

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 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 First Minister.

STATEMENT

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I should like to make a brief statement that relates to a front page story that was carried in the Winnipeg Tribune this afternoon. I refer to the several stories that appeared in that newspaper relating to The Pas Forest Complex and a report recently received by that newspaper, either direct or indirectly, by a consulting firm known as Arthur D. Little.

The reason I wish to rise now and make this statement is because I regard the story referred to as being rather misleading in several important respects. Without enumerating many of the specifics that arise therein, I think it is necessary to say that while the viability of the project is not under question by this government at this time, and while the actions of the firms themselves have never been under question by the government at this time as to whether or not the actions were legal or illegal, there are, however, other features of the project and the financial agreement relating thereto which this government has questioned and continues to question. More particularly, it must be said, I think, that the nature of the pay-out procedures by which monies were advanced by the Manitoba Development Fund to the firms in question, the pay-out procedures appeared, in recent months, to be unorthodox and also there seemed to be a time lag in terms of keeping up-to-date accounting of the flow of funds. And I believe that it should also be said that in the presence of witnesses personnel of the Arthur D. Little Company, which had the responsibility for pay-out procedures, admitted that there was a requirement that the pay-out procedures be improved upon and tightened up. In addition to that, I want to disassociate myself from any inference or implication in that newspaper account that would appear to indicate that this government was satisfied, therefore, with the pay-out procedures and satisfied with the level of fees. We have taken the position that the pay-out procedures had to be improved upon and we are still insisting on that; in addition to that we still take the view that the level of fees certainly require further explanation. So far as the basic viability of the project is concerned, we are more or less in accord with the position stated by Arthur D. Little that the project does have viability.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): The Minister has just made a statement. If there are some members on the side of the Official Opposition who wish to speak I would -- fine. If not, then I would take this opportunity, which I think is proper in the House.

I thank the Minister for his statement because yesterday when the first stories appeared, and one of the reasons that prompted my questioning at the time, that the indications were that the area of disagreement - maybe we should put it that way - between the government and the company was really very limited, strictly the question of accounting procedures, and it has been my understanding that there were in fact some items of greater importance at question. My sole concern, frankly, in this affair is that the public of Manitoba be properly protected, and from the outset this was my endeavour and that of my party to ensure that whatever was done would be in the final best interests of Manitoba, recognizing the difficulties of having developments in that area. And I know how difficult it is to be questioning, I suppose, these things because one appears then to be questioning development, and that certainly is not my object and never has been the object of our group. On the other hand, any development must be a sound development in the interests of everyone.

This continuing - misunderstanding, I suppose, is one way of putting it - between the government position now, the previous government, what's right and what's wrong, I think is very detrimental to all interests in this - the companies, the government, and the public of Manitoba, and I would hope that very soon there will be a definitive statement of some kind arising hopefully out of the audit report, and that an over-all and clear-cut statement can be made to the people of Manitoba, because the continuing concern, I think, is extremely harmful. I would like, as well as the audit report, if the government would at the same time make a statement of some kind as to the total viability of the project, because there has been continuing

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) questioning by some people as to whether or not, in fact, the northern forest resources could sustain the type of enterprise that has been established there; whether the inventories were adequately completed; whether the Department of Mines and Natural Resources were satisfied that the project in itself can be viable. All of this is of concern to the people of Manitoba in the final analysis, and I'm frankly not interested in the politics of it. I think at this stage we have to look upon the project as one in which all of us are involved. All of us as Manitobans have money involved in it, and we have to get the thing going in the best way possible, but I think it is urgent that there be as clear a statement as we can have at this time on the over-all aspects of it; the accuracy of the present financial situation; the viability of the company or the companies in the long run; and a clearing of the air, if I might put it that way, because I think that the present situation, the statements in the paper over the weekend, the questions of the First Minister at the end of last week, whether or not he would meet with Mr. Reiser, the questions yesterday and so on, I think can only in the long run be harmful, so I would hope that there would be very soon a very definite statement as to where we are going.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the authorities on this subject insofar as our party is concerned, I too want to express our appreciation for the opinion given by the Minister tonight, and in a personal sort of a way I would like to see this situation cleared up in the public mind for all concerned. Being a northerner myself, I would hope that it will progress and come to a happy conclusion, and provide the thousand jobs we are all hoping for.

In the meantime, I trust that any further remarks that may be made could be held in abeyance until such times as the newspaper report which the First Minister has referred to has been perused by those in this party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to thank the First Minister for his statement. Because of other activities I have not had the chance to peruse the Tribune to which he referred to, and the articles that are contained therein. However, I certainly will take in mind what the Minister has said when perusing the statements tonight.

On the matter of the audit, has the audit been completed and has the government already obtained a statement? I certainly, now that we are all in it and I think I am accepting responsibility too as a member of this House, to the project, because it is now a fact; we are advancing monies; and I think we all have the same interest that this project now be a success, otherwise we will all suffer, and I certainly do hope that whatever the report contains, or at least that we try and make the best of arrangements so that it can be successful.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I wonder -- I'm sorry; I wasn't in the House to hear only just the last few remarks of the First Minister's statement, and I'm wondering in view of the fact neither the Leader of our Party nor the former Minister of Industry and Commerce were in their seats, if the opportunity would be afforded them to reply to the statement at a future . . . ? No?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a Return to Order for Address No. 5 dated March 31st.

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

MR. RON McBRIDE (The Pas): . . . further clarification on the CFI situation. I wonder if the First Minister could inform the House whether the commentator on CJAY TV tonight, who stated that the MDF was not being loaned money by the Manitoba Development Fund, or that the fund was merely guaranteeing loans, whether this commentary was correct or incorrect?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear the commentator referred to so it's difficult for me to give any appraisal of the accuracy of what he said, but taking the honourable member's accounting of it, if it is accurate, I would have to say that the commentator was simply incorrect if he intimated that the MDF was not lending money but merely guaranteeing a loan, or loans.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Birtle-Russell posed a couple of

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) questions relative to Operation LIFT and how it will affect our crop insurance program and PFAA exemptions. I want to say that I did some checking and I find that there would be no loss of benefits as a result of any producer abstaining from production for one year under the crop insurance program, but only if that is the case in two years in succession; and that insofar as exemptions from PFAA payments, I want to say that there is no way in which we can exempt ourselves from PFAA payments if there is no crop insurance contract, but that the minimum contract required is only 10 acres, so that the producers use their own discretion.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question of the First Minister following up on the question from the Member from The Pas. Is the First Minister in a position to tell us at this stage how much money the principles have invested in CFI and the other related industries, and how much money the people of Manitoba have invested?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can take the question as notice, but even then I wouldn't be too hopeful about giving a reply very quickly because it's my distinct impression that it's almost impossible to determine how much equity capital has been already injected - that is, private risk capital - particularly if one does not take into account the question of fees and the relationship of the amount of fees paid out to the private risk capital requirements.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the First Minister would take it as notice and provide the House with whatever information he can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has he had any further word from the federal authorities as to whether they will provide funds for assistance to farmers in southern Manitoba because of flooding?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge, but I shouldn't say that I definitely have not received word; not to my knowledge I haven't, but I'll check.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Transportation. In view of some of the problems that have arisen this spring particularly, and early summer, with regard to the maintenance of provincial roads in particular, has the Minister reconsidered the policy of having this established from a central command, as we might put it, with specific times for each road? Is he prepared to give more leeway to the regional offices to take care of local problems, weather changes and so on?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have given as much local economy as I think I should give to the district offices. I really have a problem with the House sitting. I can't get out into the districts. I am getting complaints from MLAs from both sides of the House and from many of our supporters, claiming that our maintenance management program is unworkable. I can't accept it, especially in view of the fact that we spent, or the previous government committed us to spending \$180,000. I'm not prepared to scrap that program until we have given it a reasonable time to prove itself out, and as soon as this House gets out of here and I can get out on the road and have a look at it and make a firsthand assessment, I'm just going to have to leave it as it is; and if we do find that the system is not working, certainly we are going to have to make some substantial changes.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Am I given to understand that the Minister of Transportation is not accepting the opinions and the judgment of his men in the field but he has to do it himself? Is this the interpretation of his statement?

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking for an expression of opinion of the Minister of Transportation as to what he thinks about the value of the opinions from his field staff, and that kind of question asking for an opinion is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister's point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I direct a question, then, to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation, and I did the other day and didn't get a sensible answer, and I ask him now: is it his intention to let the roads go, in the words that he would use himself, "go to

(MR. WATT cont'd.) hell" until such time as he himself has got some time to go out and see what a mess they really are in? No answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Transportation. My district engineer lives in Boissevain and I would like to ask him if he has been in consultation with the engineer as to the condition of the roads and how the program is working in the past three weeks.

MR. BOROWSKI: May I make it clear, once and for all, that I have no intention of telling those on the other side of the House what conversations or meetings I have with my staff. It's my business and none of your cotton-pickin' business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Transportation would consider, when the House is recessed, to come to Emerson constituency first, please.

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

MR. MOLGAT: I want to thank the Minister of Transportation for the reply he gave me to my original question indicating that he is prepared to reconsider the program, because he has received, no doubt, many complaints, as I have, and I think it should be.

In view of the fact that we don't know when the House might rise, would the Minister consider pairing with me so that he may go out onto the road and see the programs himself and not be held up, because this is an urgent problem in rural Manitoba.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, before the Member for Ste. Rose changes his mind, I gladly accept his offer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't think it's quite fair for the Minister to take up the Member for Ste. Rose. I think the business of the House is of greater importance. If all of us took the same action there would be no one here to conduct the business of the House.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I'd just like to say that obviously the roads in Rhineland constituency are in much better condition than the ones in my constituency.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly not the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. FROESE: I would ask the Minister of Transportation a question. The question I would like to direct to him is whether he will be so kind, after the House is prorogued, to come to Rhineland and take a drive with me over the provincial roads in that constituency and see whether we cannot do something about them.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous administration, this Minister will visit every constituency in Manitoba.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether any members in the Opposition benches can indicate that we can proceed with Bill No. 148, which is now standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I believe that the Minister wishes to speak to it and I'm sure that, even after he speaks, according to the rules there will be an opportunity for the Member for St. Vital. I don't want to talk about the latitude of that opportunity lest I be shouted down by the members on the opposite side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to the Member for St. Vital prior to this and he suggested that if he wasn't in the House, possibly I could make a few comments and let the bill go on to committee. I have had a chance to read the bill and . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the bill has not been called, has it?

MR. SPEAKER: I . . . the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thought we were still in the period before the Orders of the Day and that the Leader of the House was simply asking for information from this side,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) because if it is the intention to proceed to the bill I would like to ask a question about the procedure first. Is it the intention of the government to refer the bill, if it goes through second reading here, to a committee? And if so, when might that committee sit, because there are some municipal people who are concerned and who want to appear before committee.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had indicated that - let me put it this way - that the bill will not be referred in such a way that people will not be able to make representations. We will not sit, for instance, if we do go to Law Amendments Committee tonight, which I hope we will, it will not be to discuss this bill; that there will be no proceeding with this bill without people having an opportunity to make representations.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . regardless of what happens to the bill, if it passes second reading, it will have the opportunity of having public representation? Fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would just hold his fire. His Honour is here to -- well, His Honour is waiting to enter the Assembly.

