

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, June 29, 1970

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.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to introduce the students who are with us this afternoon. We have 31 Grades 4 and 5 students of the Riverview School under the direction of Miss Thompson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne. And 47 Grades 7 to 9 students of the Glenalla School who are under the direction of Mr. Harvey Walker, Mrs. Irene Sulik and Miss Marge Marciski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you this afternoon.

And on the other side of the gallery we have 100 Grade 5 students of the Morden School who are under the direction of Mrs. Laing, Mrs. Witherspoon and Mrs. Cram, and that school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina; and I welcome you to the House this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder with the progress we're making in the House in terms of bills if the House Leader would be in a position to tell us what we might expect in terms of committee meetings so the public might be advised in terms of Law Amendments Committee and others.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I sort of have the feeling which, I'm not sure of, that we probably will be in a position to talk about committees tomorrow. We do have one committee scheduled for 7:00 o'clock on Thursday. That's the Industrial Relations Committee. I would hope that if the bills move as speedily as the Leader of the Opposition seems to think that they will be moving, that we'd be in committee on Thursday; but we'll know tomorrow and I hope that there will be sufficient time to notify persons interested.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I just indicate that I think Wednesday is a holiday and I'm thinking if we could establish some time so that the news media would be able to do a proper job in advising the public, that it would be fairer to them.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, as I've indicated, that by tomorrow we'd be in a position of announcing that meetings will take place on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. When will the meeting of the Economical Development Committee be called?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is in the purview of the House Leader to determine the dates of the reconvening of committees, and their initial meetings.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Finance. I think he's in charge of statutory orders and regulations is he not? When will the committee meeting be called of that committee?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I accept responsibility for many things but I've not yet been given the responsibility for the committee meetings on statutory regulations. As a matter of fact I don't think I'm even a member of that committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Youth and Education. I believe I asked him a question last week in respect to how many students have been placed and how many applications he has. I wonder if he has the answer now?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I received the information at lunch time -- This is as of about six days ago. The number that

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . are known of students who have been placed with the government at present stands at 1,450, that is as of about six days ago. The information is coming in slowly because of the paper work that's required and not everyone sends in their forms on time. But the figure that we know of is 1,450; there are probably more.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I believe the Minister said "placed with the government." Is that placed with the government departments or placed with an agency that the government employs?

MR. MILLER: Placed throughout the government generally. Some are placed directly by departments, some referred through the placement officer, but in the final analysis the placement is done by the department itself.

MR. PATRICK: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can he tell me how many applications you have on file besides the ones that were placed?

MR. MILLER: I believe there were 2,400 applications all told.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): . . . Mr. Speaker, if I could give further information to the Honourable the Member for Rhineland who asked about the convening of one or two standing committees. I would like to advise the honourable member that except those committees which have bills referred to them specifically, that the likelihood is that the other committees would be convened inter-sessionally, that is to say after the session, when the workload of the Assembly is much less. It would seem to make better sense that way and that is the way we would prefer to proceed.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then to the First Minister. I think it has been the practice that the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations meets during the session to bring in a report to that particular session and later on normally there is a concurrence motion. Will that committee not be functioning during the session then?

MR. SCHREYER: Well I'll have to check that, Mr. Speaker, but I can recall on the other hand when the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations was convened after the session, by resolution of the Assembly authorizing it to meet after the session, between sessions, to take up certain statutory orders and regulations and this has been a pretty standard practice. However, I'll take the gentleman's question under notice.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week we questioned the Minister regarding submissions to Ottawa for assistance to farmers who suffered from flooding who may not be able to seed. Has the Minister any further information?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (La du Bonnet): Well I think I answered that more than once since, Mr. Speaker - I presume the honourable member was not in the House on Friday when it was asked - and simply to indicate that the Minister had given an undertaking to the House that correspondence would be made available.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the government consider assistance for farmers who have lost topsoil, for farmers who had seeded and then the flooding came, who lost both seed and topsoil and had to seed again?

MR. USKIW: Well again any form of assistance is contingent on the response we get from the Government of Canada; so that their criteria would have to be met and I don't know what that would be, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the other day -- I'm not too sure of the questioner, but I did receive a question in respect to the question of fee arrangements or degree of fees charged by industrial overload as a consumers' matter -- and my department indicate to me that if they receive complaints, and I don't have any indication whether or not they have received complaints, but if they do, they're generally referred to the Employment Standards Division of my colleague, the Minister of Labour's Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to a certain distinction that was won by yourself, I believe, on Saturday by dint of much practice and many hours of rehearsal. The Speaker, for the benefit of the House, the Speaker succeeded in winning the pancake eating competition at -- I don't know what award he was given but it was probably a package of pancake mix.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): How many pancakes?

MR. SPEAKER: If I may be permitted I . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the contest on behalf of the entire Assembly and the prize I've received I hope to find ways and means of sharing it with Honourable Members of this Assembly. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. It's probably a two-part question. But is he aware of the pamphlet that was circulated at Manisphere on Saturday by the summer local of the New Democratic Youth, and does he consider the contents of that pamphlet as an invitation to incite to riot?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking for an expression of opinion?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'll rephrase the question then. Does he consider the contents of the pamphlet as on the verge of inciting riot?

MR. MACKLING: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is I haven't seen the pamphlet. If my honourable friend would send me a copy then I'll be happy to give him my own views about it but I wouldn't give him a legal opinion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if someone had asked me to table a pamphlet I certainly would.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'd ask the honourable member to table the document.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There has been nothing read from the pamphlet so it's not in possession of the House.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Is it necessary for the member to read from the pamphlet? If he refers -- (Interjection) -- No, no, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the rules of the House do not say that you have to read from the pamphlet; if a member refers and another member asks for it to be tabled I think it's perfectly proper to have it tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question the other day by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose relative to the levels of the Red River. I volunteered at that time as a risk that I thought that they were not being artificially kept up. That is now officially the word from my department, that there is nothing being done to keep the level of the Red River at an artificially high level.

Also to the Member for Rhineland, the branch does not anticipate a flooding problem on the Red River this summer.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. Some time ago the question was asked in this House regarding the progress in the various school divisions in the province with regard to arbitration. Could the Minister now give us the picture as far as the results of arbitration or the degree of arbitration that is now taking place in the various school districts in the province?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to give the exact figures. I know arbitration proceedings are under way in those areas. The meetings are completed; some are now simply awaiting the awards of the arbitration boards; others are still in the process of hearings. Because of the limited number of chairmen that can be picked from, the number of cases that have to be heard have been delayed up until July; but as far as I know all those that have requested arbitration are now in the process.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Education indicate how many arbitration cases have not had chairmen appointed as yet?

MR. MILLER: To my knowledge there are none that have not been appointed or in the process of being appointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, I raised a question to the Minister of Finance with regards to the 100 percent increase in telephone charges to the several radio stations in the province. I wonder if the Minister can report. Has there been any change of policy or are we still following the same guidelines?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the effective date was postponed to September 1st.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . The complaining radio station has written to the Prices and Incomes Commission with a complaint. The Telephone System has written to the same Commission explaining the justification for the charges on the basis of being related to cost and the next step would now be up to the commission as to whether or not it will consider the complaint and make any -- doesn't make decisions, but make any public announcement in regard to it. As far as I can see there's nothing left to be done until we hear from the Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in view of the extremely warm temperature today and the heat in this Chamber, whether it would be possible for members to agree to the removal of jackets on this summer day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Early in the session I posed a question to him, was the government giving any consideration to constructing a boat launching sign on highways adjacent to lakes, to, I think, make it much better for our tourist people. I believe at that time the Minister thought his department would be taking it under consideration. I wonder is it still under consideration?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I didn't give the answer to the honourable member any sooner. I do recall the question put. I have discussed it with my department and they are looking into this possibility. I will take it upon myself and give you the promise that I will answer your question within the next day or two.

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

MR. MOLGAT: . . . address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. On the 29th of April, that is two months ago, I questioned the Minister regarding policy about flooding in the vicinity of Lake Winnipeg in particular. The Minister promised that he would give a reply. Last Wednesday the Minister stated in the House that he would be having a major new policy soon. Could the Minister indicate when we may expect that policy?

MR. USKIW: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, what is the Minister's definition of "soon" because two months ago that's the reply I got. Two months have passed. How soon is soon?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think at that time that I had indicated that a review was being undertaken. We have almost completed that review and I think the answer "soon" is more relevant today than it would have been two months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs with respect to Centennial affairs. I wonder if he would be so good as to check into the coming Rock Festival and to see if there's any exploitation of youth being carried on there, specifically with respect to the sucking of cash out of our love for music "for ten bucks in advance or twelve shitty dollars at the gate"?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, yes I'll make that investigation.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I notice my friend from Lakeside was quoting. Would he mind tabling that document?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to table the document.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question to the same Minister. Could the Minister also investigate the same charges with regard to the last Rock Festival which was held at Lake Riviera?

MR. PETURSSON: I could give the same answer, Mr. Speaker.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debates on second readings. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 109, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading. Government Bills. Bill No. 109. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 109, The Dental Mechanics Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, it is with no regret at all that I'm happy to say a few brief remarks in respect to the introduction of this bill, the Dental Mechanics Act.

To say that this bill has been a long time in the works would be indulging in gross understatement. Many have been the hours and days that have been spent collectively by members of this House -- and I say this House in reference to this Legislature, many past members having participated for many hours discussing and reviewing the principles in respect to the law dealing with dental mechanics. As a result of a decision made in the previous session of this Legislature, a committee was set up, a committee on which there were members from previous committees. I want to pay tribute at the outset, Mr. Speaker, to the work of all members of the committee who met on an extensive number of occasions - I'll not go into the details of the number of meetings - that as a result of their deliberations a report was tabled in the House early this Session and the bill which you have before you provides in legalistic and legislative form the principles that, I believe, were outlined in that report.

Briefly, the Act makes provision for the designation of a dental mechanic and a description of the work that may be done by a dental mechanic, and the exceptions to the work that may be done by others. It clearly provides for the enforcement in administration of this Act by a Minister of the Crown designated under the Act; certainly takes away from the enforcement of a private professional group as had been the case heretofore; provides for inspection and so on, and I think that now the law will be properly imposed and regulated in accordance with good practice everywhere. It provides for the prohibition on the part of anyone to use the title "Denturist". It provides for the granting of provisional licenses during a period in which there will be an opportunity for existing dental mechanics to acquire the necessary expertise, if it is lacking, to ensure their application and processing of their application under regulations to be established under the Act for proper licensing. Following the period of provisional licensing they may obtain a regular license. Provides also for opportunity for inspection of proper records which must be kept by all those who are licensed to practice as dental mechanics. Provides for a wide right of entry for inspection of the books and so on and provides penalties for contraventions of the Act. It also provides that individual dental mechanics or dental mechanics acting in concert may not evade personal liability in connection with the granting of their services. Provides for the establishment by regulation of proper courses of training through approved schools and utilization of existing schools or otherwise by the department concerned. Provides for the right of persons who are affected, that is the persons would be licensed to appeal and to have recourse in respect to any definition of their right that may be made pursuant to the Act.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, the Act will clarify a situation that has been troubled over the years by indecision and a good deal of honest disagreement between great numbers of people in Manitoba as to the continuing need for this group or this professional group in society. We know of innumerable instances of complaints that have been made in respect to the situation that arises, and hopefully, the report of the committee which I believe has now been provided for in this bill, will provide a lasting solution to this problem.

