

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, July 21, 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; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Department of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 43, No. 121, No. 134, No. 17, No. 39.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the

A MEMBER: Whoa! Whoa! Whoa! Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Orders have been called, but if the honourable member's question can't possibly wait till this evening when this will happen again then I would certainly not want to be technical and let the question be asked.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Orders have been called, but I was on my feet, so I believe the question is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister or the government received a request from the homeowners in Heritage Park in respect to the low rental housing - for a review of the low rental housing development?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Yes, there was a request in the form of a letter from the solicitor from the Homeowners Association, Mr. Haig, requesting that there be a review in respect to the decision to proceed with the development in Heritage Park.

MR. PATRICK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government carried out the review or is it under consideration at the present time?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, we are proceeding with the development and my reply has gone to Mr. Haig who had written the earlier letter indicating this.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary. Did you say the review has been completed or you're conducting a review right now?

MR. PAWLEY: No, the decision is to proceed with the development. The reasons expounded in the earlier letter from Mr. Haig in our opinion were not sufficient reasons for any change in respect to plans of locating the development in Heritage Park.

MR. PATRICK: Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker. There's no review, you're proceeding with the low rental development at the present time - that it's proceeding? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Yes Mr. Speaker, I have a question to you, Sir, if you accept its propriety. We've noted latterly that you have reclaimed or used the seat reserved for the Member for Burrows from time to time and I was wondering whether there was any special significance to that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism. Has the Minister anything further to tell us about the proposed second national park in Manitoba?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism & Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, we're still studying the whole project and as soon as we have some more concrete answers to give the House we will do that as soon as we possibly can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Could he inform us as to how long the extension has been made for in cutting forage crops under the LIFT program?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(LacDu Bonnet): I'm not sure that there

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) has been an extension made, Mr. Speaker. I can check for the honourable member if he wishes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. When the Minister is talking about a second national park for the Province of Manitoba, would he at the same time consider the repeated requests made by the people in western Manitoba for a road through the "first" national park that is presently in the Dauphin area?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member well knows that if that is the situation - and I'm well aware of the road's condition through the first national park - I would suggest that he get in touch with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. When he's pursuing the question of the extension on the cutting of forage crops, could he undertake to consult with the federal government and not the NDP caucus on this occasion?

MR. USKIW: I think it's probably advisable to undertake to consult with many people but I think that there is some misunderstanding here as to the question put by the Honourable Member for Pembina. There is no such thing as an extension for the cutting of forage crops. I think the honourable member is referring to cover crops which must be destroyed by a certain date. My understanding is that that period was extended because of wet weather conditions but subject to a decision at any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): The other day, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Riel asked me a question in connection with a notice that was sent out to licensees by the Liquor Control Commission which indicated that beverage rooms, those who held beverage rooms licenses might be able to receive a dining room liquor license - pardon me, those who hold a dining room liquor license might receive a beverage room license. My understanding is, the information given to me by the Liquor Control Commission is that the Act as it formerly stood prior to any amendments made this session gave the Liquor Control Commission that authority, and it was used only on one occasion so far as the records indicate and that wasn't successful, and it's the intent of the commission not to issue beverage room licenses to those who merely hold dining room liquor licenses. The beverage room license has been used primarily in association with the development of hotel or motels and it's intended that the former practice will be continued.

There was one other question that was asked by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell in respect to regulations or provisions in respect to beverage rooms who apply for licenses to sell liquor as provided under the new amendment, and as I indicated I believed there would be upgrading conditions stipulated and that information has been confirmed to me. In addition, there will be regulations specifying the manner of the dispensation and delivery of the liquor in a shot glass at the table and so on; the particulars will be spelled out to the various applicants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question in the same general area to the Attorney-General and ask him whether it has been possible to come to any conclusions yet as to the success of the move under which purchase slips for liquor purchases have been abolished in the self-serve stores in the Metropolitan area. Has it been possible to come to any conclusion as to the success of that move and as to a possible extension of that move?

MR. MACKLING: I haven't had a report on that yet, but I think that it was fairly obvious that the abolition of the sales slip in the self-serve store would expedite the handling of purchases by the customer. I expect that in due course there will be an analysis of this, or there'll be further comment on this, and perhaps some recommendations in respect to the other stores to either simplify the process or otherwise. At the present time in those stores which are not self-serve there has to be an order given and the Clerk takes the order and fills it, so it seems that the slip is still of considerable usefulness.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Attorney-General advise the House whether it is the hope of his department to phase out the regular stores and replace them with self-serve stores on a total basis?

MR. MACKLING: As I announced during the course of my estimates, Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial change. The self-serve stores have been expanded and it's possible and probable that that development will continue. To what extent it's possible to completely phase out the old type of store I can't say at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. He was right in that it's in relation to the cover crop?

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes. The question is, how much time has this been extended and what do the farmers do to find out and to make application for it?

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm not aware of the specific details but I do recall some news item in the newspapers which indicated it was an extension of time to overcome the period of wet weather conditions. Now I would assume common sense would apply from there.

MR. HENDERSON: A supplementary question. Who do they apply to in connection with getting this extension?

MR. USKIW: Well this is an extension which is broadly implemented across the three prairie provinces wherein there is weather conditions which prevent the completion of that program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, who do they refer to when they want to say that they can't cut it and they'll have to have an extension? Who do they refer to?

MR. USKIW: Well I think it was announced as a general policy that the time period has been extended; it's not on an individual basis. -- (Interjection) -- Was the question to whom or to which office is the -- I don't believe an application is necessary. I think the time period has simply been extended. I don't think one has to make a formal application for an extension of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Finance, but in his absence I'll direct it to the First Minister. Can the First Minister indicate whether any portion of the six million dollars that was to be made available to the Versatile Manufacturing Company has been in fact forwarded to them at this time?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): The honourable member perhaps would like to take advantage of the opportunity to rephrase the question slightly. Was he asking about the availability of the six million?

MR. ENNS: No Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to clarify the question. My question is simply whether any portion of the funding arrangements that were tabled in the House some time ago with reference to six million dollars for Versatile has in fact -- no, has any installment of that money from the Manitoba Development Fund been given over to the Versatile Manufacturing Company Limited?

MR. LEONARD EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question. As of the last information I had received they had not drawn anything from the Fund, although the monies are available as per the original agreement, but this is the last information I have.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I'm at a loss to which Minister but I'll try the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the government any knowledge of why the company would seem not to be requiring this money? There was, as you will recall, some sense of urgency at the time with respect to expansion plans for the company which we assumed the money was being asked for.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the honourable member's question is that after the agreement was entered into by the firm in question they discovered to their pleasant surprise that they didn't really need the money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I wonder if he has anything further to report with regard to the overpass proposed on 200 at Emerson?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Finance Minister. Can he advise whether he or his department are making

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) formal representation to the federal committee on the White Paper that's presently in Winnipeg?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): No, Mr. Speaker, unless you want me to make a speech right now. I think they're probably all here.

MR. CRAIK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Has the committee in any way, or the federal department been advised of the 100 percent increase in mining taxation that's taken place in Manitoba in the last week?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer that it deserves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture has contacted any authority in Ottawa in regard to the millions of pounds of meat products that are presently enroute for Canada from Australia that might conceivably be dumped in Manitoba because of the American restrictions on imports to that country?

MR. USKIW: I might ask my honourable friend if he has contacted members in Ottawa as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Agriculture a supplementary question? Who is the authority in the Province of Manitoba in regard to agriculture at the present moment, or have we got one?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member is completely out of order.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. As we're only ten days away from the 1969-70 crop year, would you contact The Canadian Wheat Board to make sure whether the farmers will be able to deliver their four-bushel quota?

MR. USKIW: I think that my honourable friends ought to know that the Government of Canada has given some assurance that they expect that they will reach a four-bushel quota this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the NDP caucus have given that assurance to the Minister in Ottawa?

MR. USKIW: If my honourable friend would like, I would entertain the idea of having a telex sent to the NDP caucus in Ottawa with my honourable friend's signature on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether Mr. Chris Hansen was sent over as a consultant for the department to Denmark to look for Danish industry to come here in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, yes, Mr. Hansen was retained on a short-term basis.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister can inform the House whether this trip was successful or not.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member should know full well -- he keeps on reminding us of his many years of experience and knowledge as former Minister of Industry and Commerce -- he should know full well that any dealings with industrial prospects take many many months if not years to bring to fruition. As a matter of fact there are many industries which have come to Manitoba which have considered the prospects here over the years. These decisions are not made quickly, they're not made in a matter of days or weeks, they take months and years.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister can inform the House whether there's a dispute between Mr. Hansen and himself as to the fee that was to be paid him in connection with the

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, surely that question is hardly in order. A question asking whether or not there is any dispute to be ironed out relative to vouchers of expense, etc. is an internal matter, which you can ask about it after Public Accounts.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of order. I'll rephrase the question so that it will abide by the rules, if in fact the Minister's interpretation of the rules are correct. I have here several documents I gather Mr. Hansen is handing out today, and I wonder whether the First Minister

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) or the Minister of Industry and Commerce is prepared to inform the House of the nature of the dispute between Mr. Hansen and the Department with respect to the fee that was to be paid him for his work?

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 121. The Human Rights Act. Order please. It's a bit too noisy in here. We're dealing with the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for River Heights, Section 11.

MR. GREEN: The Member for River Heights is asking me. We're dealing with his amendment to the Human Rights Act.

MR. SPIVAK: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I was informed that we were going to 43 first, but this is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I took the floor at 12:30 because I noticed that two members on the opposition side were ready to speak on this issue and I thought that I would give them some more substance to talk about. On reflection, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that the subject that we are now discussing is a subject of great dispute as between the members of this side and as a matter of fact as between all members in the House, that we have had considerable debate on it during this session, that there will be numerous opportunity both after this debate and during this session and during subsequent sessions to say what has already been said and which would only be repeated if we say it now, and I'm therefore not going to add to what was already said before. I notice that the question was almost put three speeches ago, which to me indicated that we were ready to go. I'm merely hoping, but possibly with not too much result, that members will use my example and do likewise. We're going to have lots of time to talk about this.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to heed the words of the House Leader and I believe that the debate should be short on this. The question of human rights is something that is very dear and important and I think the debate should be on a very high plane. So Mr. Speaker

MR. CHAIRMAN: ask honourable members in the Chamber to keep their conversational level down. It's interrupting the speaker.

