it may be truly said that our quantum of freedom is based on the actions of the state. The previous capitalist society - and I believe we can now refer to it in the past tense - had no goals except those set by the marketplace. They were the goals of the selfish and the possessive and not oriented to the needs of a community.

As our standard of living rises, we appreciate that the acquisitive life is not satisfying and therefore the choice is not between Capitalism and Socialism, but between a more or less humane and democratic society. We must recognize that the state must be used not as a leveller but as an instrument to enhance freedom. Today for most people, freedom is increased by government's activity, not diminished. The state creates or supports schools, hospitals, art galleries, playgrounds, theatres, concert halls. Far more than we realize, our liberty is state-protected and collectivism enhances freedom. At the same time, we must heed the warning of a Conservative when he says that an all-encompassing bureaucratic government can become an engine of conformity and choke the society it seeks to improve with its own overwhelming presence and influence. Just as material things are necessary to life but are not in themselves life, so government activity is necessary to the civilized society, but it is not, and never will be the be-all of it. It could, however, become the end-all of it.

Basically, we humans do little more important than make speeches in public and build public works in public. Basically, we require privacy for love, for sorrow, for conception and even the on-going processes of parenthood. So in the activities of the community, the government must not be permitted to strip the individual of his dignity and privacy.

Governmental activity naturally tends to become big and monolithic. It has to be decentralized not so much for its own good, but imperatively for the good, the privacy, the dignity of the humans whom it governs. The principle of subsidiarity is to be applied. People must be allowed to make and have as many real choices in their conduct and living as will be consistent with practicality. When we recognize the proper role of government in the present circumstances we are obliged to articulate goals albeit in a most general way so that a sense of purpose can guide our deliberations and impart design to our specific programs. The old slogan of equalizing opportunity is not good enough. We do not want a society that is free only and that the slave can become a slave owner. We want to abolish slavery. The liberalism of the 1970's must move beyond opportunity to achievement. I suggest that if politicians accept the challenge by endorsing programs to enhance freedom, while creating opportunities and avenues for the individual to truly contest the influence and power of the state, then our democracy will be highlighted by the participation, the true participation of the citizens.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask that we now deal with the Detailed Supplementary Estimates presented this morning, and may I make a statement in connection therewith.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was thinking yesterday about what I would say this morning in producing these estimates and I would think that it must be well known in the minds of members of the Legislature just what one should say on the occasion of presenting a supplementary in regard to the indemnities, and from the news reports that I have read, comments and predictions by the newspapers, it would appear to me that the people of Manitoba also have been expecting that there would be a review made of the indemnities that should be paid to honourable members.

My task was eased considerably by the editorial which appeared in yesterday's Free Press, which is a lengthy editorial as you see, about a letterhead length in size, which is headed with the term "Prolonged Housekeeping". I would like to read only a few short excerpts from the editorial. The first sentence reads: "The Special Session of the Manitoba Legislature

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) which started on August 14th bids fare to be an extra special session before it is over." And another comment in the editorial says: "The main reason for the lengthening out of the session has been the sheer weight of business." And another excerpt states: "Reviewing much of the work that was covered in this session" then concludes "this would have been a full agenda for a regular session of the Legislature; for a housekeeping or clean-up session, it is obviously a bit much. This is not to suggest that the session has been unprofitable, much has been accomplished and much more may be accomplished before it is over."

Well in addition to the business that was brought in -- and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I was one of the small group of us who had had some experience in the House that I together with the others, did think that this session should last 4 or 5 weeks, 6 weeks was I thought much too lengthy. But Mr. Chairman, it's indicated not finished yet, and of course it isn't finished until we complete the Order Paper that's clear. But I must say, Mr. Chairman, that at the time that we forecast the amount of time that it would take to complete this session I did not realize, as others didn't, that there would be some matters that we would be bringing into the session which we did not contemplate at the time the session started. We all know those additional matters that were brought in beyond the clean-up that we thought ourselves we would have.