Now there may be many who say that the bill doesn't go far enough and I'm certain that there will be many, both in the dental profession and in the present dental mechanics group, who will have a great measure of dissatisfaction with some provisions of this bill; but the report of the committee was not, quite frankly, a complete answer to any one or either of the two interested groups. It represented, by and large, a compromise on a pragmatic basis.

Now there may be some who feel that the Act goes too far and there may be members in this House who despite the report, feel that the Act goes too far and of course amendments may be made. I am aware of the fact that there may be others who feel that the Act doesn't go far enough and again if amendments are made they will have to be dealt with. I for one feel that this should go a long way to satisfying the problem that has been within our society as kind of a festering sore for far too long.

I warmly commend, Mr. Speaker, the principles of this bill to the House; hopefully it can have a quick second reading and get before the committee and I am sure that we will be delighted as individuals to hear once again representations by the interested groups, but I hope that we will as a result of all of the deliberations, leave with us a workable piece of legislation

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . . which will be the benefit of all of the citizens of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General has said, this has been a very difficult problem facing the Assembly for many years. I can recall the Minister of Finance being on a committee as far back as 1966 - and the Minister advises me we are the only ones left. I don't know whether it was the wearing hours and duties of that committee that made it that way. At times it was very hard; it was vociferously heard from the public and for the public and members of the original committee had a great deal of advice from the dental profession, the dental mechanic group and those who seemed to divide up in the province, pro and con.

I was rather pleasantly surprised to see that Bill 109 follows pretty well almost exactly what the recommendations were in the final dental committee report. I note that the oral certificate of health is required from either a medical doctor or a dentist and I note that in the second recommendation that was made, that the dental mechanic would be restricted to a complete edentulist mouth, that is a mouth where no live teeth are located. This to me is a great softening of their stand from previously where they wanted the right to work on either upper or lowers or partial plates, so they have given a great deal of ground in this respect. -- (Interjection) -- I think I heard someone mention that fact that they had not given any ground. As I recall the last committee meeting under questioning the president stated quite definitely, the president of the so-called Denturists Association that is, stated quite definitely that they did not want any more than that, any more than the right to work in the edentulist mouth. I believe I asked a question - I heard some honourable members say no - but I asked the question twice of the president and twice he assured me that this was all that they were seeking and this is what one of the recommendations of the committee is.

I'm glad to see that a private association has had the right removed from them to police not only their own group but also to police other groups who they may think is intruding into their field. This is going to place a great deal of responsibility upon the Minister, and I presume that through the Department of Health, although I'm not sure, but I'm sure that it will be placed in a proper department where there are inspectors, where there are people associated with the health field. I hope that this is how the examining of quarters and the examining of offices and the check-ups from time to time will be made, not rather made by reference to the Attorney-General's department. I would hope that the administration of this will be placed in the Department of Health and Social Services because it's allied to that department and certainly not in the field of the normal employee in the Attorney-General's department I wouldn't think.

I notice though, and I may have missed it, but there is no restriction on advertising. Does this mean that the dental mechanic will be able to advertise his business in the same way as a garage mechanic? I hope that when closing debate the Minister will pay some particular attention to that point.

I note also that there must be a standardized receipt given for work on a form that will be approved by the government. I think that this will lessen any disputes that may arise in the future. And also the rather strict licensing and examination of the dental mechanic I think is in the best interests of the public. I along with the Attorney-General hope that this bill will alleviate the problem that has been facing the Assembly for many years and will be in the best interests of the people of the province.

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

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to what the Honourable the Member from Portage la Prairie has said; however, I think we are going to find that the dental mechanics are not happy with the present bill and similarly I think we are going to find that the dental association is going to take some exception to it. As far as either group is concerned I think they feel they have quite valid reasons. My own feeling would be that it's up to government to protect the people, give them the best possible standards in health care. However, at the present time I would be prepared to see this bill go to committee so that there can be hearings and we can hear all aspects of the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you adjourning it?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, like the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, this bill is a small part of my life in that a great deal of time has been given to it, and I am satisfied that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge having pointed out that there may be unhappiness on the part of both the dentists and the future dental mechanics; I would agree with that and extend it to probably all people, because I don't think this bill will satisfy everybody's point of view. I can't say that it satisfies mine either, Mr. Speaker.

May I just in passing refer to the fact that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie referred to the lack of any control on advertising. I'm sure he noticed that under the regulation portion of the bill, one of the specific provisions for regulations does include the prescribing of rules respecting advertising by dental mechanics and as I recall it the reasoning behind the official receipt was twofold. One was, to be able to state on the receipt particularly that the dental mechanic has no training or qualification for giving advice on health related to live tissues or live teeth and to indicate his restricted ability. It was felt that this was important so that nobody would be misled into thinking that the dental mechanic can do that work which a dentist is qualified to do in mouth restoration, in mouth rehabilitation and dental care. I think that all members of the committee were agreed that the dental mechanic could make some contribution to the dental health of people and to keeping costs within line, but that the ability of that dental mechanic was limited to mechanical abilities and there should be no thought that he had the knowledge or training which would put him in a position to give advice. I think that that's very important because none of us I think would like to mislead the public into thinking that the training of the dental mechanic would be beyond the ability to manufacture and fit dentures, full dentures and that.

I am not happy with this entire approach, Mr. Speaker, because I accept the theory that health matters should be so organized and co-ordinated that the services of all people in the health field should be unified and should work together. I accept the use of the para-professional, in this case the para-dental person, as an ancillary part to the whole dental health process, but I'm being realistic enough to know that the dentists have no confidence in the dental mechanic and are not prepared to give him the authority and certainly credit him with the ability to do the work which this bill proposes he shall do. That's very clear. The dentists do not believe that the dental mechanic can be trained to do the work, limited as it is, which this bill would permit. I'm equally satisfied that the present illegal denturists are not prepared to work with the dentists except in such terms which will remove from the dentists any authority to direct or regulate the services being offered by the denturist who is practising illegally.

I must say that I personally favour the thought that the dentists should work as part of the dental team and the dental mechanic should work as part of the dental team, as should the hygienist, as should the dental assistant. I have discussed this matter with both illegal denturists and with dentists, pointing out that I felt that the best way to carry out this kind of contribution which can be made by a dental mechanic or a dental technician would be as part of a clinic group with the dentist who is the best trained of all to be responsible for the work. But economics have entered into the picture. Actually the whole history of the growth of the illegal denturists is somewhat related to the fact that the denturist learnt his trade as a dental technician and then discovered he could cut out the middleman by eliminating the dentist and practicing as they say, out of the back room, or out of his suitcase or in his basement, there are various expressions used about how one illegally practised the trade. There's no doubt that these illegal denturists deliberately with full knowledge of the illegality of what they were doing, decided that they would carry on an illegal practice, break the law and provide the teeth.

The fact is also true that a great many of the public accepted -- Did I make some mistake in my grammar? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm not too happy with the quality of the teeth that we are providing in this Act. I am very much concerned about the fact that we have run into what is really an economic problem where the public has become satisfied, to a large extent. I don't mean the public generally but a goodly section of the public has come to accept the illegal denturist as a person who is qualified to do the work, in the opinion of the customer that he serves; they believe that the fees charged are reasonable as compared with that of a dentist; they have agreed that the services are available to them in such a way that is acceptable to them. There's no doubt that many of the illegal denturists have acquired the skill to do a good job in fitting, in taking impressions, in fabricating the dentures and there are many satisfied people. What makes me unhappy is the fact that we have been unable to bring together

(MR. CHERNIACK con t'd.) . . . . these dentists and para-dentists into one office, into one clinical setup where they could each contribute to the quality of the work produced out of that clinic; but I am very much satisfied, having expressed all my fears and disappointments, I'm satisfied that this Bill is one that I can support because it does recognize the mechanical skills of a number of people and the fact that they could contribute to the dental health of the public, and I would hope that out of this might come, not a further separation in the health field such as, I believe, has occurred in the medical field as between the doctor, the chiropractor and other para-medical people, but one where possibly we could strive to bring them together so that they could complement each other. I think that a dentist who could find confidence in a dental mechanic and could restrict his work and his more specialized skill, such as the surgical work, such as the fitting of partial plates, such as dealing with live teeth, that he would be freed from doing this mechanical job by competent dental mechanics. I would hope that this might be a step in that direction, rather than a step in the creation of a new profession in competition with a dentist. That danger also exists.

The reason I made all this statement -- and I suppose I can be excused. At least I hope I can, because I've lived with this for so long that I bubble with things I'd like to say about it -- but what I would like to point out, as did the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, is that this Bill, I believe, comes foursquare within the recommendation of the committee. And I must point out that the committee heard all sides, sat seriously and listened to all that was said and I think it need not be a secret to say that this Bill is a result of the compromising of the points of view of all members of the committee. As I recall it, and I may be subject to correction, but in the main, I believe that the report of the Committee on Dental Services was -- I believe it was unanimous although I don't think there was a vote, but I don't think there was strong disagreement with the report -- but I point out that it was a compromise and people will question, "You'll never get the Certificate of Health". Well, there was an indication from the then Minister of Health, and I think that this government would have to see to it that if there is no possibility of the obtaining of Certificates of Oral Health from the practising dental fraternity, then the medical fraternity could provide it. If not that, then government through its public health officers will make an effort to see to it that people who do go to dental mechanics to have the work done will be able to obtain a Certificate of Oral Health. This has been a stumbling block in the Province of Alberta and British Columbia and I'm not satisfied that it was well dealt with in those two provinces, but the solution to wipe out the certificate was also not a good solution and I would hope that we will give it a good try.

There is also the question of working within an edentulist mouth. The dental mechanics in Manitoba have stated clearly that they are not asking for the right to work with partial plates, that they don't want to be involved in that part of the mouth which has live teeth; but I can tell you that in our travels which we had about 1966 I believe, thereabouts, through western Canada, that the dental mechanics there expressed, to a large extent, expressed a great deal of self confidence in their ability to deal with live teeth, and I would guess it won't be long before the dental mechanics here, once the bill is passed, will start protesting that their knowledge and ability is such that they could start encroaching more in the field of dentistry. I would hope that at that time we will assess the situation as it exists then and that there will be no attempt at this time to make any changes along that line.

May I also say about the edentulist mouth, that there are dental mechanics, illegal denturists that claim that they have the full ability to fit an upper or a lower full denture to the corresponding part of the mouth with live teeth and they will no doubt say that when they go into committee. I want to warn, warn this Legislature not to be misled by that, because I feel again that by giving a dental mechanic the right to work in a mouth which has live teeth that perforce he will have to adjust his denture to the existing live teeth and that it may well be that there are live teeth that have to be worked on in some way in order to make a better fit, in order to create a better, healthier mouth situation.