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's assent:

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 10 - An Act to amend The Optometry Act.
- No. 36 - An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Sports Federation - La Federation Manitobaine des Sports.
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- No. 64 - An Act consenting to the merger and amalgamation of the Manitoba Farmers Union with the National Farmers Union and Others.
- No. 65 - An Act to amend The Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act.
- No. 67 - The Privacy Act.
- No. 88 - An Act to amend The Registry Act.
- No. 89 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2).
- No. 90 - An Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.
- No. 94 - The Expropriation Act.
- No. 96 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.
- No. 97 - The Suitors' Moneys Act.
- No. 98 - The Health Services Insurance Act.
- No. 100 - The Museums and Miscellaneous Grants Act.
- No. 101 - An Act to amend The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act.
- No. 104 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.
- No. 105 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- No. 110 - An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.
- No. 111 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (3).
- No. 115 - An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act.
- No. 123 - An Act to amend The Wildlife Act.
- No. 126 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
- No. 127 - The Age of Majority Act.
- No. 129 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.
- No. 130 - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.
- No. 133 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.
- No. 136 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, (3).
- No. 138 - The Development Corporation Act.
- No. 140 - The Law Reform Commission Act.
- No. 141 - The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1970.
- No. 144 - An Act to validate By-law 1695 of The Town of The Pas.
- No. 145 - An Act respecting The Town of Beausejour.
- No. 146 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 150 - An Act to amend The Revenue Tax Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

(His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire.)

GOVERNMENT BILLS (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 148. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I confess that I am certainly not an expert on municipal affairs but I find this interesting because it is dealing with a problem that is, in my view, very acute; not only acute in the areas that this bill will be able to serve, but rather it's an acute problem in suburban Manitoba as well as rural Manitoba.

On first reading of this bill, my impression was simply that this is a very feeble effort in remedying the situation, and will in fact do very little to improve the lot of the farmers or the gardeners that are caught in this assessment squeeze. I'm still convinced that it really will do very little in terms of remedying their real problems. I wish, however, in all honesty to offer to the Minister my sense of appreciation for the effort made in trying to get to the problem in spite of not reaching a solution that is worthwhile. I realize that this is a very complex problem. It's not an easy one to remedy. I think we must be honest and recognize that it's not easy to get to that kind of solution unless you study the whole idea of taxation based on assessment.

I would suggest, as I have suggested two times at least before in this Chamber, that this is one of the most pressing problems as far as Manitoba is concerned, and unless by this fall, unless the government has studied the matter sufficiently to become sufficiently aware of the problem and come up with some kind of remedy to this kind of problem by this fall, I would suggest that they are dragging their feet, because it is the most pressing problem in the area of taxation that we're facing now in Manitoba.

The Act, basically, attempts to help the people who are going to remain gardeners and scare away the people who are going to speculate in property surrounding the city area. The two assessments might work but I am rather skeptical. I am afraid that the deferral of taxes might lead to indebtedness, might lead to indebtedness more than it will lead at present, and the nine percent interest, Mr. Speaker, is one that will make the debt accumulate quite rapidly. I can only see benefit in this bill for those who keep the property for eight years or so and at the end of that period sell it, having deferred the total amount or more, the total amount of the taxes that is possible to defer under this bill. In selling this property, I understand that the taxes must not exceed the amount of assessment between the two assessments, and in that way it's possible that the landowner who will sell the property at that particular time will stand to gain.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is really not helping a great number of people and it's really not a very significant kind of help. I can't be too critical of the bill because I can't propose something that is more constructive. I would not suggest that we vote against the bill in that it really doesn't do enough, because in fact it's an effort; it's not a good one, but it's an effort, and I would recommend that we support the bill, but not voice satisfaction in that it does what we would like it to do. I'm a little bit skeptical about the fact that it ties property that can be collected for land taxes but that's really no change; this is what we've got right now. I'm certain, Mr. Speaker, that there are more learned people in my caucus on municipal matters who will be offering comments to this bill as it gets to committee.

May I suggest, just in closing, that I share the concern voiced by members of my caucus and other members on this side of the House, who said on previous occasions that really, maybe we are not giving sufficient time and notice to the people who want to appear before our committee. I wish to indicate that I am not satisfied with the way our committees have been operating; that we haven't got sufficient notice out, of which committee is sitting when. I don't think that the people of the Opposition and I don't think the public ought to be satisfied with the way our committees have been operating of late. I wish that, rather than dig in their toes and say we are going to force the issue to be this way, that the House Leader and the members of government decide to be a little but more humane and a little more co-operative and decide to hold committees in such a way that the public can make representation at their convenience.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs is closing debate?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Yes, unless there

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) are other members who would like to speak further on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a variety of comments and complaints in respect to the bill, and I appreciate particularly the words expressed by the last member that spoke because I think that his comments did make a great deal of sense in respect to his analysis. At least it was a constructive analysis insofar as the contents of this bill was concerned. I only wish that he had been with the previous government. I wish also that the Member for Birtle-Russell had sat with the previous government during the decade or so that the previous government had formed office; because the Member for Emerson made a statement that unless a solution is arrived at by this government by this fall, then this government would be dragging its feet. I can only assume that the honourable member indicting this government being in office a little more than one year would therefore by comparison agree that the previous government that sat in office for eleven years and failed to deal with the basic problems of assessment - in fact didn't even have its feet on the ground - I would have to assume that that would be the honourable member's analysis as well when he made such a comment in reference to our government after it being in office a little more than one year compared to the previous government's being in office over eleven years. But I think that probably if there had been this spirit and this attitude that's expressed by the Honourable Member for Emerson in the previous government that the previous government would in fact have taken action along these lines.

There are just a few areas that I think should be detailed. One is some suggestion that has been made that the tax deferral would eat up the complete value of the property. I would just like to give an example what the situation could be if the assessed value based on agricultural purposes of a farm was 10,000 and if because of the influences introduced to that farm as a result of urban sprawl increased that value to 20,000 dollars and the accumulated tax deferral and interest say amounted to \$15,000 before the property either ceased to be farmed or in fact was sold, then the basic level would not fall below 10,000. In other words there would be 10,000 of the 15,000 dollars that had been accumulated in taxes and interest applied to the deferral but not the remaining five, so that there would be a constant basic level - constant, that would not be eaten into; the value insofar as farm assessment would remain constant, it would not be eaten into by the tax deferral account.

There has been complaint in respect to interest. I do share the concern that has been expressed by the honourable members about the question of interest. Certainly nobody likes to pay interest in the modern commercial world, commercial transactions, but this money will be advanced by the province and considering the cost to the province in the administrative handling of this money it would not be possible unless the province is prepared to subsidize this program and certainly this is something that we may wish to look into to provide this interest at a lesser sum than nine percent. It just would not be possible under the circumstances.

There has been a suggestion by the Official Leader of the Opposition that this matter should be withdrawn, the bill should be withdrawn and should be further studied. This matter has created some concern in respect to myself and others because we are going to be dealing with Municipal Affairs in Committee between this session and the next session and I don't want to proceed from here with any rigid mind in respect to this problem; however, I do think that before we make a final decision in respect to that we should hear what is said by way of public submissions, public representations, then evaluate our position from that point on. So on this basis I would suggest that we give this bill support to committee stage, see what the public submissions have to say. If as a result of those submissions it is felt that more time is required then I think that we can hopefully by consensus agree at that point to refer it to the Municipal Affairs Committee that's been set up and to deal with matters of assessment in total between sessions. If on the other hand we find that the attitude expressed through the public submissions is such it would give us some encouragement, then we might proceed to finalize this bill through third reading this session.

So with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude my remarks.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question? Would the Minister tell me what committee the bill is being referred to?

MR. PAWLEY: The bill is being referred to Law Amendments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell me when the hearing on Law Amendments will be held to receive submissions?

MR. PAWLEY: Well I possibly should permit the House Leader to express this, but I would hope that we could make arrangements after the hearings have been completed in respect to Public Utilities Committee so that we could give reasonable opportunity for people to be heard.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this will be - I indicated to the Member for Ste. Rose that adequate notice would be given. The procedures are going to be that we are going to be - when we finish what we have before us now or substantially what we have before us now, the House will be called into Session in, let us assume, a period of five days; it would seem that that would be a good time when the House is called into session to hold Law Amendments Committee immediately after the same day as the House is called into Session to hear the representations on this particular bill.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if the House Leader is permitted to make a statement in that matter perhaps I would be permitted to respond.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I only tried to answer the honourable member who asked when Law Amendments Committee would be called.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of order, I think I was entitled to ask the question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs because he had just spoken. I don't think that the House Leader was required to answer within that rule, but having been given that permission to the House Leader may I say that I would suggest that what he has suggested is reasonable assuming that two or three days notice is given to the other people outside the community. I'm not trying to argue, I'm just saying that I would hate to come back, to find the House being called, to find that we were going into Law Amendments Committee that there hadn't been adequate notice given to those that were possibly to make representation; that at the same time that the House was called, that publicity might be given to the fact that representation would be received on this bill.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate not three days I indicated five days. For my honourable friend's information, I spoke to the Executive Secretary of the Wildlife Federation and he did not wish to make representation before it.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to know that if the -- well, Mr. Speaker, may I accept the opportunity to respond to the statement that was made by the House Leader? I don't require leave because, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader didn't have leave to make a statement about speaking to the Executive Director of the Wildlife Federation. It just so happens that I had an opportunity to speak to the Executive Director of the Wildlife Federation, too, Mr. Speaker, and he thanked me for the position that I had taken in the House, that the position I had taken in the House was quite an accurate one.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's my desire with concurrence of honourable members if it's available, that we move into Law Amendments Committee to consider the Landlord and Tenants Act clause by clause. I had indicated to honourable members that this is what -- (Interjection) -- and the Dental Services Act. The reason that I want to proceed in this manner is because if we do get back to committee, if we do get back tonight and wish to move into Committee of the Whole House, then we can consider the bill that was left over from this afternoon plus anything else that we pass in Law Amendments Committee, if that's agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm then leaving . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the House Leader a question? What is there still to appear before Law Amendments Committee?

MR. GREEN: The Landlord and Tenant Act and the Dental Services Bill, Dental Services, those are the only two.

MR. MOLGAT: That's it?

MR. GREEN: Well the Municipal -- (Interjection) -- Yes. The Municipal will not be considered tonight. I'm trying to give accurate information. I indicated that with regard to the tax deferral bill that we would meet on the day that the House was called back into session which would be five days, and we would give adequate notice.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, has the House Leader given an indication that from the time of adjournment we will be adjourning for five days and returning in five days? You know this is the first information I've had.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, not more than five minutes ago I indicated that it is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) likely that we would be talking about a period of something like five days. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, we will be back in the House tonight. I have indicated to my honourable friends the other day that we would be asking for an adjournment of that nature. I don't know the exact day that we are coming back so I don't want to give him misinformation; I'm asking for concurrence of the House to now move to Law Amendments Committee to consider the two bills that are pending before that Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I am now leaving the Chair to return when the House is prepared to resume tonight's sitting.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. -- (Interjection) -- Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, just let us get the report of the Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): By leave, Mr. Speaker, I beg to present . . .

MR. FROESE: I don't think this is proper to bring in a report at this time. -- (Interjection) -- No it isn't. -- (Interjection) -- It's out of order. -- (Interjection) -- No there was no agreement.

