

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 13, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 9, an Act to Amend the Municipal Boundaries Act, and Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne) introduced Bill No. 36, an Act to amend The Apprenticeship Act.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:

Hon. Mr. HUTTON -

WHEREAS a Special Committee of the House was appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature on the 14th day of April, 1961, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba.

AND WHEREAS the said Special Committee of the House was reappointed at the Fourth Session of the 26th Legislature on the 17th day of October, 1961, for the same purposes and with the same powers and the same members being Mr. SHEWMAN, Chairman, Messrs. WEIR, Geo. Wm. JOHNSON (Assiniboia), ROBERTS, and WAGNER.

AND WHEREAS the said Special Committee of the House was reappointed at the Fifth Session of the 26th Legislature on the 12th day of March, 1962, for the same purposes and with the same powers and the following members, being Mr. SHEWMAN, Chairman, Messrs. Geo. Wm. JOHNSON (Assiniboia), ROBERTS, WAGNER, and WATT.

AND WHEREAS by virtue of a resolution passed in the House on April 27th, 1962, Mr. DOW replaced Mr. ROBERTS as a member of the Special Committee of the House to enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba.

AND WHEREAS by virtue of the dissolution of the 26th Legislature on November 9th, 1962, the Special Committee of the House, appointed at the Fifth Session of the 26th Legislature, on March 12th, 1962, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba was also dissolved.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. THAT the Special Committee of the House appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba, and reconstituted and reappointed at the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the 26th Legislature, be now reappointed and reconstituted for the same purpose and with the same powers as set out in the resolutions passed at the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Sessions of the 26th Legislature, appointing and reappointing the said Committee.

2. THAT the said Special Committee shall consist of the following persons, namely: Mr. SHEWMAN, Chairman, Messrs. MOELLER, SCHREYER, SHOEMAKER and WATT.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT this Special Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session, and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund,

the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisers, accountants, clerks, stenographers, and investigators to aid and assist said committee in the enquiry, and to print the evidence, proceedings and documents received by the committee during the Session or after prorogation as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

Hon. Mr. LYON -

WHEREAS all self-governing members of the British Commonwealth of Nations except Canada have the power to amend their respective Constitutions without reference to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

AND WHEREAS for many years successive Governments of Canada and of the several Provinces have given consideration to the desirability and the method of amending the Constitution of Canada, without the necessity of petitioning the Parliament of the United Kingdom to enact the legislation required;

AND WHEREAS the Honourable the Minister of Justice for Canada and the Attorney-General of the Provinces, at the invitation of the Honourable the Minister of Justice for Canada have since the month of September, 1960, met in conferences from time to time with the object of formulating a procedure whereby the amendment of the Constitution of Canada might be domiciled in Canada and without recourse to the Parliament of the United Kingdom;

AND WHEREAS it appeared that there was unanimous agreement on the desirability of establishing an amending procedure as aforesaid, and thereby achieving this important measure of national self determination for Canada;

AND WHEREAS it was found possible to reconcile in part some of the divergencies in views of the Provinces and to adopt in principle for presentation and consideration by the several Provincial Legislatures a draft of legislation that, if enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament, would achieve the objective desired;

AND WHEREAS as a result of the deliberations of the Conferences between the Honourable the Minister of Justice for Canada and the Honourable the Attorneys-General of the several Provinces, the draft of an Act to be known as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act set out in Schedule A to this resolution, was prepared, embodying an amending procedure, and was submitted to the several Provinces for their approval;

AND WHEREAS in the opinion of this House it is in the public interest and in the interest of the citizens of Manitoba that the power to amend the Constitution of Canada should be domiciled in Canada;

AND WHEREAS the matter of the draft of an Act to be known as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act as set out in Schedule "A" to this resolution was referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration on May 1st, 1962 during the Fifth session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature of our Province;

AND WHEREAS the Twenty-sixth Legislature of our Province was dissolved by virtue of a Proclamation of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on the ninth day of November, 1962;

AND WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders by virtue of the dissolution of the Legislature was unable to complete consideration of this matter;

AND WHEREAS it is now advisable to refer this matter again to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders in order that the matter be given further consideration;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that this House doth approve the principle of establishing the right of Canada to amend its Constitution without reference to the Parliament of the United Kingdom;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the draft of an Act to be known as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act set out in Schedule "A" to this Resolution be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and that the said Committee be empowered to sit and hold public hearings on the said draft Act during the present Session, and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on its findings and recommendation at this session or at the next session of the Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisers, clerks, and stenographers, to aid and assist said Committees in its hearings during the session or after prorogation, during recess as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

#### SCHEDULE A

An Act to provide for the amendment  
in Canada of the Constitution of Canada.

WHEREAS the Senate and House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled have submitted Addresses to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty may graciously be pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom for the enactment of the provisions hereinafter set forth:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

##### Part I

##### Power to amend the Constitution of Canada

1. Subject to this Part, the Parliament of Canada, may make laws repealing, amending or re-enacting any provision of the Constitution of Canada.
2. No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of this Act or section 51A of the British North America Act, 1867, or affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to
  - (a) the powers of the legislature of a province to make laws,
  - (b) the rights or privileges granted or secured by the Constitution of Canada to the legislature or the government of a province,
  - (c) the assets or property of a province,
  - (d) the use of the English or French language,

shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces.

3. (1) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada that refers to one or more, but not all, of the provinces, shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislature of every province to which the provision refers.

(2) Section 2 of this Act does not extend to any provision of the Constitution of Canada referred to in subsection (1) of this section.

4. (1) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to education in any province other than Newfoundland shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of all the provinces other than Newfoundland.

(2) No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada relating to education in the province of Newfoundland shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the Legislature of the Province of Newfoundland.

(3) Sections 2 and 3 of this Act do not extend to any provision of the Constitution of Canada referred to in subsection (1) or (2) of this section.

5. No law made under the authority of this Part affecting any provision of the Constitution of Canada not coming within section 2, 3 or 4 of this Act shall come into force unless it is concurred in by the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the provinces representing at least fifty per cent of the population of Canada according to the latest general census.

6. Nothing in this Part diminishes any power of the Parliament of Canada or of the legislature of a province, existing immediately before this Act came into force, to make laws in relation to any matter.

7. No Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the coming into force of this Act shall extend or be deemed to extend to Canada or to any province or territory thereof.

8. Without limiting the meaning of the expression "Constitution of Canada", in this Part that expression includes the following enactments and any order, rule or regulation thereunder, namely,

- (a) the British North American Acts, 1867 to 1960;
- (b) the Manitoba Act, 1870;

- (c) the Parliament of Canada Act, 1875;
- (d) The Canadian Speaker (Appointment of Deputy) Act, 1895;
- (e) the Alberta Act;
- (f) the Saskatchewan Act;
- (g) the Statute of Westminster, 1931, in so far as it is part of the law of Canada; and
- (h) this Act.

## PART II

### British North America Act, 1867, amended

9. The British North America Act, 1867, is amended by renumbering section 94A thereof as 94B and by adding thereto, immediately after section 94 thereof, the following heading and section:

#### Delegation of Legislative Authority

"94A. (1) Notwithstanding anything in this or in any other Act the Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to any matters coming within the classes of subjects enumerated in heads (6), (10), (13) and (16) of section 92 of this Act, but no statute enacted under the authority of this subsection shall have effect in any province unless the legislature of that province has consented to the operation of such a statute in that province.

(2) The Parliament of Canada shall not have authority to enact a statute under subsection (1) of this section unless

- (a) prior to the enactment thereof the legislatures of at least four of the provinces have consented to the operation of such a statute as provided in that subsection, or
- (b) it is declared by the Parliament of Canada that the enactment of the statute is of concern to less than four of the provinces and the provinces so declared by the Parliament of Canada to be concerned have under the authority of their legislatures consented to the enactment of such a statute.

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this or in any other Act the legislature of a province may make laws in the province in relation to any matter that is otherwise within the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

(4) No statute enacted by a province under the authority of subsection (3) of this section shall have effect unless

- (a) prior to the enactment thereof the Parliament of Canada has consented to the enactment of such a statute by the legislature of that province, and
- (b) a similar statute has under the authority of subsection (3) of this section been enacted by the legislatures of at least three other provinces.

(5) The Parliament of Canada or the legislature of a province may make laws for the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any law made by it under the authority of this section.

(6) A consent given under this section may at any time be revoked, and

- (a) if a consent given under subsection (1) or (2) of this section is revoked, any law made by the Parliament of Canada to which such consent relates that is operative in the province in which the consent is revoked shall thereupon cease to have effect in that province, but the revocation of the consent does not affect the operation of that law in any other province, and
- (b) if a consent given under subsection (4) of this section is revoked, any law made by the legislature of a province to which the consent relates shall thereupon cease to have effect.

(7) The Parliament of Canada may repeal any law made by it under the authority of this section, in so far as it is part of the law of one or more provinces, but if any repeal under the authority of this subsection does not relate to all of the provinces in which that law is operative, the repeal does not affect the operation of that law in any province to which the repeal does not relate.

(8) The legislature of a province may repeal any law made by it under the authority of this section, but the repeal under the authority of this subsection of any law does not affect the operation in any other province of any law enacted by that province under the authority of this section."

PART III  
Citation and Commencement

10. This Act may be cited as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act.
11. This Act shall come into force on the ..... day of ....., 1962.

Madam 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 St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): There are two resolutions before us; they're virtue of the . . .

MR. HUTTON: His honour, the administrator having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. MARTIN: The two resolutions before us by virtue of the dissolution of the House on the 9th of November last, resolution "A which you will see in your Orders of the Day has to do with the revival of the Committee on the Livestock Marketing presented by the Minister of Agriculture; and the second resolution by the Attorney-General refers back to the Committee on regulations, the draft of an Act to be known as the Constitution of Canada Amendment Act. Now they're very lengthy. Do you want them read entirely? I was wondering whether we couldn't come to the point of the resolves and the Minister of Agriculture take the -- save time. We're always ready to expedite matters here, Sir.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, there's just one point for the record of Hansard. I wonder if at least once for the purpose of the record of Hansard whether the full resolution as proposed should not be recorded and then subsequently refer to an abbreviated edition of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Clerk points out we could have it recorded by making arrangements with Hansard to have it placed there afterwards.

MR. PAULLEY: That is satisfactory, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned; it would achieve the same thing. I do want it recorded in Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we'd read the resolve. Resolved this resolution No. 1 - 1. That the Special Committee of the House appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba, and reconstituted and reappointed at the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the 26th Legislature, be now reappointed and reconstituted for the same purpose and with the same powers as set forth in the resolutions passed at the Third, Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the 26th Legislature, appointing and reappointing the said Committee. 2. That the said Special Committee shall consist of the following persons, namely: Mr. Shewman, Chairman; Messrs. Moeller, Schreyer, Shoemaker and Watt. And be it further resolved: That this Special Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session, and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to the House on the matters referred to them at this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature.