I might draw to your attention that at the time I introduced the budget, I mentioned then -- or it was possibly the time I introduced the bill on income tax -- that it wasn't really necessary for the business of the province to pass the income tax bill at this session, we could have, and indeed I had contemplated earlier, that in the event that we wanted to increase income tax, that we would do what the former premier Duff Roblin did, when in December of 1966 he called a session for two weeks in December in order to do exactly what we have already done and that is to provide for the additional income tax. At that time I wasn't sure that we would decide in government the extent to which we would want to make the adjustment in income tax, and when I introduced the bill I believe I stated then that I was happy that we had arrived at the decision now, and thus be able to save the members of the House the inconvenience and the people of Manitoba the additional expense that would have been made necessary had we not dealt with the bill in this session and left it for December. In addition to that, of course, we felt it was more responsible to present the cost picture along with the reduction in Medicare premium. So I felt it was right to do, but clearly it took up a great deal more time than was envisaged; not only the time that this particular proposal took in the budget speech debate, but also there were some 19 speeches on the bill itself and that of course was not contemplated.

Well Mr. Chairman, as with the decision to pay reduced indemnities which was made at the beginning of the session, it was a government decision, so is it the government's decision that we now supplement because of the unexpected additional time that it has taken, and the supplement is now before honourable members. Of course, I'd be quite prepared to attempt to explain in detail any questions that I'm asked, but I would conclude by saying that this is still, although the Free Press suggests that this in itself has been a full session, the fact is we haven't processed as many bills as one normally does and I would still say that it is not a full session and that we are not entitled to full indemnities. It will still be \$2100 per member less than the regular session would be, which is a savings to the people of Manitoba, the revenue of Manitoba, of at least \$125,000 in a rough calculation. In addition to that we have obviated the necessity of meeting again next December.

That really concludes the introduction but I would like to make an explanatory note to honourable members to understand a slight problem that exists in mechanics, and I do that because the Whip of the Opposition Party has agreed to extend pairs to the Honourable First Minister of Manitoba, to the Honourable Attorney-General and to me to make it possible for us to go with the trade mission from Manitoba businessmen, the Chamber of Commerce, to Japan, and if the session will not have ended before we leave, I would like to leave with members an explanation of what might happen -- what delays may occur.

The procedure when we complete the estimates is that we then move into concurrences and from concurrences we move into Committee of Ways and Means, and from Committee of Ways and Means, we then move into consideration of three supply bills. That's it? The clerk is signalling to me that these committees are the ones that are considering the supply bills. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the supply bills are passed and receive whatever necessary readings are required, and receive Royal Assent, then the Cabinet must meet and have an Order-in-Council passed authorizing the disbursement of the moneys, and then, Mr. Speaker, the cheques

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) may be issued the Members of the Legislature for their indemnities. Not until then can it happen because there is no authority.

Now the problem I indicate is that the Financial Administration Act which was passed by this Legislature is proclaimed as of Sunday, October 12th. All documents are drawn and ready as of the old Act and in the event that we cannot get this machinery through that I explained until after Sunday, they will all have to be redrawn and revamped to conform to the Financial Administration Act. So I want to apologize in advance to members of the Legislature in the event that it turns out that we can't get all this done until Monday, then there would have to be some slight delay in the issuance of that. And the final statement I would like to make is that if the estimates that I've now before you are passed, then these amounts cannot be paid until some little time, in which case they will have to be mailed out. Other than that, since I have made apologies in advance, which I sincerely hope will not prove necessary or a problem, because we are proceeding quickly, I submit these estimates to the House.

May I also say, Mr. Chairman, in connection with estimates and it now being some 7 minutes to 12, I believe that there may be a feeling amongst members that it would be advisable to proceed with estimates through the afternoon if the members are prepared to postpone Private Members' resolutions until after that; and if that's the case, then we could go right through and deal with estimates for as long as committee is prepared to sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 1 and 2 were read and passed.)