A MEMBER: No agreement. No agreement.

MR. GREEN: . . . honourable member understood that I had indicated that we would go into the Law Amendments Committee . . .

MR. FROESE: Yes and report back.

MR. GREEN: . . . we would come out of the Law Amendments Committee and take it into the Committee of the Whole House. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there's anything that can be done about it, if my honourable friend insists that he objects I'm not sure that there's anything we can do.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to consider the amendments that were placed before the committee. Some of them were brand new, we hadn't had a chance to consider them and I feel on that ground I'm not prepared to grant leave to bring in that report at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want the members to know he has the right to take the position that he's taken. My colleague the Minister of Labour says that he believes there was an agreement that leave would be given but if the honourable . . . -- (Interjection) --

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): That's right.

MR. GREEN: Pardon me?

MR. FROESE: I agreed to go into Committee but not that the report would be brought back tonight.

MR. GREEN: Well my honourable friend - there's nothing that we can - want to do to suggest this.

MR. PAULLEY: I think there is.

MR. GREEN: The alternative would be to suggest that we be here at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon to consider the report of the Committee of Law Amendments. We have already called delegations for 9:30 in the morning on Public Utilities Committee but we can move into the House at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: But he granted leave.

MR. GREEN: He denies that he granted leave.

MR. PAULLEY: He did grant leave.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we'll have to come back regardless for third readings of other bills. I can't see the rush, I certainly can't see the rush in this matter.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I see his point about his right as a member of the Assembly to refuse leave to take under consideration in Committee of the Whole amendments that were moved and accepted in Law Amendments on the same day. So I'm not questioning that at the moment. But there is another procedural point before us and that is as to whether or not it is not in order for the Chairman of Law Amendments to at least move his report at this time, bearing in mind, honouring the honourable member's refusal to grant leave to have the report of the Committee, the bill considered further in Committee of the Whole this evening.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I want the House to know that this morning as soon as the amendments were available in print I gave copies, and I gave the Honourable Member from Rhineland a copy, so he had the amendments as soon as any other member had them available, and I think he had ample time to

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) consider them. The amendments, Mr. Speaker, were thoroughly explained in Law Amendments Committee and there was no rushing there.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I wasn't necessarily speaking of the Bill the Attorney-General was referring to. I'm referring to the amendments of the other bill. I'm quite agreeable to go along with the First Minister in accommodating him and having the report brought in but on the condition that I can adjourn it so that I can then look into the amendments.

MR. PAULLEY: You granted that leave. Let's not accommodate him, he's right or he's wrong.

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member suggesting that he wants to adjourn debate on the report of the committee being received - because that's what I heard him say. You have no objection to going into Committee but you will not give leave to considering those two bills tonight; is that what you're saying?

MR. FROESE: That is the point. I don't want those two bills considered here tonight because I want another chance to look at the amendments that were presented in the Committee.

MR. GREEN: Well there's no point in getting the report moved, it can be moved tomorrow.

I move, Mr. Speaker - and I'm indicating to honourable members now that I will be adjourning the House tonight to tomorrow afternoon at 2:30, tomorrow, 2:30 in the afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. . . .

MR. FROESE: I can't be here tomorrow afternoon.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is one other problem that I want to raise just before we move into committee. That is that I previously asked that the Minister of Transportation be changed for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation on the Public Utilities Committee. I would like that reversed so that the Minister of Tourism will continue to sit on the committee.

I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair . . .

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I wonder if I could ask the Honourable House Leader why it is that we could not on our return after the five days, and assuming that this is going to be so, consider the bills in Committee of the Whole? Why is that it has to be done tomorrow?

MR. GREEN: It's not illegal that we couldn't do it but we wish to proceed with it tomorrow - we would like to proceed with it tonight.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should inform the Minister that I have to attend a funeral tomorrow afternoon and I can't be present. -- (Interjection) --

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs 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, 134 - those are the only two.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 43 an Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act. We are dealing with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that Section 61.1(1) be amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "four".

Just to clarify then, we have first an amendment by the Honourable First Minister that the proposed new subsection 1 of Section 61.1 . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I appeal to you, Sir, to ask honourable members on both sides of the House to observe the usual requirements of decorum. It's impossible to even hear the Chair from here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the motion of the Honourable First Minister 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"; and then we have a sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that Section 61.1(1) be amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "four" where it appears in line three.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the sub-amendment calls for two positions rather than

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) four and it seems to me that on the surface that I would give support to the sub-amendment because it seems to me that the need for these positions has not been established in my opinion. We've had previous governments and they've been able to function without any assistants whatever and now within a year the new government is asking for four assistants. I don't know how come all of a sudden we have such a large need for people in this area and for these positions. I would certainly like to hear more of the need if it does exist for these positions. I know that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface certainly has done considerable work as far as I know and what has been related to me. I don't know so much about the Member for Osborne who is the other assistant. I don't know what services he has been performing and just what functions he is serving in this capacity. Certainly I would like to hear - he is not in the House at the present time, he is not in his seat, but perhaps we could have some explanation given as to what the functions are of the assistants and just what duties they do perform and whether there is a real need for these positions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was referring to, I'll take it upon myself to give a very brief explanation of the function of a Legislative Assistant. It is that of a parliamentary secretary, at the provincial level in effect, to assist the Minister with respect to administrative work and also with respect to representing the Minister on such occasions as the Minister cannot be present at himself. So that there is work involved in appearing in certain places in the province from time to time, representing the Minister, if the Minister is unable to attend; there is also the function that of assisting in administrative work, enquiring into the operations of the department in a way that is helpful and useful to the Minister. As such, the help given by a legislative assistant removes or obviates the necessity, I think, of hiring additional permanent staff, at least to that extent it does. Much of what is contemplated in the way of function of the legislative assistant could be performed by an executive assistant hired from outside, but doing it that way I remind my honourable friend is more expensive and I mean what I say when I say that I believe this is less expensive to the public purse than a number of alternatives that have been considered.

It might be of interest to the honourable member to know that if we adopted the practice of the Government of Alberta and appointed 17 ministers, then we would not of course require any legislative assistants at all, because 17 ministers is that number which we would have with 13 ministers and 4 legislative assistants, but the cost to the Crown I would estimate doing it this way would be at least 60 to 75,000 dollars less.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say a few words on the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I plan on supporting this motion, because I think if there ever was a time to save the taxpayers money it's right now; never in history are the people in the rural parts of Manitoba any harder up than they are right now.

MR. SCHREYER: I just want to know if four Ministers would cost them more.

MR. McKELLAR: I would like to say to the First Minister here that we have enough Ministers in our province to look after 960,000 people.

MR. SCHREYER: You had more at one time, you know.

MR. McKELLAR: Thirteen is all we ever had, thirteen - twelve and one . . . This in my opinion - I can see the duties, I can see them right now. These people can go out campaigning, they can go out campaigning, they can start the day after the session ends and they can come into every area of the province. Now can you visualize a legislative assistant in the Province of Manitoba filling the same duties as Ottawa, I can't. I can see the need in Ottawa where the distance is a real problem, the ministers can't get away because it's a year round job. This is not a year round job, it's about a four month's session on the average and this is a little longer. I can't see the need at all of any Legislative Assistants, but if the First Minister wants Legislative Assistants I agree with the Member from Ste. Rose that two is sufficient, and I would like him to think about this. We are always concerned about the taxpayer, I think everyone of us should be concerned about the taxpayer, but this \$3,000 is only going to be a small part of the total cost. I can visualize a car being part, which will cost at least \$1,500 a year per man; I can visualize an office, I can visualize a couple of people in the same office with him, so when you add it all up, you have a lot more than \$3,000.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, it's true that in the past we haven't had this and I think times were a lot better than they are right now. Had you been in the government three or four years ago and brought this in I would say yes, but you are going to find the revenues are going to be down and down considerably this year and I think it would be the wise move on behalf of the government to keep these costs down on behalf of everyone. Sure \$3,000 isn't very much and it won't be very much out of my pocket for each one of the salaries of these legislative assistants, but it will mount up by the time you figure all the added costs.

That's all I have to say at this time, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to vote for the Member for Ste. Rose's amendment, and if it's defeated I'm voting against the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): It's late enough anyway, Mr. Chairman, so we may as well kick around for awhile longer. I missed my elevator. I guess we are here because we are not all there in the first place anyway. I can't understand the real arguments that were placed to us just now because if it was necessary to have them three or four years ago then I don't know why it isn't necessary to have them now. I suggested three or four years ago it was necessary - but on the other hand, perhaps the ministers aren't as good as they were three or four years ago and . . .

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Yes, we had capable guys that . . .

MR. BEARD: . . . one of the past minister's sitting over in the loges there, maybe we could throw a bouquet his way and say well we have to make up for it some way or another. But there isn't any logic really in this move, because if we're going to agree to two, and if two is not a sin, then why is four a sin, because it's a minority government? And they haven't promised me one of those positions. I doubt very much whether I will get one and I don't think I want one anyway. Probably I'd end up on Bill 56 and I wouldn't be happy in the first place. But I really don't see any evil in it, I honestly don't. I can't see that much money being spent by it and as I said before, I had always maintained that this was a good approach, not only when this government came in, but in the last government and in the last two premiers I have said that I felt that executive assistants should be appointed and they should be - at that time I had taken the attitude that they probably could make good use of the city members in this case because they were closer to government than the rural members who were out in the country. There's not much point in bringing a rural member in as an executive assistant but where members are sitting in the city itself and where we sometimes hear representation by population, etc., then maybe executive assistants will cool the hounds that are baying at our heels when they say they want all the representation of the Province of Manitoba to come from Metro Winnipeg.

But I think that four people is not too much to add. I think we will all agree that no one minister can look after the department of health and social development. We all remember what George Johnson said at one time "take it away, I don't want welfare because it's too much." And the Member for Souris-Killarney will recall this. This is right. He said one Minister cannot handle it so this is what was done. The Member for Lakeside held one or two portfolios, then lo and behold where did he go to? The Minister of Government Services was not satisfied nor was the Minister of Agriculture satisfied until there'd been a minister appointed to look after each of those departments. I think that all this comes back to the fact that government is big business and there are a lot of us that think they are big enough now, they shouldn't get any bigger. The New Democratic Party feel they should get bigger, bigger business. I suppose that if they go through with Bill 56, they'll need another two next year to look after that.

In all seriousness, I'm going to support the four members and I don't think it will hurt. I hope they will be used properly. If I felt that it was being used for political purposes, if I felt that they were going to be used to be sent out to make political speeches for the New Democratic Party until election time, then I certainly would be up and speaking against it very much so. If I felt that it was going to relieve a Minister to go out and make speeches for the New Democratic Party then I would be against that, but I think there is a lot of work to be done, I think that the elected person is much closer to the community and to the thinking of the people of this province than those that are hired by government as executive assistants or civil servants, whatever you may wish to call them, so I do support the fact that they've taken this type of approach.