And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisers, accountants, clerks, stenographers, and investigators to aid and assist said committee in the enquiry, and to print the evidence, proceedings and documents received by the committee during the Session or after prorogation as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there isn't really a great deal to be said about this, most of the members in the House are aware of the fact that this committee was set up as indicated in this resolution and it held hearings over a quite a long period. Its hearings were wide in scope and the committee also in addition to carrying out these hearings had studies undertaken, some studies undertaken for them; they went outside of the province to investigate what was being done in other jurisdictions, and before their work could be correlated into a

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) . . . report, it is a matter of history that the 26th Legislature was dissolved, and the committee in order to carry on its work and to bring it to a conclusion must be reconstituted and the provision is here being made to that end.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I'm rather surprised that the minister opened the statement by saying that there's not a great deal to be said. It seems to me that there should be a great deal said on this matter. The subject is no doubt extremely important. The House agreed to set up a committee to study it; but the progress of this committee is to say the very least, extremely disappointing. The resolution itself says that this was passed at the Third and the Fourth and the Fifth Sessions of the 26th Legislature. We appointed and reappointed this committee now three times, and so far nothing has been produced. Well, Mr. Chairman, either the government doesn't consider this important or the committee simply has not been getting down to work; and the least we should have at this time, if we're being asked to reappoint a committee again for the fourth time, is a much more definite statement from the Minister, as to what has been accomplished to date. I suspect that this committee simply has not been getting down to work and I'm not prepared to vote in favour of reappointing it if it's not going to get down to work. I want to know what they've done; how much this has cost so far; how many meetings they've held; where and when. I think this is the very minimum the Minister should give us in view of the extreme delay that we have had so far in this particular committee.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the fact that I have been honoured by being appointed to this committee, I expect that I will be supplied with a copy of all the minutes of all the meetings to date, if they have had any, and in fact a complete file -- a copy of the file -- so that I can bring myself up-to-date in this date and do justice to the committee. I hope that that will be forthcoming.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the second resolved part or in the further resolved part that it leaves it open whether the committee is going to report at this session or at the next session. Certainly I would like to receive or hear a progress report on this committee before this session prorogues.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . before the Minister replies. There is just one point that's come to my observation in the resolution itself -- it may be that this has always been in these resolutions and has slipped my notice before, but I noticed in the very last resolve that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of Consolidated Fund the expenses of counsels, secretaries, etcetera, and to print the evidence, proceedings, etcetera as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General. Now as I say Mr. Chairman, this may have been in resolutions of this nature before; it may have escaped my attention, but it appears to me that in the wording of the resolution the Comptroller-General will decide -- it might be able to be interpreted this way that the Comptroller-General will decide as to what documents and printing of evidence, etcetera, will be forthcoming from the committee. I wonder if this matter may be clarified for my satisfaction, at least, before the resolution is adopted.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I think this is a customary clause and it's merely to ensure that all the expenditures under this matter are brought to the notice of the Comptroller-General and are audited by him. The committee may still publish matters that he may not approve of but he can then issue a report saying that he didn't approve of it and we know where we stand; but it is customary to have accounts of this nature referred to the Comptroller-General because that is a salutary control.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate the fact of the necessity of the Comptroller-General looking over the expenses but it was just in my interpretation of the wording of this last resolve that it may be implied that he would decide as to the evidence.

MR. MARTIN: Resolution be . . . . .

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would apologize to the House if the fact that I didn't enlarge on this question at this present time seems to have indicated to them that my department and the government places no great importance upon this study. That isn't the reason that I said very little on the subject. I am not quite as arrogant as some of the members in the House think I am. This is a Committee of the House. It is their work. The reason that the report has been delayed is because that Committee was dissolved when the last Legislature was dissolved, and it would have been most presumptuous if I had carried on the work of that

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . . committee and taken it upon myself, or if the government had taken it upon itself, to have brought all those studies and investigations and the findings of those papers together and had a report prepared for this Legislature. That would have been presumption. That would have been arrogance. This is the work of a committee of this House and it's only that we honored the work of that committee and honored the rights of the parties who are represented on that committee, that we are faced with this delay. It was originally hoped that we would have a report prepared for the consideration of the members at this session of the Legislature. I'm not going to say that there won't be. This is up to the committee to decide and the committee will have to make a decision as to whether a worthwhile report can be made to the House before it rises. I have some ideas of my own on the subject. I think that there has been a tremendous amount of work. I think that the work of the committee has raised some questions that may require some further pursuit by technical people to come to a sound conclusion before they make any recommendations, or want to write any recommendations into this report. But this is the decision of the committee to make; it is not mine nor that of the government. I commend the committee for the work that they have done. I commend the members who are now no longer in the House for the work that they did, and I would assure the new appointees to this committee that they will be given the advantage of all the studies and all the papers that were at the disposal of the former members of this committee and we will look forward to their contribution in the latter stages of the committee's work. I recommend the work of the committee to the House and I know that when their work is finally completed that it will have been worth waiting for. It is a very complex matter that they have been looking into. It may be that a little more time will be well spent in the consideration of this problem which they have set themselves to study.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the Minister and certainly insofar as any work of this committee, from the early part of November last, until now when the First Minister issued the writ of election I realize that the committee could not be working; but this House rose on the first of May last year and between the first of May and the early part of November there is a good deal of time. Now I think that we should have a progress report from the Chairman of the committee. If the Minister has not got all the details then he should tell us exactly what the committee has been doing to date, how many hearings they have held, where they have held them, how frequently the committee has met and also how much money has been spent so far. I think that this is the least that the House must have at this time is a progress report.

MR. MARTIN: Resolution . . . . .

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I don't think at this stage that there is a Chairman or there is a committee at all. I think that the Chairman's report might well be given once the committee has been reconstituted and they have had an opportunity to meet. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there was a report made to the last sitting of the Legislature last February.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, there is a little lullaby song that goes this way, "that yesterday is gone, tomorrow is not here yet. If we have a little bit of today let's enjoy it." Now there's a resolution before us. What's the use of digging up what happened yesterday, let's start from today.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it's true that the committee as such is not constituted now but the gentleman who was the Chairman of this committee, and who, by the way, I think is the only individual on the committee that was on the original committee, is still here in the House and should be able to report to us at this time what the committee did accomplish during the stage when he was the Chairman and when it was operating. And I think as well that the Minister should be able to tell us at this time what has been the cost of this investigation to date. Surely he has this.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interject myself into the debate except on what I believe would be a legitimate point of order, which I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to consider with me, and I'm searching here for the citation because I believe that unless the work of the committee was conducted with the public present there is authority in Beauchesne that reports or discussions on the work of a committee of the House are really not tenable in the House until that

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) . . . . committee reports back to the House. Now I have no firm knowledge myself, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not the hearings of this committee or what portion of the hearings of this committee were in camera or without benefit of the public or press being present. I know the citation is here, I haven't been able to put my finger on it as yet, but I do raise that as one matter for consideration because I know that the rule of procedure does exist.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last year we asked for a progress report and at that time the Chairman gave us a progress report "of sorts". I say, of sorts. Now we're being asked to reconstitute the committee. It seems to me that the very least that the House should have is a progress report from the then Chairman to indicate how many meetings they've held, what progress they've made, when he expects that they could complete their work, or some idea, and how much money we have spent so far, because at this rate we can keep on going. This is the fourth time that this House is going to reappoint this committee. Now how long is it going to go on?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, . . . . . to me, and I'm not so presumptuous as to think that I am an expert on the rules, but if it will help to stop this wrangling, it would seem a matter of common sense that we are not really in order to ask a former Chairman of the committee to give a report. He is not the Chairman at the present time. Therefore how can this Assembly demand that he give a report now. He can give a report once the committee is reconstituted and that can be tomorrow or any time henceforth.

MR. MARTIN: . . . . . I think that there is no committee at the present time until this resolution is adopted and the man who was the Chairman is not the Chairman at the present time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I think the point is it's perfectly true there is no committee in existence at the present time, but you're asking us to reconstitute a committee for the fourth time. All we are asking is, what has that committee accomplished in the interval since it was first established?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . ., Mr. Chairman, that it's not really possible to ask for a report at this stage for the reasons that have been quite clearly set out. I think it's also a fact that if members will refer to Beuchesne they will see that it is not the custom for committees to report evidence until their enquiry has been received and you will find that on Page 249 of Beuchesne, Section 3201, "It is the general custom not to report the evidence until the enquiry has been completed and the report is ready for presentation, but where an intermediate publication of an evidence or more than one report is thought desirable, the necessary power has been conferred upon the committee on its appointment or the House has granted leave subsequent in the application of the Chairman for the committee to report its observations from time to time." That point, of course, has really not much bearing on the matter because we simply haven't a committee. The committee has made interim reports in the past. Members of all parties have been represented on it and I think probably there is a reasonable expectation that the House has some notion of the progress that this committee has been making and I think we're in a bit of a technical difficulty here in being unable to obtain a report from a committee that doesn't exist and from a Chairman who is no longer the Chairman of the committee.

Now the request for information is one which I personally would like to see supplied and I am sure that we can find ways and means of providing that information, either by Order for Return for past history or we can ask the Chairman of the committee, when he is appointed, to submit an early interim report to tell us what we want to know. I have no objection whatsoever to anyone being curious about what the committee has been doing, but at this stage I think we are reduced to the alternative of either voting for or against the reappointment of the committee -- and I think that's what we should do. If we think that it's wasting its time we can vote against it and if we don't we can vote for it; but I think that it would be fruitless to pursue this matter of trying to extract information from a committee that doesn't at the present time exist. I think that's what the Chairman has ruled, I think it's a sensible ruling. On the other hand, I think we should take note of the request for information and find an early and orderly way in which to supply that information, which I am sure can be done.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, continuing the citation that my honourable friend was quoting from Beuchesne, he quoted No. 1. Number 2 goes on to say, "When a committee have not completed their enquiries before the end of the Session they report the fact to the



(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . House, together with any evidence which they may have taken." Now this is really all that I'm asking for is what's happened since this committee has been working for two years. Does it deserve to be reappointed, or does it not deserve to be? It's as simple as that, and if the Minister -- if he claims that the Chairman can't do it, although the Chairman is here, and was the Chairman for some two years, if he can't do it well then the Minister can tell us. How many meetings have they held? Where? When? What's been the cost of the committee to date?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Could I just pursue this point of order . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to make a comment . . . . . I think. I haven't Beauchesne before me but I have a resolution before me that is before this committee and the reason for that resolution being before the committee at this time, as I understand rules of procedure, is because of the fact that it involves an expenditure of money and as such must be before this committee. Now, it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that we haven't got a committee, so to ask for a report of a committee that has been dissolved at this stage of the game I don't think is quite proper. May I suggest this as the proper procedure -- again without the benefit of Beauchesne right at hand -- would be for this committee to adopt this resolution in order that it goes on the order paper for debate in its proper manner and then if at that time an amendment is proposed to the resolution before us asking for a report of previous committees or a synopsis of a report of previous committees and an amendment is adopted, then the Chairman who is selected of the committee would be under an obligation then if at all possible, either from his personal knowledge or from ascertaining from past records as to what the committee did, how long it met, and the likes of that. I think that's logical, if not according to Beauchesne.

MR. MARTIN: Resolution be adopted.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us at least at this stage how much money has been spent so far in this committee?

MR. HUTTON: I can't off the top of my head, but I can determine that fact and report to the Assembly tomorrow if you like.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I have a different point to bring up and I bring it up in all sincerity. It does not deal with procedure, but it does deal with something I think would be very helpful to the work of this committee. This is an important subject we're discussing and I think that it has already been shown by the Speech from the Throne itself that the government is concerned about doing everything possible for the beef cattle industry in the next short time. My suggestion is that we have in the House, are fortunate to have in the House, a man whom I believe is better acquainted with the beef industry and the raising of cattle in the Province of Manitoba, than any other individual member. I was wondering if we couldn't hold this resolution in committee until the government tries to persuade the Honourable Member for Rupertsland to become a member of the committee. It seems to me, looking at this, the names of the members of committee, while I have the most hearty respect for everyone who is on the committee, it seems to me that no one of them has the experience and the background to make a contribution in this important investigation that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has. I have had the pleasure and the profit of discussing the beef cattle industry with the honourable member on more than one occasion and I think that his practical knowledge from the point of view of raising cattle and marketing them is something that should not be lost sight of. I wish that we had on our group someone that had the experience that the honourable gentleman has. I wish there were more in the House as a whole. It seems to me there are very few of us, very few now that are actual beef producers under range conditions, and I think range conditions and the feeder type of operation are two things that have to be very carefully considered by this committee. So, my suggestion is that we let it stand for the time being and ask the government and the Chairman of the committee to try and persuade the Honourable Member for Rupertsland to become a member of it as well.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in the comments made by my colleague from Lakeside, and this seems to me to be a very sensible suggestion. I know, not only the Member from Rupertsland personally, but I know his ranch as well, and I know the experience he has in this field. I think he would make a very useful contribution to the committee. I appreciate that if he were simply to be added to the committee this would throw off

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . the normal balance that we have on the committee, but speaking for our group we would have no objection whatsoever to having that balance changed in order to have this gentleman on the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the government not going to consider the suggestion made by the Member for Lakeside?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . motion has been carried that ends the matter, but I can tell my honourable friend that the suggestion will be considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution number 2. The Attorney-General. Now therefore be it and it is hereby resolved that this House do approve the principle of establishing the right of Canada to amend the Constitution without reference to the Parliament of the United Kingdom; and be it further resolved that a draft of an Act to be known as The Constitution of Canada Amendment Act set out in Schedule "A" of this resolution be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for Consideration, and that the said committee be empowered to sit and hold public hearings on the said draft Act during the present session and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on its findings and recommendations at this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature; And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General; And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisors, clerks and stenographers, to aid and assist said Committee in its hearings during the Session or after prorogation during recess as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

MR. PAULLEY: To start the discussion on this resolution, may I have the same assurance that I had in the previous resolution that the full context including the Schedule are printed in the record of Hansard as of this date in order that it's . . . . . Thank you.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, as honourable members who were in the last House will see this is the same resolution as was passed by the House at the last Session of the last Legislature, to be exact in April of 1962, with the exception of the two final paragraphs of the preamble which note the fact that the work of the committee with respect to the British North America Amendment Act was not completed by reason of the dissolution of the last Legislature.