MR. GRAHAM: So Mr. Chairman, in the interests of forwarding intelligent discussion on the subject of human rights, I would move that the debate, or the contribution to the debate by the Minister of Municipal Affairs be stricken from the record.

MR. GREEN: I think the motion is clearly out of order and if we've gotten by that hurdle with just that little bit of a ripple, I appeal to the Honourable Member for River Heights, who knows that he'll have many opportunities of discussing this subject, to have no more of a ripple than the last two speakers. However, it's up to

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, my intention would be to speak just to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I do not expect that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or any other member on that side would expect any honourable member who has had his constituency chastized in the way it has been chastized by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, to sit in his seat and remain seated and not make a comment. I'll make it very brief.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs -- (Interjection) -- the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs -- (Interjection) -- Well let me say if he wants to attack the personality of a member then the member can fend for himself.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): No, I'm talking about you, about me.

MR. SPIVAK: But he's made a remark -- (Interjection) -- well the Honourable Member for St. Boniface shouldn't be concerned. He's had his opportunity and presented his position.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll have others, too.

MR. SPIVAK: Now let me say this, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs in his presentation presented what I consider to be one of the most divisive

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) speeches ever presented in this House. And I'm going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the Honourable Minister is prepared to continue this way he may accomplish a political result which he thinks is worthy of the goal of achievement; but I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, what he's going to do in terms of this community is going to hurt the very people that he claims he'd like to represent. He may suggest that this isn't so, but Mr. Chairman, I'm going to suggest to the honourable member that if he continues on this vein and he thinks he's very clever because he thinks he can fit one element of society into another and therefore be successful politically, if he thinks that this is the correct way then may I say, Mr. Chairman, both is he incorrect and he indicates in terms of his own attitude to political life a smallness in character that is unworthy of the position of a Minister and unworthy really of the position that has been taken by many of the honourable members opposite in carrying out their responsibility. There are differences of opinion and those differences of opinion are very real and our community is becoming divided and our society in Manitoba is becoming really divided. If anyone doesn't believe this then they are living in a fool's paradise because this is the case in Manitoba, and all the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs did in his presentation is add to it. If he wants to continue on that vein, that's up to him, but as I've indicated before, history will record and indicate what actually has been accomplished by that and the damage and danger that's been occurred as a result of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I wish to be very brief but I would like to try to be to the point, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak on behalf of the amendment and I would like to suggest why. I listened with interest to the speech of the Honourable the First Minister this morning and I was going to ask a few questions and I will ask them now and I hope that I might get an answer before the vote.

He announced a new policy with regard to giving some security to senior civil servants in terms of if they have a termination of employment, that there is a number of months that will be paid and so on. I understood in the discussion that it specifically related to Mr. Cass-Beggs but I'm wondering if it involves all senior civil servants or is it only he? I am concerned as well because we related this issue to Bill 56 and I don't think we can really get away from relating it to Bill 56. In my area, I wish to indicate, as opposed to this kind of security given to the gentleman referred to, Mr. Beggs, I have one constituent who suffered very serious losses in the downfall of the mink ranching market or mink sales last winter. Now this individual had been quite well established in his occupation and had suffered a very severe loss. Coupled with this as a secondary income and livelihood he is also an insurance salesman and now he finds himself threatened to a point where there's really not much return, and the situation is very unreasonable when you consider the compensation granted to this individual. Now because of the tension strain and worry, this particular individual is now in hospital I understand, with a nervous breakdown, and I consider this a very serious kind of case.

Now it might be argued, Mr. Chairman, that I am generalizing and maybe justifiably so. I think I am generalizing. But I'm suggesting to you that there is room for concern in this area, that if this amendment does not remedy the situation as it was pointed out by the Member for St. Boniface, it's certainly going in the right direction. We're not asking that the government be put in a position that it must be dictated, they will give this kind of compensation, but simply to have somebody from the outside give it a second look and give it an unbiased opinion.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the last speaker a question? The Member from Emerson expressed a concern, I think it's a very real one, that somebody from the outside, somebody that can make a proper assessment should be in a position to indicate if compensation should be paid and maybe recommend some compensation. I think this might not be the exact words but this is what the honourable member said. Now hasn't this been answered already? Isn't it a fact that the Premier said that he would be ready and that he intends to set up an independent commission or Board that will do just that, and that will have more power than this amendment will give anybody?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, I might have been misled but my understanding is that the compensation we're speaking about is in the area of approximately 85 dollars per year of operation. I'm quite happy, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface asked this question because I know that he knows of the specific case I am talking about and

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) I know that he is equally concerned; and I am suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that unless, unless we arrive at a concrete and reasonable kind of proposal from the government that says we will compensate this to this amount, and a reasonable amount, or we will agree to set up an independent body that will make this kind of suggestion to the government as a minimum, I don't see how either the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or myself can support Bill 56.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the point, that my honourable friend agrees that we can't at this time, we don't know what the cost would be; and my honourable friend would like to see an independent body that would review this case. All right. I think this has been promised so far. Surely my friend understands, realizes, that even, even if Bill 56 passes, from one day to the next the government will not be engaged in the field of auto insurance. Before they do this they have to do another thing. They have to bring in an Act to compensate these people and this Act will be brought in -- well my friend from across says No. Well maybe they don't have to but I'm led to believe that they will and they intend to, and I believe that they will; and if they do we in this House here can reject or accept this and

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I really think that the remarks of the honourable member are not in line with the amendment which is being proposed. It is dealing with what will happen with regards to Bill 56, and therefore - you've urged honourable members not to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have pointed out before to honourable members that they should not deal in detail with Bill 56. If they want to make a general reference it's in order but I don't wish to reopen the debate at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I'm perfectly ready to accept this, Mr. Speaker, but accept this for all the members of the House not only when I speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: proposed motion. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was actually not my intention to speak on this proposed amendment until the Minister of Municipal Affairs made the intemperate address that he did just before the noon recess and directed the criticisms that he did not only against my colleague the Member for River Heights but I submit against the residents and the voters of River Heights.

Now I know that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has appealed for calm and reason and consideration and has attempted to pour oil on waters that were troubled and certainly threatening to boil just prior to the noon hour recess and I think that there is a great deal of merit and justification in the appeal that the Minister of Mines and Resources has made and I intend to abide by it insofar as my reactions to the remarks as the Minister of Municipal Affairs will permit me. But I cannot allow the moment to go by, Mr. Chairman, without registering shock and dismay for the record at the remarks that the Minister of Municipal Affairs made. He said in effect that the Member for River Heights has no concern for people and I think that two ingredients are required for an allegation of that kind. One is total ignorance of the record of the Member for River Heights and the other ingredient is unmitigated gall. Mr. Chairman, I think that the First Minister would have been equally shocked had he heard the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I don't think that the kind of remarks of which the Minister delivered himself generate any light on the debate in question. They do nothing but generate heat and inflame passions and tempers and make it extremely difficult for members of the Committee to bring this conscientious examination of the member's proposed amendment to bear that it deserves. I for one must say that I was shocked and dismayed by the language and the attitude of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I feel, Mr. Chairman, despite the blandishments of the Minister of Mines and Resources that those statements cannot remain on the record unchallenged. In fact I'd hoped to be able to reply to them prior to the lunch hour recess but was prevented by the clock. In the two or three hours intervening, my chagrin and my dismay has mellowed somewhat and I don't intend to deliver myself of the kind of speech, the kind of comments that I was intending to make at 12:25 noon. Suffice it to say, suffice it to say that the worst thing that this government can do, the worst thing it can do, given Bill 56, given increases in corporate income tax, given increases in personal income tax, given any intrusions into the private sector that they want to make, given any arbitrary power that they take into their hands, I'll accept all of those things, not without question, not without criticism and argument, but I'll accept all of those things if they will only assiduously devote themselves to trying to unite the people of Manitoba instead of trying to divide the people of Manitoba. The worst thing this government can do is sow seeds of division and divisiveness. The worst thing this government can do - and they've done it since they assumed office in the statements

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) public and private inside and outside the Chamber of a number of members of the administration, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is only one, I don't single him out as any more culpable in this respect than a number of others - is to resurrect old specters of class and class divisions that were removed from our society and the hearts of men long ago and have no place in this society, particularly in our Centennial year and as we launch ourselves into our second century. This kind of insidious reference to and resurrection of differences and dividing lines and class differentiations, references to different sectors of society, which manifested itself again today in the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he singled out the constituency of River Heights for criticism, this kind of attitude and conduct, Mr. Chairman, I say can be nothing but totally destructive of all that this government or any other government may be attempting to do in Manitoba for the betterment of Manitoba now and in the future.

I think this is the question that the First Minister should address himself to, not the question so much of whether the amendment proposed by the Member for River Heights really falls within the ambit or the parameters of the specific question we're discussing at this time on the Human Rights Bill, not the mechanical and technical aspects of legislation that have required and have indeed received so much attention by all sides of the House in the last four months, but this question of the attitude that his colleagues, and particularly his cabinet colleagues take, towards the society of Manitobans as a whole. I think there are a number of examples on the record now, in the newspapers and in Hansard and in the public memory, to which I don't intend to make specific or individual reference for the sincere reason that I really think they are damaging and it would be further damaging to repeat them, but I think there are a number of examples which most Manitobans, if not all Manitobans are aware of statements by .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would prefer that the honourable member deal with the proposed amendment; I think he's getting a bit off the topic.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I am dealing with it, Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with it, but I'm trying to buttress my support for the position that the honourable member has taken in light of the criticism levied at him just before the noon hour recess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I think the member is free to make an analysis in that direction but I think he has been doing that for a number of minutes. I would prefer that he dealt with the substance of the amendment rather than an analysis of the personalities or the behaviour of the honourable members opposite on this and other discussions.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, we're dealing with a Human Rights Bill, Mr. Chairman, and it seems to me that it's ironic that in dealing with human rights legislation, we should be falling into a pitfall of debate that permits people to make statements such as that made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs before the noon hour recess, which I say is divisive, divisive of society, -- (Interjection) -- no, no nothing that the Member for River Heights has said in this debate is divisive of society.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're darned rights it is.

MR. SHERMAN: It may be divisive of the political partisan feelings in this House but it's not divisive of society, but I think when you single out individual segments and constituencies and "classes" that can be divisive and destructive.