So again I would plead that this bill go through in its present form in principle without any variation except any that may occur to correct grammatical or legal aspects, but that the principles set out in the report of the committee which studied this matter extensively will be such as will confirm the report of the committee; and I would say that after a year or so when we see how this works out, we would then be in a position to look at the next step; because I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that no one being satisfied with this, that there will be attempts made to make various changes in this Act after it has passed and after it has been put into practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 138, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 138. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 138, The Development Corporation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a brief statement that I'd like to deliver to the House which I trust will explain the intent of the Act and help to make the various provisions more clear to the members of the House.

This Act to establish The Manitoba Development Corporation is designed to strengthen and expand the existing Manitoba Development Fund and make it the key agency in the promotion of investment in new industry and the expansion of existing businesses in the province. The proposed Act will enlarge the corporation's area of operations and make it more development oriented and as well will place emphasis, special emphasis on the expansion and strengthening of small to medium sized operations. The government intends to expand the activities of the Corporation and I would like to specifically mention a number of steps. Firstly, the Corporation will adopt a more aggressive attitude toward capital supply. The corporation is now, or the Development Fund is now in a position to embark on more aggressive programs required to meet the challenges to the economic and industrial development which are facing Manitoba. Until now, its activities were usually confined to making loans on relatively conservative terms. Important as this practice has been and will continue to be, bolder measures are now needed to provide the expanded supply of equity capital called for in the future to increase the availability of loan capital to sound ventures through acceptance of higher depth to equity ratios where deemed advisable and even in some cases to make working capital available on terms more favourable than those in the conventional market.

The Manitoba Development Corporation or if I can use the initials, the MDC, is the only institution in the province in a position to undertake these essential services for economic development. The Corporation will be asked to explore a variety of ways of entering into an equity capital program. This in no way implies that the MDC will depart from established practices of making a complete technical and economic evaluation of all projects prior to providing financial assistance of any kind, and of insisting that borrowers or issuers have the management available to operate the business successfully in the province.

We will also insist that a marketing program is developed to ensure profitable disposal of the output of the proposed project and that sufficient capital from other sources is at risk in the project to guarantee full commitment to its success on the part of its owners. Since occasions will probably arise where more equity capital is needed than is available from the Corporation, it is intended that The Manitoba Development Corporation establish contacts with venture capital groups throughout Canada, and indeed in other countries if necessary, that could be influenced to participate by reason of the additional capital being made available by the Corporation. In order to meet the challenges to economic and industrial development we intend that the Corporation abandon the role of lender of last resort and become a development agency in the true sense of the word.

It is intended that the Corporation take the initiative in seeking out major new development projects through research, bringing them to the attention of potential investors and actively promoting them through to operating reality. Only by such a policy will it be possible to utilize the expanded capital supplies which are required for Manitoba's development. And I would mention, Mr. Speaker, that in this connection The Manitoba Development Corporation will work in conjunction with the Department of Industry and Commerce.

We believe that small and medium sized businesses have been unable to obtain the necessary assistance or management to expand and strengthen operations over the years. Therefore, this Act includes the assurance that this sector of our business community receive the emphasis and attention it deserves. Wherever possible, or whenever possible it is proposed that financial packaging be undertaken and that the Corporation's role will be that of investment banker by assisting the borrower or issuer in obtaining capital from sources other than The Manitoba Development Corporation. This practice will have the advantage of reducing the

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . Corporation's commitment to individual projects and enabling its capital to be spread over a greater number of investments.

The Corporation's initiative, particularly in view of the thorough project examination it makes should encourage participation by the chartered banks, the trust companies, mortgage loan companies and other financial institutions. It should be possible to share loans or issues with these institutions. We believe the corporation's approach is tailored, or should be tailored to encourage favourable participation with the corporation by the investment banking fraternity in Canada and abroad in underwriting the requirements of present and new industries.

Another possibility would be for the Corporation to take a subordinated position in appropriate cases. It is intended that the Manitoba Development Corporation also eventually include financial counselling in the scope of its activities. Developers of attractive projects may need guidance in determining the appropriate capital structure for the new ventures as well as assistance in obtaining capital and it's suggested that this assistance be provided.

The Act also includes an assurance that the Manitoba Development Corporation in its consideration of loan or financial arrangements shall include such matters as social significance, external costs such as pollution and effects on income level. In brief, the Corporation will emphasize the encouragement of high wage and relatively pollution-free industries. The MDC will include plant and equipment leasing in its program. Leasing I might point out is an alternative to borrowing from the Corporation for companies of good credit standing. While a lease is essentially the same as a 100 percent mortgage loan, it does offer the advantage to some companies of not reducing their borrowing ability since leases are often not listed as fixed obligations on a corporate balance sheet. We believe a well conceived leasing program can be used as a stimulus to regional development since it can provide an incentive for locating small manufacturing plants at sites outside major urban areas. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is an obstacle, a difficulty which business in rural Manitoba particularly, faces; the shortage of capital is even greater in regions of the province as is compared with Metro Winnipeg, and the leasing program is one which will be most beneficial to that part of our province.

The Corporation in co-operation with the Department of Industry and Commerce will include in its program the provision of management assistance to companies in which the Corporation has a financial position. Management consultants with appropriate backgrounds in industrial engineering, marketing and finance will be made available on a project basis to work closely with companies in which the MDC has invested both in planning and evaluation and in problem solving. Because of the vital role which exports of manufactured goods play in sustaining the pace of Manitoba's growth the Manitoba Development Corporation will be asked to develop new techniques and procedures to finance export activities by credit worthy firms. In Particular the MDC will be prepared to offer financial assistance for establishing warehouses and sales offices and for carrying inventories required to service export markets.

Another area, this is in line with the recommendation of the TED Commission, not everything in the TED Commission should be treated lightly or cast aside and there is one recommendation which can be described as a pilot enterprise program. The aim of this program which is suggested in the TED Report, the aim of the program would be to take higher than normal risks in order to stimulate and develop selectively a series of high risk young enterprises which will emphasize product innovation and eventually attract new capital into Manitoba industry and we trust dramatize Manitoba's advantages as a potential for new ventures. And we would hope that the Corporation will initiate this program at the earliest possible opportunity.

I'll make only brief reference to Part II operations. I will simply state that the government intends to make greater use of its power under Part II of the Act in order to make things happen in our economy. On the matter of disclosure of loans, disclosure of loans and equity I would like to say this: I think that the Manitoba Development Corporation is a public institution created by the Act of the Legislature and as such it's ultimately responsible and answerable to the Legislative Assembly. It has been the policy not to make public any details of specific approved loans. It is not our intention to make changes in commitments already made to borrowers in the past or to at any time publicize the internal affairs of companies borrowing from the corporation. However, to meet what we believe are the legitimate requirements for public scrutiny and to ensure the government is better informed or the Legislature is better informed the Corporation's annual report shall include information respecting individual loans, individual investments made in the previous year and this is spelled out in the bill including

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . the name of the borrower, the amount borrowed, the rate of interest and the term of the loan. As well, the Chairman of the Corporation may be required to attend meetings of the Legislative Committee on Economic Development to provide the latest financial statement of companies in which the corporation has taken an equity position. Well, so much for disclosure.

I would just state in closing then, Mr. Chairman, that the bill is a new document but most of the old Manitoba Development Fund Act remains unchanged. Although it's printed anew, I would suggest that in order to facilitate a comparison of this bill with the Manitoba Development Fund Act, I will provide a list of the significant amendments to the sections of the MDF Act during the committee stage to facilitate discussion and further consideration by the Legislature, or by the committee. As Minister of Industry and Commerce it's my belief that the proposed legislation will contribute substantially to the process of stimulating the economic development of Manitoba and I therefore submit this bill for your consideration and deliberation.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the honourable member. I have received a message from the guard at the front door that an honourable member having an automobile bearing licence number 65K62 has left his lights on. If he's in the House, would he attend to that matter.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Would the honourable member permit a question or I have two questions really. First, because of the speed-up and the fact that it's very unlikely that we'll be able to get . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting to the question. And it's very unlikely we'll be able to get copies of Hansard until late tomorrow and the fact that the Minister was reading from a prepared statement, could the Minister give us copies of the statement he was reading from?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll endeavour to make it available to those members that would like to have a copy of the statement. I believe this is going to Law Amendments Committee and I understand that there are many meetings of the Public Utilities Committee lined up in the near future so I am not so certain as to how soon this will be -- will it be considered? -- (Interjection) -- Well the House Leader indicates that it may be considered rather soon. However for those members wishing them, I will provide a copy so if you would simply send me a note or phone my office.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . party would be fine, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister would make one available for each party I think that would be satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAHAM: There is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister also stated that he was going to provide printed copies of explanations of the various sections at the committee stage. Could he provide those to us before the committee stage?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my offer was not to provide explanations of the changes. I thought I was doing that more or less in the last ten or fifteen minutes but rather to indicate where the changes were because this is a complete reprinting and the reason for the reprinting is a technical one. However, I offered to prepare a list to indicate the different sections or the amendments to the sections. I can attempt to get copies available in advance of the committee meeting as well, if you wish.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 137, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 137. The Honourable Member for Morris. The adjourned debate on Bill No. 137.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the House adjourned at the lunch hour I was dealing with the difficulties that governments through the years have experienced in dealing with the dairy industry because of the varied nature of the industry, the fact that there are various component parts within the industry working somewhat in competition with one another, and it was difficult to enact legislation that would satisfy or will suit the needs of each of the component parts. In addition to this, Sir, there is the fact that the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . . Federal Government is responsible for part of the dairy industry and the Provincial Government exercises jurisdiction in other areas of the same industry. For those reasons it's been extremely difficult to bring in the kind of a program that would bear equally on all parts of the industry and enable them to enjoy the level of income that I feel all parts of the industry should enjoy, rather than just one particular group. The fluid milk producers, I think one can say, are considered to be the elite of the dairy industry and exercise a considerable amount of influence in determining what the policies of the entire industry will be, in many cases to the detriment of the concentrated milk producers as well as those who produce for the cheese factories and those who produce cream for butter production.

It's significant I think to point out, Sir, that the dairy industry and the beef cattle industry, although the structure of the two animals is pretty much the same - each animal has almost the same component parts, but is arranged in somewhat different fashion - and yet on the one hand you find the dairy industry constantly in difficulty, constantly calling upon government for assistance, coming under the influence more and more of government control, while in quite the reverse the beef cattle industry are able to not only to survive the vagaries of the market and the difficulties that all farmers face and sometimes the encroachment of government. Not only has it been able to survive but they continue to prosper and I think of all the industries in Canada today relating to agriculture, the beef industry is one that enjoys a reasonable degree of prosperity. It might be significant to point out, Sir, as my honourable friend from Gladstone has just said and this is what I intended to say, is that the beef cattle industry have continuously pleaded with governments to keep out of their hair, to leave them alone and let them run their own industry. Maybe there is a lesson there, maybe there is something that the Member for Crescentwood may want to look into and study. It might be an object lesson to him in how well government intervention and government controls have affected an industry. I think it's also safe to say that within the dairy industry, of all the segments of agriculture that is affected by government intervention there is no part of it that has received more subsidies, more controls, than the dairy people and yet no group of farmers are in more difficulty at all times. So one is led to, not necessarily the obvious conclusion, but one is led to the conclusion that if an industry, a group of people such as the beef cattle producers, take it upon themselves to run their industry and to look after their own interests there's a greater chance that they'll achieve a measure of a success than those who are constantly running to governments for assistance.