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I presume, we are now back on Mines and Resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Returning to main estimates. Department of Mines and Natural Resources. The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, replying briefly to what the Honourable Minister of Finance had to say, as far as we are concerned, we are prepared to proceed into estimates this afternoon.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well if the other members are agreeable we can . . .

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: We are agreed to that course of action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have no objection because I have no resolution on the Order Paper; so it's immaterial to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Member for Churchill. I presume, Mr. Chairman, we will have to go through the Orders of the Day before we go back into Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Resolution 72 (1)(a)--passed; (b)--passed. The Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if I may at this time, just for the record and so it will be clear from our point of view, from our side at least, what our procedure would be in connection with this. Not only with the estimates now but the estimates to follow. We would ask that the government indicate as the estimates of the other departments are discussed whether there are any changes proposed from the manner in which the estimates were to operate under the previous administration. This would give us an indication as to whether there are some policy changes that are going to be taking place in the next period of time. We are going to try and confine ourselves on this side to dealing with those items which we feel are of major interest and to allow the estimates to be dealt with expeditiously in the hope that those who have commitments next week are going to be in a position to live up to them; but we would ask simply that in presentation of the estimates of the various departments that will follow Mines and Natural Resources, that the Minister would just indicate if there is any basic policy change that has been arrived at, that is known today, that would be at variance between what was originally proposed when these estimates were proposed last time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think the request is a reasonable one, but it is of necessity one that we cannot accept as an undertaking. I think we can accept that we will try to do so; I think in all fairness we should, but I don't want any fingers to be pointed later to say well you didn't mention this or the other, because indeed it's quite possible that we would overlook some one or the other. So that the request having been made, I would indicate I think it's reasonable and I would ask the Ministers of the Departments which have not yet been heard to bear that in mind; but I think you will have to accept that much from me and not a definite undertaking which may be one that I couldn't carry out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have a suggestion to make that may help facilitate the business. For the Ministers who are going away next week, could we not have their departments taken this afternoon with the hope that we would get some of them done before they leave?

MR. CHERNIACK: The problem -- as I've looked through this I find that some of the Ministers, well the Ministers coming up next are indeed leaving, not the province but the city, before the Ministers who are going overseas, so since we will be available this evening, it would be better if we deal with those others before it. I might point out -- well, we could do it to this extent -- the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Health and Social Services will not be available this evening or tomorrow, so we should deal with those. Then we have Industry and Commerce, Legislation, Executive Council, Attorney-General, and then there is Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Finance and Government Services, so I would suggest that all we need do to make this work is that we would take Consumer and Corporate Affairs and put it at the bottom of the list and you will then have the most expeditious way that we can present ourselves to you.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I am quite agreeable to that, Mr. Chairman, except that I heard the Minister make one remark, something about tomorrow. There is no tomorrow.

MR. CHERNIACK: There is only a tomorrow for those who are willing to make tomorrow a worthwhile day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to item 72 (a), the Minister's Compensation, I raised the question the other day of the matter of the Minister being a member of the Treasury Bench and with respect to his acting in the dual role, not only as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources but carrying on his professional services at Brandon University. I asked the question because I think it is a matter of public importance, a matter of public interest, and I didn't receive his answer with respect to this and I wonder if perhaps he could give it to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm rising to this point is that although I agree with the Minister of Labour in terms of his remarks the other day, I feel that I would like to say something because I am in the same boat as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm a lecturer at the Manitoba Law School. I teach there at the hours of 8:40 to 9:30 on Tuesday and Wednesday of each week, and for my honourable friend's information, I think that if I didn't do that I wouldn't be able to do my job as well as I do, that this is something that enables me to keep interested in other areas but it doesn't cut into my ministerial services.

As a matter of fact, I would hope the honourable member would accept the fact that I am working as hard as my fellow colleagues and I hope that I'm working as hard as he did when he was a Minister. I can also remember when I was a student at the Law School that the -- and I think he then was the Honourable Ron Turner -- was a lecturer to me, and the Honourable C. Rhodes-Smith, who was the then Attorney-General, was a lecturer to me at the Law School. So I feel that we have to answer to the House that we are doing our jobs, and that if we are doing our job, I really believe that there's no criticism in us having this other pastime.