MR. DESJARDINS: In other words it depends where you sit.

MR. SHERMAN: No, it depends on what you say. No it doesn't depend on where you sit. It depends on what you say. This is the most important question that the First Minister can address himself to, I suggest, to watching the statements inside and outside this Chamber of his colleagues in his administration, because I suggest to him that many of them are destructive and divisive. I know that the First Minister is opposed, totally, in his own person, in his own conscience, to that kind of social divisiveness. This would be one of the evils, one of the dangers that he would fight with every ounce of energy at his command; I'm convinced of that. But there are members of his administration and members of his party who I suggest are not that interested in the total unity and the total homogeneity and the total fraternity of Manitoba society and to achieve their ends with respect to specific ambitions for pieces of legislation for their own party, they often make irresponsible and intemperate statements that set one Manitoban against another. There have been frequent instances where one Manitoban has been set against another Manitoban in the past 12 months as a consequence of remarks made by members of the present administration.

This is the - yes there have been. I challenge the Member for St. Boniface to cite examples of statements made by members on this side of the House that he could construe as

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) being divisive of society. I'm talking about references to classes, the middle class, upper class, the lower class; I'm talking about references to specific constituencies; I'm talking about references to attitudes such as that made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he said the member for River Heights really typified an attitude of the people of River Heights.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to accept that challenge.

MR. SHERMAN: Well when I'm finished I'll be interested to hear from you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . again to the honourable member that he's making a speech that could be made either related to other issues or not related to anything. I don't see the particular relevance of his comments to the proposed amendment.

MR. SHERMAN: We are talking about human rights, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I know, but I still feel that you are making an analysis which is unrelated to the amendment.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I think surely the basic challenge that we all face in the area of human rights is to try to develop, if we don't already have it, an attitude of fraternity to the entire Manitoba society. I'm saying that the biggest danger the First Minister faces is that for all his good intentions in that regard, he has intemperate and irresponsible statements coming from intemperate and irresponsible colleagues who destroy the purpose before he's half laughed on it, and I cite the speech just before the lunch hour recess as a prime example. I say to the Member for St. Boniface that the charge that the Minister of Municipal Affairs made with respect to the attitude of the Member for River Heights where people are concerned and the allegation that that was typical of the attitude of the people of River Heights, is divisive and destructive. I don't think the First Minister himself would subscribe to that kind of a charge and I don't think that the Minister of Mines and Resources who has run for federal office in Winnipeg South and campaigned through the streets and the doorways of River Heights would subscribe to that kind of an intemperate remark either. I say if we want human rights, we want to address ourselves to a proper human rights environment in this province, this is the place to start. The place to start is here, where it's going to be necessary obviously for the First Minister to muzzle some of the colleagues in his administration who insist on setting Manitoban against Manitoban. Many of them have done this for the past 12 months and I think the First Minister is probably very concerned about this.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I would.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the honourable member is talking about human rights, I would ask him if he doesn't regard freedom of speech as a basic human right, therefore why should I think about muzzling anyone?

MR. SHERMAN: Well of course, I regard freedom of speech as a basic human right but that freedom doesn't embrace license as I think the First Minister would be the first to agree. I suggest that when it sets one member of society against another -- (Interjection) -- that's political. I'm glad the Minister of Transportation brought that question up, because he has continuously, since the date that I made that remark misinterpreted it, taken it out of context and misapplied it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Let's hear the explanation.

MR. SHERMAN: Furthermore, even if it were taken in the context in which the Minister of Transportation insists on taking it, that refers to political differences of opinion, not differences of caste and class which is the type of difference that the Minister of Transportation is forever referring to, forever referring to. This is a forum for political debate and I presume that the Minister of Transportation can take care of himself, if he's accused of wearing jackboots or if he isn't, but if I criticize him or he criticizes me because of the particular area of society we belong to or the particular constituency we come from, or the particular language which is our mother tongue, or the particular accent we speak with, I say that demeans him more than it demeans me, if he criticizes me on those grounds; and if I do that to him likewise it demeans me much more than it demeans him, but a political difference of opinion, political allegations in terms of the philosophy of the party in power and the party in opposition, is an entirely different thing. This is the forum where those differences are to be ironed out and hammered out.

MR. BOROWSKI: Does this apply to the Union class struggle you keep dragging into this Chamber?

MR. SHERMAN: We have never to my knowledge in the brief time that I have been in

(MR. SHERMAN, cont'd.) this Chamber, referred to class or class struggles.

MR. BOROWSKI: You referred to it on many occasions.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm referring to it in the context of remarks that you and colleagues of yours have made; I can hardly refer to it without citing the terms but on this side of the House you have never heard, certainly from me, I can say Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister of Transportation, he's never heard any reference to class or class struggle. That isn't my type of thinking, that isn't my frame of reference. I suggest that it is a divisive and a destructive and an insidious kind of attitude and approach, and if the First Minister would address himself to this question and solve that and stop the kind of inflaming of differences and the kind of inciting the difference in divisiveness that many of his colleagues generate, he would be doing this province a far greater service than he can ever hope to achieve through some of the specific legislation that he has introduced in this Chamber.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we've been favoured all morning by the whining rhetoric of the Member from River Heights; we've heard his speeches not once but a dozen times on the same subject matter. We have heard it on second reading, we have heard it in Law Amendments Committee and we were forced to hear it again today and when some member on this side during the stillness of our listening dared to indicate that the thinking of that member, the announced thinking of that member seemed to reflect that of his constituents it struck horror into the hearts of his colleagues. Now this is an astonishing reaction. Surely this is a compliment that the Member for River Heights in his speeches seemed to reflect the thinking of his constituents and what terrible fright took place in the minds and in the hearts of his colleagues. Are they so disturbed by the words of their colleague that they shudder to think that his words reflect the image of the Conservative Party? Surely we have heard enough about the subject matter that the Honourable Member for River Heights continues to harangue us with. Surely Mr. Chairman, he has used every opportunity to inject into every conceivable debate a harangue about the rights of citizens, the rights of citizens that he has so recently found had been left wanting by his government, the previous administration, for the many years; and even while he was the Minister not a word, not a whisper about the jeopardy of the rights of the many citizens in Manitoba.

Now he's fighting for the leadership. He's losing the leadership in his whining rhetoric, continually driving people to impatience in this Chamber because his speeches inject nothing new, we heard the substance of the speech on his amendment many times before. All he is doing, and I wish the Honourable Member from Fort Garry would harken, is inflaming, not only his colleagues but also the members opposite to reply, reply to what is a continual harangue, a harangue based upon some sort of neurotic suspicion that anything this government suggests is wrong, and this government has introduced more basic rights legislation in this session than was ever dreamed of in his previous administration. Look at the categorical list of legislation and then let him whine again about the jeopardy of the rights of the people of Manitoba. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in context his remarks are shallow and empty and his continued harangue reflects only on his desire to inflate which has to be the largest ego in this Chamber.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I'm not speaking, Mr. Chairman, but I was awaiting a ruling from you as to whether or not the remarks of the Attorney-General were in keeping with the same advice you offered the Member for Fort Garry, just so that I could guide myself in the future as to how I should or should not speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I would think that we have heard comments from both sides; we've heard personality analyses, party analyses and irrelevant comment and I think that we would do well at this stage to either call the question or to deal with the amendment and not to go into general analyses that are not especially related to this section of the bill.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, further on the point of order, I'm not arguing with your analysis of how the debate took place, I'm merely pointing out that you chose to admonish my colleague twice on speaking on this amendment and it rather appeared to me the Attorney-General was speaking in the same general vein and you chose not to admonish him. Now I still think it's not too late for those of us who are sincerely interested in the parliamentary process to learn the thinking of our chairman so that we can expedite the matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, rather than reflect on the partiality of the chair which the honourable member is doing, let us recall that any one of us - if it were correct that the chairman has either overstepped this authority or under-stepped it, then any one of us could get up and object. The honourable member may recall that a member on this side was speaking and I got up and thought he was out of order and I brought that to the Chairman's attention. I think that the honourable member may have had a point, but I think that rather than reflect on the chair, which everybody's trying here, that you could make your point that you think it's out of order and ask the chairman to rule. I think that that would be the proper procedure.

MR. ENNS: Well as a further point of order then, of course, I was merely seeking guidance. I do not think either speaker were out of order but I was attempting to, in my diplomatic way to point that out to the chairman.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if that's the case the honourable member does not really have a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Bill 121 I rise to speak only on this issue that has arisen with regard to the remarks made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In this Act itself it says "no person shall publish by means of any medium he owns or controls, likely to tend to deprive, abridge or otherwise restrict the enjoyment of any class of persons to which it is entitled under the law." I'm suggesting that he owns and controls his own mouthpiece and he has come very close to violating the bill that's under discussion in the remarks he made this morning. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if he had made those remarks about the citizens of the constituency of Riel I would have been very upset; if he had made them about the constituency of St. Boniface, the Member for St. Boniface would have been very upset. I think a valid point is being made here. The Minister seems to think that it's fair game to make these remarks about the constituents of the constituency of River Heights, and I suggest that in doing so he has singled out and tried to classify this group of constituents, and he is well nigh in violation of the Act which is under discussion in doing so.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member submit to a question? Is the honourable member denying that the Honourable Member for River Heights reflects the thinking of the constituents in the constituency of River Heights?

MR. CRAIK: I would think that any member is doing his job if he reflects the thoughts of his constituents. It's another thing to berate the member, but to berate the constituents of a constituency in general is to deprive them of their human rights. I suggest that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if he wished to make statements untoward the Member for River Heights, he is entirely entitled to do in the confines of this Legislature, but to single out the constituents by name, not in any general terms, but by name, to single out the constituents is a violation of the rights which the individual or class or individuals is entitled in Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would permit the question to be put and we pass the bill, the honourable member could then report the Minister to the Human Rights Commission. Let's get the legislation first.

MR. CRAIK: Well, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is being very facetious too. I don't think he's very funny at all.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not being facetious. -- (Interjection) -- If the honourable member would just permit me a moment. He suggested I'm being facetious; if he will not permit me I'll sit down.