I might also say, Sir, that since the advent of the Dairy Commission and the application of the quota system under the Canada Dairy Commission, Manitoba has found itself in the somewhat awkward position now of having lost so many of its quotas to Ontario and the Province of Quebec that we are in effect a deficiency-producing area in Canada today. I doubt very much if this situation would ever have developed if the dairy producers had been able to get together, formed their own organizations and looked after their own interests.

I don't think that we on this side can have any serious objection to the passing of this legislation since it's largely designed to assist the Minister and assist the department in compiling statistics and information that is required; and since it's largely amendments to the present Act redefining some of the sections to include not only milk where milk is designated in the Act but "and dairy products". So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think that we on this side would be prepared to see this bill go before the committee where we will be asking for some explanations of some of the sections and the reasons for their incorporation into this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief. I just do hope that this bill before us will not hurt the smaller producer any more than he has been hurt in past instances. I know that as far as some of the federal subsidies the smaller producer was cut out and I feel that we need the smaller producer just as much as the bigger producers in this province, and I sure hope that they will not be hurt further.

There is provision in this bill for assessment of producers, I take it and it no doubt is going to be governed by the regulations. I would like to hear from the Minister as to whether he knows to what extent this assessment will be made, how much they intend to spend, and I also note that there is provision for the government to make grants as well. Are any of the assessments going to be matched by the government? Is there some kind of arrangement between the government and the producer on this score or not?

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

There's also provision here for exempting from licensing. Just what requests have been made in this legislation that is being brought forward that requested to be exempted and just what type of producer will be exempted under the Act?

Once more I just would like to raise the point that if we had explanations on the various sections, certainly this would be a big help to the members because so many sections deal with minor deletions of words and sometimes this can have quite a drastic effect. The way it is now every member has to do it on his own and go through the Act in order to find out. If we did have the explanation certainly this would accommodate the members on this side of the House very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that members opposite are in agreement with the principles or the intent of the bill, that of trying to more properly determine exactly what is happening in the milk industry and indeed how best we can achieve the kind of recognition of the inputs that are made by the various producers and that their prices and the amounts which they receive for their products will reflect more accurately what they have been providing for the market.

I recognize some of the handicaps, or some of the problems that the Member for Morris points out in trying to get complete information, but I think that this is a sincere attempt to try and do a more thorough job so that we can be satisfied that at least we've gone as far as we can in getting the sort of information that is necessary to make this work to the advantage of all concerned and in particular to the producer.

The Member for Rhineland pointed out that there are certain questions that he would like some answers to, the question of assessment, the question of grants. Again I'm not sure that that is part of the Act that is going to be in effect at all. It has to do with the question of inspection, the financing of it, and at this stage I'm not in a position to know whether it will be indeed the Milk Control Board that will be involved in inspections, but in anticipation that it's quite possible that it might, this is provided; it's simply permissiveness.

We are trying to develop, or trying to find out at the moment whether or not the Department of Health can indeed look after the whole area of inspection, so that if that is the case, then those sections won't be necessary, or at least they won't be used and will be dropped subsequently; but until that is done, we are allowing for the legislation to be there so that in the event that it's decided to police and inspect the industry through the Milk Control Board we will have the facility.

Other questions that were put I think would more properly be put before the committee. I don't have all the answers at the moment and I would trust that members opposite will avail themselves of the expertise from the department in committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, call Bill No. 17, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I was absent from my desk Friday afternoon and did want to speak briefly on this bill and if in any way I was putting the Minister and the House at a disadvantage this morning in not being able to speak on it, I do apologize. However, I am prepared to add a few remarks at this time.

This is the type of legislation that I, in some aspects find that I cannot support and in other aspects of it, I can support. I support the views of government projects such as the Moose Lake project, I think that government has a just and right reason for going into an undeveloped area such as that, help people to set up their project and get it under way, but I wonder then, I have industry in my constituency which has been created by local people with local capital and it's successfully operating, and I wonder what would be the condition of government getting involved in that. I wonder. Government has said they basically don't need this bill, that it could be done under MDF and of course, then we look at the section of MDF they are businessmen and so the principle of the bill puts government in conflict with business and that is where I find myself having some disagreement; to put blanket powers, or give government all the terms of reference that's requested in this bill, I find it very difficult that I should assist in setting up a Crown Corporation with such wide ranging powers.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.)

No doubt in committee I will have many, many questions to ask with regards to the various sections of this Bill. I don't thoroughly understand all the sections and I'm not going to hold the bill up in the House, because I am sure in committee we can get the answers to some of the many questions. I know it's one of the difficult decisions of our Party to find ourselves supporting the philosophy that government can do everything or government can do things better than people. I doubt that very much, and with those few remarks I'm sure in committee we'll debate the matter at further length. Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the bill any longer in second reading and with your co-operation hope that it moves on into committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to have another long discussion about this bill. Needless to say, I was very much surprised to hear what was being said by members of the Opposition relative to this bill. In particular, I was astonished to hear the remarks of the Member for Arthur. I want to be fair to him, his speech was researched and could not have been prepared without outside assistance, at least that is my view and I see nothing wrong with that. I think that all honourable members should make as much use of research sources as they can and get as much assistance as they can. But I would sincerely ask him to go to his researchers and to advise them that there is nothing that is contained within Bill 17 and none of the remarks which he made relative to Bill 17, that are not already within the control of this government, and have always been within the control of the government.

As I indicated when I introduced this legislation, it was merely another vehicle which offered a little more flexibility; and, Mr. Speaker, since that time, and in attempting to determine just what flexibility it does allow, it would appear that the only difference between what the province can now do and what Bill 17 permits it to do, is that it can be initiated by another department rather than by the Department of Industry and Commerce. That what can now be initiated by the government under the Department of Industry and Commerce can now also be initiated by the government under the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I can assure honourable members that this is not of great concern to me, that I as Minister have a position of initiating this type of corporation within the department, because I assure the honourable members that as part of the government I can have as much influence in that department as I could within Cabinet as a whole to talk about what happens through the Department of Industry and Commerce, and if there was a resource which we felt should be initiated by the public through means of a Crown corporation, I'm quite sure that that would be done by the Department of Industry and Commerce under this government if it would not have been done so under the old government - but without any legislation. So the members who have used this piece of legislation to indicate that the government is seeking to be able to do things which they raise all type of hysteria about, and which, Mr. Speaker, I find to be an almost pathological fear on the part of honourable members, that when the word "public enterprises" is mentioned they fairly hide under their desks for fear as to what this is going to do to society.

We had an example of it the other day when we talked about the government being able to apply for a liquor license and I never heard such ridiculous comments from members of the other side which would indicate that all of the people who were now engaged in selling liquor were going to go out of business because the government might apply for a liquor license at its golf club. There seems to be something insidious on the part of honourable members in that I who make my golf club the Kildonan Club will be able to drink at that club the same as they drink at Niakwa, St. Boniface or St. Charles, or any of the other clubs, and Mr. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Sturgeon Creek says "who said this" and he expresses some amazement. He should have been at committee when this was brought up, and when the same remarks that he made this morning relative to what the Crown could do, engage in some unfair competition and throw the present liquor vendors out of business, were expressed because a government agency could apply for a dining room liquor license, and that is the same type of hysterical comment that came from members of the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say quite frankly that my disappointment with Bill 17 is not with what it does, but with the fact that it doesn't do what honourable members say it will do. If I thought that everything that they said was correct, I would be much more enthusiastic about this bill than I am, but I tried to advise honourable members of the House when I spoke upon this matter during the estimates of some departments, I tried to advise them that if the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . government wished to do all of the things that the Member for Arthur, the Member for Sturgeon Creek and other members, were afraid of, they could do it right now without enacting this legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The government is a corporation; the Province of Manitoba is a corporation, and as a corporation its field of jurisdiction is unlimited except for legislation that it passes, that it is now carrying on that very corporation which was the germ of this legislation. The Moose Lake Logging Corporation is now being carried on. It has a board of directors. It spends money. It cuts logs. It sells them to Churchill Forest Industry. It will have a balance sheet. That balance sheet will be put before the members of this Assembly to comment on. There may be some losses, there may be some gains. That was the reason that the corporation was started. But in the same way as the government undertook to run the Moose Lake Logging Company without Bill No. 17, it could do it in every field that was mentioned by the Member for Arthur the other day. And it could do it not because of legislation that we have passed, but simply because it already has the jurisdiction of doing it.

So I have indicated that without any legislation, the government could do those things, and, Mr. Speaker, if the government didn't want to do any of the things that have been mentioned by my honourable friend, the legislation would not do it. And really that's right now, and I hope that that won't continue, but that is at that point the great weakness with this piece of legislation. None of the things that the honourable members said, but the fact that we don't have listed a series of projects which are not now being developed in the Province of Manitoba that we intend to deal with. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we did have, if we had those projects and if we do get them we will have another vehicle of entering into them when this legislation is passed, which I'm sure it will be, but when we do get those lists of projects, I don't anticipate that there will be any criticism on the part of members on that side of the House because we have found a way, let us say, of integrating into our industrial development the community of Wabowden or the community of Pukatawagan, or the community of Berens River, or any of the other northern communities. What I really regret, Mr. Speaker, is that we don't have a definite industrial program to involve those people in at the present time. And if we did, Mr. Speaker, then I have no hesitation in saying that if it was a Crown corporation that was required to facilitate that development, that the government would proceed to facilitate it by means of a Crown corporation, and the fears that have been mentioned - I think I recall the Member for Arthur saying that you could have a monopoly in the forest industry, where nobody else could touch, and the person who had the monopoly would have the only rights and they would say at what price they would buy and at what price they would not buy, and the government would pour all kinds of money into that monopoly. Mr. Speaker, we have that now. We have it without this legislation. Do the honourable members not know that with respect to all of northern Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba and the people generally, the people that my Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek talks about, who he's saying we are going to have to tax, that they are being taxed roughly 90 million dollars worth to turn money over to Churchill Forest Industries and the other group in that complex, so that they will have a monopoly of the forest industry, they will prevent other cutters from cutting, which they are doing now; they will say at which price they will purchase logs and at which price they will not purchase logs, which they are doing now; and that all those things happen without Bill No. 17. There is only one difference - that under Bill 17 it will be a corporation responsible to the public which will have to answer in this Legislature, whereas under the present system it is a group of four companies who have to answer to nobody.

The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek says it's loan capital and he says that the Attorney-General should know something about loans because he is involved in it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was roughly eighteen years in the law business and you will not find a single person in my business who will say that it is wise to lend 85 to 90 percent of the estimated capital of a project to a private developer. That that is not a loan, it is not in any sense of the term a loan and no lender would advocate such a loan; and if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is so aware of business practices then he knows that this is not a loan, this is a means whereby . . .