And I can assure the Member for Riel that the finances has nothing to do with it; it's a question of me having a hobby, if I'll put it to him that way. I hope it's a worthwhile hobby. I hope it's one that I will be able to do well, and I'm not always sure that I'm doing -- every professor is worried about how his students react, but this is something that I do in addition to my ministerial duties. I feel that I am putting in as much time as my colleagues, if not more, and I feel that it not only doesn't interfere with my work but makes me a person with the kind -- with the therapeutic effect it has on my mind, it makes me a better Minister.

Now if I didn't feel that I'd give up the job. I assume that everybody here would have additional pastimes to their ministerial responsibilities. -- (Interjection) -- The Minister of Finance refuses to reveal his pastime; I, because I am in the same position as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and because an issue was made out of it, I would like the member to know that it's my position as well.

MR. CRAIK: Might I ask the question of the Minister whether he receives remuneration for his services to the university?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I do.

MR. CRAIK: Then, Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Minister of Mines and Resources is

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) in the same situation? -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move then, that the salary of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources be reduced by an amount equal to the annual salary he receives for rendering his professional services to Brandon University.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. EVANS: If I may speak very briefly on this . . .

MR. CRAIK: Excuse me. I think I have the privilege of speaking to the motion here in committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Riel regarding Item 72 (a), that the salary of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources be reduced by an amount equal to the annual salary he receives for rendering his professional services to Brandon University. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate in the strongest terms that I think for a member of the Treasury Bench to offer his services to an institution such as the university is one that is to be commended. I think that the reasons and the arguments presented by the Minister of Health and Social Services are valid, providing it is done in temperance and providing there is a need. I have done the same thing myself. The other matter of them being paid for it is quite different. The universities and other institutions that are related to government come directly under the financing of the Provincial Government. They come directly, one way or another, under the administrative responsibilities of the Treasury benches. I'm not quarrelling with anyone else as an elected member of the Legislature on this matter. Let me make that clear. The point I am trying to make is that somebody occupying a position on the Treasury bench should not be drawing part of his income from a university that is dependent on the public purse for its financing.

Secondly, I think it's wrong, and probably more importantly, it is wrong beyond a question - beyond question it's wrong for a member of the Treasury bench being paid for his services to a university, particularly at the salary levels that are being paid to Cabinet Ministers. We have now Cabinet Ministers drawing \$22,800 a year. We passed a motion this morning which increases that in the present 12 month period by another \$5,400.00, which brings the total up to over \$28,000.00. -- (Interjection) -- I would just as soon as leave it.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . just to tell him that his facts are completely wrong.

MR. CRAIK: All right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I should think that a former Cabinet Minister who handled the kinds of moneys that a Minister of Education handles should realize very well that the salary that he received as a member of the Cabinet was something like \$15,000 and that his indemnity was in addition to that, and his failure to be able to add is somewhat astounding.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware that the salary paid for administrative duties, Executive Council duty is \$15,600; the remuneration for regular indemnity is \$7,200, which added together comes to \$22,800 a year, a portion of that being expense allowance. But I would like to advise the Honourable Minister of Labour that the argument I'm making is very mild compared to the criticisms that were offered in years past, and I'm not arguing with the level.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . was logical and sensible.

MR. CRAIK: Well, we won't argue that. The point that I'm making is that I'm not arguing with the level of salary, I'm saying there is no justifiable reason, either economically or morally, because it is wrong on two counts: economically, and it is morally wrong. You know as well as I do that in years past the people have offered their services to educational institutions on a \$1.00 a year basis or on a zero time granted basis, and I can tell you that I've done the same thing myself and I've done it for a whole year. When I left the university in 1964 they were stuck for somebody to lecture the course which I was giving and I lectured for a full year for absolutely zero, because at that time I was working for an agency of the provincial government, the Manitoba Research Council, and I considered it myself to be morally wrong to accept two salaries. So the Research Council paid my salary; I gave one day a week to the university to help them out until they found a replacement. I made the move in June, and the university legally requires three months' notice to leave it. I made the moral commitment that I would continue on and teach the course for a year. I did it for a year for absolutely zero salary. The only salary I drew was the Manitoba Research Council, which was an agency of this provincial government. Now we have Cabinet Ministers drawing a salary which is twice as large, or more, than in that particular case, and in a position of sitting on the Treasury bench governing

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) the flow of funds from the public purse and working for a provincial institutions and drawing their funds from that.