I can report to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that this matter was referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations in order that in the course of their regular work reviewing the regulations they might also take under advisement the draft Schedule "A": which is appended as a schedule to the resolution. One meeting of that committee was held -- the exact date escapes me, it was in the spring or summer of 1962. A second meeting at which we hoped to include the work of the committee was slated for the 29th of November but, of course, because of the dissolution notices were sent to all members advising them that the committee no longer existed. I believe there is perhaps one further group who wish to make representations to the committee as indicated by notice given to us at the committee meeting last summer, and subsequently the committee will then want to consider in detail the draft Amendment Act in toto in the light of the representations that have been made. For the benefit of honourable members who were not in the House and who might wish to refer to the previous debate on this matter -- because I do not intend at this time to rehash the whole argument and the whole history leading up to the devising of this draft amendment -- I would refer them to the journals of the last Legislature wherein they will see the different days on which the debate was held and from those dates they can refer back to Hansard. I know that the opening remarks with respect to this resolution as it appeared at the last Session were made by myself on the 28th of March, 1962. The debate was then adjourned by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and his subsequent remarks and those of others who participated in the debate, I would commend to honourable members who may wish to follow through to see what the history, the background and the opinions of the House were at that time; and I would hope that this resolution would receive the support of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to check once again on the procedure. I well recall the discussion that took place last year where the Honourable the Attorney-General led off as he has suggested and I followed with a few remarks -- I would be inclined to say that it was a debate on a very high order and it undoubtedly added a great deal to the information of the House in general. But the procedure as I understand it now is that the committee will resume its work; there is still one delegation at least to be heard. If that can be completed it will be back here this year, at this Session or, if not, at the next Session, and at that time the House is going to give consideration to the suggestions that that committee makes. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise in connection with representations -- unless the committee is comprised of the same personnel of the former committee, any new member going onto the committee would be somewhat at a disadvantage in respect of representations unless the representations that were made before the last committee were recorded in order that any new member of the committee may have a chance of perusing what was said during any representation. New members might be in a disadvantageous position as the result of that, and it may be necessary instead of just hearing one delegation that was not heard or indicated their desire to appear before the committee, it might be necessary because, technically at least, for the new committee to hear evidence placed before this House, that the point raised by the Honourable the Attorney-General may have to be reconsidered in the light of the change of personnel on the committee. One other question I would like to direct to the Honourable Minister. Is Schedule "A" exactly the same as the Schedule "A" of the resolution that was before us last year without any change whatsoever?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, Schedule "A", although I haven't checked it word for word, should be the same except for any printers' errors that may have crept into it. It's the copy merely of the resolution that appeared last Session with the Schedule. As to his first point, the one submission that was made to the previous committee, I believe there was one copy, although I couldn't be certain on this point. I believe there was one written copy of it handed to us, in which case duplicate copies can quite easily be made and circulated to any members who may be appointed to this new committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it will be the intention of the committee to advertise its sittings once again so that if some other persons or groups should wish to make representations they could do so.

MR. LYON: That would be up to the committee, of course, Mr. Chairman, but that was the practice followed before.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, this is, in my opinion, the most important resolution since Manitoba has been incorporated and created. I would like to find out what would be the mechanics in procedure. I am sure to pass this resolution effectively will take more than one session -- at least that's my guess -- it's extremely important and before we decide on anything I think we have to educate the public and explain to them what it actually means. I'm not going to discuss it now and express my opinion, but I would like to know, what would be the mechanics or the machinery set to discuss it fully and to enlighten the public fully.

MR. LYON: Of course, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the committee -- the purpose of the government in recommending this resolution to the House, both in 1962 and today is in order to provide the public access to the committee where they may express their views with respect to this important subject. I think my honourable friend and I are as one with respect to that desirable ideal. There's no particular mechanical means through which this is done, except for those who are interested to present themselves when the committee is meeting and to participate in the discussions which are called for from the public and let us know what their views are. Any other members of the public who wish to sit and listen to the deliberations of the committee are, of course, entitled to do so; and beyond that I'm afraid that there's very little else that can be done.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, there's no intention on the government to rush into it.

MR. LYON: It's up to the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Agreed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd) . . . . and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. G. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce and Provincial Secretary) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I desire to lay on the table of the House the 45th Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Commission, with the usual number of copies sufficient for the party rooms, etcetera. At the same time, Madam Chairman, I would like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 1 of this Session. At the same time I would like to answer the question asked by my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie yesterday, in which he enquired: "Is it true that the Minister's department filled the position of Civil Defence Co-ordinator Area 2 with headquarters at Portage la Prairie without first applying for applicants for the position?" The answer is "No"; but in explanation, the position was filled by transferring a civil defence officer from the western zone, as it's called, to the eastern zone, as it is called in Portage la Prairie. He asked a question to indicate that it was not the desire of that person to be moved. There is no indication that it was not his desire; he was offered the position; he accepted it willingly; thus the vacancy was created in the northern zone or at Dauphin, which position has not yet been filled. The position was advertised and bulletined in the usual way, but the appointment has not been made.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the House go back to the two resolutions that were considered in the Committee of the Whole? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that "Whereas a special committee of the House was appointed at the (See Resolution, Page 199 of Hansard).

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, "Whereas all self-governing members of the British Commonwealth of Nations --- (See Resolution, Page 200 of Hansard.)

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could now reply to the question asked me by the Honourable Member for Lakeside the other day about a story that appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune a few days ago. He first asked me if I had seen the story; I am now in a position to say that I have. He then asks me if it is accurate. Generally speaking, it is accurate, though there are some minor omissions, particularly in a failure to emphasize that the figures are for gross debt and did not take into account sinking funds and other off-setting debt requirements. I might say that the information concerned was given to the newspaper in question upon request by the Treasury Department -- and naturally for that I take responsibility. It is not classified information; it is the kind of information that is given out every time, for example we make a bond issue. We have never made a bond issue in our history that I am aware of, and I have searched this with the department, where this kind of information has not been given out to those who sought it, and is generally available upon request. As a matter of fact I can say that last year on the 15th day of February a very similar story was written by the same man in the same paper from information that was obtained in the same way.

The honourable member asks me about the size of the debt. I can tell him that the gross direct and guaranteed debt outstanding as of December 31st, 1962 is \$632 million, made up of \$366 million of direct debt and \$266 million of guaranteed debt, which is a contingent liability, but the pertinent figure, of course, is the net debt of the province, which after deducting self-sustaining debt and sinking funds is \$169 million.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the First Minister if this story was given out in connection with a bond issue?

MR. ROBLIN: This particular story was not, Madam Speaker, it was given out on request for information by the party concerned, and as I said it has been our practice to give this information to those who ask for it.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to answer

(Mr. Baizley, cont'd) . . . . the questions asked of me by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye on Monday. The first cheques are available to the residents today and will cover that work period ending February 28th, 1963.

MR. HUTTON: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a nil report of the Water Rights Act Annual Report for the year ended 31st, 1962, and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ended March, 1962. I might say that there will be a copy of the Annual Report of the Crop Insurance Corporation made available to all the members in the Assembly.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, further to the reply given by the Minister of Municipal Affairs -- could he indicate the reasons why there was such a delay in the issue of these cheques -- or the Minister of Labour, pardon me -- the delay in the issue of these cheques?

MR. BAIZLEY: I cannot.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Have the government increased the fees or charges for hay permits, grazing leases and any other types of hay and pasture leases that they have?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Flin Flon) (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources): Madam Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . planning an increase in these, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Yesterday he indicated to the House, prior to the Orders of the Day, that there would be a reduction in beer prices from the Brewers to the Liquor Commission. He didn't indicate then whether there would be a reduction in the price to the consumer. There appears to have been a report last night that this was not the case. I would like the confirmation of the Minister as to whether the consumers would be getting a reduction or not.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I didn't indicate to the House yesterday that there would be a reduction in the price -- of the wholesale price of beer; I merely indicated that this matter would be considered by the Public Utility Board; so of course I couldn't go on and be hypothetical with respect to the other matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I read the honourable gentleman correctly he said that the prices had been submitted indicating reductions of two and one-quarter cents per dozen on bottles and 18 cents per half keg paid to the Brewers; this would reduce the cost to the Commission and that the Brewers had accepted this. This was his statement. Now this seems to be a fact. My question is: is he passing this on to the consumers?

MR. LYON: What I said, Madam Speaker, was that I would like to advise the members of the House that the Public Utilities Board will be giving notice that a public hearing will be held concerning prices to be paid for beer. Pursuant to the Act the commission recently submitted for the Board's approval prices that would achieve reduction and so on, if approved by the Public Utilities Board. The machinery, as my honourable friend may or may not be aware, is contained in Section 18 of The Liquor Control Act; all of this must be approved by the Public Utility Board. In the ordinary course of events though to satisfy his curiosity it is not customary for these to be passed on to the public.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the government considering passing on some of the reduction to the handlers, such as vendors and hotel operators? A subsequent question on the same subject, Madam Speaker, is the Attorney-General considering reduction of prices in the isolated areas of northern Manitoba which are now on a higher price schedule?

MR. ROBLIN: On a point of order, Madam Chairman, my honourable friend knows that he's not entitled to ask questions about what the government is going to do. When the information is available or decisions made, he is then entitled to ask the questions, but not at this stage.

MR. MOLGAT: On the point of order, Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General was the one who brought this subject up and I am merely pursuing the questions that flow logically from his statements of yesterday.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Leader of the Opposition? Is this the most important problem we have before us today?

MR. MOLGAT: Would the honourable gentleman like an answer to that, Madam Speaker? I'd be very happy to give him one. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that these questions before

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . the Orders of the Day pertain very much to the business of Manitoba. The Attorney-General yesterday made a speech on the subject before the Orders of the Day and I think it's perfectly proper to have questions to the honourable gentleman today. If my honourable friend doesn't think so that's his privilege.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for St. George. -- (Interjection) -- Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . who is the one that suggested yesterday, Madam Speaker, that this should be . . . . . looked into with respect to the legal point that was raised. That has had some examination and I'm of the opinion that the order should not be declined on the grounds that it is before the courts because it is a request for information rather than a debate that might take place in the House. Therefore, as far as the government is concerned, we do not oppose the order and will be glad to accept it.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the government for acceptance of the order. I was going to inform the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier -- I suppose it's not necessary now -- that it is not subordinate, not before the courts; and also if they insist I can produce signed affidavits from the person in question and from his solicitor, that the transcript is in existence. All this is unnecessary since it's being accepted.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: The next motion is mine, Madam Chairman. It's the motion that we go into Committee of Supply. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: It is not our custom here to have a lengthy statement from the Treasury bench with respect to this matter of Committee of Supply because we soon get plenty of opportunity to examine all the details with respect to it, so I will not make any lengthy statement at this time but I will just make a couple of very obvious observations that will immediately occur to anyone who looks at the Estimates themselves.

