

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, January 25, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Les Reverends Pères Oblats, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notices of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews) introduced Bill No. 35, an Act for the relief of Dorothy J. Ungar.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to have this item stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. I have been informed that two men have been convicted under The Securities Act. In view of the widespread concern throughout Canada for breaches of The Securities Act and related matters, bankruptcies, does the Attorney-General plan to launch an investigation?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend would care to give me details, either in or outside of the House as to the names of the men, we can then look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker .....

MR. GUTTORMSON: .....question. Has the Minister no knowledge of these convictions?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will appreciate that we have upwards of 40 courts a day operating in the Province of Manitoba with various offences under all Acts, federal and provincial, and if he would be good enough to give me the names, I'll be quite happy to follow through on what is requested.

MR. GUTTORMSON: .....have no knowledge of these specific cases under The Securities Act?

MR. LYON: I am aware that there was one or, I'm not sure, two cases pending on The Securities Act. I wasn't aware of any convictions or pleas or anything that had taken place.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to the attention of the House an outstanding achievement which occurred in my constituency, in that the City of East Kildonan had a fatality-free accident record for six years. Now this is something of a precedent for a city of this size and I think it deserves notation in the House records. I would like to say that it was probably due more than likely to the efficient services of the Police Department and, of course, the observance by the people passing through Kildonan and all the residents taking note and being aware of the traffic hazards that are created whenever they travel, and, as I said, I do wish it to be noted in the records.

MR. EVANS: Before the Orders, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Return to an Order of the House No. 12, standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. On December 7th an Order of the House was accepted, relating to sandbag orders for the Winnipeg flood last year. My question is, when will this Order be returned to the House? It is now seven weeks.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I'll look into this matter, Mr. Speaker. As I remember the Order it required a good deal of preparation. I'll look into it. I'm not sure which Minister is handling it but I'll find out and see what we can do.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I probably have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I was just wondering would it be possible to have

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd), . . . a text distributed to the members here of the speech he made to the Outlook Conference at Brandon the first of this week.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): I have no objections, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable colleagues of this House deem the speech worthy of distribution I'll be prepared to distribute it.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister. Did he make a speech to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture presently meeting in Winnipeg?

MR. ROBLIN: My recollection is that I did, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister would be kind enough to give us copies of that speech as well.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, unfortunately, or fortunately - I'm not sure which - I don't write those speeches out in detail. I speak from notes.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if the notes might be available?

MR. ROBLIN: If I thought my honourable friend could make anything out of them I'd be glad to let him have them, but I don't think he could.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thought there were some rather interesting statements made by the First Minister and I thought the House might be interested in hearing them as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed further, I would like to acquaint the House with the fact that on my left in the galleries we have 36 Grade 11 students from the Assiniboia Indian School under the direction of Sister Blanche Brisbois. These students are drawn from the various Indian Reserves throughout the Province of Manitoba. On behalf of the members in the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all today.

I should also like to acquaint the Assembly with the fact that on my right in the galleries we have 30 Grade 5 students from the Ralph Brown School under the direction of Miss Penner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member of St. John's. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege which I'm sure could not have been known to yourself, I believe - as a matter of fact I'm almost certain - that the children who are here from Ralph Brown School come from the school which is situated in the constituency, the best constituency of Manitoba, the constituency of Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: I must have been misinformed. I'm sorry. Adjourned debate.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, may I address a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary, who I understand is the Minister who is in charge of Centennial matters in the Province of Manitoba. I think perhaps before I go any further I should thank my honourable friend for sending me notes for a speech that he expects me to make, but the question I wanted to ask my honourable friend, and in asking it I recognize that there is a division of responsibility between or co-operation between the federal and provincial governments, but is my honourable friend aware that the information that's being given should be brought a bit more up to date because it is still being quoted, still being stated over the radios in the morning that the Centennial Train will be leaving Vancouver on January 9th. This statement was made this morning and a lot of people that listened to that will recognize that January 9th has gone by. Wouldn't it be better to get it into the past tense at this time?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Agreed.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a week ago I asked the First Minister a question that he had stated that he felt that the Chairman of Boundaries Commission should be a full-time job, and the Chairman had said that he wouldn't have accepted the job if it was a full-time job. Has the First Minister asked for the resignation or has he replaced the chairman of that commission?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker. I have, however, been in touch with the chairman and I have received a letter from him in which he outlines what I think he and I both agree to be the situation; that is, that his first responsibility is to be chairman of the Boundaries Commission and that he acknowledges, as indeed has always been the case, that this gets the first call upon his time and talents. It he's not fully engaged in that then he's at liberty to practise law or to follow his profession for the rest of his time, whatever that might be. I was particularly concerned with the question of the conflict of interest that my honourable friend raised and I have received an assurance from the commissioner that he has not indulged in anything which he, or indeed I, from what I am aware of it, regard as a conflict of interest,

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd), . . . and he furthermore said that if any time the government feels that there is a conflict of interest he is prepared to tender his resignation. It's all above board and completely in order, in my opinion. So we have this letter from the chairman and I think it's a satisfactory view of the situation.

MR. DESJARDINS: A subsequent question. The conflict of interest: did the First Minister see in the newspaper the same day that the paper that I have sent, that he was appearing in front of municipalities to try to promote a new pay television. Doesn't he feel that when he's promoting with the municipality that this could be conflict of interest? And does the First Minister mean by his answer then that he no longer feels that it should be a full-time job? Because on the 19th of January the First Minister did say that it should be a full-time job.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it will require a great deal of the gentlemen's time that's concerned, but if he has time left over which is not employed for this reason, I see no reason why he shouldn't practise law.

Now respecting the other matter, I do not think there's a conflict of interest there. This Commission is investigating the boundaries of municipalities, and I don't see that it is going to interfere with an impartial approach to that judgment with respect to the matter mentioned.

MR. DESJARDINS: The First Minister doesn't think that some of the municipalities might want to be very pleasant to my honourable friend? They certainly have something of vital importance and they're in the boundary; they might be fighting for something and he's asking them to recognize something. I would say that is conflict. I'm not accusing anybody, I'm saying that it's a conflict of interest.

MR. ROBLIN: I have sufficient confidence both in the municipal men and in the commissioner to think that that would not be the case.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways. About a year ago, a little more now, I think, he announced that a causeway would be built across the Narrows at Lake Manitoba. I have had a number of questions from the people in the area, part of whom are in my own constituency, who are concerned because they see no apparent work being undertaken. I wonder if the Minister could report on the probable timings for the construction.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the matter has been postponed temporarily. There are some tests being taken this winter. I'll be prepared to go into it much more fully when my estimates come along.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if anyone else wishes to speak on this I would welcome it; otherwise I would like this motion to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Adjourned debates on second readings. Bill No. 3, The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the purpose of asking as thorough a perusal of the bill as I possibly could, and after having made this perusal I am convinced that it is a good bill. I think it should go to the Special Committee, though, that is being set up to consider insurance laws so that we could have the benefit of all the experts in the field of insurance who would appear before us. Now the Honourable Leader of the NDP in speaking to this bill has raised certain objections, not to the bill, but to insurance companies in general, and one objection that he raised was with reference to the bill itself, to condition 3 of the statutory conditions. He said that that condition prevented individuals from settling claims between themselves. Now that condition does not prevent individuals from settling claims between themselves as long as they're prepared to pay the claims themselves. All it says is this, that the insured shall not voluntarily assume any liability or settle any claim except at his own cost, or interfere in any negotiations for settlement or in any legal proceedings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a necessary clause to be put in a bill. I think the House has got to understand that an insurance policy is a policy of indemnity, and it's only in the case of liability that the liability of the insurer to pay that indemnity arises. And if two individuals involved in an accident are allowed to settle their claims themselves and then call upon an insurance company to pay, well I think the result would be something which the Honourable Leader of the NDP has been questioning; that is, an increase in rates.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).....

Now another point that he raised too was in connection with rates themselves. He suggested that the rates should be approved by the superintendent of insurance. Now I suggest that it would be foolish to have the superintendent of insurance fix rates because it would destroy the very competition which exists today in the insurance business. If the superintendent of insurance had the right to fix rates, the tendency would be for those rates to reach a certain level. Now it may be argued by the Leader of the NDP that there is no competition among insurance companies in Manitoba today, but I wish to assure him that there is competition. There's serious competition. We have board companies; it's true that there's no competition among them because their rates are fixed by the board, but we have mutual companies, we have two mutual companies that I know of in Manitoba, and there's a real competition between these companies in the matter of rates. We have independent companies and there is a real competition between these independent companies and the other. It may be true that all that competition doesn't result in the reduction of rates that my honourable friend would like to see, but I think the question of insurance rates depends upon the public itself. We are the ones that fix the rates. The rates are only fixed by insurance companies on the basis of the ratio of insurance premium to loss, and as long as that ratio is not favourable to an insured, rates are going to increase; but if we improve our driving habits in Manitoba to the point that we can reduce claims against insurance companies, we can reduce the number of accidents. That's the surest and safest way to reduce insurance premiums.

As I say, there are a lot of good new clauses in this bill. Insurance companies under this bill are going to be empowered to write enlarged insurance coverage, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be approved in principle on second reading, and that it be sent to the Special Committee on Insurance which the government intends to set up this session.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken, I don't want to have to enter into a lengthy discussion of the bill itself but only to ask some questions of the Minister to see exactly what the intentions of the government are in this regard. My colleague the member for Selkirk has suggested that this go to the Special Committee that will be studying this matter. Presumably the Special Committee will be established in the fairly near future. When we were discussing this prior to our Christmas recess the First Minister indicated that it would be done very soon after the House reconvened, so I would assume that the committee will be in a position to deal with the bill as soon as it's reconstituted. Is it the intention of the government, however, to proceed with the bill at this session or is it the intention of the government instead to wait until the committee of the House has completed its study of the auto insurance industry in the Province of Manitoba?

Now the second point is with regard to the B. C. Royal Commission into the matter of auto insurance. This is billed as the first comprehensive study in Canada of the whole matter of the auto insurance industry. I understand that there were some partial studies in the past, one by Ontario, but nothing as complete as the one that B. C. is now conducting. I understand that something like a million dollars is going to be spent in this process. I presume that the study will not be limited purely to B. C. problems but will in fact cover the auto insurance industry in general. My question to the Minister is this: has the government of Manitoba made any contact with the B. C. Royal Commission, and is the government or the insurance department following the course of this investigation? Because I think this could be of great help to our own committee here in the work that it will be doing.