MR. CRAIK: I suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his role as a member of the cabinet should be more careful. He seriously deserves to be chastized for the remarks which he made this morning, particularly when we're discussing a bill on human rights.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, at approximately a quarter to three I indicated that there was a speech in me which I gave up. I can tell my honourable friends that there are many many things that could be said on this subject. This is a strong issue. I can't certainly agree with what the honourable members on the other side have said; I don't think that anything has been said that is wrong; but aren't we all aware here that this is in fact the ongoing debate between the members of the opposition and ourself. There's going to be many opportunities to engage in it, and can't we deal with the question in order to realize ourselves that we've had as good a go at it today as we probably need to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the Honourable Minister and do not want to enter in it, but there is something that he is ignoring in connection with this. I'm sorry that the Honourable Attorney-General is absent. There are specific sections of this Act and there was specific presentations before Law Amendments which provide us, not just for another form, but provide us a different examination and a different perspective in connection with the total debate, and it's unfortunate that what has happened - and we've argued this since, the last time I spoke for about two hours - and unfortunately for reasons best known to himself - and I think the Hansard will show this when it's published, and there's no reference, we'll have to wait until that comes - I think that if one reads the Hansard they'll find that the divisiveness that I claimed and my colleague the Honourable Member from Fort Garry has claimed, is correct - this was intended by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Services. There were remarks outside this Chamber that would indicate that this was intended and these were made yesterday. So I say this, if he recalls when the Civil Liberty Association, Manitoba Branch, presented their recommendations, they indicated that insofar as they were concerned they wanted additional amendments which would indicate property status, social status, private status to be inserted after national origin with respect to discrimination and all the other matters. Their references at that time were for particular concern for the disadvantaged. Mr. Chairman, we saw fit not to accept it and the government has not introduced it.

MR. GREEN: Would the Member for River Heights not agree that if we got into this debate and kept it going, that I certainly could allude to examples which would involve speeches for further hours on the part of members about people who have referred to class in this House, people who have referred to people in a particular social strata and what should be done to them, and doesn't the honourable member - I realize that this would continue almost endlessly - and, by the way, I think will continue endlessly. I think that the conflict that my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry . . . exist, cannot be eliminated by saying it doesn't exist, and that kind of conflict will be discussed in this House on numerous occasions, and we've had a pretty good go at it today.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, my intention is not to speak at any length. I just indicate that there was an opportunity for the presentation of this position in another context but nevertheless relative to what's happened, and I think it's unfortunate that the discussion has taken the turn that it has. If we deal with the amendment - and I assume we're going to put the amendment - the amendment proposes simply that the Human Rights Commission be given a power of examination and recommendation in particular situations. We have Bill 56 before us. That's one example. There are many others. May I say, Mr. Chairman, because the Honourable Minister of Transportation asked me about a particular situation and I intended to answer at the time I stood up and I forgot about it, not when he first asked me but when I spoke the second time - may I say this. I don't know whether his information is correct with respect to the logger, but let's assume that he's right. Then, if he's right, they would have a right under this, and he can't quarrel with the fact that they would have a right under this, and that's exactly what I am trying to provide. Whether I am right or wrong about a particular situation what's happened in the past, if in fact this amendment was passed and the situation existed as he suggested it exists - and it could very well - well, let me finish, Mr. Chairman, and it could very well exist, then they would have a right to proceed and go to this commission - and what's wrong with that?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the member a question. He raises a very interesting point. He suggests this legislation be made retroactive, and if so, how far back?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this legislation to suggest that it can't be retroactive if it has to do with a person who feels he's aggrieved by reason of an act . . . (etc.) and I would assume - (Interjections) - I did this very quickly. If you want, I can read it slowly. I don't think the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wants me to. But, Mr. Chairman, obviously the commission is going to have to determine as to its relative merits as to what it would examine, but I would think that anything that would come in recent times would be subject to examination just as anything that has happened in recent times is subject to the scrutiny of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is not limited to the things that happen after he took office but can refer to items that came before, and in that sense the retroactivity applies there as it would apply here.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well Mr. Chairman, may I just assure the member that what I said is correct. I have the agreement and it goes back to 1966. Are you suggesting that we make it retroactive? Do we stop at '66 or do we go back to '56 where the Thompson deal was made? You know, how far back do we go?

MR. SPIVAK: Well Mr. Chairman, I say this to you. I don't know how far the Ombudsman Act goes. I don't think there is any specific provision with respect to it. I think the Ombudsman, if necessary, could examine something for two decades ago. It's possible. But I'm simply saying that with respect to the examination that the Ombudsman could undertake, I believe the Human Rights Commission could have the same kind of powers and could examine, and the particular situation, if the Honourable Minister of Transportation is correct, should be examined by them, and they should make recommendation if this fact does exist. I don't see anything wrong with it and I would hope that there would be really serious consideration given this, because I think this would at least give some independent overview of what's happened with the right of recommendation in the event the government is responsible for the prohibition of anyone carrying on their business, trade or occupation.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the motion of the Member for River Heights, and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SPIVAK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights to amend Section 11 of the bill.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 23; Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. (The remainder of Bill 121 was read and passed.)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would you call Bill No. 17, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 17.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can have a copy of the — has the amendment been accepted? The one that we had stopped reading the bill on? Has it been moved? Has the amendment been moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have the name of the mover.

MR. GREEN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I had moved an extensive amendment last evening and, by leave, I would like to withdraw the complete amendment and the Member for Ste. Rose will move a series of amendments that we hope will find favour with the government. He will speak to the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, so that the member may be heard.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, last evening I moved an extensive amendment to Bill 17. Since that time there has been an informal discussion with a member of the government and, by leave, I am willing to withdraw the complete amendment and the Member for Ste. Rose will make a series of amendments which we hope will meet with some approval by the government side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the member have leave to withdraw his proposed motion? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, my amendments deal with Section 7. Do you want me to move them now or to proceed once we reach that section? Are we at that point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now on Section 5. Perhaps I could move up to 7 and then the honourable member can make his motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment. Now, for those who heard the amendment last night, it is identical, Mr. Chairman, up to the portion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Section 5 or 4?

MR. MOLGAT: Section 7, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'd like to move up to that. Section 5—passed? Section 6 as amended . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Dealing with Section 6, and in an effort to be consistent with the Manitoba Development Corporation Act, I have an amendment here which reads:

1. That the present contents of Section 6 be numbered 6(a); and
2. A new section be

July 21, 1970

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) added to Section 6 numbered 6(b) as follows: The government shall not sell or otherwise dispose of its shares to any member of the Legislative Assembly directly or indirectly, or to any person acting on his behalf, or to any firm, corporation or organization in which a member of the Legislative Assembly has a substantial beneficial interest.

Mr. Chairman, this is just being consistent with Section 45 of the Manitoba Development Corporation Act, where that Act says that the corporation shall not make a loan to any member of the Legislative Assembly; and here, in an effort to be consistent, we are suggesting that in the disposition of shares by government that the same consistency apply.

Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that this amendment be accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well I just wanted to dispense with this. I have no point of order. You've accepted the amendment? Well, we have no objection with the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6--passed; Section 7. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Bill 17 be amended by adding thereto immediately after Section 7 thereof, the following section:

"Responsibility of Minister. 7, 1(1). Before the Minister of Finance proceeds under Section 3 or Section 7, the Minister shall

(a) conduct studies to examine the benefits and costs to the people of Manitoba that can be estimated the result from any action by the Minister of Finance proceeding under Section 3 or Section 7.

(b) establish . . . terms of reference for studies conducted under (a) above, which shall require the examination of the benefits and costs that can be expected if the Minister of Finance wants to proceed under each of the alternatives stated in Section 3.

"Report of benefit cost studies and of proceedings under Section 3, 7 1(2). The Minister shall, after any proceedings under Section 3 or Section 7, report to the Legislature at the earliest possible time. The Minister when reporting to the Legislature shall (a) describe the action taken by the Minister of Finance under Section 3 or Section 7; (b) table all studies conducted under Section 1 above."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this particular section in the amendment is unchanged from that moved by the House Leader of the Liberal Party last night. I have omitted the second or third part, which is Annual Report, which I will move as a separate amendment. The government had indicated that insofar as the annual report section they were prepared to accept it provided the wording was one which was approved or recommended by the legal counsel, and so that will be separate. This section, then, is completely as proposed last night.

Now the purpose of the section, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the House aid to ensure that the government does in fact conduct proper studies before entering into any such plan under Section 3 or Section 7, and that having made the studies, that the House be advised of those studies and that the information be given to the House. That is the whole intent of the section, that there be complete review, study, before an action is taken, and that there be complete disclosure of the House after the action has been taken by government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, the Leader of the Liberal Party, when I saw his amendment, I indicated to him that the part dealing with the annual report was quite in accordance with what I indicated in the House the government would be prepared to accept, that we had no intention of not making full disclosure, and that there is no doubt that we would do it in any event, but the Act is a better Act if it contains the provisions for disclosure and therefore we are prepared to improve on the Act at the instigation of the Member for Portage.

At the same time, I did also indicate to him yesterday that I felt that the matters now raised by the Member for Ste. Rose are quite properly matters of the administration of the government and not matters of the legislative process, and in saying this, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave any doubt that I feel that the consideration that I mentioned by the Member