The first and most important fact, of course, is that there is an increase recommended to the Chamber in the cost of running the Province of Manitoba, of something less than \$15 million, between \$14 million and \$15 million for the current year. I am sure that one item that is going to attract a great deal of attention, inside the House and out of it, will be the question of salaries for members, because it will only require a little bit of arithmetic to convince those who read these Estimates that a larger sum has been provided for the indemnities and expenses of members of the House; and I may say I think without breach of propriety that there will be a bill introduced on this subject. The question of indemnities is a matter of statute and a Bill will be introduced to increase the total expense and indemnity allowance for members from \$4,000 to \$4,800, and I suppose that I ought to say nothing more about it at this time but reserve any explanations I have for this proposal for the time when the bill comes in. I think probably it would be better, if there's agreement, that we should save our debate, if there is one -- I expect there will be -- on this question of indemnities, until such time as the bill itself is introduced.

There is another matter of payment that I suppose I ought also to refer to, although I'm sure we will have plenty of opportunity to get into the details of this when we get into Committee of Supply, namely the fact that there is an increase in the salaries of Cabinet Ministers and of the Leader of the Opposition, of some \$2,500.00. I will be glad to give members a comparison of salaries paid in various parts of the country and salaries paid for other reasonably important public posts so that we may have a chance to determine whether this increase is justified under the circumstances or not; but I don't suppose that members would wish me to get into that detail at this stage when it can be done more conveniently when we can have a fuller discussion in the Committee itself.

Now the other points which will certainly be brought to the attention of members will be the fact that of the something less than \$15 million increase, \$7 million is for the provincial share in the construction of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, the Red River Floodway, and members will see that that represents an increase in the budget of the Department of

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . . Agriculture and Conservation and is the one single big item of increase in the Estimates that takes up practically half of the increased expenditures proposed. The remaining expenditures are mostly to reflect increases in education grants and in the welfare department and in health services and other services to persons of that character; very considerable increases in various items of maintenance for those who are physically handicapped and indeed for those who are in remand homes and places of that sort, which no doubt will be looked at in detail when they come. But the big increases are in the three departments which I have mentioned. Members will also see a considerable increase in the Department of Mines and Resources and also a substantial expenditure to be recommended for ARDA. This is scattered through the Estimates in several departments, Mines, Agriculture, Industry and Commerce oddly enough are all in it, and there is a substantial expenditure recommended for ARDA.

A general increase in civil service pay is to be recommended. That is shown on the Estimate Sheet as \$750,000.00. To this must be added about half a million dollars, roughly speaking, which is the normal increments given out each year to the civil servants. This \$750,000 represents a general raising of the whole pay schedule, so there is an amount in these Estimates of about a million and a quarter in respect of salary account for the governmental servants of this province.

The Public Debt Account is not voted on as such in the Estimates, but it's always shown here, and members can see that the cost of interest in carrying the Public Debt is rising from \$3.6 million to a little over \$5 million. The other details are all there for examination, and I am sure we'll have an interesting renewal of our annual encounter on the subject of money management and the investment of capital funds of this nature in the long-term debt. I will not anticipate those interesting debates because I am sure that they will all come up in their place.

Perhaps this would be a convenient time for me to make a statement, however, on the Manitoba Savings Bonds, because members probably anticipate that we will be making some arrangements for another issue of bonds in the near future and I think that assumption is correct. No final decision has been made but the tentative arrangement is that there will be another issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds this year. I do not expect they will be made at the same time as they were last year because there are certain tendencies today in the money market which we feel might make it inappropriate to issue the Savings Bonds at the same time as we did last year and, being in no particular press for money, it is quite convenient for us to select the time that we think is most suitable under the circumstances. So by way of information, I say to members of the House that there will probably be an issue of bonds, but it will be a few weeks, I should think, later than issued last year.

Now those are very general comments, Madam Speaker, and I hope they will be an adequate introduction to permit us to get into detailed considerations of the items that are included in these Estimates.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker -- Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I was rising to ask a question as a matter of fact of the . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Excuse me, I meant to say in my remarks, and I apologize for having overlooked it. My honourable friend asked me last night in what order we would pursue these Estimates and I want to tell him, as I promised I would, that we expect to proceed with them as they appear in the Estimate book. If there is any variation on that I shall give the House and the Committee as much advance notice as possible. I do not anticipate any at the present time.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, in connection with the proposed provincial bond issue, as this one that's sold, and the idea is that it should be sold only to the people of this province, what has this to do with the world markets? If there is a man in the province who believes that the province's security is good; that the security of the province is the 800,000 people living in the province; all the agricultural land, all the mines, all the natural resources; I cannot see for the life of me why wait on world markets. It could wait if it's not convenient. It doesn't make any difference to me. I'm not here ready to hand you over the money, but the general principle of waiting for the world market, the world's condition for exchange and what have you, to sell bonds to your own people on the people's security, my head does not digest it.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department I, Legislation, Item 2 (a) passed; (b) passed; (c) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Chairman -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Chairman, even though the statutory indemnities do not require to be voted, they appear on the Estimates and they enter into the total amount of money that has to be provided and, even though I recognize that a bill is to be brought in in this connection and perhaps with some of the others that are mentioned for increases, I would like at this time simply to express my opposition to the increases that are suggested for the members' indemnities. I hold to the view that I have expressed on other occasions, that the members of this Chamber, private members, are adequately paid at present and I think that it is setting a wrong example to other public bodies and to the public at large for us to be increasing our own salaries. I do not intend to debate the matter at length now because there will be an opportunity later on to do so, but inasmuch as it has been mentioned by the First Minister, I think that I should place my position on record.

This increase, if provided, will constitute a 60 percent rise in the salaries of private members of this House from when this government took over. I think that for the time that we spend here that this is more than adequate. I am not at the moment going to deal with the Ministers' salaries or the other increases that are mentioned here, Mr. Chairman, including your own and my leader. I know that the one of Madam Speaker is statutory. So far as the private members are concerned, I think that this is a mistake. I have to report I suppose, in fairness, that if it is granted I shall accept my portion, holding the view as I do that I am worth the amount as well as some of the other members of the Legislature. I think there's some here who are worth a good bit more and I think there's some here though that are not worth any more, so if it is going to be general, I'll take mine and not make any promises about giving it away to some charity or other worthy cause, so I'm not trying to disguise the fact that if this goes through that I will be accepting the increase. I'm not trying to pretend on this occasion that I'll give it away. I did that with regard to the increase in salary of the Leader of the Opposition for the short two years that I occupied that post, because I felt that, coming as it did immediately after an election, I was not working too hard at the job; that it was not required; and I tried to get the House to not make that donation.

However, this is a little different, but I can't help but recall to the minds of the honourable members that if this increase is granted and if the schedule that I have seen in this morning's Free Press is correct, that we, the members of this House, would be receiving a higher indemnity than either British Columbia or Alberta; not as high by quite a bit as Saskatchewan; certainly considerably less than Ontario; still greater difference with the Province of Quebec. We have no control over what the other legislatures do and I don't suggest that we should, but I think that we should look very carefully as to what example we set here in the Province of Manitoba, so I simply repeat the position that I have taken on former occasions. I think this increase is too fast and too far. A 60 percent increase in less than five years is, to my way of thinking, extravagant. I think it sets a bad precedent for other public bodies.

Now I shall defer any further remarks I have until the bill comes forward, but, in the meantime, I simply can't help but give notice of the position that I intend to take in this regard.

MR. ROBLIN: I should not let the honourable gentleman's comments go unremarked because I think that, in this matter at least, we can certainly say that he is perfectly consistent. He has always opposed increases in indemnities in the House and I, for one, respect his reasons. If I thought for a moment that the changes that were being made or that have been made in the indemnities in the House were extravagant or unwarranted or out of line with what we may find in the country around us, and after all we must pay some attention to that factor, then I want to assure him that we would not make the suggestion. It is a most invidious situation in which we are placed, in having to decide on our own indemnities and expense accounts and it is one which makes one hesitate a long time before one recommends it, because we are obvious targets for criticism from all sides for obvious reasons and, therefore, nobody likes to take the responsibility of making proposals of this sort lightly and I want to say that that is the case here. I don't really believe that this \$800.00 increase is an extravagant or an unjustified thing by way of salaries.

I don't want to get into a general debate because we are having a Bill and it is pointless to debate the matter twice. At that general debate we will naturally have a vote and members



(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . . will be able to record their views on this in any manner they wish, but I feel that, in view of the fact that the honourable member made some reference to what is paid in other Assemblies, that I should place on the record now and it can be discussed when we have the Bill before us what the differences are, according to my information. In the Province of Alberta, for a number of years they were paying \$4500.00. We have paid \$4000.00. We now propose to go to \$4800, which will put us \$300 over them. In the Province of British Columbia, for a number of years they have paid \$4400.00. We have paid \$4000.00. We are going to \$4800, if the order passes, which means we will be paying \$400 more than they do. I am given to understand they are increasing their indemnities in the near future, though I have no positive information to give the House. In New Brunswick, for a number of years they have paid \$5000.00. We have paid \$4000 and we are going to \$4800.00. In Newfoundland, which is not a rich province, they have been paying \$5000 to their members for a number of years and, as I say, we have paid \$4000 and are going to \$4800.00. In Nova Scotia, for a number of years they have paid \$4800 and that is what we propose. In Ontario, for a number of years it has been \$7000.00. We have been paying \$4000.00. We now propose to go to \$4800.00. In Quebec, it has been \$9700 and I think that's the peak for this kind of thing, and they have paid that for a number of years. In Saskatchewan, it is \$6000 so I think that the members of the committee might like to have those facts before them so that they can -- should have that information at hand when the time comes for the bill to be introduced into the House. I respect my honourable friend's judgment in this matter. I just don't think he's right and I hope -- I hope -- it may be a vain hope, but I hope that the public will not think that we have been rapacious or greedy in making a change of this sort. I myself think it can be justified on an equitable basis and trust that it will be thought so generally.

MR. FROESE: I just want to place on record that I have some reservations on this matter of the increase in indemnities, however, I will wait until the Bill is before the House to debate the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a) passed; (b) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: On 2(a), there's an increase indicated here. Can the Minister indicate, or did he? I unfortunately had to go out for the very opening.

MR. ROBLIN: I didn't mention this. It will also be in the Bill. As members know, there is a special allowance made to the members for the two northern constituencies of \$900 for travelling expenses, and it has been thought desirable to raise that to \$1500.00. That will also be -- those are the two points, incidentally, which will be in this Bill on indemnities. We tried this out a few years ago and we found out that members coming down here for Indian and Metis conferences and all those many things that they are expected to turn up in Winnipeg for, as well as the size of their constituencies, makes it, I think, in the public interest that they should have this extra travelling allowance in the case of those two northern seats. After all, one must remember that in those seats in particular, there is practically no municipal government and the member has to carry out the duties, not only of a member of the Legislature, important as they are, but in many respects he has to take the place of Father Confessor of a scattered variety of people who do not have organized government of their own. Consequently, he gets many calls upon his time and attention, which others of us in different circumstances do not receive. So with those things in mind, it is proposed to recommend that increase.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate fully the difficulties of the northern members. What is the situation insofar as government transportation in those areas -- like the government air services do travel in those areas, and I realize no scheduled intervals but at various intervals. Can these members make use of this service? Can other members of the House make use?

MR. ROBLIN: That is a matter that we have considered from time to time. In the past we have not been very favourably inclined towards this, but I think that, on reflection, common sense indicates that the member in that constituency should be allowed to travel on that plane if it happens to be going from one point to another and he has business to do in that area, so I propose to request the Department of Mines and Resources to make sure that that facility is open. It raises the point as to who should be able to use this transportation, apart from Ministers of the Crown, and it is my present opinion that it ought to be restricted to the actual members of the two constituencies in question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed; (d) passed.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I assume that this item is not statutory and has to be voted every year -- opposition leader.