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)

The only thing is that we've all sat down with mathematics and by the time we add up Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephones and all the rest, then, we find that they've all got jobs but God bless them, maybe they need it. I suppose we'll get along in Opposition without those jobs; maybe they'll throw some crumbs our way some day. But I don't think we're preaching for a cause. If we're going to vote for two, let's let them have four. If they come back for six next year we can say ha, ha, we told you so; you need them for political reasons maybe, or maybe they've proven to be so good that they can show us where they can cut costs by adding a couple of other members. But I really have no objection to it and I'll stick with the four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just briefly I'd like to take this opportunity to speak intimately to the government opposite. The press has long gone and left us and we have an opportunity - one of those rare opportunities - to speak about matters that concern ourselves directly and quite frankly I'd like to disassociate myself from the remarks made by the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, his frugality is one that perhaps we should understand. I'm not suggesting for a moment that his legitimate concern for the taxpayers isn't real and his points perhaps valid from that point, but it's been mentioned before and I'd like to mention it just once more and it won't take more than three or four minutes.

I don't quite feel that the government doesn't fully appreciate the fact that along with the acceptance, the unanimous acceptance of the Redistribution Bill prior to the last election the considerably heavier onus placed on those rural constituencies and the members representing them. I'm coming at it from the back door with respect to one of the objections raised with this particular matter on this Bill. And I say it with no malice or any unkind thought, but the present government is made up of primarily urban members - not exclusively - and then those who are not of urban areas - primarily again and not exclusively - are members who are receiving some special consideration for very legitimate reasons; northern members for the extreme problems of transportation costs and so forth. -- (Interjection) -- by statute, correct.

And on top of that, and we've raised some additional objections, we have established such things as the Northern Task Force which aside from doing a worthwhile job -- and I'm prepared to accept the fact that they are doing a worthwhile job, having read their first report and having listened to the apparent response of northern communities to that Task Force that I would have to retract some of the statements that I made at the time, if you will remember, at the time of the setting up of the Task Force -- but what I'm getting around to with this particular clause in addition we're talking about the possibility of four additional assistants or means of providing additional income for four or two, whether the amendment passes or not, additional people of the NDP caucus.

I would ask, and I will sit down after having asked this question, the First Minister to do a bit of arithmetic and to look at it from a non-partisan point of view and taking into account the personnel that he has been in a position or the government has been in a position to appoint to various boards such as Telephone or Hydro or Water Commission, in addition to the special allowances that members of his caucus are receiving because of their position by statute in northern ridings, in addition to the fact that most of - for me to provide anywhere near the same service to my constituents I have to put on 40,000 miles on my car, at my expense, and I do that largely - you know a year ago it was probably only 30,000 or twenty-five because my constituency of Rockwood-Iberville was -- (Interjection) -- no, my constituency was half as small. My constituency now stretches from Brooklands, 90 miles into the Interlake and it stretches past Portage and south of Portage and this can be said - unfortunately the political geography of the map is so divided that those of us who are facing most of the expenses are sitting on this side of the House. There are exceptions to it. I'm saying those that face similar burdensome expenses on that side of the House, have by statute, at least some allowance is being made - I'm making reference to the northern members recognizing that that's possibly not even enough, but Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to hold the First Minister's attention for a brief moment on this floor and suggest that the suggestion that has been made from this side that - and perhaps it was made unfairly - that this may in fact be or provide you, Sir, with a means of augmenting the incomes of the members within your caucus without doing anything that applies to the House as a whole, has some validity in it, and I suggest that the real basis for the validity is not any action that you have taken or haven't taken; in fact the validity lies in the acceptance, the unanimous acceptance of some years ago of the Redistribution Bill, which has considerably increased by the scope, the size and the type of expenses that constituents, all rural constituents

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) now face. As I say, it's not at all uncommon for a rural member to go through one car and 40, 50 thousand miles in the service of his constituents, and that based against an urban setting with different expenses but I'm sure not anywhere near the kind that I'm speaking about.

So Mr. Chairman, I will support the amendment and intend to support the Bill, but I take this opportunity to interject that plea, if you may. I have to say the press is still far removed from us so as I say this was an opportunity for an intimate tete-a-tete with the members of the treasury bench on this particular question and perhaps in the wisdom that I know is present there, although often not exhibited, you may choose to consider this matter at some future time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how lengthy reply the honourable member wanted but I will try and satisfy him with a brief reply. First, by saying to him that if he is bemoaning the fact that he has a relatively large riding now to travel and to service, that is a fact that I personally, for one, have had to live with too at times. In fact for a period of time I represented a riding that extended from the City of Winnipeg all the way east to the Ontario border, from the Trans-Canada highway all the way north to beyond the fifty-third degree of north latitude. I don't know how many thousand square miles that represents but there was no extra allowance paid for that fact even though it was at the federal level; nevertheless, many members represent relatively small urban ridings, there is no distinction made between the two. I don't know how relevant that is, Mr. Chairman, at the provincial level we do make a distinction between the large northern ridings and the smaller ones in the rural south and city. There is a statutory extra allowance paid and I don't think anyone in this Chamber really objects to that. Well, for years, Mr. Chairman, I sat on the opposite side, like the honourable member is now and received a legislative indemnity considerably less than the honourable member is getting now, representing a rural riding, nevertheless, and there was no extra allowance for travel costs.

I'm suggesting to the honourable member that perhaps he has a point when he suggests that it would seem to be disproportionate, the treatment that seems to be accorded this side relative to the other side. But on the other hand the honourable member should know that my colleague the Minister of Labour did move a motion just a few days ago to refer the matter of MLAs indemnities, and that includes the question of travel expenses, to the appropriate Standing Committee of this House in turn to be taken up, we hope, in a systematic way by an independent committee, outside committee. I don't mind saying for the record that I regard the present provision for travel allowance for MLAs to and from their riding to be anachronistic. I believe it covers the mileage to the session at the beginning of the session and to the home at the end of the session and I don't know in what way that can be reconciled with the requirements of modern day demands put on an MLA and it is not in keeping with the practice in other provinces and the Parliament of Canada, and so I would hope there would be some changes made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted one or two questions really of the First Minister. He mentions that the cost of an extra Minister in comparison to the four members as mentioned in his amendment. I was wondering would this take into consideration for these legislative assistants the several costs and the same privileges maybe that go with a Minister in the way of cars, desks, secretaries and allowances and the likes of? I was wondering what level that would stop at?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the provision here is to authorize an emolument which I can advise honourable members in no case would exceed \$3,000, and furthermore, for actual out-of-pocket expenses, there is no provision here for entitlement to automobiles or the like. Secretarial service would be that of the department of the Minister's office; just the barest of essentials in terms of office space.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is continuing.

MR. MOUG: A subsequent question. I would wonder then if a department became involved where it would look realistic to have representation to Europe and so on like that, of course this would be an expense as though it were a Minister?

MR. SCHREYER: Out-of-pocket expenses, Mr. Speaker, as submitted by actual voucher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from The Pas.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a couple of brief comments here in terms of the nature of the debate. I think that to discuss the proposal before the House in

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd.) . . . terms of supplementing the income of backbenchers on the government side is not what was intended by the legislation. Certainly I don't know of any backbencher on this side that couldn't earn more by not being a legislative assistant in some other line of work between sessions, so the purpose of the legislation is to allow the backbencher to be able to get involved in the process of government and to share some of the responsibilities in a minor way with some of the Ministers. The purpose of this legislation is not to supplement the income because all of us could make more in some other way between legislative sessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. All those in favour . . . The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'd just like to take a minute to make a couple of remarks. Every member is entitled to express his opinion and say why he's voting for it but I resent the remarks made by the Member for Souris-Killarney when he suggested the minute we put these assistants on the payroll that they're going to start campaigning the very next day. I want him to know that I still remember a February by-election when your government used executive assistants to campaign against us and in fact when Ministers, under the pretense of being in an area for certain departmental work were used for campaigning and I think we all, the Liberals are aware of it and we're aware of it and I think you're the last person that should come into this House and accuse us of this. At least allow us to make that mistake, to commit that sin which we haven't done yet. Allow us that courtesy and then he can come in next year and say look what their guys are doing.

All we're asking for here is really - we shouldn't be proud of it, it's cheap labour - because \$2,500.00 a year to me almost is, you know as one who has talked about the minimum wage for years, is an insult. I've had the Member for St. George working in my office for two months for nothing and I suppose when the session is over he's going to go back to the farm, but should this thing go through and he continues to work, he's going to work day in and day out for the rest of the year for \$2,500, which I think is cheap labour. If the Member for Souris-Killarney is interested in economics and saving money, he should be the first one to get up and say let's get this bill passed, because it's going to save the government a heck of a lot of money. You know an executive assistant starts off at \$8,400.00. What does he do? You know, in terms of real work, what does he do? These guys will be work horses and I think if you're really interested in what you said, you should vote for the Bill.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, before you . . . I'd like a ruling on whether the members who are going to be appointed Legislative Assistants are eligible to vote or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry that's not in order at this time. The Members have been called in and we are now ready to vote.

MR. McKELLAR: It is a particular point of order. I would like you to make a ruling on it.

MR. GREEN: . . . order. According to the bill everybody is eligible to be legislative assistants, so on that basis nobody could vote - including you people, that's right - so I would think that the point of order is not relative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion . . . Order.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, this is spelled out right here on Page 8, Section 12 Page 8. "A member shall not vote upon any question of which he has a direct pecuniary interest and the votes of any members so interested shall be disallowed." Now I want a ruling on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that there is no discussion at this stage. I've called the question and the members . . .

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Well Mr. Chairman, on a further point of order. I think that by the admission of the House Leader, all members on the government benches . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I don't believe, I do not believe it is in order for the member to speak at this time.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the government House Leader has said that anybody on that side could be appointed a legislative assistant . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, on a point of privilege. . .

July 21, 1970

MR. SHERMAN: So that rules all of them out, Mr. Chairman, except those who belong to the cabinet.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege I don't want to be misquoted by the honourable member. I said every member of this House, I did not say on the government side.

MR. SHERMAN: Well on that point of order then no member of this House should be entitled to vote on this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think that we've had - would the member sit down. It seems to me that when a division is called for there is no point of order on any other discussion that is in order at that time.

MR. McKELLAR: You haven't called the vote yet.

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

A COUNTED VOTE was taken the result being as follows: Yeas . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BILTON: He went from 9 to 11 that's the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's late in the evening, would the honourable members please rise again, so that we can have the correct count.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 16; Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the sub-amendment lost. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I was paired with the Member for St. Boniface. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, likewise I was paired with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, while honourable members are in the House that may have other things to do for a moment, the Member for Rhineland has agreed that he would give leave to the House going out of committee, getting a report, to come back into committee and hear the Landlord and Tenant Bill, so I just want members to know that we will also consider that.

MR. McKELLAR: Well Mr. Chairman, have I got a right to ask for a ruling on that motion that I made? We have another vote and I want a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I don't understand the member's question.