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GREEN: Oh, sure.

MR. ENNS: Could the member indicate under what terms the CMHC lends money for housing units?

MR. GREEN: CMHC, Mr. Speaker, lends money for housing units, because the CMHC is a public corporation which knows that unless this money is loaned in this way, private enterprise will not involve itself in the field; and the CMHC also knows, Mr. Speaker, no private lender lends money on that basis. The only reason the private agencies get in under CMHC loans is that they are guaranteed by the government. Every CMHC loan that is advanced by a private lender is guaranteed by the government. So you have the government -- Oh, yes, I indicated this, I indicated this many times in the House. You have the government standing in a position and this is what this CMHC system really was. It gets in on the basis that it is going to take all the risk in order to support private enterprise, and that is what the CMHC system was. The CMHC also built homes directly, and they did much more good for the people of this country when they built homes directly than when they financed private loans; but nevertheless, no lender lends money on that basis - and I am talking about a private lender. And furthermore, with regard to CMHC they could take the housing situation in this province and show that a loan ten years ago, because of the very predictable inflationary value of land, even if it was 90 percent, would only be 50 or 60 percent in a few years time because of the spiralling cost of housing. But nobody could say that that will take place with regard to the forest complex in The Pas. Mr. Speaker, if that industry decides that they cannot make a go of it, every member in this room knows that the amount of money that has been invested in the project could not be secured by the assets that they will be there, and that's the difference. And yet the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek seems to say that it is wise, it is businesslike, it is good public enterprise to gamble the people's money as long as you give it to private firms on the basis that if money is made they make the profits, but if money is lost the people lose, that that's legitimate as far as he is concerned; but reverse, to take the people's money and make sure that the equity in the organization continues to remain with the people, there is something unholy about that.

Mr. Speaker, that's what the Member for Sturgeon Creek says. He said that it's perfectly legitimate, perfectly legitimate to proceed on the basis of lending the money to private enterprise, and apparently he doesn't care what the risk is, go a 100 percent or a 120 percent of the value, if you like, as long as you give it to private enterprise, that's legitimate; but if you say that for the same 100 percent of the people's dollars that you are going to proceed with the enterprise on your own, then there is something unholy about that situation. Well, I agree that there is that difference of opinion between the members of the Opposition and ourselves. We do not look upon private enterprise as being divine. We say that if there's a transaction whereby the people can participate and the transaction is sound, we will proceed with it and we will not be hung-up on a doctrinaire position that the public should not be involved; the others say, we are doctrinairely against the government involving itself in business. We're prepared to let that difference be plainly seen by everybody and we're prepared to let the public decide on that obvious difference between us and, Mr. Speaker, that apparently has been amply demonstrated by the debate that has taken place on this bill.

I want to indicate that it doesn't mean nor should it mean that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says that the government then becomes involved in every business transaction that comes along. It still leaves the government in a position to choose those areas of activity which it feels require the public participation and which are sound transactions and it leaves them to reject those areas of activity where the public should not become involved. I indicated to members earlier in the year that a well-known member of their party - and I am not going to reveal the name, but I assure the Members that this is so - a well-known, well-respected member of their party then came to see me in my office, wished to go into a housing development where he would receive 90 percent of the participation from the Federal Government, but he wasn't prepared to go ahead unless the province participated for the balance of 10 percent. With a loan. But this rugged individualist, Mr. Speaker, wanted 100 percent of public money before he would lift a finger. These are the so-called free enterprisers, the rugged individualists - I assure you that he didn't hang around very long. But the fact is that those kind of deals are available every day. Those are the kinds of deals which were made by the previous administration, that is the kind of deal that developed the Simplot Chemical factory in Brandon and Mr. Simplot is the first person to admit it. Mr. Simplot is quoted as saying in one of the national magazines that "when I go into an enterprise I don't use my own money, I use somebody else's money".

Mr. Speaker, I have been around with businessmen long enough and I have acted for

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . businessmen and I don't blame them for doing this because I think every businessman should seek the best advantage that he can get and none of them like to invest their own money. They invest the people's money. They invest the people's money either by getting government support or by taxing the people through prices or by floating bond issues or by selling stock but they do not invest their own money. So when the Member for Sturgeon Creek talks about the investment of public funds, I know of no investment that has taken place in the Province of Manitoba that hasn't been supported by public funds. Now the private enterpriser gets public funds from the people and he can't develop without getting those public funds. Doesn't the Member for Sturgeon Creek know that? Hasn't he seen it in his own business . . .

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Not in my business.

MR. GREEN: . . . . that every penny that is used to develop any industry comes from public funds and in many cases, I'm not going to say in every case, but in many cases it comes from the public funds of the people of Manitoba. That's what happened with Simplot, that's what happened with Churchill Forest Industries, that's happened with numerous other industries that were initiated through the Manitoba Development Fund; they were all initiated by public funds and the people of Manitoba had to be taxed for them. If they were successful, Mr. Speaker, if they were successful . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe the last remark is not quite correct and the Honourable Minister should not leave that impression when he says the people of Manitoba had to be taxed by them. If the Manitoba Development Fund in the past 10 years ran heavily in the red, certainly the people had to be taxed for it. But if the Manitoba Development Fund went out and sought foreign markets, foreign capital in New York and San Francisco, the direct onus of taxation on any of these funds did not fall on the direct taxation of the people of Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's - first it's not a point of order; secondly, it doesn't change anything that has been said as between the Member for Sturgeon Creek and myself. The Member for Sturgeon Creek said the same thing. He said that if the public goes into an industry and they use public funds, which is what has been done with everybody who's got money from the Development Fund, and the industry is not a success, the public will have to pay for it. The same is true of every industry that you have just spoken of. You say that if they don't make a success, if there is a loss, the public will have to pay for it. Well, that's exactly what the Member for Sturgeon Creek said this morning. The only difference is and there is only this difference, that if they do well in the one case, the person that you have propped up is the one that gets the benefit of that public investment whereas if they do badly, he loses it and then the position we are taking, if they do well, not only will the public have made the investment but they will also have reaped the returns of the investment.

MR. ENNS: A person doing well makes no contribution to the economy . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside said the person who does well - and he throws this out in a sarcastic way - I don't want to be unfair to him - he says he does nothing to contribute to the economy. I never said that. I think if a person does well . . .

MR. ENNS: You just finished saying that.

MR. GREEN: I never said that at all. I said that he keeps the benefit of that public investment. I'm not saying that having kept the benefit of that investment, he hasn't also done something useful. There's no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, I've never made any apology for doing well. I've said on that side of the House and I've said on this side of the House that I've always tried to make as much money as I can and I haven't been entirely unsuccessful. But I'm not saying that the public should not itself try and do well. When I was on that side of the House -- (Interjection) -- I'll be with you in a moment.

MR. FROESE: . . . permit a question ?

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. FROESE: The Minister stated that both private and government business uses public funds. Is it not a fact though that in connection with private business it's the investor's choice that they want to invest; on the other hand of the government, we determine here as a government, not the people.

MR. GREEN: I say that it's the public choice. You see the Member for Rhineland and I and the Member for Sturgeon Creek and I have a basic difference of opinion. He thinks that the government is something apart from the people. I say that the government and the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . Legislature is the best way of expressing the will of the people that I know of and if you had your way, the public would never have a choice as to what they should invest in. You would always say that the private individual should make the choice and I say that we are here for the purpose of giving the public something which they never had under the previous administrations. We are here to give the public a choice which they haven't had before and if the honourable member says that when he is here speaking it is he who is making the choice, then I say that that's the difference between his view as an MLA and my view as an MLA and, Mr. Speaker, if I'm wrong about this, I'm wrong about public insurance, I'm wrong about everything that I say. If I am wrong about the fact that when I am elected to the Legislature, I am here to respond to the people's will and to do the people's will and to give the people an opportunity that they haven't had before, if I'm wrong about that, then I am wrong about the other things. But I don't think that I'm wrong about that; I think that you fellows are wrong. I think that you fellows are wrong in thinking that you are there for the purpose of preventing the public to have a choice because that's what it amounts to. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Member for Lakeside. I agree and I have always accepted that challenge and I am willing to take every single program that has been initiated by this group or which will be initiated by myself as a Minister and I'm willing to test it on whether it is efficient, whether it is less expensive and whether it is more equitable. If it is those three things, then I say do it. And you people say, no, if it is those three things but it interferes with private business, don't do it.

Now that's the difference, Mr. Speaker, because I am prepared to say that for everything this bill makes possible, we have to prove that it was the best way of doing it, that it works, and I accept it because I have never dreamed that it would be otherwise. I accept the fact that everything that the government does within this piece of legislation has to be brought into the House, that the balance sheet of the Corporation has to be brought into the House, that it has to be reported first of all to the Minister, if necessary through a committee, and if that's the kind of an amendment that the Member for Portage la Prairie intends to move I have no objection and will not be opposing that kind of an amendment because I never dreamed that it would be otherwise.

I believe that everything we do, you know, people over there in the Conservative ranks could dream it would be otherwise because they took the position and the First Minister of this province, Mr. Roblin got up and said we appointed five respectable geniuses to the Manitoba Development Fund and we can give them a \$100 million and we have no right to ask them what they are doing with it, unless the law is changed. He claimed that that party, that administration passed the law which enabled them to give \$100 million or \$200 million to five respectable people and, Mr. Speaker, I can remember his words. When we questioned what these five respectable people were doing with the money, he said we have no right to ask. But why are you people suspicious? You know Morris Neaman or the other names that they mentioned. Who do you think these people are, the Three Stooges? That was his argument. And the Member for Arthur says that we are operating under a system which will enable people to spend money which they are not personally involved with. Those were the words of his speech and yet the previous administration - and I say to the Member for Arthur that everything that we do under this bill will have to be brought to the Legislature, the corporations, the balance sheet, their operations will be subject to scrutiny. If the Member for Portage la Prairie believes that it's not there now, we have no objection to an amendment of that kind. But the administration - take the Member for Arthur's words - they gave that much money, \$100 million to five people and then they said, we have no right to ask these people what they are doing with \$100 million. Well, he had a very good reason for saying that, because that \$100 million is the kind of money that was going to Churchill Forest Industries and which they had no intention of revealing and which I say to the honourable members in this House that had they revealed it, they wouldn't have got the support of their own back bench because that's the kind of a deal that it was. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention whatsoever . . .

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not mention the fact that the previous government had made the commitment of \$100 million, but I did say that \$100 million had been committed and that \$45 million had now and that this government presently would carry forward that program and make a further commitment of \$45 million and there's nobody has denied it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that all of the commitments for money - and this

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . was made clear before and I know the honourable member would like to get out of it - but all of the commitments for money to the Churchill Forest Industry's complex and I then deal with all the firms, were made prior to this administration coming into office. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact, that has been stated by the First Minister. . .