MR. ROBLIN: The opposition leader is statutory. You will notice that we are asking the House to approve the same increase in salary there as we are suggesting for Cabinet Ministers. It's not statutory.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The point that I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, will be brief. It amazes me to find that in appointing this special committee of the House to deal with a livestock matter, we have a paragraph to the effect that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisors, accountants, clerks, stenographers and investigators to aid and assist that committee in the enquiry. Now I'm not suggesting for one moment that the work of that commission is not important. It is important; it is very essential; but I submit by the same token, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the Leader of the Opposition in this House is equally important. Our democratic system depends on a strong government and a strong opposition, and I suggest to the members of this committee that in the complex form which our government takes today that it is absolutely impossible for one individual occupying a position as Leader of the Opposition to carry out his duties, to make the investigations, and to make the research which is necessary to properly carry out the duties, without certain permanent help.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we take a look at what some of the other provinces are doing for the Leaders of their Opposition. The -- I beg your pardon -- In the Province of British Columbia, the Leader of the Opposition there receives \$8000 a year for his assistants. In the Province of Quebec, the Leader of the Opposition receives an allowance of \$8,000.00. He receives an expense allowance for official entertainment of \$2,000; he receives a living allowance, which is not taxable, of \$2,000; then in addition to that he has his salary as a member of the Legislative Assembly which is \$6700; then in further addition to that he has travelling expenses. He has a general secretary and there is an allowance of \$9000 made for that item. He has a private secretary and there is an allowance of \$5500 made to that item. -- (Interjection) -- Quebec. Now these figures are as of July, 1961. He also has a stenographer, an ante-room clerk and, during the session, there are additional stenographic help supplied to the members.

Now in the Province of Ontario, the indemnity paid to the Leader of the Opposition there is \$5000 which is taxable. He has a \$2000 allowance per annum for expenses which is not taxable. He has a representation allowance of \$2000 per annum which is paid in addition as an allowance against expenses. In further addition to that he is paid the same amount of indemnity or the same amount of allowance as a Cabinet Minister, which was \$12,000 in 1961. Now he also has executive assistants and additional help, and when I was in Toronto last summer I was in the office of the Leader of the Opposition, and at that time the House was not in session. At that time he had a full-time research assistant; he had two secretaries; he had a clerk; and he was equipped with all the staff that was necessary both for doing the clerical work in his office and for doing the research work, which is so necessary and essential in a modern Parliament for a Leader of the Opposition to have.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in Manitoba the Leader of the Opposition should be furnished (a) with a full-time secretary; and (b) with a full-time research assistant. I think that is the only method by which we can be assured that the Leader of the Opposition, regardless of who he may be, may have the staff necessary to do the research work which is so essential in the proper carrying out of the duties of his office; and I would strongly urge, Mr. Chairman, that additional funds be made available to the Leader of the Opposition for a research assistant and a full-time secretary.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this is a familiar discussion because it has taken place on this item for a number of occasions now. In fact, I remember so well making something of the argument, although I never think I went as far as my honourable friend has gone today, by making something of this argument when I sat in the seat of the Leader of the Opposition. At that time the indemnity of that post was \$2500.00. It is now proposed to make it \$6000 and, as the former Leader of the Opposition would be quick to point out, this represents an increase of about 150 percent in the last few years, so that the emoluments of this post seem to be

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . . increasing at a faster rate than any other in the gift of this Legislature, and personally I find nothing wrong with that. I think the recommendation of \$6000 is justified under the circumstances.

I got \$2500, and I remember so well that when the suggestion was made that I could do with a little more help, I think I may even have made the suggestion myself on occasion, but the then leader of this government used to point out to me with great pride that if I needed more help it was up to my political party to get out and find that kind of help, that that was what we had political parties for and that we couldn't always be depending upon the public purse for every little thing we wanted here and there. In fact, it took quite an effort to get an office for the Leader of the Opposition in this building when I occupied that post. My first application to the Minister responsible was unceremoniously dismissed, in no uncertain terms, as being completely unjustified. In fact, he left the impression that he thought I was rather impertinent to think of it, but to the credit of the then leader of the government he took another view, and when I appealed to him as I did on that occasion he was kind enough to let me have a room way up on the third floor -- 333, I think it was -- one of those generous gestures. He makes the odd generous gesture and I think that that was certainly one of them, so that this -- (interjection) -- Well, you built it better than you knew, because I was able to justify your contention that the Leader of the Opposition could move from that post to that of the Premier of the Province without the assistance that was asked for at that time, and I must say that I found it in the issue no difficulty at all to get along as Leader of the Opposition without either the extra money or the clerical staff that was requested at that time. So if my experience is to be counted for anything, there isn't a great deal of substance in the proposal made.

But I don't want to leave the matter at that, because it might be thought ungenerous if we were to simply rest our position on the treatment that we got, and to say, well it was good enough for us, it's good enough for them. I don't think I would like to rest on that position. Last year the Leader of the Opposition did make a rather eloquent appeal for some consideration in this respect and I undertook to consider it, and everybody knows that if you undertake to consider anything on this side of the House it is generally expected that you are going to do something about it, so we had a word or two on this subject before the Session opened. I hope I am not betraying any confidence if I should say that -- let me say the point was raised with me, I think that is the best way to put it -- and I think that we can agree to provide the honourable gentleman with a full-time clerical assistant in his office. It is not provided for specifically under this item. It will be taken care of in the general stenographic pool that the government operates, and of course we shall take care to secure somebody that has received his approval in this respect, but we will be glad to supply the Honourable gentleman with a full-time clerical assistant for himself.

I hope -- I feel certain that this will immediately provoke the suggestion from some other honourable gentlemen here, some of whom lead parties and some of whom do not, that they be accorded similar treatment. I must say, however, in advance, and probably to their disappointment but perhaps not to their surprise, that it has been thought best on this side that we should recognize an Official Opposition and accord them the facilities and the amenities of that office and that we should stop there. I know there is some debate as to whether that policy is fair. I, myself, do think it is constitutionally correct, and that is the policy that we propose to adhere to in this respect. But I want to tell the Honourable Member for Selkirk that I am holding no grudges here, bygones are bygones, and though I couldn't get it when I was over there, we'll be happy to see that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition does get that kind of assistance and I trust that it will be useful to him.

MR. GRAY: I agree with the previous speaker that constitutionally he is right, that the opposition who has one member more than the other opposition should be -- I know it is three now, but there was a time it was only one -- should have the privilege or the constitutional right as being the Leader of the Opposition. Also, I am not opposing the increase of salary or indemnity because I feel that if a person, if he wants a member of this Legislature to do his work right and just, has got to be indemnified of at least part of the losses he has to be and run for the Legislature. It is a very great expense -- election expense -- number one it is an effort; it interfered with his business; interferes with his livelihood. It is true that the Honourable Member from Lakeside has an old age pension scheme on his farm. He told me

(Mr. Gray cont'd) ..... once that his farm is his old age pension, but others haven't got it -- others haven't got it.

But my complaint is this. I'm sure if you took a plebiscite in the province today everyone will tell you, as far as actual genuine opposition to the administration, our group are and have been for a quarter of a century. I am sure that my leader at the present time is putting in as much work, if not more; brings a stronger opposition; enlightens more the public than the government and the opposition -- official opposition; and still he has left -- of quitting his job day in and day out, of leaving the place that he works and makes a living at, interfering with his pension from the CNR, and is always on the job here. I think perhaps either this \$6000, or add another addition of money to be given to defray, not his livelihood but his expense. I think I was present at that secret meeting which you said that you had with the Leaders. I wasn't told but I do know -- yes, yes, yes, but you said it yourself a minute ago, Mr. Premier. That's what you said. That's my understanding. I'm sorry if my hearing is not good, then I apologize and I take my statement back, but I think you must have discussed it. I can assure you that my leader never told us anything about it, but I bet -- I bet a difference of the price of beer between the price that is suggested and the price charged, that you must have had a conference with some of the leaders and your own cabinet.

I am not objecting to anything that the Honourable Member from Selkirk asked for. I am always for higher salaries for everybody, and some day, probably when the bill comes up, I'll make my contribution, but I won't do it now. But I want to register my disapproval that one of the most important groups -- I'm not taking in Administration -- the opposition groups in this House were and are our group, and if you don't want to believe me, if you're smiling, read your Hansard and read the Journals, and you will find there are many, many laws on the statute books that the governments, either the Liberals or the Conservatives, have introduced after we have tried to get it for years and years. I don't know whether I'll have my head chopped off by my group for getting up now, but I felt -- and I'm speaking in my own name -- I felt that an injustice has been done to our group.

..... Continued on next page

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I tried to get up before the Honourable Member for Inkster did, to thank the Premier for his announcement insofar as staff for my office. It is true that last year I had spoken about this in the House and indicated what was being done elsewhere. My colleague the Member from Selkirk has this year. The government has been very good in providing me with an office here in the Building, and I thanked the Premier for that last year and I do again now, but as I pointed out then, it's extremely difficult to make use of that office, however, with no staff, because it means that if you are absent at all there is no one to take care of it and you simply cannot proceed and do business; you can't get letters typed and so on; and those were the reasons for which I asked last year for full-time staff. I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that this is in the interests of good government. Our system operates on a government with opposition. This is true of many fields in our whole system. Our economics works on the basis of competition and I think there is nothing better in business, for example, than good competition. Similarly, here in government I think that while the government has the responsibility of running the province, the Opposition has a very serious responsibility in providing responsible and useful opposition to the proposals of the government. In this way we can get the best government possible and probably the best laws to suit our people, so when I asked for staff it was simply on the basis that in order to do the job which I hold, I felt that this was necessary. I appreciate the announcement that the First Minister has made today and I thank him very much for it. I am sure it will make for certainly more effective work on our part, and I hope, better government in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of giving the Leader of the Opposition the assistance that he will now be getting. I am in a different position. I have no one else to speak for me so I'll have to speak on my own behalf, and I feel that -- I would appreciate getting some stenographic help, especially during the time that the Sessions are on. I know the other parties have their committee rooms. I don't know whether this help that they have is paid for by the government or whether they pay for it themselves. I'd like to receive some verification on this matter and wonder whether something could be made available for me in this case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, apparently the First Minister of this Legislature and the Leader of the Opposition in the past have been presumptuous enough to raise in the debate their own peculiar position, and they having established this precedent maybe I should say a word or two in connection with democratic government and its operation. Now I'm not preaching for a call. I realize quite fully that the Honourable the First Minister has already indicated what the answer of government would be if there were other requests forthcoming from other parties, and as he said this, Mr. Chairman, he was looking directly at me because of the fact that I'm sure that in the past this question has arisen. I rose on one occasion I recall, a few years ago, in support of the then leader of the CCF Party, who in my opinion was doing just as much work in the interests of the good government of Manitoba as the then Leader of the Opposition, the present First Minister. Now as far as I'm personally concerned it isn't a question of dollars and cents. I'm perfectly happy, whether it's justifiable or not, to act as the Leader of my party in this House at exactly the same indemnity as a member who may be in this House from one session to the other and never take part in any debate, and I think it will be appreciated by the members of the House that this is not possible for me to take the position that I have to take in this House without a considerable amount of research and a considerable amount of detailed study on various matters that are of concern of the Province of Manitoba. I appreciate very much the fact that the present government has made available to the Leader of the party that I represent office accommodation on a twelve-months basis. I find it most handy. Unfortunately in the type of employment that I am in at the present time, it is not possible for me to use it at all times. Now the main reason in rising at this particular time is not a personal appeal, but the Honourable the First Minister mentioned something about the constitutionality of the set-up in government. I believe it is a fact that the Leader of the third group, the New Democratic Party, in the Province of Ontario has provision made in the Estimates within that province for help and assistance insofar as he is concerned in the pursuance of his activities. I would suggest this to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition when he tries to pinpoint the question of government and opposition, it's a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)..... throwback to what I don't think any longer exists in the Dominion of Canada, that is, the old two-party system of government. I think that we have to recognize today that that is no longer valid -- at least no longer valid, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, west of Quebec. So while I say that I am not preaching for a call at the present time, I think that the matter should be given consideration as to additional aid insofar as whoever may be the Leader of this group in the Legislature. I appreciate very much, and I recall quite vividly the remarks of the Honourable the First Minister last year when we were dealing with the Estimates, that it was up to us on -- if I recall correctly when this question was raised, he said to me something to the effect, "Well Russ, you get out and work and maybe you'll be the Opposition and will receive the benefits of the indemnity and additional assistance of the Opposition."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say what is very very obvious, we did try and we tried real hard. I'm not very satisfied, as we all know, with the results of that, but I do think that we could have worked harder in the interests of democracy and the interests of government of Manitoba if there was more availability for research within our group. Again, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm personally concerned, irrespective of whether we're recognized or not financially, we are recognized in accordance with the laws of the Assembly as a party in the Province of Manitoba. We have at least 15 percent of the total votes that were cast in support of our party. I think that in the interests of good government, not for me, Russ Paulley personally, but in the interests of good government, that this matter should be given consideration.