MR. McKELLAR: Well I don't understand you either but I want a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What ruling would you like? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, again, in an attempt to expedite matters, we are going to have to vote on a similar question. The honourable member is challenging the right of people to vote because they may -- well let him make his challenge. I think we should have a ruling and have it heard now because we are going to have to vote on it in a few moments.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Souris-Killarney is challenging the chairman's ruling as to whether or not his motion was in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I just clarify the situation and then the honourable member may challenge if he so wishes. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I suppose it is in order for an honourable member to request the chairman to make a ruling, but it seems to me that he can do so only if the honourable member is on a point of order questioning the right of someone to vote. In that case then it comes before the chair for the chair to make a ruling. But if the honourable member is merely asking for a ruling in the absence of any challenge on his part or any point of order on his part, contending that a particular member or members might not be entitled to vote, then I fail to see how it can come before the chair for a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it, the bill before the House dealt with matters of the Legislative Assembly and the reason that we deal with that in Committee of the Whole is because it concerns the conduct or the indemnity of members of this Assembly. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. And it is within, only within -- well may I continue without interruption?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't give a continental where the interruption comes from. We have dealt in this House since I became a member of the House I think on four or five occasions, at

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) least, dealing with the matter of indemnities, pensions and other emoluments of the members of this House, and that is what we are dealing with at the present time and on these occasions the question as to whether or not a member has a pecuniary interest are cast aside and set aside. The only time that the pecuniary interest of an individual member of this House arises is whether or not that interest prescribes to a conduct of a member dealing with an Act before this House. My honourable friend, the Member for Portage la Prairie shakes his head.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is the Minister of Labour questioning your ruling? I understood you made a ruling. Now the Minister of Labour is suggesting perhaps that you made a wrong ruling. — (Interjection) — Well what are you speaking on then.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm trying to indicate to my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie that insofar as the application of pecuniary interest is concerned, that we have . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You made your ruling on this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid that my ruling has been misunderstood. I would like to repeat it for the clarification of members of the House and particularly for the Member for Souris-Killarney.

We called a division and after the division was called and we were prepared to vote, the honourable member got up and asked a question about pecuniary interests. I am not concerned about what the content of his question was; I suggested to him that he had no right after a division was called to raise any question on pecuniary interests or any other subject matter. I refer him to Rule 10 (1) which says "when members have been called in preparatory to a division no further debate shall be permitted." I was not objecting to a question on pecuniary interest, I was objecting to "a question", so that is my point.

Now we are at this stage where I am about to move the vote on the motion of the Honourable First Minister and I believe that when I do that it is in order for the Member for Souris-Killarney to get up and to make a speech on pecuniary interests or any other question. I would just like to clarify that I was objecting to his question in a sense of any question, not the content of his question; so perhaps I could proceed to put the motion and the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney can raise a question at that time or make a speech.

I therefore call the motion as proposed by the Honourable First Minister 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". The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, at this time I will ask you to make a ruling on Section 12, Page 8 on the motion we are going to deal with at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I just want to clarify my own position. If the ruling is passed it will reduce the number from five to four. Does the motion then have to be put as amended or would then the bill pass with No. 4 in it?

The motion now is to reduce the number from 5 to 4, I take it, and the section would read four instead of five? All right.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit in answer to my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Killarney that this is not a question in which a member has a direct pecuniary interest. I repeat what I said before: if that were so, no member could ever vote on a question of this kind. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry takes that as a suggestion from myself that no member can vote. Well I really think that the honourable member is being facetious in interpreting my words as such; surely members can vote on legislation which deal with remuneration. This is not a question in which a member has a direct pecuniary interest; it is a question as to what the remuneration of members of the Legislature shall be. The fact that he happens to be one does not indicate a direct pecuniary interest to that member and I would ask you to rule accordingly.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would question whether members at large would be affected in any way by a vote on this question, because members who are not presently labelled as legislative assistants are purely in the stage of being hypothetical assistants so I think any member would vote. I would suspect, however, that there may be a different position for the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Honourable the Member for St. Boniface constituency and the Member for Osborns constituency who have been designated already by a decision of this House as being legislative assistants, and now because it was not in the original Act, because it's not in the estimates, because it's not in any other provision, except I believe this bill, who may then be in a questionable position - those two I think there may be a question on. I would think for other members that there is no problem.

MR. GREEN: On the same question. I want the honourable member to be serious, and I know he is being serious, but to seriously consider the following; that we all as ministers have seen on numerous occasions the salary of a Minister suggested to be reduced to one dollar, and if one were to follow the logic of my honourable friend's position to a conclusion it would mean that the Minister could not vote on this question. I submit that that is not a logical interpretation of the rules; that minister apparently has a direct pecuniary interest in his salary and yet the rules are not to be interpreted as dealing with salaries which are paid as a matter of remuneration to members.

I would therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is a nice distinction that the Member for Ste. Rose has made, but I would suggest that everybody can vote on this question.

MR. MOLGAT: On the same point, it seems to me that there is a difference though, because it is accepted that ministers are paid; it is now part of the estimates of the House. It's been part of the structure that they are paid salaries, we might question the amount but it is nevertheless a part.

What we are doing here now is we are saying that a certain category of individuals who has not at this stage been paid, is now to be paid, and the question is whether the individuals who are going to benefit from this should vote or should not vote. This is my only consideration, whether those two individuals in the light of the fact that we are really creating something new, something that doesn't exist at the moment in which they have a pecuniary interest, should vote or not. Really I don't think it will make any difference to the final vote in the House, but it seems to me there may be here a question because of the fact that we are instituting a new practice in which two members at the moment do have, because of the way it was handled, a direct interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, after the statement made by the Honourable the Minister of Labour I didn't think it was really necessary to say anything more on the matter, but unfortunately - unfortunately we don't have instant reply so members don't have before them the explanation that was given by the Minister of Labour, but it is one that bears repeating therefore. That is simply this, that the Legislative Assembly Act - over the years it has been well understood that matters pertaining to members' emolument obviously are matters in which members have a direct pecuniary interest and yet members have always dealt with that question and voted for and against measures of indemnity and expense allowance and even pensions - matters of pension are a matter of direct pecuniary interest; they have all voted.

Now what is before us is an amendment to what? To the Legislative Assembly Act, an Act which has in its bearing on matters of direct pecuniary interest to members, have been voted on by members notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 12 of our Rule Book.

Now I put that to the side for members to consider and I want to refer to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Usually he is very logical in what he puts forward but tonight I think he will on reflection have to admit was not one of his better exercises in logic, because the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose tried to draw a distinction as between whether or not a Minister got paid at all or whether there was a motion to reduce his salary by degree or an amount. Either way, the Minister when he votes against a motion to reduce his salary, is voting on a motion that is of direct pecuniary interest to him and him alone. Now members can argue that that motion is pro forma and therefore doesn't mean that much. But I want to certainly disagree completely with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose's contention that a question as to whether or not there shall be any salary is a question of direct pecuniary interest, but a question as to whether it shall be \$1.00 or \$2,000 or \$8,000 is not a matter of direct pecuniary interest. That to me is just, you know, to me is not logical. And I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, two other points.

In a way I would welcome a ruling on this question of members voting on direct pecuniary interest. First of all I would like it defined more precisely just what is meant by "direct pecuniary interest" because it might be of interest with respect to other measures that come

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) before this House from time to time. But I really don't expect a ruling because I am in full agreement with the position taken by the Minister for Labour that it is really not necessary to have a ruling because the practice is well understood and has been long standing, therefore why should we offend our understanding of the rules and practices. Finally, I say that what we are arguing about in a sense has become academic because there are, in any case, only two members that could be said to have a known pecuniary interest and they're not here, they're not here, and no others are therefore in the same position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, despite what's being debated at the moment, I would hope that the review that was promised just a few moments ago that I understand will be taking place in between sessions on some of the matters that I referred to just a little while ago will in fact take place and be presented at the next session so I can vote on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Raineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. If Rule 12 does not apply in this case, when can it be made applicable? It seems to me it can never be applied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was in reality eminently logical because it grew out of a request that was made a few moments earlier by some member on this side - I'm not quite sure now who it was - but a question as to who the prospective appointees were that the government had in mind and although that appeared to be perhaps an inflammatory and a questionable enquiry at the time, I think the logic of it is now substantiated by the point raised by the Member for Ste. Rose.

It seems to me that what is at issue here is the question of the interpretation of our Rule 12 in this Chamber, and if anything, the rule as it's specified and spelled out on Page 8 should be submitted to the Rules Committee for examination and interpretation and for identification as to what a direct pecuniary interest involves. The First Minister has touched on this point and it seems to me it could well be submitted to the Rules Committee for examination between sessions because this is the key phrase and it's the point at issue here.

I was interested in the remarks of the Minister of Mines and Resources. He suggested that my interjection in the debate was a facetious one, and perhaps to a degree it was, but I think he created the situation for himself when he said that the appointments were open and available to any member of this Chamber. Now that is true, but if he hadn't said that I wouldn't have raised the point I did. What we are concerned with is the people that the government has in mind for these appointments. If they've been notified, if they've been advised, they have an unquestionable direct pecuniary interest in this clause, in this section of this bill. If there has been no suggestion to anybody in the government's ranks that they're in line for this kind of an appointment then they don't have a direct pecuniary interest; but if there are two or three or four members of the government ranks who have been so advised, then I submit - I would expect my friends in the Treasury Benches to concede that those two, three or four people do knowingly have a direct pecuniary interest, and the Rules Committee of this House should come to some kind of a determination between sessions as to what that phrase means.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I love to listen to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry. I said the other day, suggested to my honourable friend that he shouldn't pontificate in this House and we've just listened to a pontification from my honourable friend. — (Interjection) — I don't know how to spell it; and I may not be able even to pronounce it correctly, but I do love to listen to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry because I know - and also the Member for Souris-Killarney - because both of them have been in respective jurisdictions, one Federally, the other Provincially, that have had a pecuniary interest in the salaries of members of Parliament or members of this Assembly, and both of them have voted on them. — (Interjection) — Yes you did. Because your salary was increased . . .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . before I got there.

MR. PAULLEY: Before you got there?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, before I got there.

MR. PAULLEY: And how about the other MPs?

MR. SHERMAN: I don't know, but I went in . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh you don't know. That's exactly Mr. Chairman, what I'm suggesting to my honourable friend that he doesn't know.

MR. SHERMAN: No, no. On a point of privilege Mr. Chairman. That is not what my honourable friend is suggesting to me. What my honourable friend is suggesting is that I voted to raise my salary in parliament and I did not. I went to Parliament after that raise had taken place.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I say to my honourable friend he went there afterwards and got all of the benefits as the result of individuals within the Assembly who obtained the benefits of a pecuniary interest in what they were voting upon; and that is the proposition that we've got here today. My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney, to my knowledge, and he's not going to dispute me, voted in this Assembly for increases in his particular emolument. And I want to say, too, as far as the Member for Ste. Rose is concerned I do not recall that when an increase was granted to him as the Leader of the Official Opposition, that he absolved himself or voted against the increase that he was granted as Leader of the Opposition at that particular time. My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney, nods his head in assent. Now then, is that right? — (Interjection) — Sure, my honourable friend says — (Interjection) — That's right. And Mr. Chairman, isn't it true that the honourable the present Leader of the Official Opposition by not opposing when we were considering the estimates of the Legislative Assembly this year by him not voting against or absenting himself from the provision of his emolument as Leader of the Opposition . . .

MR. WEIR: How about yours as Minister of Labour?

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, that's right. Exactly — this is the point that I'm trying to make.

MR. BILTON: Ditto.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, and my honourable friend the Member for Swan River now when he was Speaker of the House — (Interjection) — he did not . . .