MR. WATT: Will the member permit a question? I ask you then if you say that the Churchill Forestry Industry program is wrong, that it is not in the best interest of the people of Manitoba, that in the Premier's words that it was a black day for Manitoba when that agreement was signed, why do you not salvage what is there now and call it \$45 million loss by Tory misjudgment and simply say we've lost \$45 million. we have no intentions of putting \$45 million more good money after bad. Answer that one.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the honourable members previously and if the member wants to get back into that debate we're prepared to do it. But the fact is that we have certain contractual commitments to that complex, we are not saying that it will be a failure; I have been the biggest booster -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I have never -- (Interjection) -- well, let the honourable members - Mr. Speaker, I stand here, let the honourable members find one word and I'm not exactly the least talkative person . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: No, not you Sid, no!

MR. GREEN: . . . let them find one word where I said that that proposition would fail and I am prepared to pay the honourable member \$100 on the spot if he'll find me one word where I said that proposition will fail. I have said and I repeat that I'm the biggest booster of that proposition. I hope that they will be a big success, I hope that they will be a big success . . . Mr. Speaker, will you ask the honourable member . . . on the point of privilege?

MR. WATT: On the point of privilege . . . I did not say that the honourable member said it was a failure, I referred to the remarks of the First Minister when he said it was a black day for the Province of Manitoba when that agreement was signed and it was -- why don't you make it white now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I doubt if the honourable member has a point of privilege. A misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of a statement made by an honourable member is not really a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: That fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I can accept the fact that this was the blackest day for the Province of Manitoba because I say that deal, on the face of it, is a bad deal for the Province of Manitoba, but I wish the complex all the success in the world because if they don't succeed, where will we get back the \$90 million? How can I help but wish them success? When Mr. Lytton came to my office, I wished him a big success. Really I'm wishing him a big success because I want the \$90 million back but that doesn't make it a bad deal from the outset. I say it's a bad, it was bad for anybody to have made that type of transaction and I repeat, if the details of that transaction were known to the back bench of the Conservative Party, it would never have been a transaction. That's why the First Minister got up and said, we can't ask these five men, these five people who are not, who are not the Three Stooges. -- (Interjection) -- Of course it's an assumption.

MR. CRAIK: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? May I ask the Honourable Minister if the agreement was not tabled in the House at the time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the agreement with regard to Churchill Forest Industries and the number of - the feet of lumber that they would get, that was tabled, but there was nothing tabled to show that the development was going to be financed by the money belonging to the people of Manitoba and as a matter of fact, the Minister at that time - and I was astounded to have read these remarks - the Minister implied that these people are so rich that they don't need any Manitoba money, they've got their own money and those were the words that he came out with, which the Member for Ste. Rose has quoted so many times in this House.

So that that part of the deal, what forestry rights they were getting and the fact that we had to count every tree for them - you know, somebody talked about that the government is going to do the research for them. Well, the government does the research now for many of these private firms. The Member for Arthur, I think, said the government will have to spend money on research for these Crown corporations. We spend money for research on wild rice, we count the trees for Churchill Forest Products at the rate of \$1,200,000 for three years. We build roads -- (Interjection) -- No, but we do research. We do mining explorations to the tune of roughly \$400,000 for the mining corporations. We do those things that the Member for Sturgeon Creek is talking about and all that we are saying here in this bill is that we are

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . opening up a dimension, we are saying that we will have available to us - and this is what the members are really afraid of and the hysteria and the fear has just been oozing out from that side of the House - that we will have available to us, in addition to every other option, an option of saying this should be developed by the people themselves. And what's so wrong with that option, Mr. Speaker? I've often said, you know - and it's been held against me by the Left New Democratic Youth that Mr. Green said in the Legislature and it was during my years in opposition, I have no objection to a private enterpriser coming in, investing his money and making money in Manitoba. But what I do object to is the Government of the Province of Manitoba putting up all the money for some private enterpriser to make money.

Now, would any businessmen take a different approach than I am taking? Does the Member for Sturgeon Creek know any businessman who's prepared to advance 100 percent of the cost of a project and not participate in the project other than loan, because I've never met one and I've dealt with businessmen for 18 years and nobody lends 100 percent of the value unless they are a partner in the business or unless the interest rate is such that they are really getting more out of it than a straight loan and in this case that's not the case. The interest rate for much of the money was below the market rate. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, at that time - and that's what the Member for Sturgeon Creek is not aware, but that's what sparked the debates in the House - it was a question by the now Minister of Finance, the then Member for St. John's who found out that the interest rate on the \$3-1/2 million which was the first advance, was 6-1/2 percent and that the market was at least that or the money that we were borrowing, that the rate that we were borrowing was approximately those figures.

MR. ENNS: Will the member permit a question? But that the rate of 6-1/2 percent was above the cost of the money borrowed by the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the monies that were being borrowed, loaned by the Fund - I hope I've got my grammar correct - the monies being used by the Fund at that time were being used at a rate which was comparable to the rate at which monies were being advanced. It was higher at the date of the loan but it's lower now and it was comparable at the time of the question but I don't want to go into that a great deal. The fact is that it may be necessary under the scheme that the member - if pursuing the scheme that the Member for Sturgeon Creek is pursuing, that if you can't entice them by normal loan and you want the industrial development and you're depending on free enterprise and you're not prepared, you're doctrinairely not prepared to have a Crown corporation then you've got to do something of that nature. You've got well - the Federal Government is giving them \$15 million or they're entitled to \$15 million in grants from the Federal Government or you've got to give them a preferred interest rate or you've got to give them preferred taxation; you've got to give them something to entice them to come. If we are to proceed on the basis that you suggest and we are unable to attract capital because Saskatchewan is willing to give a little more than Manitoba is, or Ontario's got a nicer law, then you've got to come back and give them something and we are saying, rather than resign ourselves to the fact that we're going to have to pay a higher price, we want one additional vehicle and that vehicle is a Crown corporation.

The Member for Rhineland on the one hand, he says that we should tax our mining companies, we should increase the royalties and let us assume, you know, that the royalties are now 11 percent, let's assume that we made them 22 percent or 30 percent. Eventually the Member for Rhineland would have to say, well if they won't develop for these royalties, there's no choice but to develop it ourselves unless you reduce the royalties. You've got to do one or the other and all we are saying, Mr. Speaker, and I -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, we don't intend to do nothing and I am not - you see it may be that the Member for Lakeside considers doing nothing a legitimate alternative but I don't consider it a legitimate alternative. The fact is that he says - I say that you have to do one or the other.

MR. ENNS: . . . years experience in Saskatchewan have proved this.

MR. GREEN: One of the things that I have learned if I've learned anything - some members will say well you haven't learned anything - but the fact is that it's good to have as many options as possible and we here will have another option and if my honourable friends are right in saying that we are going to be developing all of Northern Manitoba with Crown corporations, I say it's wonderful. I don't see it myself. I wish I could be as optimistic as they are but we will have one other option and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the true doctrinaires have been smoked out by this bill because this bill doesn't give the Manitoba government any

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . power that it doesn't already have and if it has been a vehicle to smoke out the pathological doctrinaires of the opposition, maybe it has served the purpose. Because, Mr. Speaker, the biggest joke that we could play on the Opposition, if we were in the mood to play jokes, would be to say let's not proceed with this legislation but let's develop with Crown corporations those areas which we want to develop just to prove to them that their fear of the legislation is nothing but hysteria because that's what it is, Mr. Speaker. It's nothing but hysteria. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, he keeps talking about Saskatchewan. He knows that there was a box factory went broke in Saskatchewan.

MR. McKENZIE: Shoe factory.

MR. GREEN: Or a shoe factory went broke in Saskatchewan.

MR. McKENZIE: Brick factory.

MR. GREEN: Yes, a horse meat factory went broke. You know Brandon Packers went broke here in Manitoba. Brandon Packers went broke here in Manitoba; they were not a Crown corporation. Prudential Acceptance went broke -- (Interjection) -- I hope I'm using the right term here - Atlantic Acceptance went broke at costs of literally hundreds of thousands of dollars more to the people of Canada. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me?

MR. WATT: What about Pool Packers?

MR. GREEN: Pool Packers? Mr. Speaker, Pool Packers is a co-operative or was a co-operative - I don't know how they came along but I know what happened with Brandon Packers. I could you know, recite that story. I know that thousands and thousands of firms have gone broke from time to time at costs to the public. Nobody else pays but the public when those firms go broke. Mr. Speaker, in 1929, the whole economy of the United States went broke and as a result of that economy you had a depression and I've said this in the House before but it bears repeating because as the Premier says "repetition is the mother of learning". The whole economy of the free enterprise world went broke as a result of the reasons that are being advocated by members on the opposite side that this is the way the economy should be run, because Herbert Hoover said exactly the same thing as the Member for Sturgeon Creek says. You could take the two people, you could compare their speeches and they were exactly the same. -- (Interjection) -- yes. And the fact is as a result of them going broke, millions of dollars were lost, people committed suicide and other such things. You had a depression that was the worst economic depression that the world has ever known. It probably had a great deal to do with the coming into being of the Second World War where 30 million people lost their lives and the Honourable Member for Roblin is preoccupied with a box factory going broke. I just don't understand his perspective. -- (Interjection) -- The fact is that it is possible and I am not going to stand here and say that everything that the public will do will earn money and I can't think that members of the opposite side will say that everything that private enterprise will do will make money. And when they lose, in both cases the public pays.

All we are saying, Mr. Speaker - I'm glad that the Members of the Liberal Party are at least a little more willing to be objective about this piece of legislation than members of the Conservative Party - all we are doing is we are creating another option. It still depends on the people of the Province of Manitoba as to whether that will be used or not. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, although I wasn't really too enthusiastic about the bill when it went in, I am very enthusiastic about it now especially by what has been said by the members of the Opposition with regard to it.

MR. ENNS: . . . member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? In the latter part of his speech he made much ado about the leaving open the various options for action and I agree with that. Can he explain how he can be assured that the options of private enterprise will be available to the government if the government pursues certain lines of action, particularly where by law they exclude activity such as in Bill 56 of the other option that he speaks of?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, first of all with regard to this bill that we are presenting - I find the argument rather difficult - with regard to the bill that we are presenting the argument of the opposition members has been that you are putting up a Crown corporation to compete with private enterprise and that's their big argument. There's nothing in this bill which says that there will be an exclusive situation such as we have with Churchill Forest Industries given to private enterprise by the previous administration. There's nothing in this bill to say that. And if we say that, members of the Opposition or all members of the Legislature will be able to say we shouldn't do it just as they have said with regard to Bill 56, so that I am not as fearful as honourable members opposite that private enterprise will not be able to compete with us.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . I think that private enterprise will compete. They are being permitted the full scope of development at the present time and nobody is stopping them from doing it and we don't see that there's going to be any letting up of activity, not because we are in the government; it's not because they like Mr. Schreyer, it's because they like the resources that are available in the north upon which they can make money and they're welcome to come in and on reasonable terms attempt to see what they can do with regard to those resources. Nothing has stopped that and this bill doesn't stop that.