There's no question that this matter of auto insurance is one that is foremost in the minds of our people, and properly so. Many of them feel that there are inequities in this. The Leader of the NDP the other day spoke about the question of cancellations. I understand that there are at least two firms in Manitoba, two very large ones, who have established a policy of no cancellation. But nevertheless there is a good deal of public concern. There are some very high rates being paid by certain people. When some of us question these we are told, "Well, they're an awful lot higher if you go to Montreal or Toronto," but we really have no means of knowing what is right and what is not right. So the B. C. Commission, I think, provided it's not limited purely to B. C. problems but in fact does cover the insurance industry in total, will be of benefit to every province. So I would like to know whether the Province of Manitoba has contacted the B. C. group, or if they will, and if we will be able to get the material -- or at least the basic material -- I don't suppose we would want all the briefs but the basic material -- and whether, if there is any question that it's purely a B. C. one, that maybe an approach could be made to the B. C. Government by the Province of Manitoba asking them to

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....ensure that while they do this they do a project that will be of value to all of Canada.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Honourable Member for Selkirk who indicated that he had adjourned debate for, I think it's two days, in order to give himself an opportunity to study the provisions, and I presume also to study what was said by my honourable leader inasmuch as he took issue with him on certain points. I just want to clarify a couple of the matters which my honourable friend from Selkirk did say.

In the first place, he objected to the suggestion which he quoted my honourable leader as having made, and that is that the superintendent of insurance should set rates - (Interjection) - or approve rates as he now corrects me. I looked at Hansard and the words used by my leader were "to review rates," and I think there's quite a difference between reviewing rates and approving or setting as I thought he had said, but even approving. In other words, what was suggested and what I have no doubt that this committee that will be established will look into is the question of how the rates set by the insurance companies will be reviewed by the superintendent or by some other independent body whose interest is that on behalf of the public rather than on behalf of the rate setting body.

Now I am under the impression that the Honourable Member for Selkirk voted last year in support of the establishment of a review committee on the entire question of automobile insurance, and surely the intention was clearly set out that the method in which rates are established will be carefully reviewed. I would hope that if the honourable member will be a member of this committee that he will come into it with an open mind and not with the preconceived ideas that he now has, that the rates are set by the public, by the customer public in the give and take of insurance premiums paid as against damages suffered, and I hope that he will be able to look into this objectively and not with this idea that he now seems to have that insurance companies are merely concerned with a balance of costs as against income. I think whatever his preconceived ideas might be that he will learn from the work of the committee that there will be a great deal more ascertained as to the methods by which these insurance companies operate in establishing their rates.

He also seemed to take issue with something said by my honourable leader on the question of the Act providing as to liability, negligence rather. And what my honourable leader said - and it's reported on Page 350 of Hansard - was that if he happened to be involved in an automobile accident he could not say, "I am sorry, Sir. It was my fault." By legislation he would be prevented from doing so. He said, "I cannot voluntarily, even if I am in the wrong, suggest by such terminology, in accordance with that Act, that I'm sorry." And what he was referring to was a section of the bill which says that the insured shall not voluntarily assume any liability or interfere in any negotiations for settlement. And I think that the point was validly made, that there is this prohibition, there is this restriction, and it is in the Act and therefore makes it incumbent on the person involved to be very careful of what he says and not to make any admissions even though he knows them to be perfectly true. And I think that's an objection made which should be studied and I'm sure will be studied when this bill comes to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: It was my intention to move the adjournment of the debate which would thereupon close it. Would anyone else like to speak in the meantime?

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if for the record perhaps you would care to put the motion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Bill No. 6. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate for my honourable colleague from Kildonan pending getting some further information, so I will now turn it over to my colleague from Kildonan.

MR. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on this Bill 6. It is commendable that we are moving in the right direction but I'm afraid it's only of a little degree. As we all know, when people are ill that is when they need the greatest amount of compensation, and this bill only raises the ceiling by \$600.00 from \$6,000. Now we realize that there are many skilled workmen in this city and in this province who are earning more than that, and

(MR. FOX cont'd)... here we are, trying to set a ceiling again as in the past and discriminating against them twice. When they are disabled they are only receiving 75 percent of compensation and then we place a ceiling and those of us, or those of the people who are more skilled are penalized twice in essence. And as I said, when they are disabled there are many other expenses and they certainly could use the extra money that should be coming to them.

There's one further item in this bill, Mr. Speaker, which is not very satisfactory in my opinion. There is some ambiguity with regard to the standard under Clause 3 in Section II. It says, "Where in the opinion of the Board, furnishing a further or better education to a dependent child who is applying himself to the satisfaction of the Board in an elementary or secondary school course, or a course leading to a university degree, or a course in technical training acceptable to the Board." Now I am sure that if we want to make this a fair clause we should set a standard so that there will be no choosing for the Board that one dependent has to have a certain standard, another one another standard and so on. There shouldn't be a means test for each individual dependent child. There should be a standard set so there's no doubt that everyone who comes up to that standard is eligible. I think that is sort of ambiguous. Also, as I said, it should take the means testing out of it, that not each dependent child has to apply for in a specialized way in order to appeal to the Board to get its tuition fees.

The third section under Clause 3 also is a little ambiguous in that it doesn't say that everyone shall get the fifty dollars. It's from zero to fifty the way I understand it, and the other part in that is that a person a dependent cannot complete his education, university or technical, he can only have a first time university schooling. Now we realize that people today do need higher education, but here again we are putting a limit on as how far they can go. They can only go to one degree and possibly we should allow them to go to a second degree - a B. A. to an M. A. and so on. A person is handicapped to begin with under these conditions where a father has been disabled or killed outright, and consequently all the assistance that these people can get certainly would be to their advantage, also to our advantage as well, because sometimes we lose people that if they had the higher education do not get it - they naturally do not produce as much for our social economy.

There is one more item that I do not see in this bill and which is one of the perennial problems that arises with Workmen's Compensation, and I would just like to bring it to the attention of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, and that is that there should be a review more often of those who are on partial or permanent disability at the present time. The cost of living keeps rising continually; the dollar has depreciated; yet these people if they have been disabled in the past are on a certain straight sum of money which has been allocated to them through the Workmen's Compensation Board and they have no way of getting an increase, unless there's a review and these sums of money are brought in line with the current costs, and I think this should be looked into too. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, if no other honourable member wishes to take part in this debate, I would like to close it. I would like to thank the honourable members for their contribution, and to clarify for the members of the House I would like to give them the comparative benefits and the increases that this government has brought forth in its years in office. So that there won't be any misunderstanding I will read them into the record.

We have increased from \$50.00 a month to \$100.00 a month the widows' pension. During the same period we have increased from \$70.00 a month to \$135.00 a month the pension for a widow and one child, and we have increased from \$90.00 a month to \$170.00 a month the pension for a widow and two children. Now in comparison to other provinces, there are five other provinces who presently pay \$75.00 a month, one province pays \$85.00, one pays \$90.00 a month, Saskatchewan pays \$110.00 and then \$75.00 after 70 years of age, and British Columbia pays \$115.00 a month.

We increased children's allowances from \$20.00 a month to \$35.00 a month, and we have increased orphans' allowances from \$30.00 a month to \$45.00 a month. Other provinces: British Columbia - \$40.00 to age 16; \$45.00 age 16 to 18; \$50.00 age 18 to 21 for education.

Alberta: \$45.00 up to the age of 16, extended to 21 for education.

Saskatchewan: \$45.00 to age 16, 19 for education, \$60.00 for an orphaned child.

Ontario: \$40.00 to age 16 and at board discretion beyond 18 for education; \$50.00 when widow or invalid widower dies.

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....

In Quebec it's \$25.00 to age 18 as long as attending school, and \$35.00 when widow or invalid widower dies.

New Brunswick is \$25.00 to age 21 for education.

Nova Scotia: \$30.00 to age 16 and to age 18 for education.

Prince Edward Island: \$20.00 to age 16 and to age 18 for educational purposes.

Newfoundland: \$25.00 to age 16 and to age 18 for educational purposes, and they may have \$10.00 a month for illness which is at .....discretion.

Fatal Accidents: Immediate cash payments have been increased from \$200.00 to \$300.00. Other provinces: Quebec, Ontario and Saskatchewan \$300.00; British Columbia and Nova Scotia \$250.00; Alberta, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland: \$200.00. I might add there is a \$50.00 allowance in Manitoba for a burial plot; there is an immediate cash payment of \$300.00, bringing the immediate expenses to \$650.00. One other province is \$600.00, which is Quebec. Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland are \$300.00.

In 1960 there was a new section added to this Act which provided an increased benefit to a dependent mother for \$100.00 a month. Permanent disabilities: minimum pensions have been increased from \$15.00 a week to \$34.62 a week. Partial disabilities have been increased to the proportion of \$150.00 a month irrespective of the date of accident. In the other provinces: Permanent total disabilities in British Columbia \$30.00 per week or \$130.00 per month or actual earnings if less. Alberta: \$35.00 a week, \$151.67 a month or actual earnings if less. In Saskatchewan: \$32.50 a week, \$140.83 a month. Ontario: \$150.00 a month or actual earnings if less. Quebec: \$25.00 a week or actual earnings if less. In New Brunswick, \$150.00 a month re permanent disabilities due to accidents occurring prior to January 1, 1959, \$25.00 a week or actual earnings if less relating to accidents occurring prior to the first date. In Nova Scotia: \$30.00 a week. Prince Edward Island: \$20.00 a week. Newfoundland: \$15.00 a week.

We have increased, Mr. Speaker, the maximum average earnings from \$3,500 to \$6,000 and it is proposed with this amendment that that increase will go to \$6,600.00. Other provinces: \$6,600 for British Columbia, \$6,000 in Saskatchewan and Ontario, \$5,600 in Alberta, \$5,000 in Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and \$5,000 in Nova Scotia. Mr. Speaker, I commend these amendments to the honourable members.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take this occasion to point out to the honourable members that during the period taken by the last three or four speakers it has been very obvious that considerable private conversation has been going on. There were no less than some 16 or 18 private conversations going on when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I think you'll agree with me that this is rather distracting. I realize that a certain amount of discussion must go on but I would ask the co-operation of all members of the House in accordance with our rules to use discretion when one of the honourable members has the floor.

Second reading, Bill No. 17.

MR. EVANS: May I have this order stand?

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable minister have leave? Agreed.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, last evening when we adjourned we were discussing the .....and we still have a motion, an amendment from the Honourable Member from Selkirk, and I would like to speak on this. First of all I would like to set the record straight. There were certain things that were said here in this Chamber yesterday - in fact one man was accused of making a falsehood - and I think that we should set the record straight at this time.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)....

The Leader of the NDP Party said that he did not support the pension; said this when my colleague from Lakeside was speaking and I think that I will be able to prove that if he didn't, if he feels that he didn't, he's probably the only one in Manitoba that feels this. First I would like to quote from the Free Press of May 6th, 1965: "A move by the Manitoba Government to establish pension for private members and cabinet ministers was supported by New Democratic Party Leader, A.R. (Russ) Paulley in the Legislature Wednesday. Speaking during debate on second reading of the bill which would establish pension for legislators after serving eight sessions in provincial House, Mr. Paulley said he approved the principle of a pension for members." This was the Free Press of May 6th.