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) for Ste. Rose and which are contained in this amendment, are some of the considerations - I don't think they are all and I think that other members could add things if we wanted to - but they are certainly some of the considerations which any responsible or reasonable government would enter into in dealing with this kind of operation. I might say that although cost benefit studies are mentioned, it was not the intention, with the original setting up of corporations, that they necessarily should show a black line at the bottom of the ledger sheet, or black figure; that it may be that red figures on the bottom of the ledger sheet would still in certain cases require the government, as a matter of policy, to enter into the type of arrangement that is permitted by the bill, but I would think, Mr. Chairman, that to try to legislate prudence, to legislate discretion, to legislate appropriate policy decision on members of the administration, can really have not that good results.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the question as to whether or not a government is operating in a proper manner, and to question as to whether it is properly criticised or properly censured or properly condemned, to use a harsh word, depends on how it acts on those things which it is its duty to administer. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that last year when we were talking about the tabling of studies - for instance, which is contained in this report - that I at all times said that the government had a discretion not to table them, and I still say and I have repeated on this side of the House, that I believe that a government could have a study which in its discretion it need not table. Now, I'm suggesting that when it does or does not use that discretion is the measure of the competence and otherwise effectiveness of a proper government, and I say it suggests, Mr. Chairman, that those are the things upon which the government is ultimately measured; and for the honourable member to put them into the - attempt to put them into legislation similarly to what was done with the Manitoba Development Fund Act, is to, I suggest, try to catch something which in the last analysis cannot be caught, and that is to try to legislate the entire administration of the executive branch, which is an impossibility. So, Mr. Chairman, not because I disagree with the general policy of what is being suggested here, and not that I don't suggest that government would have to take these things into consideration, plus take things into consideration which I might not be able to think of at this moment and which other members could add to the amendment, but because I think that an executive branch of government has to be free to act in accordance with its policy and with its program, rather than within legislative confines, I suggest that this amendment not be accepted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in saying that, I can assure the honourable member and I can assure other members of the House that when the government decides to set up a Crown corporation within any of the provisions that are contained in this Act, if I as Minister, or if any other person here as Minister could not get up and say that they have done the right thing, whether it be a feasibility study and whether they table it or not, I suggest that in a proper case if the government does not table it that they should be censured, that all of the things that are suggested by my honourable friend should certainly be the subject matter of legislative discussion, we have to be in a position of answering for them, and Mr. Chairman, I say further that if we can't answer properly and we can't indicate that we have done the things that we are entitled to do by the legislation in a reasonable, prudent, and in every other way responsible manner, then we should be kicked out on our ear. And those are the kinds of things, Mr. Chairman, upon which the people will measure the government and I would ask the people to measure our Act in the same regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, in looking at the resolution or the amendment, it brings two thoughts to mind. One, of course, is that we wouldn't want to discourage private corporations from approaching government under this type of a plan. In other words, there may be times when a private corporation would want to approach government for assistance, or in fact approach government to go into business with them, but they wouldn't want disclosure, public disclosure of their corporation to Opposition, because of the fact that . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . is reading the part that is headed Annual Report. I just want to be sure that he has the correct amendment, because I have not been dealing with the disclosure provisions, I have been dealing with the provisions headed "Responsibility of the Minister and Report of Benefit.

MR. BEARD: Well, the responsibility of the Minister is to report to the Legislature everything that they have dealt with.

MR. GREEN: That's fine. Then you're dealing with the correct . . . I just wondered whether the honourable member was dealing with the last half of the amendment, but apparently he is dealing with the first half.

MR. BEARD: I can realize where the two of them are closely knit together but I would hope that, in the last analysis, that private companies can be in fact encouraged to come to the province and to develop, and I of course look to the development of the north in conjunction with government in some cases and would hope that this would not discourage this type of an amendment.

I think that there should be an allowance for some type of a review, particularly where the public feels there are mistakes, but if the Minister would rather deal with this under the Annual Report, then I will leave that part of it to the second part of the amendment. But perhaps the Member for Ste. Rose can elaborate on that because it would bother me if we were discouraging people from approaching government in a business . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The honourable member.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in reply first to the comments of the Member for Churchill, this portion of the amendment, the first part, I don't think provides for disclosure of any company information. It provides for the disclosure of any studies conducted by the government relative to cost benefit and the whole project involved, and I don't think would involve the disclosure of any private company information, which is certainly not what I am seeking.

In reply to the Minister's comments, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that in all probability this would be the prudent course for any Minister to follow, and that to that extent, when he says it's not necessary to put it in the Act, he may have a point. On the other hand, there is no guarantee if it's not in the Act that the Minister would follow it. It could well be that the Minister would decide, for reasons of his own, that this is a particular project that he wants to see done and that he's convinced is going to be good per se, with no better information than his own decision, and I suggest that insofar as the funds which are going to be advanced by the people of Manitoba after all, that there ought to be a guarantee in the Act that the proper and prudent course be followed and not simply be at the discretion of the Minister.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have found in the past a good deal of difficulty in getting from government at times, information that I thought should be the information of the House; in fact, at times, the impossibility of really knowing what studies have been conducted. I can think back to our debate on South Indian Lake. Not only was the problem at one stage that the reports were not being published, but beyond that, the point that the Opposition members didn't even know what studies had been conducted so couldn't really ask any questions on the matter because they had no means of knowing really what had been undertaken in studies or what hadn't been undertaken. And so to get around - and I recognize South Indian is not on a par with this one because it wasn't the question of setting up a Crown corporation or anything of the sort - but I think again, in the interests of open government, in the interests of making this House more responsible, in the interests of protecting the taxpayers' money, that there should be no objection to having the information produced and that the studies are undertaken. Why should only the government side know about the studies and why should not the Opposition be advised in the same way? How can the Opposition be expected to do its work of responsible opposition if it isn't a party to the information that's available to the government side? How could we on this side determine whether or not it was a wise venture for the government to enter into a certain agreement under this Act if we are denied the studies that back up the government decision in the first place? It is putting us in a position where we virtually have to rubber stamp the government decision because we do not have the information that is in the government hands and we do not have the research facility and the money required to do the research ourselves, so it simply means that we can't do our job in opposition - and this applies to whatever party is in opposition. The same thing every time.

So the government here is asking for very substantial rights, or at least the authority to do some very substantial things. I have some hesitations about it. I repeat, as I have said in many debates in the past, I would rather see things undertaken by private enterprise; I would rather see things undertaken by cooperative groups; I would rather not have the government enter into it if there is another means of doing it. I am prepared to accept that there is no other means of getting a venture going, and then I am prepared to support the government

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) getting into it, but before that's done I think that the public have a right to know the full facts, and I think this House must know the full facts, otherwise we would end up by handing under Bill 17 some extremely wide powers to the government and having no possibility in the future of the members on this side of the House being in a position to do a reasonable assessment and a responsible job of opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose's further explanation on the amendment before us, it would appear, or rather it indicates to me that he is beginning to understand our party's position in total opposition to the bill, but I would like, because it is precisely the unrestrained powers that Bill 17 gives to the government that my leader made his position clear on when first speaking on this bill, but I would like to speak in support for a moment for this particular amendment even though having indicated that I do not support the bill as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, this House needs hardly be reminded, although perhaps for some of the new members that weren't here in the immediate past, the last few sessions, particularly the last session of the previous administration, where the whole question of availability of reports, feasibility reports, studies, was one that took a considerable amount of time in the debate, the Honourable Minister responsible for this bill - I believe it stands in his name, Bill 17 - was most adamant in enunciating the very argument that the Member for Ste. Rose has now put forward, and perhaps, with due respect, perhaps even more dramatically and with greater vigor, because at that time we were asking and demanding the reports, the studies, the feasibility studies with respect to northern power development at Southern Indian Lake. We wanted the transition reports of the north, the consultant firms, with respect to the communities; we wanted all the underwriting, consulting engineering reports at that time; and I would hope that the government would not choose to use the phrase that has been used so often, that we didn't get them, so that that justifies their present action now. Quite frankly, the reports were always available. Though the particular kind of reports were available to members of the opposition perhaps not in the manner and the form that they wished or wanted them - but it was made very clear to them that the reports were available to them at Hydro or other sources - the specific reports dealing with inter-departmental study groups were not available, and the position on that particular matter really hasn't changed much from the transition from the past administration to this administration.

But it would seem, particularly, that the amendment here calls for the supplying to the House the kind of information that was deemed so vital and so necessary when the government, under its Crown corporation the Manitoba Hydro, was contemplating certain developments with respect to the power supply of Manitoba, that - and I think I am correct - that there was this general call and it was supported from all members of the opposition including the members of the New Democratic Party, the members of the Liberal Party, the Member from Rhineland, who made this, and I must admit, having been the Minister at that time, one of the most difficult periods of my time in office, that it was - and why was it difficult? Because I recognized the validity to some extent of the members' opposite argument of that day, that it was difficult for them to pass judgment, to either agree with the government's proposed action or with Manitoba Hydro's proposed action, or disagree with it, without having the fullest opportunity of having the material before them. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while I quite recognize that we are not dealing necessarily in the same scope of projects, but we have no way of knowing what the government's intention is under Bill 17, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made specific reference to that fact that he did not want to be in any way hemmed in by any restrictive clauses to Bill 17. At the committee stage, we moved a restrictive clause asking that the word "renewable" be inserted, which would limit the actions of Bill 17 to specific areas. The Minister, in his wisdom, rejected that because he wanted Bill 17 to give him the fullest range of power that only he and future government decisions or future cabinet decisions of that government can envisage as to how they proposed to apply Bill 17.

Now, that being the case, Mr. Chairman, we can't really say that we may just only be dealing with a relatively minor development of a cooperative nature, or a corporate or company nature in the north, if you have anything to do with setting up a timber company of some kind or a cord-cutting operation of some kind or a store of one nature. We quite conceivably are talking of some major developments in the north. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would, having

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) on several occasions cautioned the government about the approach that they are taking generally in the area of mining, I would rather suspect that if the government survives that long that, within a relatively short period of time, we will be demanding on this side that the government do exercise Bill 17 to make up for the slack that will develop because of the lack of confidence or the concern or the uncertainty that the government is injecting into that particular primary industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman - I am sure you yourself, Sir, were in the House - when a great effort was made which was well reported by the media of that day, that the question of having full access to all feasibility studies, all reports with respect to any development that the government may choose to undertake with the use of public funds, that these reports, these feasibility studies be made available to all members of the House so that they could participate in a more genuine manner and a position of knowledge, and either commend or criticize constructively the proposed government action or intervention in the private sector in this insurance.

To this extent, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment before us by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and would indicate my party's support for the amendment before us at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to know whether the honourable member was here when I replied to the Member for Ste. Rose, because if he were here, then I thought I answered that question; if you were not here, I am willing to repeat my answer, but if you spoke in spite of my answer then I have nothing more to say. Was the honourable member here when I spoke?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a general principle, the honourable member should not repeat answers for people who are absent from a debate since other members were in fact present.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, then I just ask the honourable member whether he was here when I spoke.