With regard to Bill 56, an interesting fact came up the other day. The Chief of the Insurance Bureau - and it's interesting, Mr. Speaker - he got up and he says that "the government has got a licence to steal." How does he know? How does he know? Because he's got the licence now. What he is worried about is the assignment of the licence. He's not worried about the licence; he's worried that the licence is being taken away. But he said something else that was very interesting. He said the Province of Saskatchewan, they wanted to come and sell insurance in the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Manitoba rightly refused them to come to Manitoba. Who wants that corporation selling insurance in Manitoba?

Well, Mr. Speaker, how can they say this after all this argument about freedom of choice? They did not want to compete with the Province of Saskatchewan Insurance Corporation selling in the Province of Manitoba, so they prohibited them, the very same people who now yell about freedom of choice. Mr. Speaker, with some of the people - and I don't say this is true of every free enterpriser because I know some who are pretty tough and who can make their way; the first person who spoke to us at Public Utilities Committee indicated he'll make his way - but with some of them they say, rugged individualism, free enterprise means every man for himself, as the elephant said when he danced among the chickens, and that's really their philosophy. Mr. Speaker, all we are saying is that there's going to be another option available to the people of Manitoba so that they can say, as the Member for Lakeside now says, that if you do this, if the public does this, we will cut your water off or we will cut your capital off or we will remove our premises from your province. We want to be in a position where we have something to say about what economic premises stay in Manitoba and what do not stay, and the only way you can have something to say is to have some economic control, and we are going for only a very small bit of economic control but it brings out hysterical comments from members of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit one more question? It's really concerning a statement you made about the congratulations and the wishing well of C.F.I. Do you not think the government's wishing well on one hand is good, but every time they get the chance they try to shoot their head off with a shotgun?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I have been around business people too long to think that they are affected by remarks like that in the newspaper. This transaction that they entered in, they knew full well what they were doing; they knew full well that it would be the subject of legislative debate; they knew full well that there would be extreme controversy as to whether what was done was a right thing or was a wrong thing; and with open eyes and knowing all these things, they decided to accept \$100 million. And that's because they are like the stage actor who really is not concerned with what people say - and he uses the expression, "don't applaud, just throw money". I say that they are hard-headed enough to go into business whether or not there is applause or not, if there's money to be made.

MR. WATT: Would the Minister permit a question? The Minister indicated in his remarks that the insurance companies in the Province of Manitoba now have the licence to steal. Is he indicating that they are stealing from the people of Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that that's what the Insurance Bureau said, that the government is seeking a licence to steal. And then I repeat, I said how does he know? Because he's got the licence now. That's what I said.

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

MR. WATT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Burtiniak, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, and Uruski.

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.)

NAYS: Messrs. Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Graham, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Watt, and Weir.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether we should ascertain whether the vote of the Member for Elmwood has been recorded . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I understand his vote was recorded.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 29, Nays, 16.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 43, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member from Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to delay this discussion but rather record my feelings toward Bill 43. Much has been said on both sides of the argument, but I fail to see how we can compare the operation of this Legislature with that of Ottawa, in the degree that is outlined in this legislation before us. I know that the ministers in their function have heavy responsibilities, but they have ways and means by which they can receive or hire the assistance that they need, plus the deputy ministers and such other people that may be required.

Now insofar as the indemnity is concerned for the proposed five assistants, I wonder if this is not setting up a situation whereby members are being, would you say, discriminated against? It has been said on the government side of the House, and it is worth repeating, that you have the thirteen ministers, then you have appointments to four boards. And then as has been suggested, that there are three members on the government side that get \$1,500 northern allowance, plus the five assistants and you, Sir, make a total of 26 out of 28 which suggests, and although it may not be the intent, that to be on the government side of the House privileges are extended that are not extended to others. Insofar as the expenses of a member are concerned, it has been extensively outlined that those that are representing their constituencies in so many ways, as well as being in the House, are put to considerable expense. I'm inclined to agree with the words of the Honourable Member for Riel, that rather than have a bill such as this, that the entire matter of indemnities be reviewed. It was suggested by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell this morning also that an effort could be made in this direction.

I know in my own particular case, Mr. Speaker, with the session last spring and then the session in the fall, plus the fact that I was appointed to the Northern Task Force, it was unfortunate that I was not able to attend all the meetings throughout northern Manitoba, but I did my best to serve whenever I could, having in mind my personal responsibilities at home. There were others that could attend all the meetings and did attend all the meetings, and I congratulate them for doing so, but it was because of the fact that I had personal responsibilities, a small business and what goes with it, that I felt that I couldn't give the time. If this suggestion that is being put forward that five assistants should be appointed, it will not be too long, Mr. Speaker, before there will be inroads made and that will be extended beyond that number. I feel confident that the other eight ministers in due course will see to it that they have an assistant too, and in my own small way, I am trying to indicate to you the situation that is going to develop out of it all.

The Honourable Member for Churchill made mention this morning of deputy ministers sitting below the ministers themselves in the handling of estimates. The committee that sat on the rules have recommended this, Mr. Speaker, and that has not come before the House so far. I wonder, Sir, if the assistants' indemnity will include or will it be over and above the \$20 per day allowance, per diem allowance allowed to members that sit on committees between sittings? Again I say that no member of this House should have a monetary advantage over the other because he happens to be in the Opposition. I don't want to give the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we all realized when we accepted the nomination and were appointed, or at least elected to the House, that certain sacrifices had to be made. We all did this. I personally am very proud to be elected and very proud to serve, realizing above everything else that I would have to make sacrifices and I am willingly making those sacrifices, and I have not risen in my place today with a view to putting forward my own case with the thought of influencing the government in any way of increasing the indemnity but rather to see to it that there is fairness on all sides and advantages should not be allowed to be taken because one happens to be a member of the government.

(MR. BILTON cont'd.)

I am not saying this, Sir, in any disrespect to the First Minister and those associated with him in the front bench, but I would appeal to them most sincerely to keep this in mind because it is giving a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction. We are all here for a purpose to serve the people and again I say with all sincerity that I would much rather see the whole situation of indemnities looked into, and as suggested by the Member for Birtle-Russell this morning, by an independent body outside of this House. Surely in that way, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province will be satisfied as to the outcome of any recommendations, be they up or be they down, but I feel that an impartial body set up for this purpose would be far better than having legislation such as this coming forward from time to time which creates that cleavage which to my way of thinking is unfortunate for this Legislative Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable First Minister will be closing debate.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments that were made by members during the course of debate on Bill 43. I must say that I believe I heard the remarks of just about everyone who has spoken on this debate. It strikes me that some honourable members are confusing what are really two separate issues here. I know many members who have spoken have suggested that the matter of members' indemnity is something that should be treated at this time as well, and I certainly am not going to argue with that contention, because I can accept the argument that there must be a better way of dealing with the question of determining members' indemnities. I believe that the Committee on Rules has taken this matter under consideration and has recommended, or is about to recommend, that members' indemnities be dealt with by a body apart from this assembly, by an independent commission not unlike the one that was established twelve years ago or thirteen years ago, to determine electoral boundaries. If that's the view of the honourable members, certainly I do not quarrel with it.

That is one approach; the other is to take the base of the members' indemnities and in the absence of any other arrangement, in the face of failure to agree in any other arrangements, to simply take the cost of living index and apply it to the base that we now have established and live with that. That is another alternative. Although I suppose honourable members would be interested to know that in Ontario, although I can't swear to it, I understand that in Ontario they have adopted a procedure in determining members' indemnities whereby the amount is related to that of the Civil Service wage schedule, and annual increases are in accordance with the level of increase for the comparable levels of income in the Civil Service. This has not been formally adopted yet, certainly it has been discussed seriously in this manner in the Ontario Legislature.

My colleague the Minister of Labour shows me that in the report of the Committee on Rules that met on the 10th of March last and which reported to the House, in Recommendation 19, the committee recommended that members' indemnities be referred to an outside independent body and that this body consider all relevant legislative duties and remunerations or expenses in carrying out the functions of a member of the assembly, and I certainly concur with the general spirit of that recommendation. It is just a case of getting agreement on both sides of the House that this is the best way to proceed.

But having said all that, I still must make this point, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the function of Legislative Assistant or Parliamentary Secretary is something which relates to the executive branch of government. Honourable members who would argue that this is an additional expense on the public purse, I would simply indicate to them that it is cheaper, significantly cheaper, less expensive, to proceed by way of having four legislative assistants assist ministers than it would be to appoint simply one additional Minister of the Crown. What is the approximate cost of appointing an additional Minister of the Crown? I estimate it to be somewhere in the order of 15 to 20 thousand dollars per year. Approximately 15 thousand in terms of Minister's salary without MLA's indemnity and then the expense of office accommodation, staff and expense allowance, it certainly does take it over the 20 thousand dollar mark. I had it in mind, Mr. Speaker, and quite frankly I thought I could get concurrence of honourable members opposite that it was an experiment worth attempting and one that would cost the public purse less than half of appointing an additional Minister.

I know the Member for Birtle-Russell made the argument this morning that it might well

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . be that there is need to increase the number of ministers. He suggested that the Department of Health and Social Development was one example of a department that was too large. I can think of one or two others that are really too large for the easy administrative operation by one Minister. But I say, Sir, and I say it with the complete satisfaction that I have the figures right, that it is more expensive to appoint one additional Minister of the Crown, twice as expensive in fact than it would be to have four legislative assistants assisting those Ministers who have particularly heavy and onerous administrative responsibilities.

The Member for Swan River argues that having established four, the pressure would be on to have additional numbers, other Ministers would insist on it. I'd like to say to the Honourable Member for Swan River that the appointments come under the Executive Government Organization Act and can be done only with the concurrence of the First Minister; and I can tell my honourable friend now that there is absolutely no intention of increasing the number further, in fact there is a possibility -- well, it would have to be done by amendment to the Act; it would have to be brought here before the Assembly -- and I'd like my honourable friend to know that having given that undertaking now, it would be most embarrassing, would it not, to come back a year or two or three later, or whoever is First Minister a year or two or three later, asking that this be increased.

I will agree to this, Mr. Speaker, that the practice at the Federal level is one that does not apply with complete relevance to the Provincial scene. After all the size of operation of the Government of Canada is much larger. Parliament itself is approximately four times that of this House. The fact remains that since 1958 when the function of Parliamentary Secretary was introduced to Ottawa by a former Prime Minister who I'm sure is well known to the Honourable Member for Swan River - it was introduced in 1958 - it is found to be a function that is worthwhile, and I am sure that the Honourable Member for Morris would be one of the first to vouch for that statement, he having served as Parliamentary Secretary for a period of about four years.

Now I fully admit that there would be no justification for having 12 or 13 Legislative Assistants, but, Mr. Speaker I've no embarrassment, no compunction whatsoever about asking for approval to have four, because the two that have been operating as Legislative Assistants since last Fall, albeit without any pay and at their own expense, certainly there has been a great deal of work and public service that they have performed. The Member for St. Boniface when he spoke the other day may not have gone into very much detail but he certainly is in a position to outline the way in which a Legislative Assistant can be very helpful and very busy in the public service. The amount of money, honourable gentlemen, that we're talking about is \$10,000.00. It's in the estimates of Supply - \$10,000 is the grand total. Therefore, if we should decide to appoint the full complement that is asked in this legislation, which would be four not five. -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. BILTON: I didn't question the cost. I questioned the principle. I wonder why he is arguing the cost item at this point.