Now it's wrong in terms of economics and, more so, it's wrong from a moral point of view. If you want to offer your services to a university or an educational institution or some other cause that is government-sponsored or otherwise, whether it's the Red Cross, United Way, any organization, that's fine. Cabinet Ministers should be prepared to do it for zero remuneration, and I can't understand why the Minister of Health and Social Services and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would see fit to do this and I can't understand, if it has been given consideration by the First Minister, why this practice has been allowed to continue. And I must state categorically that I'm referring to people sitting on the Treasury bench. This is the main concern. People that are members of the Legislature are in a different category.

That's my point, Mr. Speaker. With those very brief remarks, if you want further documentation I can give it to you. It's strictly a matter of principle and I recommend this motion to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume therefore that the honourable member is not concerned with how much time they spend at this work at all. They could be spending all the time that they want at the university and not be Ministers, but they shouldn't draw income from the university. That's his point. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Resources has previously indicated that what he is doing is at the request and beseech of the university, and is doing it at tremendous cost and loss of time and effort to himself. I think other than that, that the proposal by the honourable member is not deserving of any further debate and I would invite that we have the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . speak on this motion because I want to bring to the attention of members of the committee that a precedent was established both at Brandon College and the University of Manitoba. It was established in 1951, and I'll give you the two men who were involved. The present Honourable Walter Dinsdale at that time was nominated by the Conservative Party to run in the constituency of Brandon-Souris, and the very day he was nominated he was asked for his resignation. Now that's the day he was nominated -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Walter Dinsdale. Now, Dean McEwan of the Department of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba was nominated to run as the Liberal candidate in that very same by-election of Brandon-Souris and he was asked for his resignation -- (Interjection) -- Just wait till I finish my speech, Sir. They were not even -- the very day of the nomination. Now this is the point I want to make out. They were not even elected to the office and it was pointed out Dean McEwan could not go back to his job; he was asked for his resignation. I think the Honourable Member for Riel is right. I think he's right and the people of Manitoba thinks he's right and I think it's about time, if the honourable member wants to devote his services to help Brandon University, he should do it in the manner in which the Member for Riel suggested and I think the public, after this discussion here today, will be quite concerned about this very same thing.

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

MR. McKELLAR: No. I'm speaking as a taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba; I'm speaking as the representative for Souris-Killarney; I'm speaking as a life member of Brandon University; and I want the people here, you members of the people here, that I think it's about high time that we played the game right and square, because we're playing with taxpayers' money and the people on the Treasury benches have a responsibility second to none to represent the people of Manitoba as an administrative body of this province and I think they cannot do justice to the people when they take another position of which public moneys are forthcoming to pay for their services rendered. Now that's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: As First Minister I suppose it is incumbent on me to say something in connection with the - it's not controversy - the debate that has welled up relative to whether or not a Minister of the Crown should be undertaking any other kind of paying occupation whatsoever. In my own case, over the years as a Member of the Opposition here in this House, I've always regarded the position of MLA of the provincial Legislature as one that is really at most a half of the year or equivalent occupation in terms of the time that it demands of the individual

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) member. So I see nothing wrong with an MLA carrying on with his other occupation, and if there is a time clash between his duties here and that of whatever other job he or she may have, as long as arrangements are made whereby the MLA pays for the substitute while he or she is here in this Chamber, that the public is not in a sense being required to pay double by having to pay for a substitute as well as paying the stipend of the MLA. I don't think there's any great dispute here; there's a sort of general understanding of the right ground rules.