MR. ENNS: I must confess to having been in my seat at the time the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources spoke. I also had the pleasure of being engaged in conversation with the Honourable Minister of Finance at the same time and there was a great conflict of interest presented to me as to who I should be listening to at that particular moment, both being eloquent in their own particular way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent on me to make some comments as we are passing Bill 17, The Manitoba Natural Resources Development Act, and the amendment before us request that studies, when they are being made, of cost benefits and so on, that these be tabled and that we be informed of the matter previous to going into the venture. If we take a look at the sections, refer to Section 3

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Just on a point of information, I don't want the honourable member to misinterpret the amendment. I don't read anything into it which would indicate that the Minister of Finance could not advance the monies before the honourable member knew about it. That's not my reading of the amendment.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Well, the amendment says that before the Minister of Finance proceeds the Minister shall conduct studies to examine the benefits and costs to the people of Manitoba that can be estimated to result from any action by the Minister of Finance proceeding under Section 3 or Section 7; and if we took a look at Section 3 of the bill, it says "with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance may . . . such conditions as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may prescribe." And then it says under (b), "Make loans to a company with or without security" and (c) "guarantee the payment of principle and interest on monies borrowed by a company. This means that this is pure speculation; that we are giving the power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to Cabinet, to speculate on behalf of the people of Manitoba as in going into a mining venture, and certainly, if that is the case, I feel certainly that they should then be prepared to accept the amendment before us because, if a venture should not be a success, then they would not only accept the blame, then the House would be blamed. We, as members on this side of the House, on the Opposition, would also receive the blame. I just wonder what the situation would be, though, if it turned out to be good. Then, no doubt, the NDP or the New Democratic Party would take

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) the credit. They would then take the credit and, on the other hand, if there were losses, we would have to share the blame. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? I know fully well what would happen in a case like this. If you came out, good and well. Well, you could go to the people and tell them, well this is what we did; this is what the New Democratic Party did, and this is what the government has done for you. But, if it turned out the other way, we would be left holding the bag because we allowed you to do this and we gave concern to what you are trying to do now.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member say that the reverse would be true? That if the project came out well and he had his way, then he would say well, it's not their project; it was the whole Legislature's project, but if the project suffered, he would say it was their project. So, regardless of what is said, the government that is in power, that is in power when a measure proceeds, is the group that will be blamed. Is that not correct?

MR. FROESE: This is all the more reason why we should know and why the amendment should be passed, that we are aware, ahead of time, of what venture the government is speculating on going into. We should have some knowledge of whether this is good, or will be or could be a good project, or whether it's a poor risk. Certainly, I wouldn't want to have the people of this province speculate and gamble on this, knowing ahead of time that it might be a shaky thing and that the chances are rather for losing their money than winning. I don't mind the odd time to probably spend a few dollars on my own risking it, but I certainly wouldn't want to risk the people of Manitoba's money on poor risks. Therefore, I think this amendment should be accepted by the government so that we on this side of the House have some say in the matter before the government enters into these ventures.

Then, too, part (b) says that established terms of reference for studies conducted under (a) above, which shall require the examination of the benefits and costs that can be expected if the Minister of Finance was to proceed under each of the alternatives stated in Section 3. Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Ste. Rose has brought forward a very valuable amendment, and I certainly will endorse it and feel that the government should really give consideration to this and pass it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't want to extend the debate at all but there was one point that the minister mentioned which I neglected to reply to in his comments. He said that it may not be that these are necessarily money-making ventures that the government would enter into, and therefore that the cost benefit study might, in fact, show a red figure. Well, Mr. Speaker, to me this is all the more reason that the studies should be produced, so that the House and the people of Manitoba are completely aware of the reasons for proceeding with the venture, and I agree that there may be times when we would agree to a venture, even though it wasn't a money-making one, because of the other benefits attached insofar as employment of people or rescuing certain communities faced with potential disasters and so on. So the fact that it is going to make money or not make money, I don't think is the object.

The point is that, prior to -- or at least that the House should be aware of the full facts, and unless the studies are produced, the House cannot be aware of the full facts, and I would ask the Minister not to take a rigid position in this. I know it is difficult for Ministers to accept amendments from the opposite side of the House, but I would ask the Minister to reflect on the days when he sat in Opposition and to think that he may return there much sooner than he expects, and to think of the responsibilities that come upon all sides of the House. Ours on this side is one, assessing carefully what government does, making sure that we bring forward the other side of the coin, but we cannot do this if we are not given the facts. I would appeal to the backbenchers on the government side to consider the amendment I am proposing and check if it is not a reasonable request that the House be made aware of any studies undertaken, good or bad, and that the House then be in a position to make a sane, reasonable decision on what the government proposes, rather than be forced to discuss it from this side of the House in a vacuum of information when the government side of the House has full access to studies.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just make a short remark with regard to both what the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Ste. Rose have said. I made no change in position when I was on that side of the House to the time that I am on this side of the House, and when I was on that side of the House I always agreed -- and I never shook from the position -- that it was within the government's discretion not to table certain information. I said it was unwise for them not to do it but that they had a right not to do it. I still say that, Mr. Chairman, and

July 21, 1970

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) I say that a government is judged, not by the legislation it makes, but by the way it acts, and despite what the Member for Lakeside says and I'm not going to open another big, long argument, the fact is that the reports that the government had a discretion not to table were tabled by this government. I say that a government that acts in an arbitrary fashion and decides that it's going to withhold from the House matters which the general public feel that the House should properly have gotten, will be made to pay for it; and the honourable member says that I may be back on that side of the House. You know, that's not an unthinkable thought. That's something that could happen to any politician. I could make many unkind remarks about, you know, what might happen to other members of the House, but even though they are unthinkable, there is no particular benefit in saying them. We could open up a lot of sores. The fact is that I am now here, that I am not here saying anything differently than I said when I was over there, and maybe, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the small reasons that I'm here.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's pretty even. I believe the ayes have it.

MR. GREEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. On the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 23, Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I have a further amendment to the same section, or rather following the same section, as follows -- Mr. Chairman, I must apologize. I only have one copy of the amendment. It is in -- or unless the Legislative Counsel has it. It is really the same -- the results will be the same as the second portion of the amendment proposed last night, only it has been re-worded by Legislative Counsel, I think, to conform to the Act. So I move that Sections 8, 9 and 10 of Bill 17 be renumbered as Sections 9, 10 and 11 respectively, and the following section be added thereto after Section 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the honourable member to wait until we complete Section 7. I have not yet passed that section of the bill.

MR. MOLGAT: That's right. I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN? (Section 7 was read and passed.) Section 8. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I move that Sections 8, 9 and 10 of Bill 17 be renumbered as Sections 9, 10 and 11 respectively, and the following section be added thereto after Section 7.

Section 8 (1). Where, under clause (a) of Section 3, shares have been purchased in the company, as long as the shares or any of them are owned by the government the Board of Directors of the company shall, within four months after the end of each fiscal year of the company, make a written report to the Minister upon the operations of the company during that fiscal year, including an audited statement of its operating revenues and expenditures and such other information as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may require.

8(2). Where the Minister receives a report under subsection (1), he shall lay the report before the Assembly forthwith, if it then is in session, and, if the Assembly is not in session, within 15 days after the beginning of the next session.

8(3). Where a report is laid before the Assembly under subsection (2), it stands permanently referred to the Standing Committee of the Assembly on Economic Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is agreeable to the government now.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The balance of Bill 17 was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the bill being reported, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): A recorded count, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays. Call in the members. On the question of the bill being reported.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 27; Nays 22.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried, to report the bill. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill 39, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 39.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could deal with Bill 39 part by part rather than page by page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 39. The Municipal Act. Are we dealing with the Bill part by part? (Part I and Part II were read and passed.) Part III — The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Part III, we have Subdivision VI which deals with the remuneration of members of council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What page, Mr. . . . ?

MR. FROESE: It's on pages 58, 59, 60 and 61. There was an amendment brought in to Section 111 (4) but I want to deal briefly with the matter of remuneration of council and council members. Under the old Act, there was provision in there as to what remuneration would be paid or in the way of indemnity and so on. Under the new bill this is left to their discretion, and I'm just wondering whether we will not have a great variance in the remuneration or indemnities that the various council members and reeves will receive under this particular new bill in this division. And I'm not just sure whether this is fair in all respects. I think guidelines should have been set down, a range, in which the salaries or indemnities could vary. I don't say that they should be the same because some of the municipalities are indeed much larger than others; the administration is greater; and no doubt some councils are smaller and there is less administration. Surely I'm not saying that the indemnity should be the same, but I think we should have laid down some guidelines and a range in which the indemnities would fall under, and I think the committee should not have completely discarded this matter and left it at complete discretion of council as is now being proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Parts III, IV, V, VI and VII (to Page 245) were read and passed.) Part VIII . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move a — Part VIII, we have reference to Section 291(1)(d) on Page 151. Mr. Chairman, I have a confession to make. I wanted to make an amendment earlier on and I note that I have got past the page. If I had leave of the House to go back . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: By leave? (Agreed)

MR. PAWLEY: What I would like to do is amend Section 291 (1)(d) in reference to — if you turn to the clause which reads "for prohibiting the sale within the municipality of fireballs, squibs, firecrackers and other fireworks to any person." I would like the words "regulating or" added after "for" — that Clause (d) of subsection (1) of Section 291 be amended by adding, after the word "for" in the first line thereof, the words "regulating or". If we leave it as it is, then the municipality will only have the power to prohibit and not to regulate if they should so wish to regulate rather than, in fact, to prohibit. I would move thus, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the amendment accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Parts VIII to XV of Bill 39, pages 245 to 404, were read and passed.) The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: It's not being pointed out where amendments were being brought in by committee, the Municipal Affairs Committee. Should it not be pointed out to members that amendments were made in committee in the various sections?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill 39 was read and passed.)

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, what title have you on that bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The title on the bill is The Municipal Act. Bill be reported.

Bill 43, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. There are only two pages. Section 1 . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment for Section 1, 17. Bill 43; as members will recall, this is where the government is passing a bill asking for the authority to hire up to five executive assistants, and also for the Cabinet to have the power to pay indemnity allowance, salary and reimbursement for any purposes that they deem fit. My

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) amendment places this power -- takes the power away from the Cabinet and makes the Act responsible to the Legislature. So I move Section 17 be amended, (a) by deleting the words "or The Executive Government Organization Act" where it appears in line 3; and (b) by deleting all the words after the word "assembly" where it appears in line 6, up to the word "and" where it appears in line 8.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is a procedural problem before us because it was my intention to move an amendment to Section 17 that would replace it in its entirety. After it's been moved and copies have been circulated, the Honourable Member for Portage may still want to amend the section even in its amended form, so if you would be agreeable to withdrawing

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would be willing, by leave, to withdraw my amendment and let the government proceed and then take an action then. (Agreed)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like to propose an amendment to Section 17. I would like to move as follows, then, that the proposed new Section 17 of the Legislative Assembly Act, as set out in Section 1 of Bill 43, be struck out and the following section substituted therefor -- and I am wondering if a copy of this might be circulated.