MR. WEIR: Buzz, we voted two for you.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, that's right. I agree with this, but the point that I'm trying to make Mr. Chairman, is that so far as the application of Rule 12, "pecuniary interest" does not apply insofar as the Members of this House are concerned. So I suggest that with the bill that we're dealing with now Rule 12 does not apply, Rule 12 only deals with pecuniary interest outside of this House and the application thereof to the Members of this House. And I would suggest that this is the context in which we should consider my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie who as Leader of a third Party presently receives an extra emolument, if I am correct, of \$6,000 a year by virtue of the fact that he is the recognized leader of a party within this House. I would venture to say, and I think that I am correct, that when this particular matter of the appropriation of the estimates was before the House in the consideration of the Legislative Assembly appropriation that my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie did not say well now, I can't take any part in this and I object to it, or, I do not vote; because it is not recorded as far as I am aware in the journals of the House of the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that he should not vote on this because of the fact that he may have a pecuniary interest.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, this is the basis on which this proposition is before us. There has been and there is historical precedence on this and to suggest that two individuals, namely the Member for St. Boniface or the Member for Osborne should not vote — whether they do or whether they don't, that's their baby — but the suggestion that they should not vote because of pecuniary interest on this particular resolution I think is going beyond precedence that has been established in this House in previous years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I've been very interested in everything that's been said tonight and those members that have spoken thus far know the reason for paragraph 12 that is in our rules; and they know very well that it goes beyond the confines of this Legislative Assembly when that rule was put in there. I know my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney is a reasonable man, a good living man and a high thinking man and he's put his finger on something that he thinks he can tickle the government with. This is all to the good. But at the same time, at the same time, I think enough has been said on this particular matter and that we should deal with it at the earliest possible moment in order to get on with the business of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the front bench of the government side of the

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) House is good enough to keep standing up for awhile and keep talking, it'll get the First Minister off the hook and we'll be able to saw off by three, because he'll probably have to replace some of them.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear those remarks, I tried to listen. I'm not sure whether anything said was intended as an insult or not, but it's late and my callousness to insult grows better with the passing of hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, as Rule expert Number 56 in the House, I would like to make a brief comment and I'd like the Chairman and the House to consider the implications of the ruling that is going to be made. There are several insurance agents which will be eligible for the compensation the Premier has mentioned. Will they be allowed to receive this compensation when - will they be allowed to vote on compensation on Bill 56?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. On a point of order, I believe that I raised this matter some months ago and had a ruling from the Speaker that any member of the House who had operated as an insurance agent would - whether or not he should have the right or not to vote on Bill 56. I specifically asked for the ruling and the Speaker made the ruling.

MR. GREEN: Just on that point of order. There was no ruling.

MR. GRAHAM: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with the pecuniary interest not the picayune interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . I intend to make a ruling in connection with Bill 43. I think that we've heard sufficient discussion. I can quote from Beauchesne if honourable members would care, but I would simply make this simple distinction which has been made by other members that I believe a pecuniary interest applies to the interests of honourable members outside of this House and that when it relates to matters concerning the indemnities of members or pensions or other such matters, salaries, that this in fact does not constitute a pecuniary interest as understood in Section 12. I believe section 12 prohibits a member from voting for something which would benefit him in terms of a business or other interest outside this Chamber. I would therefore give that as my ruling.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3 -- pass . . .

MR. WEIR: Nay.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the passage of Section 3 . . . Section 3 includes the recent amendment which was just adopted by the . . .

MR. WEIR: All I'm doing is keeping up with my commitment to support all of the amendments all the way down the line but vote against the sections. So really all I'm doing is maintaining my commitments to the House earlier. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on Section 3 and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A COUNTED Vote was taken the results being as follows:

CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 16.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the section passed. (Section 4 66.1 to 66.2 (1) were read and passed. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment following on 66.2(2). I beg to move that a new section to be numbered 66.2 (3) be added to read as follows: "Within 30 days after the commencement of each session of the Legislative Assembly, the Minister shall lay before the House a report showing a breakdown of all payments made to or on behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly," - I'm reading from a transcript which is difficult to read "by way of indemnity, allowance, salary, reimbursements for expenses and any other purpose whatever and not previously laid before the assembly."

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it might save time if the honourable member would indicate whether it's his understanding that information which he requests in this amendment is not forthcoming in any case in the form of the Public Account statement?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe it does come in public accounts

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) in that form. I think Public Accounts shows what is paid to members by way of indemnity, by way of transportation allowance, but it does not show what it paid for attendance at committee meetings and expenses attending committee meetings. Now I may be wrong. — (Interjection) — Well before the Minister of Labour shakes his head too vigorously, it may fall off, I would recommend that he look at public accounts. Because Mr. Chairman, I believe that the format of public accounts that I have seen does not show that, it shows, true enough, the indemnity, the standard expense allowance, that is the one-third, the travelling allowance to the Legislature, which is a very small amount, but I don't think it does show any other expenses paid for committees and so on.

I think that in view of the fact that we are making some changes here that rather than ask for it by Order for Return, which can be done obviously, that we simply establish it as a standard rule that this be deposited before the House annually. Furthermore, public accounts as the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm having difficulty reading the — you also had difficulty? Could you indicate whether there's any date, as of what date you wish that information or is it — (Interjection) — no, no I understand the deadline, but what is the effective date?

MR. MOLGAT: For the previous fiscal year is what I have in mind. Mr. Chairman, what I have in mind is simply this.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well let's just clarify that. If it is on April 4th then it would be for the year ending four days prior to that, is that correct? Is that what the honourable member has in mind?

MR. MOLGAT: Well it may be difficult to produce it that quickly. I'm not really concerned about the — you know the technicalities, whether it's April 4th . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . legislation we're dealing with, are you not concerned?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Finance wants to discuss the technicalities, fine; I will reword it or ask the Legislative Counsel to reword it in such a form that it meets that, but I think what I'm concerned about here is that as a general principle, if we are going to have payments made and expenses paid for members of the Legislature, outside of the normal indemnities and so on, that it be reasonable, that rather than ask members of the House to put in an Order for Return that it be established as a standard practice that this be tabled every year.

Now this year, for example, I did table such an order for return and I got my answer as to what members were paid for attending committees and so on. All I'm suggesting is that in the interests of the House, and again the public, that the disclosure should be made. I think if it was simply a matter of course there would be no problem.

MR. SCHREYER: I want to indicate to the honourable member that there is no disagreement in principle with his proposal. However, it would expedite matters I'm sure if instead of saying "within 30 days after the commencement of" each session, it were to read that "during each regular session" because the requirement that it be done within 30 days would make it awkward with respect to the end of the fiscal year, etc. And furthermore, there are special sessions and the like, so during each regular session and then go on with the provision.

I'm wondering if there would be time now to check in a systematic way to see whether Public Accounts really does provide this information. I mean, would the honourable member really insist on moving this amendment if he were to be shown in public accounts that the very information which he is requesting here is already provided in public accounts? We are having a copy of public accounts being brought down now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if in fact Public Accounts did reflect this in that way, a breakdown of what was paid by way of indemnity, allowance, salary, reimbursement for expenses, attendance at committees — if this was shown in public accounts this would be acceptable to me, but the public accounts I have seen don't show that. I'll be happy to go and get my copy.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, in terms of public accounts may I say that my recollection of public accounts is that it would show the total, the total of expenses that were coming to any member of the Legislature, over and above his indemnity and his regular expense allowance, if it amounted to over \$1,000; if it amounted to over \$1,000. If there is anything under \$1,000 it is not listed in public accounts because of the magnitude of the number — if you

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) expanded all the way you would have a book like so, and I think that the limit that shows up in public accounts, for members as for other accounts, is \$1,000.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Honourable Member permit

MR. WEIR: Yes, I'd be more than happy to

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at Page 204, Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1969, and the first line reads "Member Bazley, Hon. O., constituency Osborne: indemnity \$4,800, expense allowance \$2,400, living allowance and area allowance nil, mileage nil. The next one is Barkman, L.A., Carillon: indemnity \$4,800, expense allowance \$2,400, living allowance and area allowance \$1,200, mileage \$8.00. Shall I read this list? — (Interjection) — Well, but it comes down to \$58.60 and \$13.20 on mileage. Now what is there missing from this.

MR. WEIR: All of those things are statutory.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what's missing from this is what's paid for attendance to committees between sessions, expenses relative to committees between sessions and any other expenses which we may now be paying under this Act for people attending to special functions, or per diem allowances or anything else. All I'm seeking is that there be one place where the total amount paid to every member of the Legislature be so labelled, but it is not.

MR. PAULLEY: You haven't read Public Accounts.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister of Labour could attend some other place at the moment and allow people who agreed to deal with the matters before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I rise, because I think that the intent of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is being misunderstood. The purpose is to obtain information in a session relating to the activities of the honourable members for the period leading up to the session. The information that's contained in the Public Accounts is a year behind, and it's not full information to begin with, and the purpose is because the honourable member has already indicated, he asked and received an order for return bringing it up to date so that he would be in a position to deal specifically in the debate in this session, or in the session in which the information is required, with accurate and pertinent information with respect to the members. I don't think that there is anything wrong in the intent and I would think that the government would be as interested in seeing to it that there is some degree of restraint shown with respect to the allowances and expenses to be attributed or allocated to the members of the Assembly, and particularly the members on their side, and therefore would not in any way suggest that that information should be withheld.

I believe as well that the wording would have to be changed to accomplish that intent but I think that that is the objective and I think the objective of having information right up until the time of the session is valid, whereas the Public Account information is one year behind and is not valid. If we follow the suggestions of the Honourable First Minister, we are simply going to have to follow the procedure that the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose suggested, which is to file an order for return immediately the session begins each year asking for information up to date.

MR. PAULLEY: Ah sit down you pompous poppycock.

A MEMBER: Oh come now.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It's with a great deal of tolerance that I have allowed the Honourable Minister of Government Services to interrupt and to act in a manner which I consider not respectful and in a manner which does not suit a member and I wish — and I said this before — he makes very little contribution to the debate after 10:30 each evening, he makes less of a contribution after 12 o'clock and it would in fact,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member is going beyond a point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of order or point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that I have to have the Honourable Minister of Government Services interrupt me in the way he did now, in the way he has done in the past few days. It doesn't lead to a worthy discussion, and in addition Mr. Chairman, it simply prolongs the debate and at the same time indicates that what I've suggested before, that the Honourable Minister of Government Services should fall asleep after 10:30 and allow the proceedings of the House to commence if we are going to get anywhere.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, of all the pompous asses I've ever sat

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) in this House - the Honourable Member for River Heights is the most pompous ass that I've ever sat with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: On a point of privilege. Is pompous ass a parliamentary word? I just wonder . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has no point of privilege. Possibly the Honourable Member for River Heights has, but not my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of privilege Mr. Chairman, it's not necessary . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would the honourable member sit down. I believe that the Minister of Labour is using unparliamentary language and I would ask him to withdraw.

MR. PAULLEY: I will not withdraw.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw, because in law drunkenness is a good defense.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Here is a point of privilege. I am not drunk; I'm absolutely disgusted with the performance of the Member for River Heights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think that we've heard enough on both sides and I would - I realize . . .