With respect to Cabinet Ministers I would agree to this much, that a position as Minister of the Crown, in my mind at least, is such that it requires of the Minister full time attention to duties, and that at most any Minister, because of some lingering obligation, is required to give some time to finish out a contract, if you like, that it can only be on the basis of minimal time allotment. So that one could put it this way, that a Minister of the Crown is giving full time to his job as Minister, I think there should be enough leeway that he be permitted to carry on, if you like, with an avocation, an avocation or hobby - and to me it seems it can only be nominal amounts of extra salary involved, maybe 1,000, 1,500, certainly at most \$2,000 per annum. I would certainly not only be uneasy but I would be opposed to any Minister of the Crown carrying on with work that would take such time that he would be receiving more than \$2,000 per annum.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I don't know that there is much more to say except that I do feel that two hours or three hours a week of lecturing at the Law School or at a high school or at a university seminar can hardly be regarded as taking the Minister away from his principal obligations to attend to his duties as Minister. And as long as it's clearly understood that it can only be just a couple of hours or so per week, it remains then an avocation with him, and I think with that understanding there should be no difficulty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to illustrate my own position as a member of the Legislature. I own the licence of the Government of Manitoba as insurance agent. I cannot, in no way, shape nor form, make one five-cent piece out of that licence from the revenues of the government if I was prepared, or had an opportunity, prepared to sell insurance on government cars or any other particle of insurance carried by the Government of Manitoba. And just for the reason that you're not allowed to; a member of the Legislature cannot accept any revenue from the Government of Manitoba. Now where do the universities get their money? They get it out of this little package of goods here that I have right before me, the estimates -- yes, it's right here, this is where they get their money, right here, \$43 million.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . from or a portion of it?

A MEMBER: The school boards. -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. McKELLAR: No, sir. -- (Interjections) -- What? The doctors don't get their money out of there, they get it out of the corporation . . .

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend were . . . no doctor could be a member of the Legislature.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I just tell you it's an actual fact, that an insurance agent who holds the licence of the Government of Manitoba cannot accept five cents. I say the same interpretation should apply in all cases.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, would my honourable friend extend this, because of there being grants or appropriations financial-wise to doctors through medicare, to school teachers through a portion of the budgets of the school boards, that if his argument was logical and carried through to its conclusion that it would deprive doctors who are in the medicare scheme, it would deprive nurses who receive part of their salaries as the result of grants contained in the estimates that my honourable friend waved, and others as well. And even possibly farmers, livestock producers and the like. How far can you carry this?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I rise now and I give this only as an example, but I'm not concerned about the backbenchers and I'm not concerned about any loss of revenue. I'm referring to the treasury benches which the honourable member here mentioned, and this is the one because they are the administrators for the Province of Manitoba, and we want it to be accepted as such.

MR. BOROWSKI: The Member for Souris-Killarney said that no members of the House can get any money from the government. I'm wondering if he could tell us how much money

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) the last Speaker of the House, who was a member of your government, received in direct money from the government in advertising from various departments including the Highways Department. The Member for Swan River owns a newspaper.

MR. BILTON: I wonder what the honourable member is alluding to - various departments - what does he mean?

MR. BOROWSKI: The question was how much money did the Honourable Member for Swan River receive from the various government agencies in advertising revenue when he was Speaker of the House?

MR. BILTON: For the benefit of the honourable gentleman, the organization that I belong to is a corporation. Is he suggesting that the people of my area should be denied publicity of the government through advertising in my newspaper?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear. I'm not against this, I simply rise to say that because some of your friends think it's something terrible, and I just wanted him to know that you were doing the same thing as a principal shareholder. Let's not start throwing muck in this House because I can throw a lot of muck too.

MR. BILTON: If the honourable gentleman has anything to say to the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne he should direct it to him and not to me.