Now, just to make sure that both newspapers understood well, I'll quote the Tribune of the same day: "Support for the plan was given by New Democratic Party Leader, Russ Paulley, who claimed the sharp attack of the plan by Liberal members was only one side of the story. His defence of a pension scheme came after a stinging attack from the member for St. Boniface."

Then, if this is not enough - I think I should help my friend again - on Friday, May 7th, in the Free Press: "The House split 37 - 13 on the issue with government member James Cowan (Winnipeg Center) joining with eleven Liberals in the House and the lone Social Creditor Mr. Froese in opposing the bill. New Democratic Party members joined with the government in voting to approve the legislation." Now the Tribune of the same day: "However, the NDP teamed up with the Tories to approve Premier Duff Roblin's motion that the bill receive scrutiny in the Chamber by a vote of 34 to 11."

This is another newspaper, the 7th: "The NDP joined forces with the Roblin Government today to block a Liberal demand for a public hearing on the pension plan for MLAs and Cabinet members. The pension plan was revised by the government ... but this had failed to satisfy the Liberals." And I could go on - I don't want to quote out of text here: "However the NDP teamed up with the government to approve by a vote of 34 to 1 the Premier's motion that the bill receive scrutiny inside the Chamber."

Then, on Monday - this was after a good rest on the weekend - "The Liberal minority of 14 members stood off the attempt by the government majority of 36 members backed by 7 New Democratic Party members to put through pensions for members and Cabinet Ministers."

Then the Tribune: "The Session, originally expected to end Friday, (This, by the way, I should say that this was brought - we always claim that this was brought in at the last minute) picked up steam Saturday as the Liberals bombarded the plan for more than seven hours. The NDP members are supporting the Conservative measures."

I'm nearly finished but I think that this is important to -- that everybody could be friendly again. Now this is May 12th - Free Press: "New Democratic Party Leader A.R. (Russ) Paulley in a press release blamed the House debates, the press, television and radio, everybody, for misinforming the public about the effects of the amending of the bill."

On May 12th, speaking of Mr. Paulley, he said, "Most reports in the Press and over ....." - this is the other newspaper - "over radio and TV dealt with the original terms of the bill. As a result the public was misinformed, he added."

Now I think he was referring to amendments and I might say there was only one single amendment that was presented. The others were all -- nothing was in order. We had a motion on the floor and practically every day, well two or three times a day we had another page of different changes, but there were no amendments presented. This was false.

And then finally this ... after an interview that the Leader of the NDP had, my leader at the time said this - this is the Free Press of May 22/65: "New Democratic Party Leader A.R. (Russ) Paulley was charged Friday with attempting to mislead the people of Manitoba in respect to his party's stand regarding pensions for members of the Legislature and Cabinet Ministers. Manitoba Liberal Leader Gildas Mogat made the charge following a television appearance by Mr. Paulley on a public affairs program. The Liberal Leader said Mr. Paulley made the following statement on the television program: 'In the field of the question of pensions for MLAs we agree with the principle of pensions for MLAs as indeed did almost every other member of the Legislature. We opposed the original bill and sought improvements to the bill.' That statement, said Mr. Mogat, is absolutely untrue." And so on.

I could lend this book to my honourable friend, and to help them out if he wants to check I would say that he spoke - if he wants to take note of this or read Hansard tomorrow - if he'll



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...look in the Hansard of May 5th his remarks were on Page 2317; on May 8th, 2489 and 2547; May 10th, 2598 and 2601; May 11th, 2608, 2635 and 2661.

Now I'd like to say we've talked about this. I think that we should have the vote from that Hansard, and this is from Hansard. Now the first one on the second reading which my honourable friend said yesterday that he did not . . . . The Nays were Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Cowan, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure, and all the others voted in favour of this going to committee, accepting the principle, and my friend was not absent. His name is next to the Leader of the House. There's Moeller, Paulley and Roblin, amongst others. And then there was another vote that everybody except Mr. Cowan at that time voted with the government.

Now this is -- oh, I think while we're straightening everything out we might as well see what the Honourable Minister of Welfare said, because he had something to say also. He said that he was not interested in the bill, that he didn't fight for this bill, I think this is what he said yesterday. Well, we'll see. Maybe this is not fighting for the bill. On Page 2515: "With respect to priorities, I just want to say one word, Mr. Chairman. With respect to priorities I think this has been an item that has been pretty low on the priorities of this government for some time, because I recall my first month in Cabinet where the former Provincial Secretary, the Honourable Marcel Boulic had this as one of the programs that he felt should be implemented, should be brought in for the benefit of Members of this Legislature. And why was he thinking about that? He was thinking about it primarily because we saw some of the tragedies of that '58 election. We saw some of the people in here . . . ." - he's talking about the people on welfare apparently - "people who had been cabinet ministers who did not have their houses built of brick and have their nest eggs tucked away as some people have mentioned, and who had very great difficulties in readjusting to life outside the government," and so on.

Another one that was quite interested at the time was the Attorney-General, and this is what he had to say at the time: Replying to charges of Larry Desjardins, St. Boniface, that the Roblin Government cabinet ministers would be feathering their nests under the proposed pension scheme, Mr. Lyon suggested that if such were the case the Member for St. Boniface in the House of Commons - he's always bringing something else up - Roger Teillet, the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, must be equally guilty under the Pearson Government's Pension Plan. He also lashed out that "the St. Boniface MLA's emotional attack on the government proposals have angered more than one member of the Roblin administration during the current session." But listen to this: "It's just not good enough in this day and age, he told Mr. Desjardins, to stand up like a bull in a china shop, going after every straw man in sight. You have to have some substance." And he closes with these . . . . "Mr. Lyon said he was glad Mr. Desjardins opposed the pension legislation as that is probably the best indication that the bill is right. And then they withdrew the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it might - this is a different motion. I just wanted to set this thing straight. If the Leader of the NDP felt this way this time, this is fine. The important thing is now that he saw the error of his way. I think that he's kind of sorry for what he did in 1965, saw the light, and maybe some people talked to him and this time he is certainly with us, as he said yesterday, in supporting the motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and I think this is the important thing. We're very pleased that he is with us and we think he is doing the right thing. This is exactly what the Honourable Member from Lakeside said yesterday and that I repeat, and I agree with practically all the remarks that my honourable friend made yesterday on this special bill.

There's one thing that was said by the First Minister yesterday that I agree with. He said, "We, the Members of the Cabinet and myself, must take full responsibility." I agree with that statement. I think that we have under consideration here, Mr. Chairman, two different, very different issues and I think that we should study these two separately. First of all, there's the justification of salaries paid. This is the one point that should be dealt with, and then, No. 2, the way, the kind of method, the means the members of the Cabinet used to bring in this legislation. The first one, the justification of salaries, is not too important. The Leader of the NDP Party is not too concerned about that and I daresay that quite a few of the members on this side of the House are not too interested in this. We might disagree, the members of the Opposition might disagree on the question of salary - it is only natural because you will not have 57 people that will say these are the salaries that should be paid. But the First Minister, very weak while discussing the second issue, spent all his time trying to prove this first part which -- by the way, the Member from Selkirk did not, to my recollection, say

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... one word about the size of the salary, if the salary was fair or not. The Member from Lakeside did, and I might say that I do not agree with the statement made by the First Minister defending these salaries. I certainly don't agree with all that he said. I think that he left a lot of things behind.

The First Minister said that he would like to see these people paid what they are worth, and he said \$15,000.00. This is starting by misrepresenting facts the same as when he announced to the press that there was a raise in salary. The salary is not \$15,000; the Cabinet Ministers are getting \$22,800.00. It's not the same thing as \$15,000.00. Now he said that this should be done the same as other provinces. It doesn't matter if a province has three or four times the population we have or more, or the same population in the city, three times -- not three times, 1 1/2 times the population that we have in all Manitoba like they have in Ontario, and I think Ontario are getting, what? Just \$2,000 more, and they certainly haven't got \$4,500 or I think it's \$4,600 that they pay no tax on. And besides this, I, for one, think this is the weakest of all arguments to say, "This is what they're doing in another province. This is what they're doing in another province - we're being justified." This is what the people are fed up with, what they're doing in other provinces, in these provinces with the politicians feathering their own nests and not worrying about the rest of the people. This is why there is such a turmoil; this is why the political condition here in this country is so mixed up, why the people don't know who to vote for or why, why we have so many parties, because they're losing confidence in these things and to say, "this is what they do in this province" is not good enough for me.

But the main reason - the First Minister said, because he wanted to compare the Ministers to the leaders in other fields and he chose the Chief Justice - I suppose he wants to compare him to the Attorney-General - different leaders in industry, the President of the University and different civil servants. How gullible does he think the members of this House and the people of Manitoba are? How gullible? You have a man that is talked into running for politics at the last minute, he's practically been pulled off the street and been made a Cabinet Minister, and you're going to compare him to the President of the University who's been working for years and years to qualify for this position? Who has all kinds of degrees, has been attending classes and so on? One man who was popular wins an election maybe by one vote as we saw the last time, and he could be made a Minister, oftentimes for political reasons; oftentimes for political reasons. We have some members across from us who are not Cabinet Ministers and I defy anybody to say that they wouldn't do as good a job. I'm sure that the member from Brandon would be an excellent Cabinet Minister but he's not in the same clique as the First Minister and he will never be a Cabinet Minister. The same thing with the member from Virden. Those are qualified people, people that should get the Cabinet posts. You have a man that quit; he wasn't too happy - the Member from St. Vital - because he wasn't considered and you mean to tell me that you're going to say these people should be paid like the President of the University. You take the Chief Justice, you're going to compare him to the present Attorney-General, a man who graduated, who received his call to the Bar just one or two years before coming in this House, before being made the Attorney-General, and he's on the same -- I'm not saying that he's not doing a good job in the Cabinet. I'm not suggesting that at all. And he was young when he came here; there's nothing wrong in that. He had to start and I think he has a good future - he has a good future. What's going to help him is the terms he spent in here. And if he ever becomes a judge it probably will be the reason. Nobody's hurting him. This is not hurting him, to say that he is -- and are you going to compare him to the one, the head man in his profession in Manitoba, and say that he should get the same salary? Well this is kind of ridiculous.

MR. LYON: I can assure my honourable friend I'm flattered by the comparison.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I like to flatter you once in awhile and then I can knock you down a little .... but I must say that I mean what I said. I think that my honourable friend has a future in this life and I think he's a very capable man. I think he's very good and I think he could become a chief justice one of these days but I want him to get dry behind the ears before he gets that job. I think that he has a little while to go and look at the difference in age.