"A member of the assembly may accept from the government any indemnity, allowance, salary and reimbursement for expenses authorized under this Act or The Executive Government Organization Act, and reimbursement approved by the Provincial Auditor for reasonable expenses incurred by the member in transacting public business pursuant to a resolution of the assembly or the direction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or have any or all of those expenses paid for him on his behalf by the government, and nothing in this Act disqualifies the member from sitting and voting in the assembly or subjects him to penalty for accepting the indemnity, allowance, salary or reimbursement, or because those expenses have been paid for him on his behalf, but nothing in this section authorizes the member to accept appointment to a statutory board, commission or body, the remuneration in respect of which is paid from the Consolidated Fund, or to accept remuneration or reimbursement from the government in respect of any duties performed as a member of or under the direction of any statutory board, commission or body."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Well perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should explain the purpose of the amendment. Actually I have done so in the sense that at the time of debate on second reading I indicated that there would be a number of changes made, more or less to accommodate some of the points raised by honourable members opposite. With respect to the amendment that I have just moved, the intention is to make it more clear than it is in the bill that a member may have monies paid to him; if he is a legislative assistant, a member may have -- I'm sorry, forgetting any reference to legislative assistant for the moment. A member of the assembly may have paid to him, out of the Consolidated Fund, monies necessary to cover reasonable expenses as approved by the Provincial Auditor's office, and in addition to that, or alternatively rather, if monies are paid, not to the member for expenses, but paid for expenses on his behalf -- that is the monies do not actually come to the member -- this would be authorized under this amendment.

And, of course, it has been a matter of some dispute and argumentation over the years as to whether a member who has expenses paid on his behalf is not in violation of the Legislative Assembly Act. I can recall some instances where members of the assembly have gone on government business and have had certain expenses, certain kinds of expenses paid on their behalf, and have not had their right to sit or vote here questioned, but yet, perhaps more in an academic or theoretical way -- this point has been raised from time to time -- the passage of this section would make it clear beyond question or beyond doubt.

Now I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this still would not satisfy the intent of the Honourable Member for Portage because I notice that his amendment, which I presume he may still wish to move, is to delete certain specific words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, on this I can see where, if the member was going with a Cabinet Minister, then the Minister could pay the expenses of the member during the time that he was away. If the member did take a trip somewhere, had to go to Ottawa, for instance, he

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) would then submit an expense account similar to that which is done during the committee now? So it would be on public record, would it?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes Mr. Chairman, and of course, as the wording would indicate, it's all subject to approval by the Provincial Auditor's office. It would have to be regarded as reasonable and in accordance with prevailing practice within the public service with respect to allowable expenses, and of course it is accountable, I should advise the Honourable Member for Churchill, it is accountable in the same sense as any other allowable expense approved by the Provincial Auditor's office. It certainly can be requested as an Order for Return in this Chamber. In that sense there is accountability.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I should make reference to one other intention. It's more than an intention - one other provision of the amendment which I have just moved, and that is to take care of that argument or fear that was put forward by honourable members that the passage of this bill would open the door wide for the appointment of MLAs to statutory boards, commissions and the like. That is not the interpretation or the intent that we gave to the legislation in the first place, but on reflection, I suppose I should admit that one could interpret it that way, and so if one reads closely the last four or five lines of the amendment I have just moved, you will notice that there is specific reference here that this bill does not in any way authorize the appointment of members to statutory boards and commissions. That remains, as it was before, a matter to be done, if it is to be done at all, by specific acts of the various Crown corporations, boards and commissions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to amend the amendment? I move that new Section 17 be amended by deleting all the words "or the direction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council" where they appear in lines 6 and 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, in speaking briefly to the amendment, the intention is to have the appointments responsible to the Legislature and not to the Cabinet. I wonder, and other members may consider, whether or not an MLA who, whether he's in opposition or in government, is really a member of the policy-making process of government, and for an MLA to work for a salary for that government makes me wonder if there is not a conflict of interest. On one hand, he's earning a salary as a civil servant, on the other hand he has to wear another hat as a policy-maker in the Chamber, and for this reason I think that if the government is going to vote this through with their majority, that the least that could be done would be that the members who are going to be appointed should be responsible to the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I rise only to say that I made the comments that I intended to make on Bill 43 at second reading and to say that the amendment moved by the Member for Portage was in front of me, and that I support his amendment wholeheartedly; and that winds up the comments that I want to make on this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, upon consideration of the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Portage, my first reaction was to think that it would really make it very difficult for any MLA that is being referred to here as eligible, to receive reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses to have expenses paid on his behalf because he is engaged in doing some work for the public good. Now thus far there seems to be no disagreement about that. So far. But the Member for Portage would move to delete the reference that there shall be direction by the Lieutenant Governor in Council given to the MLA or MLAs, as the case may be. Now in what way, then, would the member or members be engaging in this work? Where would they receive their direction, their instruction, the request to engage in certain activity of one kind or another in the public interest, unless it be only by means of a resolution of this Assembly? It is certainly a restriction on the intent of the legislation, but I would not at this time presume to say that it is quite unacceptable. I think the inclination is that we should accept the honourable member's amendment and see in what way, if any way, it is seriously impinging on what the intent of this legislation is all about. Perhaps we'll try it for a year or two. Certainly it would still enable members to conduct certain work in the public interest by means of authorization by a resolution of the Assembly, and then other places in the Act it will still enable those who are legislative assistants to work on the direction of the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) Lieutenant Governor in Council in assisting - which is what its prime function is in any case - assisting a member of the Executive Council in the carrying out of his duties. So that being the case, I wish to indicate now that we will accept the honourable member's amendment to the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. He put the question on the amendment as amended and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 1 of Bill 43 was read and passed.) Section 2-- The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Section 2, I would move that it be deleted, but since in recent days this motion seems not to be in order, I would take the opportunity of speaking against the clause.

I feel that by putting it in the Legislative Assembly Act this will now become the rule rather than the exception, and I don't like to see that become a rule since I don't subscribe to the principle. This will allow any member of the Assembly to borrow from the Agricultural Credit Corporation or the Development Fund, or the new Development Corporation Act, and I don't like to see members become involved with the government in this way. Certainly it is much better if members are independent of Crown corporations and not being subject to them or indebted to them, in that they might consider themselves not free to speak out and criticize. Once you become involved, this no doubt has an effect; and then too, by incorporating it into the Legislative Assembly Act, I think we are subscribing to the principle, we're setting it out as the rule, and I don't subscribe to that. I feel that if this has to be, that it should be in the particular Acts concerned and that it rather be an exception than the rule.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland raises a point which was made by the Leader of the Opposition, and certainly, if not the Leader of the Opposition, by other members opposite, with respect to Section 2 of this Bill, and at the time I indicated that we would give consideration to an amendment here so as to make it clear that the intent was not to enable a member to enter into a loan agreement with a Crown lending agency after he became a member of this House, but rather to amend it so that it would make it clear that if he, prior to becoming a member, had entered into such a loan agreement, well, the legislation would permit that loan arrangement to simply carry on.

So, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Section 2 of Bill 43 be amended by striking out the word "entering" in the third line thereof and substituting therefor the words "having, before he was elected as a member, entered" and it goes on. The effect of this is to remove any doubt as to the eligibility of a person who became a member subsequent to his entering into a contract but would not enable a member of the Assembly to enter into such a loan contract after the election.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this was a point in which I was concerned when I spoke on the Bill originally. I gather, then, that the intent would now be changed; that a sitting member of the Legislature now could not enter into any kind of an agreement to borrow money from either the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation or the Development Fund; that if he had been previously in a contract, then it would not disqualify him from becoming a member and from sitting and voting as a member, but he could not, as long as he is a member, enter into a contract. Correct?

MR. SCHREYER: Right.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . into a new agreement after he had become a member.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, that would certainly satisfy my own request. In fact I did not go that far. I had suggested to the First Minister that Cabinet Ministers of course be excluded because of their particular capacity. I had no major objection to other members entering into a contract, on condition that the House was advised of any such contract, and we had prepared an amendment to that effect, but this is even more restrictive than the one I was suggesting and I'm prepared to accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3, 61.1 (1) passed -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think you called Section 2 as amended passed, did you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 2 as amended was read and passed.) Section 3, 61.1(1) —

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, now that Section 2 is passed, I have an amendment here — you'll probably rule it out of order but I think I should bring it forward anyway; this is in connection with per diem allowances — that Section 59 (4) be amended by deleting the words "during the period of 60 continuous days" in the fifth and sixth lines of the section.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest my honourable friend was perfectly correct when he suggested, before he presented the motion, it would be out of order, because it involves the expenditures of public funds and it's not within his competence to move such a motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, since the Act is before us, I think I have the right to speak on it even though the motion is ruled out of order.

This is probably not the most popular thing to do as a member, to speak on the matter of indemnity of members, but I feel that the motion that I proposed was to delete the 60-day clause, or part of the clause, so that the 60 days would no longer apply but the expenses would be paid for the time that the session was on. This year we have a very lengthy session and this is causing a further burden on members from outside the City of Winnipeg who are away from home. Not only that, certain members will be on Utilities Committee which will be sitting during the session while all the members of the House may not be present, so that this will be a further burden on members of that committee. That is not necessarily the case when members meet after the session because then they are being paid their expenses for attending committee meetings. However, now, because the House is in session, they will not be remunerated for those days that they will be sitting in Committee of Utilities. Therefore, I think that some form of remuneration should have been considered by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or by Cabinet and brought in at this session. This will probably be considered by the Rules Committee later on, I don't know, but anyway it will not apply to this particular session, and I feel it's an unnecessary burden on some of the rural members who have to be away from home and who are incurring an additional expense as a result.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say a few words in support of what the Honourable Member for Rhineland just brought up, as one of those who've been in for some time and one of those who was in here when we first got \$3,000 a year with no expenses allowed; now we're up to \$7,200 with \$20.00 a day for the first 60 days. On an ordinary session this is sufficient, but I'd like to inform the members that this \$1,200, the maximum of \$1,200 is taxable, so you end up with about \$800.00. So this is the problem of many rural members. I don't like to speak for anybody else, because it is a personal problem, but it is a problem with the hotel rates gone up as they have. We used to get hotel rates of \$5.00 a day; we paid 50 percent. Now we pay \$10.00 to \$12.00 a day and three-quarters — we pay three-quarters. Meals have gone up and all your other expenses incurred have gone up, and I think for the rural members who are not — I think there should be some consideration. It's true that no member of the Opposition can move this motion or amendment to the motion, but I would hope that the government would give serious consideration to a change, to take out the number "60" and leave it wide open, and only pay on sitting days. This is what I think; it should be on sitting days only. If it's 80 days, you pay for 80; if it's 90, you pay for 90; if it's 60, you pay for 60; or if it's 50 you pay for 50. But I think this is the way it should be worked out.