My honourable colleague for Inkster, and I want to thank him for his flattery when he says, at least inferred, that as Leader of this group I make more proposals and suggestions and take a more effective part in opposition than even that of the Official Opposition, and I want to thank him for that..(interjection) .. No, it wasn't wishful thinking. I think, Mr. Chairman, I think that it's an absolute fact. It was recorded officially in the press insofar as the last House was concerned when we were only one member less than the Official Opposition, that on .....

A MEMBER: The last House?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, the last House, we were one less than the Official Opposition, which seat cost me \$3,500, but apart from that, the press at that time recognized the effectiveness of our party in the Legislature, and I want to assure this House that insofar as we seven are concerned now, as against 13 -- in a dice game I'd rather have seven than 13 at any time -- and I'm sure that the people of Manitoba will get far more value from the seven than they will the thirteen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed; (c) passed; (d) passed; (e) passed. Resolution No. 1 passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: With regard to (e) Mr. Chairman, the operation of the recording equipment. Is it under this item that we should ask what to me is an annual question, about the number of subscriptions to Hansard? If my honourable friend would prefer that it be taken up under his Estimates it's ....

MR. EVANS: Whichever you like. It is within my ....

MR. CAMPBELL: .....just as leave, if it's in my honourable friend's department, would he make a note of it in case ....

MR. EVANS: Yes, I'm able to answer at the moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. EVANS: Paid subscriptions to Hansard, 224; free list, 159; total, 383.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does my honourable friend have last year's figures shown at the same time?

MR. EVANS: I have not. I can get them put in my honourable ....

MR. CAMPBELL: They're on record I think. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: .....this item. Does this just include the remuneration for the gentleman who does the recording of the Sessions? This is the item, is it, dealing with that? Is the increase of \$150 as I see it just applicable to the recorder, because if it's not, I question as to whether or not the item is sufficient for the valuable job that is being done by the operator, and I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Ray Sly for the valuable work that he does. I think that when we daily receive copies of Hansard that we should pay a tribute to this young man for

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . the capable manner in which he is able to switch over from one to the other and fully record the debates that happen in this House, and I would suggest that if this is the item, in my opinion Mr. Chairman, the increase is insufficient when we take into consideration the increases that have been made to others in the House on this occasion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a).

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the -- is the Minister getting information on that subject?

MR. EVANS: Salary of the operator of the recording equipment?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is this the item?

MR. EVANS: The operation of the recording equipment, salaries \$ 1,100.00.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I raise the point that in my opinion this is totally inadequate for a gentleman that has to sit here day after day listening to much of the balderdash and harangue that goes on in this Chamber -- it's certainly worth more than \$ 1,100 to the individual and I would suggest that the government give consideration to making it a little more remunerative.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't rise to deal with the same point that my honourable friend has, although I would certainly agree with him that the operator of this equipment does an excellent job and I'd extend my compliments to him too, but what I would like to say here -- and for me this may again be a concession -- because I would like to record the fact that I think the Hansard staff as well, is doing a good job. Perhaps I don't very often pay compliments in this Chamber; perhaps I usually rise for other reasons, and I am not unmindful of the fact that I am one who opposed the introduction of Hansard into our proceedings, not for the reasons that have been ascribed to me, because many people have continued to say it was because of the cost. It was not because of the costs but mainly because I was afraid that it would encourage the practice -- and I think it has -- of reading of speeches in this House; something that I deplore. However, that isn't the fault of the Hansard staff, and I think that they have done an excellent job and I think that the Hansard continues to get better and better. I'm not speaking of its contents. I'm speaking of the job that's done in producing it, and I am one who has not been noted as being an enthusiast in the olden days for the service itself. I think that the folks who are in charge of it have been doing a very excellent job and I think that a lot of members have probably noticed that we have fewer corrections now than we used to have. I think this is all to the good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1 passed; item 3 (a) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Unfortunately I had to be out for a moment at the very beginning of the discussion of estimates. I wondered if the ministers could provide us at the very outset with a list of numbers of "stands". I believe this was done last year and if it could be done before we go further into estimates, I think it will save us all a good deal of time and then we can simply make our own calculations from there.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I have a tabulation here that was given to me today and I can see that members will get this by tomorrow, but in the meanwhile I can give any information that's requested. For example in the Comptroller-General's Department, the staff provided these estimates No. 70.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I agree with that point and I have another one that I would like to raise. I notice that the salary of the Comptroller-General is given here, but in the most of cases the salaries of the Deputy Ministers are not given and I would suggest that we have, as we had last year, a list provided as soon as possible that gives the salaries of the Deputy Ministers and the chairmen of Boards and Commissions, and then a list of any that there might be who have received extra remuneration in addition to the regular salary. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be better if these were shown in the estimates; then as I say, it would be better if the other salaries were shown, but if that's not going to be done, then if we could have as early as possible in the day a list showing them, it would be useful.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're on the subject of lists, there's one other that -- in fact there may be others as well, if not right in this department, we're coming up to it next -- and that's the grants that are given out by the government. Each year the question is asked and . . . . . have to be a long string, if they could simply be produced on a Gestetner machine, then it would, I think, save time for all concerned.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the other salaries in this item, I notice

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) . . . . . something that is quite unusual in governmental circles, that the total amount is down. I presume that that is because of the operation of the central processing equipment. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: As my honourable friend will observe, it's not down by any significant amount as things go in this field, but it is because we have reduced the number of audit clerks. The amounts payable to audit clerks is down considerable because of the introduction of other methods other than manual.

MR. CAMPBELL: As my honourable friend says, it's not down any very large amount, that's true, but . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . as these things go, I think \$9,000 is a lot of money and I'm rather pleased at having saved it.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right. I wasn't going to deal on that point; I was going to say that it was the trend that I was noticing, because the usual trend here and other places is up. I'm not criticizing that; I'm just asking about the operation of the central processing data, if that's what it's called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed; (b) passed; Resolution 2 passed. Item 4 passed?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, is this the item that deals with the question of the statutes of the province and the binding and the likes of that?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the question, or ask the question, as to whether or not the government is giving any consideration for another revision of the statutes of the province. The last one, I believe, was in 1954; at least it's dated 1954 -- I think it was started prior to that -- it's ten years now or almost ten years. I don't know what difficulties the legal fraternity has when they have to deal with cases in court, etcetera, in finding out the revisions and the amendments and changes in legislation annually, but on your poor CNR worker as I am, I have great difficulty in having to thumb through 10 or 12 volumes of the statutes of the Province of Manitoba in order to find out whether black is white or whether it's orange or green, and I would like to ask of the responsible minister whether or not steps are being taken for another revision of the statutes, and if not why not; and if so, when might we expect a new revision of the statutes of Manitoba. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, would I suggest this is necessary because it seems to me that each year, give or take a little, that there are more amendments and changes in legislation than there were in past years. I have in my office at the present time most of the statutes going back to 1912 and '13, and I notice that they're very very thin volumes, and when we compare them with the activities of legislatures in the past ten years, the volumes are almost as thick as three or four years of the changes in statutes that they were previously, and I raise this point, Mr. Chairman, for some comments from the responsible minister's office.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that we are now proceeding with the revision of the statutes. A special staff has been hired to carry it on. The Attorney-General is prepared to deal with that in his estimates, but I can give this advance information to my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is dealt with in the estimates of the Attorney-General because I've just glanced at the estimates. I must confess that it was just a glance; I didn't note any provision in the estimates of the Attorney-General's Department and that's why I asked the question as to whether or not on this item that this matter was covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN . . . . . passed; Resolution 3 passed. Department II, Executive Council. Item 1 (a) passed; (b) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we have an addition here this year under Executive Council; that's the Minister without Portfolio. Could the First Minister indicate what will be the expected duties?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that is a question which I ought to answer in any detail for my honourable friend, not because I wish to be uncivil, but that it really is the business of the Executive Council as to how we employ this gentleman. He will be a member of the Executive Council and undertake the duties that are assigned to him there, and I think my honourable friend will understand if I say that I don't think I should give any enlargement on that answer.



MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed; (b) passed. Resolution 4 passed. Item 2 ....

MR. CAMPBELL: Did we get the number of salaries here, or is that going to be furnished as a .....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I can give the information here on the salaries. The Premier's office -- seven.

MR. CAMPBELL: Seven?

MR. ROBLIN: Seven.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 passed. Resolution 5 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: This is about the same as last year. I take it that there is no expectation of a conference this year; is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend knows as much about it as I do, I'm afraid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....Resolution 6.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm always at a loss to know, when it comes to grants and miscellaneous here, where to find them all and where to speak on this subject matter, because when we get into roadside parks and one thing and another, it .....

MR. ROBLIN: .....would be prepared to make a statement on grants -- it may answer some of his questions -- because it is quite true that grants are scattered through the estimates. Those grants which apply to a particular department are as a rule included in the grant figure for that department. For example, there are a large number of health grants, welfare grants, grants of various sources. Well, they are included in the figures for that department, and as we come to the department you'll probably notice an item for grants and you'll have a chance to enquire as to what those are. There are a number of grants that don't belong to anybody in particular, mostly of a cultural nature, and those wind up in this particular item that we see before us now, and I would like to place on the record so that members will have the information, the grants that are proposed to be paid out of this estimate for the coming fiscal year. Although members may not get them all down today, they'll be in Hansard tomorrow and will be on the record for all to see. The grants that we have here are as follows: Manitoba Drama League, \$1000.00; Manitoba Theatre Centre, \$7,000.00; La Cercle Moliere, \$500.00; Manitoba Museum Association, \$7,000.00; Historic Sites Advisory Board, \$1,000.00; Winnipeg Art Gallery Association, \$12,000.00; Men's Musical Club of Winnipeg Limited, \$2,000.00; Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Limited, \$18,000.00; Royal Winnipeg Ballet of Canada, \$12,000.00; Brandon Arts Council, \$3,000.00; St. Boniface Museum Association, \$10,000.00; Frontier College, \$500.00; Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, \$2,500.00; Canadian Area of Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, \$500.00; Canadian Highway Safety Conference, \$1,200.00; Royal Canadian Humane Association, \$100.00; Manitoba League of the Blind, \$100.00; Last Post Fund, \$250.00; Boy Scout Association, \$2,500.00; The Girl Guide Association, \$2,000.00. That leaves unallocated a sum of around \$7,000.00 out of the \$90,000 which is in reserve for contingencies that are unknown at the present time and which may arise during the course of the coming year. Now if there are any questions about any particular grant that anyone wishes to ask about I would like to do my best to answer. I notice in reading through here that I don't seem to have mentioned the Rainbow Stage, and there is an allocation to be proposed which apparently didn't get into these estimates -- this book -- when it was prepared, I think of \$2,500.00 this year. I want to assure the House that this is not being made so that they may reconsider their decision to fire me as an honorary patron of their association. I have had to accept that blow as things stand, but when their case was made this year, they did convince us that this was something which we ought to recommend to the House as worthy of support in this way, so there is, I think, a \$2,500 grant for that particular group.