So when the First Minister wants to compare the Attorney-General of this province who is an assistant - what was he - I don't know, there's nothing wrong with that. Let's get this straight that I'm not ridiculing the position that they have; but let's not compare a housewife or a country funeral director or a store owner or a radio ..... - there's nothing wrong, not a thing wrong; but they don't get paid the same as the president of the University. This is my

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)....point. And they are not in there for their knowledge. You do not become an expert from one day to the other because you receive three more votes than so-and-so. No. And you're not expected, you have people that are well paid, this is why they have to pay them well so they can cover your mistakes. This is why the civil servants have to be paid well, this is the reason. You can do away - the Minister can go away for a holiday, they won't miss him too much. They're ordinary people. The Minister, the people serving in this House are ordinary people representing ordinary people and we ask of them a bit of sense because they're going to establish the policy. But they are not experts. They are not experts. The Minister of Agriculture is not necessarily an expert in that, he's not asked to be. And my colleague the funeral director doesn't become an expert on highways. Maybe he drives not quite as fast as other people because of his profession; he can see the holes in the highway, maybe that's it; but he's not an expert. And let's get this thing straight. And they're not meant to be, there's nothing to be ashamed. I'm not insulting a single one here. But don't insult the intelligence of the people of this House and say that they should be receiving the same as the Chief Justice of Manitoba and the President of the University. This is going quite far.

These people came from the bottom, and how many years did it take the President of the University to achieve that position? How many years -- or certain engineers or people like this. And what do we have, just ordinary people here who were not forced to come in public life who felt that they had a duty -- and I think it's right and they have a contribution to make. And in the States they have people getting salaries for \$100,000 or so. They come in public life, they become a one dollar a year man because they think there's a contribution to make. And you will not take the top salary and say everybody must have the same salary or we're not going to get the right people. Some people that can provide for their family that might take a cut in salary are interested believe it or not in working for their country and for their province. I think that we should pay the cabinet ministers enough that they are not asked, and their family are not asked to - shouldn't be deprived and shouldn't have to make any undue sacrifices because they're giving their time. This is fair, this is right. And I would like to maybe discuss this salary one of these days but we don't like, as I say, this is the issue, of trying to justify these salaries and I don't think that you could say well I have to compare it to the Chief Justice of the province and this is the reason everybody will stay quiet and say that's true, the Attorney-General is the same as the Chief Justice of the province.

Some of the cabinet ministers have qualifications and some haven't and I would dare to say that the First Minister when he was looking around to see who he would choose in his cabinet - of course there's a certain clique that would be excluded - but forgetting these would look for somebody with a little bit of common sense, with a little bit of judgment. This is the main thing, but these people are not experts, they don't necessarily need any degrees or anything like that. For one I can't quarrel with the salary of the First Minister, even if he had 2 or 3 thousand or 5 thousand more I wouldn't quarrel with that. I think that the First Minister of the province - I think that this is something different. He has certainly a big responsibility and this is fine. I do believe that even the salary that we're discussing now that some of the cabinet ministers deserve, some. Do you see this in industry -- everybody gets the same salary, everybody? We've got a minister without portfolio who will be getting the same thing, the same thing. This is not what was said when they announced the increase though - if I can find it. Oh yes, "Duff and 11 Ministers boost their own salary, etc." Premier and his ministers are in Churchill for meetings today and tomorrow, in Churchill. I think they're sub-letting this building. In a government information service press release it revealed that effective September 1st Mr. Roblin's salary was increased by \$3,500 a year from \$14,500 to \$18,000.00. Cabinet ministers in charge of departments receive increases of \$2,500 a year raising their salary from \$12,500 to \$15,000.00. This is misrepresentation. It's \$5,500, \$5,500 that they got, \$5,500 - better than that because on \$3,000 they don't pay a cent income tax. The raise boosts the minister's actual income to almost \$23,000.00. In addition to their salary each minister receives an indemnity of \$4,800 - and if there is an increase - and there's a lot of people hoping - in indemnity, the ministers will get that too. Some more, with one-third again not subject to tax. I feel sorry for them. It's got here that the ministers that were in charge of a department would receive this money but we have one that has \$18,000, he's not named yet of course but .... We came to another thing. He had to take care of the ministers because - what do they call this? - the insecurity of tenure. Three ministers since I've been in the House in 1959 have been replaced. One of them got a full-time part-time job for

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...\$12,000.00; very insecure. The last one that was defeated. The one before that, we create all kinds of commissions for him, I don't know what he's doing now - Mr. Christianson from Portage, they tried to see that he didn't feel too insecure for awhile. And I don't think they had to worry about Mr. Steinkopf. I think he still has an office in here too, I don't know how he's making out. They're too insecure they've got to give them a little money.

Now as I say, this was trying to justify the salaries. Some members from this side agree with the government, this is well. Some don't. This was not mentioned in the motion. I think that they should have decent salaries; I don't think they should be compared to the Chief Justice of the province; I don't think that they should be a uniform salary. This is not done - my honourable friend was talking about industry - this is not done. The better ones get more money, those that produce. I would like to see a certain amount from the government, the same as they vote shares in all star games or football teams, they have a certain amount, and they vote shares. I think that two or three of the cabinet ministers work an awful lot more than the others, are worth more, they have more experience. Two of the cabinet ministers were pulled off the street.... They win the election. This is fine and this is no disrespect to them but how do we know what they're going to do, what experience. Do you know of anybody in industry they just pull off the street and you take over with this kind of salary? They didn't do that with the Chief Justice of Manitoba nor the President of the University.

Now, as I say I don't agree with everything the First Minister said on that. But, on the second point, the second point - and now we're getting in the important part and this was the reason that caused this amendment - is the way this was done. In 1965 this cabinet brought in on the very last day, two or three days I think -- well I got it here, might as well bring it in. Brought in on May 3rd. This was the first reading mind you, it took a few days before we got that. And we had on Thursday - the Chief Justice by the way the man that received this high salary was around the hall here ready to adjourn, were all set to go, tried to railroad this - this was something well thought up. They had worked very hard on this. They worked so hard, this was so well prepared that although we start second reading on the 6th, on Friday May 7th we received the first set of amendments. At 5:21 on Monday, May 10th just before adjourning in the afternoon we got the second set of amendments. That same day 10 minutes after eight, these poor people worked all through the dinner hour, we received another set of amendments. This was brought in at the last minute. We didn't go for it, we felt that it wasn't right, that it was a scandal, we opposed it and that was defeated.

Now last night the Minister of Education when we were leaving shouted across here we'll fight an election on this. The government had a chance to fight an election on this. He wanted the members - the First Minister said yesterday that he wanted the cabinet minister to be well paid, what they deserved. Did they deserve more after June 23rd than before June 23rd? I ask him. Why did we try to fool the public again. He says well now we're talking about this now. They've been receiving this salary since September 1st. Is there a single person here that thinks that there's much chance that this will be reduced; a single one? And it was also - the fact was brought up that we made provision for another cabinet minister, and somebody said that this was probably for blackmail and it certainly would indicate that we're trying to keep the backbenchers quiet, because who knows, if I'm quiet I might get this job. And this is pretty good, it's pretty tough to just because you feel that this is not honest that you feel that you should represent the backbenchers on the government side, that you should represent your constituency and that you feel that maybe you should get up and say something, but when you've got to think that maybe you're going to lose that chance of being a cabinet minister, you're going to worry.

Now Mr. Chairman, there's another thing, there's the increase in indemnity. Nothing has been said. Is it a question they're trying to shame the people and say well if you're against the high salary for cabinet ministers you're not going to get anything. All the backbenchers on the government side are worried and thinking about this, what's going to happen, are we going to get it, how much. I daresay that if these people that are sitting in the backbench on the government side, the people who a few minutes ago, the same as those from this side of the House, bowed their head and asked for divine guidance to bring in fair and equitable laws in legislation, the people that will have to go in their constituency and explain what they've done. I hope that they'll stand on their own two feet. They certainly owe certain loyalty to the cabinet, but what is loyalty They're not asked to give the cabinet a license to steal.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....

Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that was mentioned was the way that this was brought in for the members, the Leaders of the Opposition. For years we've asked that the Minister, that the Leader of the Opposition be treated as a cabinet minister. And I myself asked this, I started three or four years ago and somebody had before me. Well now he has a bigger salary than the Minister. They are paid \$15,000, if you want to be technical and talk about the salary, he's getting \$18,000.00, more than the cabinet ministers according to this. But there's a catch. He himself said that in a democratic country, a democratic government to be strong must have strong opposition. And look at all the civil servants, the research people -- I'm not talking about the people that are advertising for the Conservative Party -- I'm talking of the people that are working in the different departments. And the Leader of the Opposition until just a short time ago did not have his own secretary, now he has a secretary -- nobody for research and so on. Out of \$6,000 -- he doesn't like me to say this but I'll say it anyway -- out of \$6,000 he had to pay everything himself, nothing, nothing was allowed. He had to pay the tax on everything, nothing was tax free. Now if the government was sincere in raising their own salaries, the cabinet, members of the cabinet, I think that they should discuss this with the Leader of the Opposition and say, "All right, what do you think of the salary, what do you need most." Not put him in a position that if he takes the salary he has to pay -- he has to take it as a salary, pay all the taxes and get his own people for research himself. Everyone in this House knows that to have a strong opposition you must have people to be able to make research and so on and this is what we're asking for. And the First Minister yesterday tried to give the impression that there was a deal made, and that wasn't right. That wasn't right. You can't take advantage of saying that something is confidential and leave doubts in the minds of the people of Manitoba that maybe the Leader of the Opposition made a deal. That is not right at all.

And last, the last thing that we object to, is that the government took advantage of a law, it's certainly not the intent of the law, to get away from paying income tax. How can they do this without being ashamed? And how can the backbenchers look down, members of the Cabinet, and agree that this is right. I don't care how many laws there are if there's a loophole. Law-makers -- people that want to use the ability to pay principle. We're in the income tax business in this province but the gentlemen in the cabinet do not pay too much income tax. They don't pay income tax on \$3,000.00. I defy, I challenge any Cabinet Minister to tell me how they're spending that \$3,000 on expense. I'm not talking about one-third of the indemnity. Actually it's \$4,600 that you don't pay taxes on -- much higher than the average wages here in Manitoba. The Chief Justice of Manitoba must pay tax, so does the President of the University. \$4,800, and if you give a raise to the rest of the members another third of that raise, over \$5,000 -- tax free. The people that are making policies that are saying we will try to take this thing away from the homeowners, the people that put on the tax on heat -- it was the last resort, we had to tax the heat of the people of the north and in Manitoba when we have 30 - 40 below zero -- the people who are now going to put in an income tax, people who will probably ask that the premiums, the hospital premiums be raised. These are the people that say all right this law is for other people, for others not for me. I've got \$3,000 tax free. You can stand there and say that this is honest that it's fair? Other provinces do it I suppose.