MR. SCHREYER: Well I had the impression, Sir, that while the Member for Swan River may not have put much emphasis on the cost factor, one or two honourable members did, and so I'm really replying more to them than to the Member for Swan River at the moment.

The amount of expense allowance that there would be entitlement for would be in accordance with the same level of expense allowances that is accorded to anyone in the public service. It's upon voucher, upon proof of expense incurred, and the expenses would be paid not to the honourable member but directly to the source of the billing. This would be a procedure that I think would help to keep things simple and would also be a way of ensuring that there was no additional emolument being enjoyed by the honourable member. It would be upon submission of invoice of expense. The money would have to be accounted for, be paid out and would have to be accounted for through the usual accounting channels, the Provincial Auditor's office, and would be entered for course into Public Account, in our annual statement of Public Accounts which is tabled for public perusal each year. So I'm not really worried about any escalation in expense costs, just a case of reimbursing for out-of-pocket expenses. That's really what it amounts to. The emolument would be a fraction of \$10,000; in other words if there are four, it would be \$2,500 maximum per Legislative Assistant. This is scaled down somewhat from the Ottawa practice but then again in many ways we can't hope to compare nor should we even try to compare with Ottawa's practices and levels of indemnities and emoluments paid in that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . jurisdiction.

Now I must say that the Member for Ste. Rose and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, they interpreted the contents of Section 17 in particular, in a way far broader than the intent is, and therefore just to make sure that there can be no mistake about it, there will be amendments offered in committee stage simply to assert and make clear that the terms of this bill do not extend the powers of the government to appoint members to yet more boards and commissions. This Bill 43 does not change that at all; only by way of amendment to a specific act, like the Hydro Act or the Telephone Act or the Water Control Act will it be possible for the government, if it wanted to, to appoint an MLA to boards or commissions. Bill 43 does not, I insist to honourable members, does not extend powers of government in that respect one iota. All it does do is clarify - that's really the intent of the section in question, to clarify the present provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act. There is an anomaly in the Act, I say for information of honourable members, in that the terms of the Legislative Assembly Act authorize the government to pay certain kinds of allowances, salaries and indemnities and expenses, but there is no clear provision in the Act that members may accept without raising some doubts as to their eligibility to continue sitting as a member of the Assembly. In fact the Legislative Assembly Act as it presently is worded, specifically precludes a member from accepting certain kinds of emoluments and expense allowances; and in the past from time to time doubt has arisen as to the propriety and the legality of certain honourable members having accepted certain payments from the Crown. As a case in point, I can recall one occasion when the Member for Ste. Rose and my colleague the Minister of Labour when he was Leader of the New Democratic Party, they both were asked to attend along with the government of the day on a certain delegation to Ottawa relative to Air Canada. The two honourable members went on this delegation. Expenses were paid on their behalf for lodging and food while they were in Ottawa, and air fare. I've been advised by law officers that while the Crown has the authority to make such payments on their behalf, they seriously question whether under the terms of the Legislative Assembly Act they had any right to accept such payments of expenses on their behalf; and that's the kind of anomaly that Section 17 is intended to remove for all time. And just to make sure that it is not used for any other purpose other than that, the amendment offered in committee will stipulate that nothing, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 17, nothing in the Act is to authorize the government to appoint a member of the Assembly to any statutory Board, commission or body offering remuneration, etc. Now that should take care of that fear that was expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that Section 17 could be used as an opening by the government to appoint MLA's in all manner of means to all manner and means of bodies and commission. That's not the intent and even the possibility of that door being opened will be closed by the amendment that will be offered.

I go on to make a couple of other observations relative to comments made by honourable members - yes, the Member for Roblin was asking why it was that the Bill had not been proceeded with earlier. I want to explain to the honourable member that the bill was given second reading - June 11th when it was introduced for second reading and -- (Interjection) -- Right. I'm advised by my colleague that therefore it must have been distributed a couple of days or more prior to that, so let us say approximately the 9th of June; it was introduced for second reading on the 11th, the Leader of the Opposition spoke on it on the 22nd, ten days later, so he had ample time. The Honourable Member for Roblin had ample time as well. I take it that wasn't his complaint that there wasn't enough time to peruse it. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well I have a very good reason which I do not mind telling my honourable friend about, and it is simply that I wanted to proceed with this bill after the passing of the Executive Government Organization Act because I regarded that as a companion bill to this; and I'll tell you why. Because in the Executive Government Organization Act, which was drafted in the first instance by the former government and which we adopted, there are far more powers given to the Cabinet, to the executive branch, than we are seeking in Bill 43, so I really cannot understand the argument of my honourable friends when they complain that Bill 43 is giving Cabinet too much power to better organize the administration of government, when they're prepared to give authority for much more sweeping powers in the Executive Government Organization Act. By virtue of that Act it is possible for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to terminate departments, establish new ones, shift activities from one department to another without any legislation coming before this House; and yet there wasn't too much opposition, if any, to that kind of bestowing of authority on the Cabinet. Yet here we're limiting the request simply to the authority to appoint four members of the Assembly as assistants to existing Ministers; there seems to be a great -

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . to use a colloquial expression - a big hang-up about it. And why should there be, in light of the practice, the experience of the past 12 years in Ottawa?

I know that the Member for Morris has been strangely ambivalent on this Bill 43, because on the one hand he has said in this House, not when speaking to Bill 43 but prior to that, he has been heard to say that the function of Parliamentary Secretary as practiced in the Federal scene has justified itself and that when he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Honourable Alvin Hamilton he justified himself in that role. That being so, I think that the Member for Morris, not being an egotist has no right to think that other members here are not capable of justifying their role as Legislative Assistant.

I do accept his second argument which was that we must be careful not to have as many Legislative Assistants as there are Ministers. Well in Ottawa there happens to be that same number of Parliamentary Secretaries as there are Ministers. My honourable friend I'm sure is out of date, because I - well, I wouldn't want to bet on it but I feel quite . . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: May I just interrupt and tell the First Minister that I checked just yesterday and find out that there are 14 Parliamentary Secretaries.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there are 14 Parliamentary Secretaries in a House of 265 then it would seem more or less proportionate to have four here out of a House of 57. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Well that's - 14 over 26 is 4 over 13 - I still insist that the proportion is -- well obviously Mr. Speaker, the proportion is not far out of line; in fact the proportion probably argues in favour of the modesty of our proposal here.

Now, let it be clear, the intention is that the assistants that would be provided by virtue of this bill would be not confined to the length of the session of the Legislative Assembly but would be for that period of time plus a good part of the rest of the calendar year; and in addition to that I indicated the approximate range of indemnity, it would be about - or extra emolument - it would be about \$2,500.00. In terms of expenses, that would be on production of vouchers, just as expenses up until now are paid for under existing administrative arrangements, subject to approval by the Provincial Auditor's office, the Comptroller's office, and publishable in Public Accounts. So really I don't think that we are weakening in any way the control of the purse nor are we opening up Pandora's Box that will result in any significant increase in cost to the public purse.

I say once more, and I think it bears repetition, that the appointment of one additional Minister alone would cost the public purse more than the experiment I have before honourable members here contained in Bill 43; and I would be among the first to suggest to honourable members that if the experiment was not proving out, if it was not justifying its continuance then we would be under no obligation to perpetuate it. I think that members who have any interest at all in experimentation, innovation in the interests of seeking new and better ways of doing things, should want to give this proposal a try.

Now I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by coming back to the matter of members' indemnities. I think that honourable members have a valid point when they suggest that there is a better way of dealing with the question of members' indemnities. But it's not just the question of indemnities, there are other matters which could better be done and should be looked at by the committee on rules or any outside independent body, and that has to do with the rather outmoded provision we have now with respect to members' travelling expenses. I believe the present provision is that they are to receive expense of travel reimbursed to them only for coming to the Session and for leaving of it, and in our day and age any member worth his salt has to travel back and forth within the province, particularly between the Capitol and his riding and certainly elsewhere in the province much more than that. So that provision has to be updated as well.

Secretarial service. I think we have come to a time when we should not be quibbling as to whether or not members of an opposition party are entitled to a year round secretary. I think that a block of money should be available for that purpose, whether the caucus of that party wishes to use it primarily for stenographic and secretarial work, or whether they want to use it partly for that and partly for research is up to them. That is something that should be changed and again my colleague the Minister of Labour advises me that the Committee on Rules has recommended certain changes in that respect as well.

Well, those are the kinds of things that should be changed, and to make those changes I suspect has to be done by way of amendment to either the Legislative Assembly Act more than likely; and similarly the proposal I have here in Bill 43, requiring an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act, is simply to bring forward a new idea of modest cost within very well defined limits which I feel can bring about just a little better administration of public affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable First Minister would permit one more question just for clarification. He talks in terms of a stipend of \$2,500 for the assistant plus any expenses that are documented. If he is given an assignment in the name of the government, does he also get the \$20 expense which is a statutory allowance today for members that are working on committees.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps to clarify that it would require an additional amendment in committee. Certainly a member who is attending on committee work - is that what the honourable member is referring to?

MR. BILTON: Assignment by the government on some particular proposition that may develop, that the government decides that he should represent the government on or something of that nature.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, clearly a person who is assigned on some public responsibility of one kind or another can not be receiving for the same period of time two separate expense accounts.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have one question if the First Minister would permit me. In his remarks he mentioned that the government has wide ranging powers and some of the legislation we've passed this session is granting additional powers to -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but in other bills we've granted extra powers to various Ministers. So then with the Civil Service as staff, you know, to back up the treasury, would it not be fair for me to ask the First Minister, don't the opposition need some help of various natures to be able to qualify themselves and their debate or . . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's why I said towards the end of my remarks that it was time for us to provide for secretarial assistance and/or research assistants to opposition members through their respective caucuses.

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

MR. FROESE: Being out of the Chamber during the first couple of minutes that the Premier spoke, did he indicate to the House as to how many assistants would be appointed during the current fiscal year?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the committee has been concurred in and agreement can be reached, we are ready to proceed. I know that the honourable member's - probably his next question is will he be entitled to some such assistance, and the honourable member, to be fair, realizes what a difficult position we are in relative to himself. However, perhaps we can work out some kind of proportionate arrangement which wouldn't result in very much money but at least perhaps would be satisfying to the honourable member for other reasons.

MR. WATT: Could I ask the First Minister a question? Do you suppose that an executive assistant to the Minister of Agriculture would offer some incentive for him to call the Committee on Agriculture, or would it just give him the possibility of ranging a little farther out than Rome.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I know the Honourable Member for Arthur well enough to know when he is being serious and when he is looking for a rise out of someone.

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

MR. WEIR: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Burtniak, Cherniack, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

NAYS: Messrs. Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Graham, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Watt and Weir.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 30; Nays, 16.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the honourable members that Public Utilities Committee meets at 8:00 P. M. tonight and I would move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

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