MR. PAULLEY: He'll rue the day he said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe it's quite late at night or early in the morning. I think that our . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, precisely for that reason . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . if you permit, Sir, I'd like to suggest that in light of the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, the principle of which amendment we're inclined to support but we want to make sure of two things, one the wording which we'd like to discuss with Legislative Counsel, and also we'd like to find out whether the kind of accounting that he is suggesting in his amendment is the kind of accounting that can be carried out without undue difficulty to the Provincial Auditors office and Department of Finance, whichever of the administrative agencies deal with this. We'd like to check that. So I'd ask that the bill be stood, and we could perhaps proceed with the other measure that the House Leader referred to earlier.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, it will be necessary for the Committee to rise, for us to get a report from the Law Amendments Committee by leave, then by leave go back into Committee of the Whole House, since we are rising we'll have to get leave to go back, and if that procedure is agreed to then we wish to proceed.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a ruling on your part that was put forward here and has not been dealt with.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. You did make a ruling and I would like to see that ruling either substantiated or dealt with in some manner before the committee rises.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the member is referring to my request to the Minister of Labour to withdraw his comments and I would once more appeal to the Honourable Minister to please . . . in the interests of . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of withdrawing my remarks insofar as they apply to the Honourable Member for River Heights; and if it is the desire of this House to ask me to withdraw I will.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that a member who has felt that a question of privilege has been raised against him is entitled to say that there is no question of privilege, which is what the Honourable Member for River Heights said; and if he doesn't insist on a withdrawal I don't think that the Chairman need insist. If the Member for River Heights does insist that's a different proposition; but the Member for River Heights is shaking his head. He raises no question of privilege and Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that under the circumstances there's no necessity to have the question raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: On a point of order. May I suggest, and whatever disposition I'll go along with, but we're only a few hours, maybe 72 or 100 hours from the First Minister standing in his

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) place and suggesting to the Chair, Mr. Chairman, that whether or not a member, whether or not a member raised a matter of privilege when unparliamentary language was used, it wasn't a matter of privilege it was a matter of responsibility, matter of responsibility for the Chair to see that the matter was carried out.

Now Mr. Chairman, I don't really think in the number of hours that we've had since that that matter has really changed - and it's a matter for you Sir, it's a matter for you to arrive at a conclusion at and to deal with as you see fit - that the decision as I've understood it up to this point was yours and that it was one that was raised by the First Minister just a relatively few hours ago in terms of days.

MR. PAULLEY: Again, Mr. Chairman, I will not withdraw my remarks. If it is the desire of this House to appeal to the Speaker and he names me, I'll leave the Chamber. But I am convinced that the statement that I made is a factual and true one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader,

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I submit that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is saying is quite correct with regard to the general use of unparliamentary language but what the Member for River Heights and the Minister of Labour were concerned with was a charge by the Minister of Labour against the Member for River Heights and I submit that on that kind of a specific charge if the Member is not raising it, that it needn't be raised by the Chair. I respect what was said about the First Minister's remarks and I respect what the Leader of the Opposition says, but I say that in the circumstances if the Member for River Heights is not raising the question and the remarks were directed at him that it needn't be proceeded with. The Member for River Heights is not raising it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Do I understand now that this Bill 43 stands, so that I could have an opportunity to check the wording on; I'm not clear on just where we stood. It has been stood? All right.

MR. WEIR: That part is settled, it's a matter of the Chairman clarifying the position that is his, that essentially, it seemed to me, he'd made a decision on. I'm not trying to press it one way or the other, I just indicate that as a result of what was said the other night I think that we abide by that responsibility, being one who believes in it, that the Chairman is put in a position of arriving at a decision in some way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, about the only thing I could add to the advice given you on this point of order is as follows: I must agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. My interpretation of the rule governing "point of privilege" and the enforcement thereof is not changing simply because of the change in circumstances. It is my distinct understanding of the rules that Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman as the case may be, is the custodian of the decorum of this House and that if he deems a remark to be unparliamentary he does not require necessarily any member to insist on a retraction for the Chair to ask for it, and that is still my position. I can say in addition to that that really the onus is either on the person to whom the allegedly unparliamentary remark was directed and to the Chair itself to take the initiative in asking for the retraction of such a remark. I find it passing strange that it should be some other member of the Assembly. I have no particular view on that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if to resolve your difficulty, and I admit it is one for you, if we simply couldn't agree by leave to let the matter drop where it is. I think it's sufficiently embarrassing as it is, let us simply drop it. That would clear your position, Mr. Chairman, and I would be prepared to move that by leave the matter be dropped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might just point out that my own inclination is to refer to the Speaker, but if the honourable members wish to, by leave, agree to let the matter rest without further procedure then that is in their hands.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I'd like to clear this point up. The Member for Ste. Rose has suggested that by leave we do not deal any further with that question but set it aside. Are the members in agreement with that suggestion? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I was the member that raised the question; I will second the motion of the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the matter is at an end at that point. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I beg to present the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their 13th report:

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 87 - The Manitoba Dental Services Corporation Act.

No. 139 - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews 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, I beg to move, by leave, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill, No. 139 -- and, what's the one we've just been dealing with - 43? 43.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rhineland seems to have some question about 43. 43 is the one we've just been dealing with and we have to get back into dealing with it.

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 No. 43, an Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act. Bill 139, an Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act. Section 1--passed; Section 2(a)--passed; (b) . . . By page?

MR. GREEN: Page by page please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 139 was read page by page and passed.)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can just remain seated for a few moments until they come back with the amendment on Bill 43. I wonder if they can be told that we moved rather quickly, maybe they can get back.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite matters, I wonder if I could by leave while we're waiting for a touching up of wording on the amendment proposed by the Member for Ste. Rose if I might by leave indicate to honourable members that there is an amendment that will be proposed to the last section of the bill, Bill 43. The subject matter of which has been brought to the attention of leaders of the opposition parties and which I'd like to read now to inform honourable members of the content.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable First Minister have leave? (Agreed)

MR. SCHREYER: I would propose to move that Section 5 of Bill 43 be struck out and the following section substituted therefor:

This Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent, but subsection 1 of Section 61.1 of the Legislative Assembly Act and subsection 2 of Section 61.1 of the Legislative Assembly Act except Clause (a) thereof are retroactive and shall be deemed to have been in force on, from and after the first day of April, 1970. In other words the beginning of the current fiscal year. This is what I propose to move when we get to the last section of the bill.

MR. FROESE: By way of explanation, what is the import of making certain parts retroactive to first of the year?

MR. SCHREYER: Well does the honourable member - I understood that the honourable member was provided with a copy. If he has a copy, if he will check the subsections referred to in the proposed amendment which I will move, I haven't formally moved it yet, he will see that it refers to the paying of the out-of-pocket expenses to the Legislative Assistant but not beyond the beginning of this fiscal year, only as of the beginning of this current fiscal year, in other words, April 1, of this year.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, if I might just enquire and I realize we haven't reached it yet, but helping, I think, maybe fill in time at the moment and not trying to debate it, my understanding was that it was -- well I see it's retroactive from the standpoint of the whole section. My understanding was that the retroactive part was to look after a particular case, and I'm not asking for a definition of the particular case but my understanding is that it's not a general thing to be applied in terms of a number of instances or a number of individuals; it's a retroactive feature designed to look after a particular case that has been in existence since April 1st of this year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that is basically correct except it does not apply to one particular case, it applies to two; but in the case of one of the two the amount is negligible, if not non-existent, so that . . .

MR. WEIR: All I knew of was one, so I . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, in terms of its practical effect it really applies only to one although theoretically it applies to two, but there would be no amounts of money involved except a nominal amount in the purest sense of the word nominal.

I'm wondering, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose who moved an amendment which has now been revised, if it is necessary to have him here to move it again unless -- I suppose, under the rules, it's in order for me to move this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as we have indicated that we are accepting the principle of the amendment, in order to save time I would be prepared to move the amendment, and accordingly I move that the bill before us -- Well, Mr. Chairman, just delete that. Perhaps the page would take this over to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Section 66.2 of the bill be amended by adding a further section 66.2(3) to read as follows: "Each year within 90 days after the end of the fiscal year of the government, if the Legislature is then in session, or if the Legislature has not been in session, within 15 days after the beginning of the next ensuing session, the Minister of Finance shall lay before the Assembly a statement showing the amounts paid from the Consolidated Fund during that fiscal year to each person who has been a member of the Assembly during that fiscal year, by way of indemnities, salaries, allowances, reimbursement for expenses or otherwise."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on reflection I find it necessary to ask this question of the mover of the amendment: Is it the intention of his amendment that the expenses that would be so reported would be those expenses as are authorized pursuant to this Act, to the Legislative Assembly Act?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm thinking here, really, of what's paid in total. What I think we should know, what the public should know is the total amount of money received by any member of the Legislature for all purposes as a member of the Legislature; so, be it for whatever purpose it is, that the total amount paid be some way or other put down on paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: . . . my honourable friend the way . . . Manitoba bond, bond interest would be paid to me. Well I'm just worried about the way it's worded.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I'm not thinking of anything a member might receive as bond interest. I'm thinking of what he would receive by virtue of being a member of the Legislature and paid by the government to him. That's really what . . .

MR. SCHREYER: While the honourable member is consulting, I would suggest to him that I infer from what he said that he is referring to all expenses that are paid in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, the question then is, do members receive monies from other sources? And here I have to depend on legislative Counsel. No. Bond interest obviously not. Well, if this covers the whole thing, then under the Act would satisfy me.

MR. SCHREYER: Well I'm suggesting then Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member accept a revision in wording so that the words "in accordance with the provision" — after the word "expenses" in his motion, the words "in accordance with the provisions of this Act" be inserted and then it will be clearly understood what is referred to.

MR. MOLGAT: I think this would cover what I have in mind, Mr. Chairman. I think that would then leave the only other payments with which I would be concerned being anything received from other corporations; for example, members who are on the Telephone Board, the Hydro Board, and so on, and this is something that is clearly ascertainable. I think it would be preferable if those figures were shown as well. Really, what I have in mind is that the public ought to know what members receive in total by virtue of being members of the Assembly, and anything that emanates from that particular function.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the point made by the honourable member is something that we will want to explore further. I think if he accepts the addition of those words "in accordance with the provisions of this Act" and leave it at that for now, and between now and the next session some closer attention given so as to cover the expenses that are involved in the case of those appointed to statutory boards and commissions, and that's a case of some legislative item we would bring forward next session.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the First Minister and the Minister of Finance for agreeing with the proposal in principle and accepting the rewording so that it is in proper terms to be an amendment to this particular bill. I think that they know what I am seeking to do and they agree with me that it ought to be done, and on that basis I accept it. If there is further information that we find at a later date that ought to be added, I gather from the First Minister — and he is now nodding in agreement — that he is in agreement that there should be complete disclosure, and this satisfies me. I thank him for accepting the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for bringing forward the suggestions he has brought forward, and also appreciate what the First Minister has had to say. I think that the way things are going these days that it's more important that the public realize what each and every member may receive and I am sure the First Minister agrees that the more explanation there is insofar as the spending of tax dollars are concerned, toward members of the House, the better it will be, and I think a much fuller picture of what is being done in this particular respect would be well because the future no one knows what may hold in this particular direction. Again, I want to compliment the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for his efforts and diligently staying with it and getting the answers from the government that have been forthcoming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question? Do the members wish me to read the amendment again? Moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that a new section 66.2 (3) be added: "Each year within 90 days after the end of the fiscal year of the government, if the Legislature is then in session, or if the Legislature is not then in session, within 15 days after the beginning of the next ensuing session, the Minister of Finance shall lay before the Assembly a statement showing the amounts paid from the Consolidated Fund during that fiscal year to each person who has been a member of the Assembly during that fiscal year by way of indemnities, salaries, allowances or reimbursement for expenses in accordance with this Act."