I can't see for the life of me, Mr. Chairman, how these people can stand there and accept this, be able to mock the people of Manitoba when they're imposing all these taxes. As I say, I challenge to tell me where these expenses are paid. Maybe they buy coffee for people coming into their office. They've got a car, gas and oil. If it's too cold, some stooge comes and warms it up; if it's dirty a stooge comes and cleans it. This is what they have. If they go on any trips, anywhere, banquets, they freeloader all over the place. Who pays for that? And they've got \$3,000 tax free plus another \$1,600.00. Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear, but oh we'd love to keep quiet. Maybe we'd have a nice fat raise also and we could use it. It would be nice to get a fat raise for our Leader, but there's a limit. How can we look at ourself in the mirror in the morning? How can we --(Interjection)--somebody wanted to answer that? --(Interjection)-- A good question. I know, I'd like you to answer it. I'd like you to answer it. When you're counting that \$3,000 and you fix your income tax sheet you think of the poor guy that's working for maybe \$3,000 a year, you figure out how much he's paying and you can say he's got \$3,000 look what he's paying on income tax, I've got \$5,000 tax free. You tell me how you can look in the mirror.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....

Mr. Speaker, I certainly -- it's not just the principle of just to see that they get a decent salary. I don't care, I would support the First Minister, as I said, getting a larger salary than he's getting - the salary that we have now, the true salary without this tax evasion. I would support it for some of the ministers but not the way this was brought in, not at this time, not when we want to mock the people of Manitoba, the people of this House, not when we want to blackmail or bribe the rest of the members. I certainly will vote for the amendment as brought in by the Member for Selkirk and I hope that some of the backbenchers anyway will stand on their own two feet, will show a little bit of gumption and guts and vote for the amendment because I am sure they think it's right.

.....continued on next page.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise on this matter because when one looks at the estimate item that is before you one realizes that we are discussing an estimate vote of \$4,500 dollars increase over last year and one realizes that we have before us estimates in the same department calling for the expenditure of something in excess of 100 million dollars, brought in by the Minister whose salary increase of \$4,500 is being questioned by honourable members opposite.

We also have before us on these estimates probably as broad and as wide-ranging a plan for the progressive change of education in Manitoba as has ever appeared before the legislature of this province in its history. That is why I say, Sir, that I hesitate to rise to talk about a \$5,500 item on the estimates today because I really think that there are matters that most members of the House wish to get down to and to discuss, matters which are of perhaps much greater moment to the people of Manitoba, the future of the children of Manitoba, than this particular \$4,500 item. Nonetheless I think that perhaps a word or two should be said, and I hope in moderation unlike what - the speech that just preceded my few words about the salary increase because I do believe that the bulk of what can be said in reason and in logic, not in emotion or in rhetoric, but in reason or in logic has already been stated by the First Minister, and that to add anything much more to it is really whipping a dead horse or thrashing the proverbial old straw.

But I do think one or two things deserve comment because some of the points that have been raised do require some elucidation or perhaps some comment. The Member for St. Boniface was good enough to say, and here I congratulate him that he thought the Premier of the Province of Manitoba deserved the salary that is now accorded him once the estimates pass the Committee of Supply. Salary in the area, I think it is of \$25,000.00. That is roughly the equivalent of the salary of the Chief Justices of our two Courts in this province and in every other province of Canada. And I mean no disrespect whatsoever - and I repeat that - I mean no disrespect to the Chief Justice of any court of any province in the land because I feel that even at that sum very probably those extremely well-equipped gentlemen right across the country are probably underpaid. But I do say that I was happy to see the Honourable Member for St. Boniface acknowledge the fact that in this day of progressive change in the latter half of the 20th Century the Premier of any province, in my humble estimation, should be receiving if not the same, perhaps more than the Chief Justice of a court of the province - and I say that from a knowledge of the kind of work and the kind of responsibility that accords in both positions. I repeat again I take nothing away from the position of the Chief Justice whatsoever.

So I was happy to have the Honourable Member from St. Boniface confirm this fact for us because this is the case that the jobs of our various Premiers across the country today are perhaps more important than they have ever been in the history of our country before because we have many problems of great import in Canada today, problems between the federal and provincial governments, problems between the Province of Quebec and the rest of the English-speaking provinces of Canada, in which I think it can be said without hyperbole whatsoever, that perhaps the future of this country resides on the kind of men that we have holding these positions and on the kind of intelligence and application and moderation that they can bring to the council tables that are required.

And so I need not say to the Member for St. Boniface, nor I believe to any other member in this House, that the Premier of a province, not necessarily Manitoba but we can talk about Manitoba, should be accorded a salary which is in some small way commensurate with the tremendous responsibility that that particular person has, because, as I've mentioned before and I think this is so very true, I am sure that most members if they ponder this question will realize that there is much more going on in this country today than the mere discussion of fiscal relations or the arrangements on Medicare plans or all of these other things which are greatly important to the people of Canada. There are discussions going on today and we are in a period of transition and change in this country today which could well decide the kind of future we are going to have as a nation -- indeed if we are to have a future as a nation at all.

And so I for one, as a citizen, not speaking as a member of the front bench, but as a citizen, am happy to say that I feel that the Premier of any province should be given the kind of salary commensurate with these responsibilities in order that his mind may be free of the day-to-day problems of maintaining his family, his home and so on, in order that he can devote one hundred percent of his time and his talents and his intelligence to the problems of the province and to the problems of the nation. Because after all that is why he is there; that's why he's there in British Columbia; that's why he's there in Newfoundland; that's why he's

(MR. LYON cont'd)..... there in Manitoba. And I think all of us can say here following upon, and agreeing with the Member for St. Boniface that in Manitoba we are privileged to have a Premier who need take second place to no provincial leader in Canada in terms of the job that he is doing not only for his province -- and I say this in a non-partisan way -- the job that he is doing for his province and the job that he and his colleagues are attempting to do for Canada in terms of the problems that face us as a nation today. And so there I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface --(Interjection)-- I was hoping that perhaps I was saying in perhaps a more genteel fashion what my honourable friend was trying to say, but perhaps found himself incapable of saying.

Now when he comes to the Cabinet Ministers, again I have to take some particular interest in what he said because he did admit that there were some on this side who might, who might conceivably be worth the amount of money that we see in this particular estimate and that will appear in other estimates, for Ministers of the Crown. Inclined as that he is always to indulge in personalities, I was waiting breathlessly for him to announce from the summit, his judgment as to who these three people were, knowing full well that I would not be included among the three musketeers, but I thought that because he, unlike most other members, is not averse at all to indulging in personalities at all times, and in all debates, that he might tell us from the benefit of his great wisdom as a man of public affairs in Manitoba, who these three people were, because it might make some of us sleep a little better tonight to know we at least were in his good books. The others of course, including myself, would have to fall by the wayside and take whatever deduction in pay the honourable member would accord.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think of God, Diefenbaker and you.

MR. LYON: Oh, my honourable friend says he thinks of God, Diefenbaker and me. I think there's another triumvirate forming up now because we have heard of people refusing salary increases before, and I think of three who have refused them, and this is the new triumvirate. It is the Member for Lakeside, John Diefenbaker and Gildas Molgat. That is the new triumvirate my honourable friend is obviously referring to --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend in giving us the benefit of his advice as to how we should grade the Cabinet Ministers -- and I'd really like to discuss this further with him, because it is a most interesting theory as to how one is going to grade a Cabinet Minister. Is it going to be sartorially on the basis of how he knots his tie, or is it going to be on the condition of his shoes when he walks into the House? Or is it rather going to be on the manner in which he drives his car, whether or not he appears to be a good fellow to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or a good girl, as the case may be, because we are proud to have the first lady Cabinet Minister in Manitoba's history sitting behind us here. (Just a housewife.) Some housewife! Some housewife! (what is she?) And wait until my honourable friend comes.....

MR. DESJARDINS: The President of the University or the Chief Justice?

MR. LYON: ..... opposite this housewife when he has to bring her estimates before the House because I think he will find, as he would with most housewives, that they're quite capable of looking after my honourable friend in any debate that might take place in this House or outside of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: They shouldn't need \$28,000 to do it.

MR. LYON: But I do want to ask my honourable friend what would be the standards of gradation for a Cabinet Minister? Would it be on the amount of money that is voted in his particular portfolio? That would be an easy one, one that comes easy to mind. On the other hand, would it be on the number of portfolios, and perhaps he would advance the very interesting suggestion that I understand has been followed in the Province of New Brunswick that if you hold more than one portfolio then you get paid for each portfolio.

MR. DESJARDINS: I said that?

MR. LYON: No, my honourable friend didn't say that. I don't credit him with that much imagination. This was done by the Liberal Government in New Brunswick.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right. I stay in Manitoba. You worry about New Brunswick.

MR. LYON: Because that would provide an interesting test -- and I merely point out to my honourable friend that if he were to adopt that test that I presently hold three portfolios and if he would like to incline his thinking to what this might do to my particular salary, I'd be quite happy to hear his suggestions in that regard.

MR. DESJARDINS: And you're trying for the leadership, I know that.

MR. LYON: But let's look at this situation a little bit further because it is rather an interesting one. How are we going to grade these people and say who is a first class, who is a



(MR. LYON cont'd).... second class and who is a third class Cabinet Minister? Because I think once we agree that we establish that principle with respect to the Executive Council, then must we not, to be consistent, move down to the Legislature, and then we will have levels of members in the Legislature. And where then is the Honourable Member for St. Boniface going to stand?

MR. DESJARDINS: First class. You second class and third - that's easy.

MR. LYON: What salary is he going to be receiving or in effect will he have a deficit with the Legislature? I don't know. He might end up owing us money if we were to put in a grading system for members of the cabinet. Let me come a little bit closer to him with my honourable friend because these theories of course must, I presume have some acceptance among the Liberal Party in Manitoba. He gets up and speaks presumably as the spokesman for the Liberal Party of Manitoba? I presume that they would then acknowledge the fact that the Honourable Walter Gordon who went into the Federal Cabinet recently, I understand not with the full approbation of the Leader of the Opposition and without portfolio and I don't know with what salary - but how would my honourable friend grade him? Has he given Mr. Pearson the benefit of his advice as to how Mr. Gordon should be paid?

MR. DESJARDINS: That's the next item - Federal Government.

MR. LYON: Maybe he could tell us about his close friend and ally the Federal Member from St. Boniface, the Honourable Roger Teillet. Does he get the same amount of money? For instance, does the Honourable Mitchell Sharp? I believe he does. Now perhaps my honourable friend would care to tell us whether or not he agrees with that. Because of course if we're going to have a graded system in Manitoba, then we must grade them federally as well because this is a new principle and this is being advocated by my honourable friend, so I would appreciate having his views which we could make sure Mr. Pearson got a copy of in Hansard telling us how Mr. Pearson should grade his Cabinet and what the senior and the junior ministers should be, and perhaps he would give us the benefit of his advice as to where Mr. Teillet would fit in this scheme of things. --(Interjection)-- We know of course of my honourable friend's undying friendship and his admiration for the Federal Cabinet Minister from Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Tell us about your tax free money, Red.