MR. SCHREYER: The First Minister mentioned \$2,500 as being allocated for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I'd like to know if that's for the Canadian Branch or does that include money set aside for sending a representative overseas to the Commonwealth Conference?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, as I read that perhaps the Honourable Member didn't get it. \$2,500 goes to the Headquarters, and \$500 goes to the Canadian Area Association.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I was going to remark to the First Minister when he read the list that I didn't see Rainbow Stage, and I know that last year we had asked for con-

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . .sideration for this group because we felt that they were doing a very worthwhile tourist work, as a matter of fact, by their summer presentation and I am happy to see that they have been added to the group this year. I wonder if the Minister could table the list that he has given to us. Could it not be given to us in a form, because it would be easier for us, I think, if we did this and simply put it in our own books and then next year if we have to refer we can see any changes that occur. Insofar as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, I wonder if the Minister could indicate exactly how the two groups work. There's the Canadian group who meet once a year, and this varies from province to province; then there's an overall group that meets elsewhere outside of the country, and what is the relationship between the two, and how often does that other group meet?

MR. ROBLIN: The Canadian Association is a branch of the Commonwealth Association. Both of them meet annually.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, another question in connection with this Parliamentary organization. Do you expect to see the day when a common member of this House could be appointed as a delegate?

MR. ROBLIN: Members of the House have been appointed to the -- at least to the Canadian Area Association.

MR. GRAY: Oh Canadian, yes, but I'm waiting for an overseas cruise . . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): The Honourable First Minister mentioned a sum of \$7,000 for Manitoba Museum. I wonder if he could elaborate or explain this. He's talking about this \$7,000 for the Manitoba Museum; what does this include?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like for the benefit of the Press to warn them not, if they would be kind enough, to not to publish the figure on the Rainbow Stage until I have had a chance to confirm that I gave accurate information. I just heard that perhaps I didn't; it's another sum. So let's not -- let's just leave that until I am able to give the correct, the accurate information to the House.

My honourable friend asked about the Manitoba Museum, was it not? Well, the way this works is that originally, the group concerned submits a brief to the Provincial Government indicating why in their opinion they are entitled to some public support, and then they usually accompany that with a statement of their financial situation and where they get their money from, and their suggestions, usually rather ambitious, as to what share of that total cost the government should be asked to contribute, and what we try to do is assess the relative merits of the proposals that are put before us when compared with the amount of money in total that is available for distribution in this general field of cultural grants, and members may realize that this is not an enviable task, because it is extremely difficult to be sure that one's judgment is absolutely sound and right in weighing up the merits of various worthy groups, and believe me, there are a number of very worthy associations that come to us and ask for help, and it is quite a problem. So what we try to do is to pay special attention to those groups which are provincial in their character, that is, that either are represented all over the province, or who operate as a provincial association designed to benefit all the people of the province even though of necessity they may be located in one particular place and therefore it follows that the people nearer them probably have a better chance of making use of their facilities than others do. But that's just one of those things you can't get away from. But we try to weigh up those cultural organizations which seem to be worthy of support in this way, and one of the ideas that we have introduced recently is that we will take an organization and make a small basic grant to it, which is a no-strings-attached grant, and then we say, "You also raise money from the public, and on certain terms and conditions and between certain levels we will match what you get from the public." So that we are certain that there is a measure, a measure of public support for what this organization is doing and that they are not simply perhaps an in-grown group that are living on themselves and coming and asking for government support without any real roots in our community. So we try to combine a basic grant with this matching principle. Now I know there are some members of the House that don't believe in matching grants, and I suppose it may be the case in this instance too, but we think it is a good thing to encourage these people to get public support in the knowledge that it will also attract an additional measure of public support as well, and that's the formula that we use with the Manitoba Museum of which my Honourable Friend enquired, and the amount that's given to these organ-

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... izations is purely an arbitrary amount, it must be admitted. I mean to say, who is to really say whether a museum should get \$7,000 or \$70,000? It's a very difficult question to decide and I'd be the last one to say that we got exactly the right balance, but we have a rough idea how much money the Legislature is likely to approve in this respect. It's increased about three times in the past few years and we try to apportion it to groups that have what we trust is a legitimate claim for public support. I hope that gives my honourable friend what he's looking for.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wasn't questioning the amount but I certainly welcome the information that the First Minister gave us. My reason for this question -- I wanted to know if the Eskimo Museum in Churchill qualified under this. I don't think there was ever a letter written for a request such as you mentioned, but I know that it was done verbally and the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce might not remember because you say a lot of things -- but when on a trip up north I did pass along the information of the curator, I guess you would call him, of the museum there, and had a discussion. It certainly wasn't an official discussion, just two people discussing this, and I was under the impression that, if he thought of it anyway, he would bring it up, discuss it in Cabinet. I think that, Mr. Chairman, this is certainly a worthwhile museum. The Honourable the First Minister, I am sure, on the trip up north, as well as all these members that visited Churchill, had a chance to see the old building and then the new building that was being built. I don't think they are getting any grants at all. Talking about culture, it's the culture of the Eskimo. I think they probably are the only ones in Canada, and it is certainly, for those who visited this museum, I think that they were impressed, and I think it was certainly something worthwhile, and I wonder if -- I know that those people -- maybe they didn't follow the proper steps, but I know that they were trying to get a grant. It was extremely difficult for them to build the proper building for this. They are doing that themselves, they're building the building themselves, and I had promised the curator that I would at least mention it to one of the ministers and I did so, but I realize that this might have been forgotten. I wonder if -- you say there's a sum in there. Could I inform them that they could make proper application, or is it too late now?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it's never too late. I may say that I have not had officially from this group any request for a donation, and if one were received it would create some problems, to be frank about it, because there are a number of small museums across the province. There is the one to which my honourable friend refers to; there are local museums of various character. There's one in The Pas, and there are a couple of others that are dedicated to old cars and things like that and -- it sounds rather odd but nevertheless they are fascinating places -- and the people in the areas concerned are extremely happy about them and are always asking for assistance. What we would propose if we received a request of this nature was that the matter should be dealt with under the aegis of the Manitoba Museum Association. In other words, we think probably one authority for museums in the province is enough, and that perhaps they could deal with this problem and encourage those local museums which showed promise or had some particular characteristic that is valuable and that they wished to preserve. In fact, my colleague has just been telling me that he believes that the Manitoba Museum are looking at the problem from that point of view and I think that is correct, so I would suggest that those people ought to be asked to get in touch with the Manitoba Museum and see what arrangements can be worked out. It's going to be hard to find enough money to go around unless we do something of that sort.

MR. DESJARDINS: I want to thank the First Minister for this information, and I will certainly pass this on, but I certainly don't think that this museum could be compared with a museum of old cars or .....

MR. ROBLIN: No. Well, I don't think they should draw that comparison if you intend to attribute it to me because I didn't make it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, what I'm trying to say is that the First Minister was talking a little while ago about the culture, and this is not just a local museum. I think it's a museum that's situated--exactly the definition that he gave a little while ago--and it's situated up north, but it represents a lot of work done all through practically half of the province, and I that this should be taken into consideration. I think it's more than a hobby; it's certainly something worthwhile.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Mr. Chairman, I heard the First Minister speaking of Rainbow Stage and he used the expression that he thinks that they are planning to recommend \$2,500 to the House. I am wondering if that was just a matter of saying that this is now included in the budgetary item or whether we will have another opportunity to discuss this or other grants.

MR. ROBLIN: The grant proposed for Rainbow Stage -- I am uncertain of how much, that's all.

MR. CHERNIACK: I understood that, but I didn't know whether the expression "to recommend to the House" means that we will be considering this or whether this will be an executive decision.

MR. ROBLIN: No, my honourable friend is considering it right now when we pass this estimate, so he should make any remarks he has on the subject at the moment.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the help that the First Minister has given me. Mr. Chairman, I was not ready -- I was not aware that we would actually be dealing with cultural grants today, and therefore I cannot speak in the detail that I would like to speak especially not having had an opportunity to write down the specific amounts which the First Minister read to us. However, he did say that in the last few years there has been -- I think he said the amount was tripled -- and I look back to the Public Accounts which we were given last week and I find that for the year ending 1962, which I have a right to assume is two years ago, the amount allocated was \$90,000 . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, may I either correct my honourable friend or myself, I'm not sure which. What I intended to say was that since we became responsible for these grants they have been increased in this way.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's quite a few years ago, Mr. Chairman. It seems that way. In any event, in the Estimates for two years ago the sum of \$90,000 was set aside, the sum of \$82,000 was expended, the unexpended was \$7,700, which would indicate to me that there hasn't been much change expected this coming year from two years ago, and I would like to point out to the First Minister that there has been a tremendous change, even in two years, in the public acceptance of the various cultural institutions that we have in the Province of Manitoba and particularly in this City, and the acceptance which I suggest merits consideration for an increase in the amount which the government allows itself to spend for this purpose. The First Minister seemed to be looking in this direction when he said that there are some people here who object to matching grants. I hope he did not think that I established a principle of some type that matching grants are wrong. I spoke about education; now we're talking about cultural institutions, which are those supported by the public, and I certainly accept the idea that public recognition of the need is evidenced by public support, and when money is paid in by the public in the form of donations that should be something that the government recognizes. Therefore, I am disappointed to find that there is no proposed increase in this item when \$90,000 was allocated two years ago and I think it can be generally accepted that the public has shown a tremendously increased interest in music, in art, in drama, in so many other of the cultural aspects of our social life, and I would strongly suggest that the Executive Council should look carefully into the question of the advisability of providing themselves with additional monies which they could use to further foster the growth of the cultural institutions which I believe are so important in our way of life.

Now, dealing with the museum, I would think that this is one of the institutions in this province which has had the least growth, and I had occasion, in the Metropolitan Corporation as well as in the City of Winnipeg, to point out to the museum just the point made by the First Minister, and that is that unless they get busy and start stimulating the public and start bringing in more support, they are not likely to get much assistance. Yet I am looking to this government to see to it that the museum has a proper roof over its head and has the proper facilities whereby it could record those very important historical matters which would be of interest to maintain in a museum, and I am hoping that when we come to deal with the recognition of Canada's centenary that we will there find that a proper location, a proper building will be provided for this most important aspect and most neglected aspect of our cultural life here in Manitoba. So I understand that I can move nothing but I can certainly hope that I could move the government in some way to see to it that they provide themselves with sufficient

(Mr. Cherniack, cont') . . . . funds with which to make that contribution which I think a government of the Province of Manitoba ought to make in the growth and development of the cultural part of our life in this province.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend will be relieved to know that we've been moved already, because last year under the cultural section of these grants -- some of them are non-cultural -- the recommendation was in round figures for \$62,000 -- the museum and the art gallery and all the rest, that kind of thing. This year it is for \$74,000 which is an increase of in the neighbourhood of 20 percent, so -- 12 on 60, roughly speaking, 20 percent -- so it looks as if we are at least moving in the right direction although I am frank to admit that I would never take the position that we can be proud that we have been magnanimous in this field, because the fact is that it's extremely difficult to arrange for this money to be available with all our responsibilities and we are conscious of the legitimate expectation in this respect. I think we will see quite a change in this whole structure when the proposals of the government with respect to the Centennial that my honourable friend referred to materialize. I am not going to anticipate the debate because we are bringing in a bill to deal with this, and undoubtedly members will have their say at that time, but I do expect to see quite a change in this whole field if that bill is accepted by the House and if the developments which I envisage actually take place.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I . . . . The \$12,000 increase must have come from somewhere and if I am right in assuming -- I am right, it was \$90,000 last year -- then at whose expense was the increase of \$12,000 brought in and how much was actually expended in the last fiscal year out of the \$90,000.00?