When we brought this in at the time, I remember, about four years ago, it looked very good at the time, and at that time we were sitting about 60 days or 65 days, but this year I think we are up to about 90, I think, right now and maybe another four or five more days yet, so I would hope the government would give serious consideration to this change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we're all appreciative of the situation prevailing to members, our rural members, at this session, and that was one of the reasons, quite frankly, that it was suggested that I should bring in the amendment to the motion of the House Leader instructing the Rules Committee to take this under advisement, or set up an independent commission, which had been the original recommendation or a recommendation from the Committee on the Rules. Of course, that process will not make it applicable to honourable members at this particular session, and that is the point, of course, being raised by the members opposite. We know that increases have gone up in hotels and eating. Of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) course, those of us who reside in Winnipeg still have to eat, although I guess it's a little cheaper to eat at home than it is to have to eat, say, at a hotel.

A MEMBER: Who eats at home?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, we don't go home these days; we're here all the time. But anyway, it is unfortunate that it may not apply to this particular session, and I agree with my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne that this has been an exceptionally long session and I join him in the hope that these added costs will only last for another four or five days and we can go back to our respective families.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3, 61.1(1) — passed? The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman. 61.1(1). I gathered the First Minister was going to make an amendment but if he is not going to move his, I have one I intend to move in any case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to 61.1(1) as follows: That the proposed new subsection (1) of Section 61.1 of the Legislative Assembly Act as set out in Section 3 of Bill 43, be amended by striking out the word "five" in the third line thereof and substituting therefor the word "four".

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to the amendment. I guess my wording will have to be somewhat changed from the written form but the wording will be: That the amendment be amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "four" where it appears in the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that Section 61.1(1) be further amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "four" where it appears in line 3. The Honourable Member.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the copies that I have sent around are not quite accurate because I haven't had time to change all of them. They were intended as an amendment originally to the section as it appears, not knowing whether or not the government was going to make the changes. I don't suppose that my proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, will endear me to a number of the backbenchers on the far side to whom I've been appealing on a number of occasions, to stand up to their front bench and not necessarily be led around by the nose and show some independence of spirit in this House and I understand that there are some hopefuls who — (Interjection) — Yes, certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member, does he recall at all the days between 1953 and 1961, more particularly between 1953 and 1957 when he sat golden-haired in those days in the back benches and why has he forgotten those days?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, not only golden hair but I even had some hair in those days. No, I really don't remember, Mr. Chairman, that I was particularly a "hopeful" at that point. I think I tried to retain an independent spirit all the way through and stand up for the things which I believed whether they were favoured by the front bench or not. However, — (Interjection) — Yes, I tried to contribute to the debates, that's true. Well, my honourable friend may think what he wants to about my motives. That's their game. However, I'm not being critical of the members who may be aspiring to higher office. I think that that's quite in order.

However, I don't really think that this is the proper course to follow and that's the reason I'm moving for the change and I mentioned this in my original comments on Bill 43. I think that there are two distinct functions in government. Under the British structure we accept that they are in a way together here in this House, because this combines the Executive Branch — that's the 13 gentlemen that belong to the Executive Council — and then the other members who are not of the Executive Branch but of the Legislative Branch. Now when we assemble here in this House, we are legislators. My honourable friends have a dual responsibility, that of executive and legislators. But to bring more members or a disproportionate number of members of a legislative body into the executive I think gets away from the function for which this House exists, and I submit that 13 Cabinet Ministers is ample to operate the Province of Manitoba; that that is a sufficient executive branch for a province of our size; that we should not be constantly adding to that and I recognize those gentlemen are busy gentlemen and if they are too busy then the way to get around it is to do it through staff appointments of the members,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) not suggesting any more staff -- (Interjection) -- No no. Oh no, I think you've got ample now; you've got too much. But if it were found that there are functions that cannot be performed, then it should be true staff attached to the Executive Council not by taking away legislators and making more executive members of them because I think that this destroys then the function of the Legislature as such. So my objection . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member mind explaining just a little more what he means by staff on the Executive Council.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, or staff on the Executive Council if it is required for research or staff in each department, if it is required to take away some of the load from the Minister, but my point that it's not because I find it . . . away with jobs for members of the House, but I just don't think that it is right because we're going to end up, Mr. First Minister, with so many of the members on the government side having other than legislative functions, either on boards, commissions or legislative assistants that I think it is thwarting the legislative process and I don't think it makes for good government because - and I've, through many of my speeches in the course of this session I have appealed and one of my bills is just to give the private members independence, to remove them from dependence on the executive, from too close a connection to the executive branch so that they can properly fulfill their legislative function, which is a different one, and to retain that independence which I think is necessary in a House of this sort and in order to provide good government.

So my objection to this is really a philosophical one. I don't think it's a right course of action. I know my honourable friends can say in Ottawa that's the course that's followed but this is a different situation. For one thing, Ottawa deals with a tremendous expanse of territory. The Ministers have to be away from the House on many occasions on proper official government function. Then the legislative assistant performs a function of representing the Minister in the House, being able to reply for the Minister in the House, deal with questions for the department in the House because the Ministers are away. That isn't the case here. Our Ministers don't need to be away that much. The province is not that big, they don't have to be away for extended periods so I think that removes it.

Secondly, the Ottawa House sits for very lengthy periods, almost full time now. Some might think that we're heading that way in this House. I am hopeful that this is not a standard pattern but the pattern in the past certainly has been that the House sittings are a matter of eight, ten, twelve weeks. And again the period of time that the Ministers are held in the House is a limited one and hence they don't need, again, the legislative assistants the same way because the Legislature is not sitting for that lengthy period, so I don't think that we can equate the Ottawa situation with this and I think that it is not the proper course to follow; that what we really need are, if it's 13 Cabinet Ministers, fine; 13 Cabinet Ministers, members of the Executive responsible to the House and every other member a legislator, as independent as can be in spirit, speaking out exactly the way he feels and the way he thinks his constituents need to be represented on issues.

Now, the Minister could say then well why then do you limit it to two? Well, Mr. Chairman, the facts are that we have two now. It's an accomplished fact; they have been performing functions; I'm not denying that they should be paid for what they have done in. If I had my choice I would have none, but if they exist, fine. It's done, but I'm not suggesting that we should go on beyond there. Let us stop at the two that we have and let us not expand it beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, it was a rather interesting stating of position that we have just heard from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I'd like to suggest to him, however, that it is - and I have stated this before - that what is really intended here is to see in which way and least expensive way it can be arranged to provide for a greater assistance and sharing of the workload among the members of the Executive Branch of government. Now one clear alternative that is open, of course, is to simply increase the size of Cabinet. But I want to point out to my honourable friend the fact which I'm sure he's aware of in any case and that is that simply appointing one more Cabinet Minister would in itself be more expensive than to take this option of providing for some easing of the workload by appointing four legislative assistants. In fact, as I calculated it, the appointment of a full Minister and the expenses that accompany that is more than twice as much as two - almost two and a half times as much as would be the case involved here in the appointment of legislative assistants and providing for

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) a pretty nominal extra emolument and out-of-pocket expenses. So this quite frankly is in the nature of an experiment.

Now, the honourable member therefore I take it will not be objecting on the grounds of expense because this is in every respect a less expensive way to proceed. I take it then that he is putting much emphasis, in fact he has in his remarks, put much emphasis on what he believes to be a departure from long-standing practice and that is to maintain a distinction between the roles of the Executive and the Legislative Branch. Well, this is something that has been at work in Ottawa now for about 11 years. I don't believe that it has in any way affected the fundamental nature of Parliament and its operation, the fact that there are now in parliament some 20 or so parliamentary secretaries or parliamentary assistants. In a House of 57, the honourable member argues, in a House of 57 having a Cabinet of 13 and four legislative assistants is making the Assembly perhaps too top-heavy with persons other than legislators and other than those who are exclusively legislators and I find that also pretty difficult to accept inasmuch as an Assembly of 57, having 13 Ministers and four legislative assistants, still leaves that group with very much in the minority so that the fundamental balance of the Assembly, I don't believe, would be affected.

Now having said all that, let me just indicate to the honourable member and others that in provinces with a smaller population, a smaller budget, smaller administrative responsibility, they have moved now - I can give some examples, New Brunswick for example, a Cabinet of 17 I believe - and if my honourable member is inviting me to increase the size of the Cabinet to that number then of course - but I am sure he wouldn't want to do that because to do that would be adding significantly to the expense of the administration of the province. What is involved here in terms of expense is \$10,000 which in itself, for the total proposal and that is as I said again or said before, is substantially less than adding only one more Minister.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't feel that it would be better to speak at . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, if I can be given about 30 seconds, I think I can make my contribution because I don't really intend to prolong the debate except to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: My question, Mr. Chairman, one remark of the First Minister and that's that the Minister for all purposes need to be at the full level. There has been a history in Manitoba on at least one occasion that I know of of a Minister without portfolio had a very much reduced salary and his obligations were in line, I think, with the honorarium or the wage that he got in relation to it so that it is possible to do it the other way and the cost factor isn't necessarily there. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to say that I don't intend to repeat all of the arguments that have been made at second reading and the other stages of the bill, only to say that I'm going to support the amendment or the sub-amendment because it's better than the amendment. I'll support the amendment over the main motion and regardless of what it is, I'm going to oppose the section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm confused too. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I would move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Your committee has considered Bill 121 with no amendments, and Bills 17 and 39 with amendments.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just before I adjourn, may I have the consent of all of the honourable members to change the public representation of this group on the Public Utilities Committee by changing the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, taking him off Committee and putting on the Committee the Minister of Transportation. — (Interjection) — pardon me? No, Joe is anxious for some more work here. Agreed? (Agreed)

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Government Services, 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 8:00 o'clock Tuesday evening.