MR. LYON: These are some of the thoughts that occurred to me as I was sitting languishing here this afternoon listening to my honourable friend taunt on about salaries and about what a poor bunch of people we were over here and what a terribly dastardly -- I think it was an act of theft he described that we have participated in and so on -- All the same lovely, delicate epithets that we have come to expect from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who, with his usual stiletto-like wit which he brandishes like a broad-axe, comes into the House and unburdens himself from time to time of his great wisdom and lets the rest of the populace realize that at least there is one member here who is not afraid to speak his mind. I sometimes only wish that my honourable friend would organize his mind before he speaks it, but nonetheless we have come to be accustomed to this kind of treatment from the honourable member and we enjoy it. We wouldn't want to do anything to change him because that would represent such a fundamental change in his personality that I'm sure none of us would recognize him after the transformation. I might tell him however, that if we were on the graded scale of MLA's, that if this transformation did take place, he might then qualify for a slightly higher category than I perhaps would be prepared to give him at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks teacher, thanks teacher.

MR. LYON: And so as we discuss this \$4,500 item in these estimates of something over a million dollars...

MR. DESJARDINS: Forty-eight tax free - that's what I'd like to discuss now.

MR. LYON: Now, there's my honourable friend you know. I can't keep this within myself any longer. On Saturday evening when I'm not out banqueting - as my honourable says "free-loading", and when I have occasion once in a while to sit around with my children, we watch television and one of the programs that we get a great deal of enjoyment out of is a program, the Jackie Gleason Show which comes to us from Miami, and Jackie Gleason, to my way of thinking is one of the great comics of all time, one of the great impersonators of all time. He can impersonate a buffoon, a loud-mouth, a simpleton perhaps better than anybody that I have ever seen, and he has that wonderful show - he and Art Carney and the two ladies who are on the show with him - known as "The Honeymooners". And in that show of course we all know the character, Ralph Cramden. I'm sure my honourable friend has heard of Ralph Cramden. They've seen him. The blustering, fuming, "I'll knock you to the moon" Ralph Cramden. And

(MR. LYON cont'd).... every time, every time, and I'm not trying to be difficult, or I'm not trying to be mean to my honourable friend but I do want to tell him that if he should ever lose his seat in this legislature, I think we could find a job for him and I think we should let Jackie Gleason know that if he's ever run short of characterizations for Ralph Cramden, or if he's ever ill, we've got the perfect stand-in for him here in the Legislature of Manitoba. Now the only problem is that he won't be acting but nonetheless despite this minor disability I think we'll have a bit of a standard for him.

MR. DESJARDINS: you could go down the sewer with Carney.

MR. LYON: .... my honourable friend even ...

MR. DESJARDINS: ... your salary. I'll take Gleason's salary.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend just confirms what I have been saying. He even knows the lines. He knows the lines.

MR. DESJARDINS: Now we get a lesson how to beat the income tax.

MR. LYON: And I daresay that that job would pay my honourable friend considerably more than he would get under the present system as a member of the legislature and I know it would pay him more than any job he would get under the graded system that he advocates for the members of the Executive Council and for the Members of the House, and so not entirely facetiously I say to my honourable friend, take a look at that program again and if you really need a letter of reference don't hesitate to come to me because I would write about you in the most glowing terms.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm on Cramden's advisory staff.

MR. LYON: ... for that position. Well now, seriously, and my honourable friend knows --(Interjection)-- seriously, I do feel that I have perhaps wasted as much time of the House on this matter as I should because I think there are as I said at the beginning, important matters in the estimates to be discussed but there were just a few comments that my honourable friend made that really begged for some further elucidation or for some discussion and I take my seat content with the thought that the Cabinet colleagues that I have the pleasure of sitting with on the front bench of this government are doing a job for the people of Manitoba. We're not all perfect. I found this out because all I have to do is look in the mirror in the morning and I know that - and I do that occasionally. But I do want to say to my honourable friend as well that in my experience over the past eight, going on nine years working in this Cabinet - and I daresay the Member for Lakeside could probably make the same statement about his colleagues in his time in government - I have yet to run across a more dedicated group of people than the people that I have had the pleasure of working with. Now I know that my honourable friend will say that's past, that's just political hyperbole, that's rhetoric, and so on, but I hasten to assure him it isn't because I know that my colleague the Member for Lakeside can make the statement. I know these people are doing a job for the people of Manitoba. I know that the salaries that are accorded them are not out of line with the responsibilities, the changing responsibilities that they have at this present time. I know that the minute anyone stands up from this side of the House and begins to speak on this matter, he can be accused, as we have been, of speaking from a point of self-interest; I've been trying to speak from a standpoint of what the office deserves and disregarding the personalities. And I say that with great respect, because we had the same argument a number of years ago with the Honourable Member for Lakeside when according to his own light he say fit not to accept an increase, himself, which was accorded to the office of the Leader of the Opposition and I think if we try to look at this in the light as we do always, as we have to do always with the civil service, that the money is paid to the office up to the particular incumbent, and my honourable friend can probably make a very good argument, one that I would probably even accept myself though I might not vote for it, that the present incumbent of the Attorney-General or Minister of Tourism or Commissioner for Northern Affairs shouldn't be getting the money that he is getting. I might have to agree with him on that, but I ask him to do what I have to do and what all the members of the Cabinet have to do when we're looking at civil service rates for the heads of commissions, for the Deputy Ministers, for senior officers and so on. We have to look at the position, we have to look at the responsibilities that attaches to the position, and we have to pay the position what the going rate is for that kind of a position in today's world. So, while my honourable friend or anybody else can say I'm probably just speaking from a standpoint of self interest, that there's a conflict of interest in anything that I might say, because of course I'm involved directly or indirectly in the matter, I do want to tell them that I have today, Mr. Chairman, that I have been trying to consider this in the light of what the

(MR. LYON cont'd). . . . office deserves, and in consideration of that, in consideration of the responsibilities that attach to the office here and in other provinces - and these are matters that are discussed from time to time in any gathering of Ministers that you find in Ottawa or in other places where ministerial meetings are held - you will find the same kind of dedication that I have described here. Here I am myself, infringing my own rule, talking about the particular people, but it seems that the particular people who come to an office, whether they're Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit (and I have found this in my experience right across the country) are dedicated people. They are people who in each case is well worth the money that he is being paid from the public coffers. They are people who are making a sacrifice, I must say - speaking outside of this province, never mind our own group - a sacrifice above and beyond any stipend or salary that they may be getting. That has been my experience in communication with people in Cabinet positions, people in public office, right across Canada and on that basis and on the basis of this being, I think, reasonable in the circumstances, I too plan to vote against the motion.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, when we dealt with the estimates of the Minister's salary, until the motion was brought in by the Honourable Member for Selkirk last night, I had the impression that members of our Party were spending a great deal of the time that was taken up to that time dealing with the matter of policy presented in the White Paper and indeed with the Department of Education. I heard some rumblings, I believe from the group on my right, as to the time being taken by members of our Party on that matter. I am proud that at least they could be accused of a tremendous interest in the field of education, in the departmental operations and in the White Paper which is an important document. I assume that members of this Committee need not be reminded that the time that is being devoted . . .

MR. MOLGAT: . . . to interrupt the member. I don't know of any rumblings being heard from our group regarding the speeches that were being taken up.

MR. CHERNIACK: I said I thought I heard rumblings and I often hear rumblings. If I misunderstood the rumblings then I certainly withdraw the suggestion that there was any feeling on the part of the members on my right to the effect that we're taking up too much time, but I don't mind saying that I think that if this is a rumble that you hear you'll hear it clearly. I think that we're taking up too much time on this resolution and I don't know how much more time will be given to it. This is all time which is being charged against the estimates and leaves just that much less time for us to deal with the business of the House. Nevertheless, it seems to me, listening to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and to the group and to the nine people who are reporting to the people of Manitoba and indeed outside of Manitoba what is going on here, that there is a great deal of enjoyment and pleasure in hearing the brickbats that were thrown back and forth in debate, and I suppose it's good to relax on occasion, Mr. Chairman, so we could all have the occasional laugh.

I must confess that I did not find it too pleasurable or enjoyable when there was a descent into personalities, when there was a questioning as to individual abilities of individual people, about their individual backgrounds, about their individual merits. I didn't particularly enjoy or find it funny when it came from either side of the House. I have a right to say, Mr. Chairman, that I was uncomfortable. I have a right to say that I have not had as much experience in elective office as other members of this House, but I think I've had as much experience in different levels of elective office as any, and having sat through the Winnipeg School Board and the City of Winnipeg Council and the Town Council of Winnipeg Beach and the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, I had to come to this House in order to listen to speeches descend to the level that they sometimes do in this House, and I deplore that fact, and I think it's not necessary, but to the extent that members of the House get pleasure out of it, and I confess to you by looking around and seeing the looks of enjoyment that I say I feel that I must have been in the minority, so I apologize like did the last speaker for taking time to express myself in that respect. I would much rather that we were attacking the policies of the ministers than that we are attacking them individually as individuals. But I would much rather deal with the question of the level of salary as it ought to be, and about the method in which suggestions are to come to this Committee or this House as to how salaries should be adjusted, either raised or lowered, than I am in discussing these matters that have taken so much of our time.

I, for myself, have not until yesterday heard the government give any form of accounting as to the reasons why it was thought that an increase was justified and indeed that that increase was justified. Were it not that fortuitously I happened to see the part of a television

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . program where the Honourable the First Minister, perched on a table in a rather uncomfortable fashion, was attempting to satisfy the people he was addressing on T. V. about what his actions were - and I think that he was uncomfortable not only physically but also mentally in trying to do it - if not for that, then yesterday would have been the first time that I heard this report that he gave us, and I certainly think that it came at the wrong time coming as it did so many months after the deed was done.

I think that the timing was bad; the leader of our Party already expressed that sentiment himself. It was bad in view of the fact that I think it was on the same television program the Honourable the First Minister talked about the minimum wage, and I think that on that program he as much as said that in his opinion the minimum wage ought to be increased. And he did in fact say that he was asking the Minimum Wage Board to sit in earlier than it was normally required to do, to study this question, and that was I think last November or so, and to this day we know nothing about the minimum wage but we do know that the wages, the salaries of Cabinet ministers was increased. I deplore that.

I do know that not many months ago, possibly one of her first acts, the Minister of Municipal Affairs addressed herself to Metro on a hold-the-line basis, and I do know that about the same time - and I may be wrong in a matter of months - this Cabinet decided that the hold-the-line should not apply to its salaries. I do think that was bad. I do think that being a newly elected House with a depleted majority they should have had the courtesy to come to this House and say, "We think that salaries must go up" for all these various reasons that were given. But no; the Honourable the First Minister said, "This was our responsibility. I take full responsibility for it," and so he should and so he must. But I do feel that there is a certain amount of lack of a feeling of having to account, in advance, for the decisions that he proposed to make, and I think that that was wrong.