MR. ROBLIN: This \$90,000 is made up of several different categories of grants, one of which is cultural, and that's the one my honourable friend was thinking about. We actually appropriated and spent the \$62,000 I referred to last year for the cultural section of these grants, and we are actually appropriating -- and we trust we'll spend -- the \$74,000 for the same sets of grants this year. Now he makes the point, where does the extra money come from because the total is just the same, and I can give him the answer, and that is that a number of grants previously shown under this Executive Council item have been transferred to departments where they have a direct and germane connection. For example, let me give him these -- in fact I'll give him all of them -- well, I don't know whether I can get them all, but some. The Canadian Welfare Council got \$3,000 last year under this grant. That's transferred to grants under Welfare in these Estimates; and the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg got \$2,000.00. That's similarly transferred to Welfare. So while our total of \$90,000 remains the same, actually it represents an increase on the cultural side because we've taken out some grants which seem to recommend themselves for transfer to the individual departments who are directly connected and, as I said before, when we get to those departments you'll see "grants" and then you'll be entitled to ask what they are, and you'll find some of these are over there.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister indicates now that he actually did increase his budget by about \$9,000 in this year, and I'm happy to see that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the agricultural museum at Austin is presumably handled through the Department of Agriculture. Is this not correct? Going on to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, my honourable friend the Attorney-General was the gentleman who went to the last one which I think was held in Nigeria. Well, as a matter of fact, as a result of that conference there was a rather interesting comment made, I think, by an honourable gentleman from Vancouver who belongs to the party of my friend on the left, and I appreciate that the Attorney-General was unable to spend quite as much time in Nigeria as the other gentleman in view of certain actions taken by the Leader of the House, but nevertheless I think it might be useful if the Attorney-General would give us at this time his comments on the conference and possibly his comments on what the gentleman from Vancouver had to say about his trip.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to give my honourable friend some comments. I don't know if there is sufficient time left in the afternoon to cover the full conference. May I say at the outset, and I am sure these remarks could be borne out by the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Member from Lakeside, or any others who have had occasion to attend Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meetings outside of Canada, that it is an

(Mr. Lyon cont'd) . . . . . experience that any legislator will treasure all of his life, because it is through these meetings that one gets, not only the feeling, but one can see some tangible results and some of the tangible assets of this great Commonwealth of Nations to which we belong. There were gathered in Nigeria representatives from every part of the Commonwealth of Nations. There were from Canada 14 delegates; I believe four from the House of Commons, three from the Senate, and the balance from each of the provinces with the exception of Quebec -- Quebec and Alberta, I believe, were not represented and one other province that was about to have an election at that time. With that exception all other provinces were represented and -- as a matter of fact, most unfortunately, one of the delegates, namely from Prince Edward Island, passed away while in Nigeria representing his province.

The agenda for this conference was much the same as is followed for all of the other conferences, namely, a tour of the host country for a period of approximately three weeks followed by a conference of all of the delegates that convened in the National Hall in Lagos at which the discussion topics for the conference of this year were debated. I arrived late for the conference itself and, as a result, was able to take in only the last week of the tour of Nigeria, but I did participate in the full sessions in Lagos the debates that took place with respect to the conference topics. The conference topics this year evolved around the role of the Commonwealth in international relations, having regard particularly to specific roles that Commonwealth countries could play with respect to technical aid, and so on, and I was able to hear from all parts of the globe the excellent work that is being done in terms of technical assistance by the senior countries of the Commonwealth assisting those junior members who are in the developmental stage at the present time. And may I say that with respect to Nigeria itself, which is a country which achieved independence only in 1960, that there one could find tangible examples of the tremendous work that is being done by other members of the Commonwealth and particularly by Canada. It was a matter of great pride to run across Canadians in practically every part of the country. You can imagine my own surprise, and indeed delight when at Kaduna, the capital of Northern Nigeria, to be accosted in the airport there by two former constituents of mine from Fort Garry, the husband who is on loan from the Canada Department of Agriculture to the government of Nigeria doing research work on the tsetse fly and other associated diseases which reflect on the cattle industry in that part of the country. We ran across Canadian teachers in Ibadan which is the largest city in the country and the university centre of that country, and we ran across Canadian technicians as well in the capital city of Lagos. Their national television system has received a great deal of assistance from the CBC in Canada.

I can report to honourable members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that the reputation of Canada and of Canadians is very high indeed in Nigeria. I can report as well that the work that is being done -- or that part of it that one could see in the very short time that I was there which was a little over two weeks -- the work that is being done in terms of technical assistance is of tremendous help to the people of Nigeria, and on more than one occasion, members of their government from the highest level right through the civil service and so on were able to tell us how appreciative they were of the work that Canadians were doing on behalf of this developing country.

Well, the country itself is populated by some 42 millions of people. Its size is approximately that of the Province of Ontario. It is tremendously rich in natural resources and it has come a terribly long way over the past quarter of a century. With the new independence which came to them in 1960, they have in effect become the showplace of democracy in Africa. They have a federal set-up such as we have in Canada, with only three provinces or states, and as I mentioned to you before, we sat in the National Parliament called in Lagos for our conference. The Prime Minister of Nigeria opened the conference, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, and he gave a most thoughtful and learned address to all of the delegates mentioned -- all the delegates who were assembled there -- and left, I think, a very lasting impression upon all of us. Here was a statesman of first rank in the world; a man who emanates from northern Nigeria; a Muslim by religion; a man whose professional background was obtained in Britain and who has not only a command of the English language, but who is one of the most thoughtful persons that one could envision in public life in that country. I suppose one could say as well that one of the greatest advantages of this type of gathering accrues not only from the formal gatherings that you have,

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) . . . . .but as well from the informal relationships that are built up as you travel together about the country. Talking over problems of government with members of provincial or state houses from Australia or from Malaysia or from Aden or from Pakistan or from India not only assures you, as we know from our reading, that they enjoy the same system of government, the rule of law, and all of the inheritances that we have in Canada from the British parliamentary system, but it assures you, as well, that these are not just words; they don't give just lip service to these doctrines; they believe in them as strongly and as fervently as we do here. I think one other thing, one other impression it left upon me was this -- as a North American, and you tend, I think, in a continent like Africa to think of yourself as a North American rather than as a Canadian, particularly because they think of you in those terms -- but we cannot expect as Canadians to see the precise form of our parliamentary democratic system transplanted into one of these new countries and to flourish precisely the way we would have it flourish here. It just won't happen, because their geography, their climate, their customs, their religion all motivate changes in this system, and so there will be changes that take place from time to time -- changes that are not perhaps in accord with the way that members of this House would necessarily want things to run, but I think running throughout this whole piece, in the short time I was there, was the assurance that these people have a love for democracy, and more important, they have a love and a faith in the Commonwealth which is sometimes much stronger than we would find here in our own country, and in that respect one certainly feels that this Commonwealth of Nations to which we belong and this Commonwealth of Parliamentary Association whose main purpose is to engender understanding and whose main purpose as well is to maintain and to enhance the whole principle of the Commonwealth relationship is being well fulfilled.

Now it would be impossible, as I said, in a short time to make any more comments or a specific nature upon that conference. I regard it as certainly one of the most enlightening experiences that I could have had as a member of this Legislature. I may say I was very proud indeed to have been asked to represent Manitoba at it. With respect to the second portion of my honourable friend's question, I must plead some ignorance because I think the incident in question was at Ibadan. There were three touring parties of delegates at this particular conference; the number of delegates was approximately 120. They were broken down into three parties of 40 each. I am sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to know that I joined our group at Ibadan on the day they left and I wasn't able to participate in any of the activities that may have been commented upon at that particular site. We went from there into the Muslim north and I am sure my honourable friend is well enough acquainted with the customs of the Muslims to know that certain of the -- what we would call basic necessities and joys of life with respect to libation, are never ever seen or heard of in those Muslim communities, and this in itself was a revelation and I can assure you that there was no problem in that respect in any part of the tour that I was connected with at all. The honourable member of parliament for Vancouver East, I believe it is -- he made certain comments. He was in the country much longer than I was; he is a much more experienced parliamentarian than I am, much more experienced in the ways of life than I am, and I defer to any comments that he may wish to make about Africa. There might be concurrent comments that could be made about what experienced parliamentarians do when they get away on these trips. Thank heaven, I'm not an experienced person in that regard.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his excellent comments on his tour. I certainly agree with him that these tours are extremely useful. It seems to me that the Canadian one in particular, which brings people together from every part of our country -- people who have to do with the setting up of laws in every province -- is extremely important. Too frequently, Canadians from one end of the country misunderstand those in the other end and don't realize the problems each group faces, so this annual meeting of people who have responsible positions is certainly very useful. I wonder if the Minister could indicate where the meeting will be held next year for the Commonwealth group and where it will be held for the Canadian group.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . information, I doubt that it's available as yet. Usually it comes to us sometime in the spring.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, we still are on Resolution No. 5

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd) . . . . of the six, are we not? Grants and Miscellaneous? Resolution No. 6. Yes. About a month ago or six weeks ago, your very good friend and mine, Mr. McMullen, spoke to the Chamber of Commerce at Neepawa -- I understand he is Managing-Director of the Travel Convention Bureau -- and gave us a very good talk and a film. The purpose of it was to stimulate some action at the local level and make some long-range plans at the local level for our centennial, and I know my honourable friend, the First Minister, has suggested that we will be dealing with a bill on this subject matter as we proceed in the House, but it is important that if we are going to have some action at the local level that we know shortly what amount of money we are to receive. Now Mr. McMullen suggested that there would be both federal and provincial grants, he expected -- and he certainly inferred that -- to those communities that made long-range plans in this regard, so that I hope that something will be forthcoming, although there is nothing apparently available in the estimates for that at the moment.

Now on another subject matter -- well we did discuss museums, and it seems that nearly every town of any size in the province are planning a museum. I have a little clipping here from Minnedosa -- "Planned Museum" is the heading of the article, and apparently they've set up a committee charged with pursuing the matter further and asked to report to a later meeting of the organization. They're doing that at Neepawa too, and I understood the First Minister to say that at the moment there was no basis for grants to museums, and did I understand him to say that organizations such as is referred to in this article -- in Minnedosa and Neepawa -- that they should write to the Manitoba Museum and make their plea to them rather than to the government? Well then -- perhaps my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, and I can get together and plea together with somebody that we get some help in this regard, because we know in Neepawa, following our 75th anniversary that we held four or five years ago, that there are plenty of articles to fill a huge museum. They rented the school auditorium at the time of our 75th and it was jam-packed full of articles -- museum articles -- and I think this is something that we should promote and foster if we can. I, without boasting, Mr. Chairman, I have travelled through 47 of the 50 states I guess there are now, and these are some of the things that I like to see when I go down there, and they have plenty of them. True, they exploit them to some degree. You've got to pay to get into -- you've got to pay down there to see the natural bridge. You've got to pay to do a lot of things, but we are trying to increase our number of tourists that come here every year. We're doing the utmost that we can. Tourism is on the increase and I suggest that we should be doing more in this regard, and advertise them. Let the people know that we have these kind of things.

Last year, during our Session, there was an announcement made in regard to the historic sites, and I don't know whether that comes under this particular department, but Manitoba Regulation 9-62, being an order under Section 4 of The Historic Sites Prevention Act, they listed a number, quite a number of historical sites, one certainly in my constituency or probably more, and they are historic sites. But what are we doing about them? We are not doing anything. I think there was one designated at Flee Island and it is an historical site, but nobody would ever know that it was an historical site because there hasn't even been a marker put up or anything. The No. 3 that is listed here is right on No. 4 Highway -- right on the highway. We could put up some kind of a sign, I suggest, to let the people know that it was an historical site and is called the "Arden Camp Site" and I think that we should do more in this regard.

Now I don't know whether this is the department or not that deals with unconditional grants, but an Information Services Bulletin, dated December the 7th last, reports the Honourable the First Minister as making the announcement in regard to the adjustment grants to the municipalities.

MR. ROBLIN: This is the wrong item to discuss that subject.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's fine. I couldn't find it in the estimates, but inasmuch as the announcement was made by the Provincial Treasurer I wondered whether it would come up here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (6) passed. Item 5(a) -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: The Minister of Education handles this particular item and he is unable to be here this afternoon, so perhaps we could just skip over it and come back tomorrow and proceed to deal with Item 6, Vote No. 8, the votes for these Royal Commissions and Enquiries.



A MEMBER: Or we might even rise, I suppose.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think probably that would be an agreeable suggestion. I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, if it is the wish of the House, without moving onto the other items on the Order Paper, I would be ready to propose the adjournment at the present time. That being the case I move, seconded by the Honourable Member the Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.