MR. BOROWSKI: You're the guilty one.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I believe I understood the Minister of Transport to say I was the guilty one. What does he mean by that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Before this degenerates into name calling and more and more argument, I think we should keep in mind the business before us. I think we're getting a little far afield here. We've heard debate on both sides. If the member still have contributions that will be new and interesting, let them make them, otherwise I suggest we vote. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: This is far too important a matter to just hurry up and slip over. I feel there's a principle involved here, as pointed out by the Member for Riel, and I think it's a very worthwhile principle. Surely if it's a matter of the Cabinet Ministers not getting sufficient pay that they have to do moonlighting, I think then we should be reimbursing them at a greater amount so that this wouldn't be necessary. I feel that a Cabinet Minister's first charge should be on the government. His time should be devoted to the government, and that certainly when the Cabinet is appointed that they will give the service that is needed to the attention of government in this province. They've accepted a full time job in my opinion.

The amount of criticism that was levelled a year ago at the former Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the charges of being a part-time Minister, at that time we had to listen to a lot of verbiage. Now that this charge is made here they just want it shut up, that there should be no adverse publicity coming to them on this point, and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this needs to be discussed. I think this matter should be discussed and aired, and if there is a change to be made then let's make the change. This present government has been championing the cause of the poor man, and if we're now having Cabinet Ministers who are moonlighting and probably having a \$30,000 a year job, I think there is some discrepancy in this whole deal.

Also, the matter of the conflict of interest. I would like to hear from these Cabinet Ministers that are performing other jobs. They're not involved in the same type of job. The Honourable Minister of Health has indicated what he's been doing; we have heard from the Member for Riel as to the motion before us about the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Is there any conflict of interest at any time in the work that they are doing in addition to their Cabinet duties as Ministers of the Crown? How many more are there in the Cabinet that are accepting or have accepted positions in addition to their regular duties as Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd like to ask the Member for Rhineland - and I suppose rhetorically my friends who surround us, and others - whether they would be agreeable to the following proposal, that inasmuch as the Ministers of this Cabinet were selected at a time when contractual arrangements had already been made for the next semester of the school or university term, and if I were to undertake that following this, the completion of this regular semester of the university year, that I will undertake to request every Minister of the Crown to desist from engaging themselves in any kind of contractual obligation to teach or to undertake any kind of other paying occupation while Ministers of the Crown, would this be satisfactory? The reason I say that is because some kind of obligation had been entered into just prior to becoming

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Ministers. Of course it could have been broken, but only to the inconvenience of one or another of the institutions of higher learning involved. In any case, the amount of time given is so small that it must be regarded as avocational rather than vocational.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation chose to take me to task a few moments ago, and as I said then, I did sense the word that he suggested that I was guilty and I asked him, guilty of what? Apparently it had to do with advertising, and I think for his edification and to the edification of the House, I'd like to refer to the Legislative Act, Chapter 18. "Nothing in this Act renders any person ineligible to be nominated for or elected as a member of the Legislative Assembly or disqualifies him from sitting or voting in the Assembly by reasons only of the person . . . sub-paragraph (e), being a proprietor or otherwise interested in a newspaper or other periodical publication in which official notices or advertisements are inserted which appear in other newspapers or publications in the province or which is subscribed to by the government or any department, branch, board or commission thereof, unless notices or advertisements or subscriptions are paid for at rates greater than the usual rates." And I want the Honourable Minister to know that we're always below the usual rates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: . . . made by the First Minister. First of all, as I said before, I'm not at issue with Cabinet Ministers that are volunteering their services, particularly in the area of teaching. I think it's a two-way street and both can gain. What is at issue is the emolument or stipend or amount of money that they are receiving from an institution such as the university that supplements their Cabinet salary. I think this is in direct conflict.

The Member for Rhineland is not far wrong when he called it moonlighting, and I think in the responsible position that you're in as Cabinet Ministers, to me it's incomprehensible. Now you've made the statement earlier that you had a limit of \$2,000 . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I hate to interrupt my honourable friend but I note that it is now past half past twelve. I move that the committee rise.

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

Mr. Speaker, the committee has considered certain resolutions, and directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, 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 2:30 Friday afternoon.