Having said that I feel that there is a great deal of justification for an increase in the salaries to Cabinet Ministers; I say that there is a great deal of justification for an increase to people in public office and people in elected office who have to give of their time in order to be able to participate in the work that they were elected to do, and it is true they weren't asked -- well some were asked -- but in the majority they all come into it because they enjoy it and they feel they have a contribution to make. And when one considers the kind of abuse they have to take not only from some of the electorate but also from their fellow elected members, then I sometimes think that no matter what they get it is not sufficient, if it were not for the satisfaction they have in doing their jobs.

So I say that I am satisfied that they were due for an increase. I am equally satisfied in my own mind that members of the Legislature who come here in the backbench, on both sides of the House, and give of their time should be recognized in terms of - not as was said - that they are not deprived, that their families are not deprived or make undue sacrifice, but indeed it should be recognized that they are giving of their time and that they are giving up certain of their other normal activities, be they in terms of earning a living or be they in terms of family, social or other communal responsibilities. So I think it's justified. It may even be - and I'm putting that "may" in it because I haven't studied it carefully - that the actual amount set by the Cabinet was justified. It may be. I certainly don't think that an across-the-board expense account without having to account for it is justified in view of the fact that there is a separate expense account for which chits are filed and accounted for. I do think whatever they get as Cabinet Ministers ought to be fully taxable as indeed all salaries ought to be, but that's another technical thing.

I certainly agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk on that, but I think that the manner in which this was done was bad and deserves a reprimand, and to the extent that my vote will help to make it a reprimand, I intend to do so. Certainly not in terms of the Minister involved, because I think that no one has suggested that he personally is involved and certainly not in terms of any of the other Cabinet Ministers because I am not prepared to go into merit ratings except when it gets on the election platform where I am prepared to state that one or another member in my opinion does not do the job adequately. But the job should carry a salary commensurate with its responsibilities and I would not stoop to think that I have the ability to merit rate the people involved. I feel however that, as I say, that the government deserves a reprimand and for that reason I feel that we are, those of us who decide to vote in support of the motion, are doing so.

I found it necessary, Mr. Chairman, to take up the time that I did not want to be associated with many of the things that have been said and may yet be said by some of the people.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . who will vote the same as I do. I do want to say that in spite of all the readings of all the Hansards and of all the press reports that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface wants to bring, I am satisfied that when the Great Debate - and I say that with capital letters - on the pension was carried on there were two members of our Party, I recall, that did participate briefly to state a point. One was our Honourable Leader and the other was the former Member from Brokenhead, and as I recall it and I'm sure the record will support it, they took the position that they felt that pensions were justified, that the principle was justified, and if I recall the rules of the House, that was a matter for debate under second readings, and that they said then that when the matter comes to committee for study, after the principle is adopted that pensions are justified, they will then look -- or our representatives on the committee would then look at the question of amount and at the question of qualifications and other entitlements.

So the fact that we supported the principle of pensions is nothing for which I apologize. The fact that I have already said that I feel that there is justification for an increase in Cabinet salaries is something for which I need not apologize. The fact that I have said that in my opinion there is justification for increase of the indemnities paid to members of the legislature is something for which I do not intend to apologize. And the fact that I intend to vote in such a way as to indicate my participation in a reprimand to the Cabinet for the manner in which it carried out this increase is also something for which I do not expect to apologize.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Member for St. John's has been rather courteously taking some of us to task I believe for what he believes to be too much time spent on this particular item. In doing that he was simply following the lead that the Honourable the Attorney-General - and I hope he's not leaving because I wanted to say something about him - what the Honourable the Attorney-General had said just before him. I have no apology for the time that I have taken or will now take on this matter because I consider this too to be a matter of principle, and I think that when we come to a question that we really sincerely believe to be a matter of principle, then much as I am impressed by the amounts of money that are contained in the estimates here, I consider principles so far as this Legislative Assembly is concerned to be even more demanding of our time than amounts of money, and I make no apology for debating something that I consider to be definitely a matter of principle.

My honourable friend the member for St. John's says that with regard to the pension bill of two years ago that his understanding is that his Party took the position that pensions were justified. My recollection is that every member who spoke, bar none, took the position that pensions were justified as such, every member of the House in every Party took the position that pensions were justified. The question at the time, as now, was whether they were being applied to the right people and in the right way. That's the question that's before us here and that's the one to which I intend to address myself very briefly once again, and I wouldn't have risen at all because of what the Honourable member for St. John's said, my real reason for speaking again is what the Honourable the Attorney-General said, because I am glad, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the honourable gentleman's reputation, that just at the end of his speech that he did get down to a discussion of the point at issue. I'm glad he did because otherwise I'm afraid that his speech would have gone down in history as one of the most ineffective that has ever been delivered in this House. My honourable friend has a reputation to maintain as being good at drawing red herrings across the trail - and I concede that he is good at that - but his red herring today had neither size nor quality, nor smell even, that would lead anybody astray at all. He didn't even come close to diverting attention from the subject that he was attempting to do.

But my main reason for wanting to correct him is that several times he spoke of this raise as being \$4,500, and my honourable friend demonstrated once before in this House that he's not a very good mathematician. Good lawyers don't have to be good mathematicians I'm sure, but I do think my honourable friend is able to subtract \$12,500 from \$18,000, and I want him to realize that it's not \$4,500. Once I believed he used the correct figure but several times he used the other figure. But the amount is not the important thing. I just reiterate once again - and I of course am one that does object to the amount that's involved - but the part I object to most strenuously of all is this \$3,000 tax free. I think it's completely unjustified; I think it's cynical; and I think it is the kind of thing that this House should censure very very clearly, and we have taken the one method that we have - the one method of being in order in debating this, Mr. Chairman - to place a motion, a straightforward motion before the committee so that it can be debated on its merits and on principle, and I think there is a

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . principle involved here when we have people, regardless of what is said, and I certainly don't believe in getting down to personalities, and the fact that this happens to come on the salary of the particular Minister, perhaps the Minister that I would be the least likely and that I think my honourable friend the member for Selkirk would be probably the least likely of all to move such a motion, but it happens to be the first one and the principle is the thing that we're discussing. I have no objection whatever to going on record as being opposed to the amount, but particularly to the manner in which it was done and then more particularly and more emphatically to the fact that this \$3,000, for which in my opinion there is no justification and for which no justification has been attempted, should be placed before the House.

My honourable friend the First Minister is not lacking in ability to defend the position that he takes, and yet when the famous pension Bill was before this House I think I am recalling it correctly when I say that until he arose to announce that they were abandoning the legislation, that he never once—never once spoke on that legislation. And in this case, having made his statement at the beginning, he never has attempted, as far as I can tell, to defend this point that I consider the most important of all. I am most concerned and to me it's a matter of principle that should be censured in the most severe terms and we have chosen the one way that lay before us in order to do that.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital); Mr. Chairman, I realize the dangers of following speakers of the capacity and eloquence of the two previous speakers, but the reason I rise is that when the member for St. John's opened his contribution he made two statements, one of which I agree with and one of which I disagree with. The first one was that the House seems to be dwelling a bit on a conflict of personalities and I agree entirely with him that this doesn't serve any useful purpose. The second statement was, as I interpret it, something to the effect that his Party was prepared to make a real contribution to the debate as regards to the White Paper, and I would like to speak on this because I would like to question how much contribution they are really making at some times and as to whether a great deal of the time it isn't essentially a regurgitation of some idle coffee room chit-chat that they wander in here with --(Interjection)-- I'm just leading into it. I would like to . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There seems to be some objection to the honourable member speaking on the amendment to the -- I would point out to the honourable member that we are on the amendment to the main motion. If the member is going to speak on the White Paper, I suggest probably that he speak on the main motion after we have cleared the amendment.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I have every intention of coming back to it and I certainly hope I do get the opportunity. I would like to have broadened out a bit, but if there is objection to it I can drop it at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: I believe the member is speaking in order. I've no objection to his continuing.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may on the point of order, if my honourable friend the member for St. Vital is going to try and justify as to why there should not be a reduction in the salary of the Honourable the Minister of Education and use his arguments that have been processed insofar as the White Paper is concerned, then I would suggest that my honourable friend would be perfectly in order. We want to know why the salaries should not be reduced as much as we want to know why they should be.

MR. CRAIK: I thank the Honourable Leader of the NDP for bailing me out here and giving me the opportunity, as well as the Leader of the Opposition. In order . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably, since the honourable the member for St. Vital is given the opportunity, I should go over the amendment again. That Item 1 (a), Minister's Salary - Salary and Representation Allowance of \$18,000 be reduced to the level of the 1966-67 appropriation of \$12,500. Now the debate, members of the committee, thus far has been on the general Ministers' salaries.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to talk about the White Paper. I wanted by way of example to pass comment on the Minister's salary, and if I might be allowed to continue with this example I think it might be worthwhile. If you feel not, I'll simply hold off and come back.

I would like to say that like so many people in so many professions, it is very difficult to adequately reward them for their real contributions. Our society being what it is and our associations being what they are, don't allow this to take place. Now, in the case of the Minister of Education's salary there is no question at all about the amount of money involved

(MR. CRAIK cont'd). . . . here as far as I'm concerned at least. We know very well just by way of example, and we don't have to use examples that have been used here today, but within the school system itself we have, outside of the government, superintendents and even principals of high schools who were making considerably more than the Minister of Education prior to this raise. So, I want to continue the debate; I would like to come back to it; I'd like to make this one point. There's little question, since it's the Minister of Education's salary that is in question here, there is no question about the magnitude of his salary in comparison to other institutions related to education right within the province.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I'm wandering astray here and I don't know my legal boundaries. This is the liability that an engineer has to pay in his first round in the House, and keeping company with these farmers and lawyers and undertakers long enough, I certainly hope that some of their superior knowledge rubs off on me, so with that I'll sit down.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, if I diverge even slightly from the point at issue I do so on a point of privilege, because there appeared today in the Free Press a story saying backbench revolt may face Roblin, and I happen to be one of the individuals who is named as one of these people in revolt.

I would like to say first of all that I have always prided myself in being a person capable of making up their own mind and their own decisions, and while I might have a word or two of criticism as others in this House have offered, I certainly do not quarrel with the salaries being paid the Ministers. I would like to remind this House that after - and I presume that it was after Ministers were embarrassed to the point in the discussion on pensions where not many of them were defending the pensions - I arose and spoke in defence of those pensions.