MR. CHERNIACK: Legislative Counsel if the word "paid" should be there — paid in accordance with this Act. Okay.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 4 — passed; Section 5. . . .

MR. SCHREYER: It is at this point that I would like to move the amendment that I indicated earlier I would move. I move that Section 5 of Bill 43 be struck out and the following section substituted therefor: "This Act comes into force on the day it receives the Royal Assent, but sub-section (1) of Section 61.1 of the Legislative Assembly Act and sub-section (2) of Section 61.1 of the Legislative Assembly Act, except clause (a) thereof, are retroactive and shall be deemed to have been in force on, from and after the 1st day of April 1970."

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed motion, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The remainder of Bill 43 was read and passed.

MR. GREEN: I move the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

IN SESSION

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with third readings on the bills that have been passed now. Bill No. 43, Mr. Speaker, to start with.

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill No. 43, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (1) for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. I had indicated, when speaking on second reading of the bill, that I was going to move some amendments and if they were not acceptable that I would vote against third reading of the bill. By and large, the amendments we have proposed have been accepted. One major one was not, that deals with the question of the number of legislative assistants. However, in view of the general agreement of the government to proceed with acceptance of our amendments, I am prepared to support third reading.

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

BILLS NOS. 109 and 121 were each read a third time and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs that Bill No. 17 The Manitoba Natural Resources Development Act be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, again I shall be very brief but as on Bill 43, we have indicated on second reading of this bill that we are prepared to let it go for second reading, discuss it in Committee, that we have amendments to move and if we felt that the major part of our amendments were acceptable we would support the bill all the way through.

The major amendment, in our view, was the complete disclosure of any - no, number one, that complete studies be undertaken; secondly, that the House, the people of Manitoba be given the full information on any such project by government under Bill 17. The government has not seen fit to accept this amendment and therefore I'm not prepared to support the bill on third reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39 . . .

BILLS NOS. 39 and 139 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, my resolution, and the amendment of Mr. Paulley standing in the name of the Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why they didn't call the first one. I don't intend to speak at this hour. On that basis I'll just pass it up because - I don't see why one resolution has to be pushed when the other one . . .

MR. GREEN: I can explain that to my honourable friend if he feels that that was the problem. I'm aware that there was a resolution which was duplicated on the Order Paper, one of them being incorrect, the other one being correct, and I was just seeking the correct resolution because I know the one standing in the name of the Member for Fort Garry was not correct, so that's the only reason I passed it up. I had no intention of rushing the Member for Rhineland.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

I can move to the resolution of the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the meantime standing in the name of the Member for Lakeside. I'm sure that he would be ready to proceed. On Page 5 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have a 40-minute dissertation to make on this resolution. I would be more than happy to launch on at this time but I would ask leave to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed)

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in view of the hour, if the Leader of the House would not consider simply having the House adjourn for this evening. I think we've done a great deal of work and -- (Interjection) -- Well whatever the government wishes.

MR. GREEN: Okay Mr. Speaker, there's no particular problem. I would indicate that we will be in Public Utilities Committee tomorrow at 9:30, that we would like to adjourn the House until Monday morning at 9:30; that on Monday morning at 9:30 we would come into the House, hopefully not for a long time, have Law Amendments Committee meet on the tax deferral Bill, also assess ourselves as to where Public Utilities Committee is at the time, and then if Public Utilities Committee is -- well when we know better what has happened we will be able to give more information, but in the meantime before I adjourn, if there are any questions, I'd be happy to try to deal with them.

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier to the House Leader that I would like to ask a question, and the Minister of Finance as well, and I indicate now that I'll be happy if they take the matter as notice.

It comes as a result of a matter that was brought up earlier today by the Member for Rhineland, in that the people that are away from home during a session have run out many many days ago, weeks ago Mr. Speaker, in terms of expense allowance. We're in a position now I think, although the motion hasn't officially been moved, of adjourning the House until Monday. If the House was prorogued and Public Utilities was to meet, the members of Public Utilities Committee who aren't otherwise employed by the government either as a Cabinet Minister, as a Leader of the Opposition or otherwise would qualify for a per diem allowance and expenses while they're away, and I would just ask if the government would consider the fact that there are members of the Committee that are being asked for a period of time while others are being released from legislative duties, to see if the same rules would not apply to members of the Public Utilities Committee that qualified for the per diem allowance and the expenses for the period of time that the hearings take place. I think that they're being asked to do a service that other members of the House aren't being asked to do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask it as a question and I'm not really looking for an answer tonight; I recognize that some consideration probably has to be taken in terms of the rules and legislation and so on and I'll be content to have an answer at a later date but I thought the matter should be raised.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to look into both the advisability and the legal aspects of it. It does of course occur to me that those members of the Legislature who are not members of Public Utilities and who are interested in attending meetings would then not qualify in accordance with that suggestion. That would have to be automatic. I'm sure the government will be prepared to look at the proposal and see what could be done or should be done.

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Speaker, if I may just on that point. It's no different from any other committee that sits in between sessions at which all members of the Legislature are welcome, but in which no expenses are paid but their interest and concern is invited. They're able to take part in any of the committee hearings with the exception of moving motions and voting so that in that context I don't see any real difference, but I think it's something that should be considered by the government.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated this to the House Leader but I think it should be mentioned at this time before we commence what could be a marathon Public Utility session. I wonder whether the government would consider -- and the matter would have to be brought up in committee but the government majority would rule -- the advisability of determining a time limit with respect to the hearings each day so that we know exactly what the position will be and so the public will know as well for those who are interested and who may be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) appearing whatever time it will be. I do not think that we can expect, and I think the House Leader agrees with me in this respect or comments were made similar to this, that we can expect to proceed in Public Utilities with the hearings in the same way as we proceeded in the House over the past three or four weeks, with marathon sessions from 9:30 until 1:30, 2:30 in the morning. I just do not think that this would be the right procedure and whether the time limit is 11:30, 12:00 o'clock or what have you, it would seem to me that there should be some agreement so that it'll be known by all the members who are involved.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would indicate whether, in consideration that would be given to his suggestion, he would be prepared to consider in turn the possibility of adopting another procedure as well, one that has been in use in Ottawa, and that is of setting a time limit on the total length of the time that will be given to the hearing of any and all submissions on a given subject matter in a standing committee.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I may say that I probably would be very agreeable to that if that had been arranged for at the time that the hearings commenced, or before they commenced. I do not think at this time it would be a wise decision on our part because of the intense interest, and all I'm suggesting, and I think it's a reasonable request, I do not think that we can continue meeting from 9:30 until 2:30 in Public Utilities as we have in the House, and expect to -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry? Well, I think we can, but I do not think that it will be conducive to the kind of debate in this particular area of concern - dialogue and debate that takes place with the people who are making the representations and with the segments involved in our society. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader would consider this and that some reasonable time limit will be put on it and that it be known.

I said on the other aspect it had been agreed at the beginning and there has been some determination of this - this is fine; but I just think it is unreasonable to expect the public, and I say it is unreasonable to expect the House to continue to meet 9:30 till 1:30 and 2:30 when we know that we have 120, 130 submissions, and I don't know how long it will take but if they average half an hour we are talking about 50 to 60 hours.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has raised another aspect and I would say it's one of the things that could be considered by the Rules Committee which is up for debate, I gather, the next time we meet, and at the expense of possibly stealing the remarks I was going to make on that occasion, may I say that it will be good to have something that it is possible to consider that wasn't considered last time, but not tried at this session. I'll be going into that a little further at a little later date because of the disappointment that I have in terms of the handling of the Report of the last Rules Committee. But in my view this is the type of thing that does affect rules, both of the House and of the operation of the associated committees, and I would think that would be the proper place to deal with it and not on a case where we happen to be, on a particular occasion, faced with a large number of representations.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to associate myself with the last remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and in so doing, point out to him that even though this might be the more desirable and ideal way of proceeding by having had this dealt with by way of a recommendation from the Rules Committee and an adoption thereof, nevertheless I'm sure the Honourable Leader would agree that it is possible for any standing committee of this House to make its own decisions relative to how it will conduct its business, hours of sitting, and the time it will give to the hearing of any subject matter.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can just reply to that, I think that that's certainly true under the existing rules, but there is another rule within the Rule Book, as I recall, that says that the rules of the House essentially apply to committees of the House, and if they don't apply any more in committees of the House than they've been applying in the House, they won't get in our road.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not to prolong this, but the obvious really hasn't been said with respect to taking more seriously into consideration the views expressed by the First Minister about accepting the limitations of the total debate on the subject matter. If that were said, as my colleague -- (Interjection) -- no, no, with the representation. If that were known at the outset, then those particularly interested in the subject matter would be in a position to discipline themselves with respect to the kind of representation or what they would choose to make it -- (Interjection) -- No, it's just a question of utilizing time. If, for instance, they knew that there were 15, 20 or 30 hours, or two days or four days set aside for public representation on debate, it may well have had a bearing on the submissions before us. Not having had that in

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) effect, I would have to concur with my colleague, the Member for River Heights. It's not any obstinacy on our part to find it difficult to accept a change of the rules at this stage of the committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: the honourable member, who is prejudiced by the fact that if the committee agrees that henceforth, as usual - not as usual; all day today I think the Honourable Member for River Heights has been fairly quiet when he was in his seat, but he's broken his own . . . - just who would be prejudiced who has not yet been heard, who would be told by the committee, "We would like you to confine your remarks to X number of minutes." How are you prejudiced by the fact that others have spoken at a longer period of time?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I was referring to the obvious. I think that we well know and we anticipate hearing legitimate representations and no doubt considerably repetitious. Had there been a knowledge of limitations placed on the tenure of the hearings or the representations, there might have been a self-induced motive on the part of those making the representations to suggest that for maximum -- Naturally they are prejudiced; in this particular case we have a group of concerned individuals who are concerned with their livelihood and who one would expect to put forward the best possible of arguments to describe their case, and to do this, one facet certainly would be to utilize the time made available to them to make public representation in the best possible manner, and if those conditions were known, it may well have been evident to themselves that groupings of representations, or one thing or other, or the manner of the representations themselves would have been portrayed in a different manner.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose anyone here is expecting a decision on the matter now. It's just put forward in the way of asking members opposite to consider the suggestion, and perhaps at this time it would be best to adjourn.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . say that I think it would be very unwise of the government to suggest -- (Interjection) -- Oh, no, I have not said this. I think it would be very unwise of the government to suggest or proceed along the idea that's been suggested by the First Minister. -- (Interjection) -- I say I understand your suggestion and I'm saying it's an unwise suggestion at this particular time, and I offer it for their consideration.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, may I then, once again, just to underline it, remind the members that on Monday at approximately 10:00 o'clock the Law Amendments will meet with regard to the Tax Deferral Bill. May I therefore ask all members to notify anybody that they know would like to make representation. May I ask the co-operation of the Fourth Estate, if they are still awake, to help us in this connection, and may I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn until Monday at 9:30.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 9:30 Monday morning, July 27th.