Now I do not agree with some of the points that have been raised in this House, particularly by the member for Lakeside and the member for St. Boniface, and this is rather odd because on many points I think we see quite similarly as to viewpoints. But the member for Lakeside suggests that because of the lack of security of tenure of office that people serving the public should not receive the proper remuneration. Now there's only one alternative to this, if you accept this as a reasonable viable argument, and that is that eventually only the wealthy would represent his fellow man.

Now I want to tell you from a personal experience that even the backbencher here does so at some considerable long range cost, particularly those in business, and particularly those in business where it's pretty much a one man show. You can't give service to your customers, people of your community for nine months of the year, be away almost three months - and sessions gradually are getting longer, the trend is towards more lengthy sessions - you can't serve the public in this manner without some personal cost because your customers will not tolerate three months' absence. They're expecting, and quite justifiably in the business world, 12 months' service out of 12 months, and when the backbencher is away, if he runs a business, his business suffers. This is natural and there is no rebutting that particular argument.

In the case of Ministers - the actual Minister in point - think of what his potential might have been had he stayed in medicine, a young doctor getting on his feet, becoming established. Why, I suggest to you that the salaries being proposed now, at least in the estimates for Ministers, is rather puny compared to the potential of such a man.

Now this argument started off on a high plane but like so many arguments in this House they never stick to the point. We have had reference from that side that there was no criticism, no criticism at all of anything but the method, yet we had the minimum wage dragged in, all the tear-jerkers you can imagine. But sticking completely to the point, I would like to use the same sort of defence I used in the discussions on pensions in this House. I believe that Ministers, because of this lack of security and tenure of office, can - after having cut all bridges behind them or burned all bridges behind them - be faced with at least a few years of real problems financially in getting re-established in whatever course in life they may have come from.

And then there's another angle which I touched upon during the pension discussion and I think this is worth the examination of this House, when I pointed out that we try to make our judges literally independent so that their judgment will not be biased because of lack of means to be properly taken care of financially, and I think it's just as important that a Minister of this or any other government have that sort of consideration when he's in office. I think it's rather a tragedy if we should be paying Ministers a salary which, when you consider all the various extra expenses to which they must be put and to the extent of "living up with the Joneses" too, because this is expected of Ministers, that we should certainly see that they are recompensed and be worthy in the eyes of their fellow man.

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . .

This idea that people should serve the public for little or no cost might be quite acceptable in the levels up to municipal government, but I think when you go beyond this you're getting into a different category altogether, because even in our federal House now membership means pretty well a full-time job. I've heard the Member for Lakeside compare even the duties of a backbencher in this House and say that -- compare this on a three month basis. Well it isn't my experience that it's a three month job. I find that my correspondence concerning political matters is very much in excess of my business correspondence. I have even had, because of the lack of knowledge or lack of interest, I don't know which you would define it as, I've even had people come to me with divorce problems which is not within the purview of this House at all as you quite well know.

So that I wonder when a newspaper, a supposedly reliable newspaper can print these kind of stories, it is not worthy of some . . . . examination. The Member for St. Boniface got up a while ago and quoted quote after quote from the newspapers. Are these newspapers so completely reliable that we should accept them rather than Hansard which is a recording of the talks and expressions of people in this House? I don't want to see ever that we get governed by newspaper in this province. Certainly there are people within all parties who differ at times with the policies and the methods of that party, and I would be ashamed if I had to admit that I was not one of that type of person. It happens in all parties, as I mentioned previously, but to conjecture that the government is going to fall on an issue such as this, which I think is a tempest in a teapot, because as the Premier of this province pointed out, it is before debate in this House. Sure some of you may question the method, but it is before debate. It has to be passed in these estimates. If it were not so all this holocaust would not have developed.

So even the method you can't criticize too severely because under our democratic system Ministers have to be responsible and defend their actions. The defence is here now, and certainly I would not see the downfall of this government on some such issue as this. I would like to think that if it were important enough I would have the courage to still be a very independent type of person, but not on an issue like this. I think this is a tempest in a teapot, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . ask the member a question, the last member that spoke? Does he agree that the \$3,000 tax-free, the increase, does he agree that this is right?

MR. LISSAMAN: We enjoy that within our indemnity and I believe, correct me if someone might say otherwise, there was even more possibility in the recognition of tax-free but the advantage was not taken of it. Now this is what I understand.

MR. DESJARDINS: That wasn't my question. He's not answering my question. I asked if he agreed that the Minister should have a further, beside the one-third of the indemnity, should have another \$3,000 tax-free?

MR. LISSAMAN: I find no quarrel with this. In any shape or form of business you can charge up necessary expenses and so on, and I think there are many many expenses that you can't put your finger on that Ministers may be exposed to and should have some consideration of.

MR. DESJARDINS: Isn't it a fact, Mr. Speaker, that their expenses are already paid for, the Ministers' expenses are already paid for? Isn't that a fact that everything is charged to the department? There's no quarrel there. I'm not suggesting that they should pay that, but this is already being paid.

MR. LISSAMAN: Ask as many question as you will, I say I have no objection to this.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, that's what I want to know. All right.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask another question of the honourable member who just spoke. I gather from what he said that he felt that the newspaper story to which he was referring was a fabrication by the newspaper involved. Is it not correct that the story came from one of the backbenchers on my honourable friend's side of the House?

MR. LISSAMAN: I have no knowledge where the story came from. I think in great part it's conjecture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have not seen the morning paper, whatever this story was in, but I have heard that my name appeared also opposing the increase in the Minister's salary. I must say that this is entirely untrue because on many occasions I have remarked that our Cabinet Ministers are young men, raising young families who have to have an education, and I definitely think that they are entitled to the



(MRS. MORRISON cont'd) . . . . salaries that they are receiving so that they and their families can have some future security after they devote their time, long hours, day and into the night, working for the people of Manitoba and I am wholeheartedly in support of the salaries that they are receiving. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, I think I should say a word at this time because my name was also included in that story in the paper, and as also mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, it might be possible the story came from myself I think I should say -- but I admit I did have a word with one of the reporters out there during a session of coffee last night. As I mentioned yesterday, I'm a farmer and farmers don't go into detail; they do business in a hurry and they get it over with. That's the way it's done.

I must admit that I'm not against the salaries that are to be paid to the Ministers because I know that many of these men are young men - younger than myself, in fact I'm senior to three-quarters of them in age - that they devote many hours of their lives and many of them have moved from the country to the city, have had to sell their businesses, buy houses in the City of Winnipeg and have started a brand new life with their families, and this \$18,000 which we're now talking about is little or nothing that will compensate them during their years to come, because most of us know that after we've reached the age of 45 our possibilities of getting greater salaries are nil. We've reached our peak at that age. --(Interjection)-- Well, I would say that's quite true. You'll find it when you reach the age of 45. --(Interjection)-- No, this is true. This is true. We're on the downhill march. If you don't reach it before the time you're 45 you might as well wash yourself out, you're going as far as you are going. I don't know about Doug Campbell, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whether he's reached his 45th or not but he's still I think retaining the same salary of \$4800 right today that he reached in the last eight years since I've sat in the Legislature.

But this whole thing bothers me. Here we are, 57 of us, and if you average it out at the hourly pay, the rate of hours or the cost of running this Legislature, I imagine it would be up about \$25,000 since we started this performance yesterday. But there's a principle involved and the amendment to the motion is to reduce salaries to the Ministers from \$18,000 to \$12,500. Is that not true, the Honourable Member for Selkirk? That's the motion that's before us right now.

Personally, the thing that I must say, and I know I'll get slapped down likely - maybe not - I think the timing was maybe a little bad, a little bad. Businesswise - businesswise, the public began to think that maybe the backbenchers, and I was accused of getting this extra salary myself, and this is many many times the public were really riding me for getting this \$5,500. If I wasn't an insurance agent I couldn't have talked myself out of it. Being an insurance agent you have to always at all times defend the policies of the insurance companies, so I had to defend them on the grounds that I wasn't worth any more than \$4,800 at that time; the Cabinet Ministers were worth \$18,000.

But getting back to the story in the press. I had a story in the press not very long ago - many of you read it - it comes from Ottawa. I had to defend myself there. I didn't have the privilege of the Legislature to defend myself in so had to use the news media how I voted at Ottawa. It seemed that the press at that time knew how I voted at Ottawa and the pressmen also gave me the reasons why I did vote for a certain man. I had to defend myself on the grounds that I had to tell them, well if I don't know how I vote I don't know how I'm going to tell anybody else. In the meantime, I also told the constituents at home how I voted at Ottawa previous to that because many of them put me on the spot and I had to be truthful. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't know. You all know and you read the rebuttal in the newspaper anyway.

But this is the position we're put in as politicians. I'm always asked what I'm worth in the Legislature. Well some days I think I'm worth a devil of a lot because I'm losing money on the farm; I'm losing money in the insurance business. The Wawanesa Mutual are taking dollars away from me every day I'm here because I'm only nine miles away from the Head Office of the Wawanesa Mutual. That means quite a bit. I also have to hire a man on my farm to do the work which I should be doing while I'm going to Sports Days and attending to the widows' problems. --(Interjection)-- That's not a lie either; that's the truth.

MR. MOLGAT: Are the people of Manitoba expected to pay for that?

MR. McKELLAR: So I hope that -- from what I can relate of the number of duties a member has to perform -- I hope this doesn't go in Hansard. --(Interjection)-- Well I once had a widow that approached me on a problem and asked me to her home - this was before I was married - I was propositioned before I left the house. Now I don't know whether to consider that an asset

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . or a liability as a member of the Legislature, but I think that our honourable gentlemen in the front row are worth every bit of their \$18,000 and I'm going to vote for them as such, but I think they should give considerable thought when they raised their wages when they did, and I'm only sorry it was done so as a member of our party.

I think that's about all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. Maybe there could be cut out -- some parts of my speech could be cut out of Hansard, but they're on the record now and there's four years to another election. Maybe my constituency will be done away with anyway and it won't really matter.

..... continued on the next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): May I address a question to a couple of the members on that side? May I only address one to the last member or can I address one to other people named in that article? Well may I direct a question to the honourable member who just finished speaking. On a point of clarification then. There are really two questions and I wanted to ask this of the Honourable Member for Virden and the Honourable Member for Rupertsland but I understand now that I can't so I direct it to him. He was named in that article and I would like to know first as to - I think he has already explained it but I'll ask him again "are you or were you in favour of the amount of the increase; and secondly are you or were you in favour of the method and the timing of the cabinet salary increase?"

MR. MCKELLAR: I think, Mr. Chairman, I made myself clear I'm not in favour of the . . . . -- I am in favour of the increase. Personally, I didn't think the timing was maybe the proper way. I had nothing to do with the timing so I . . . . but personally I don't think that the timing . . . . . And I think this is where the irritation exists on the side. . . . . With a few political, you know advantages - this is a real political advantage don't ever think - but I think this is right.

I also want to make it clear to the House right here that at no time did I mention anybody's name and if a pressman wants to put peoples names in the paper that's his choice, just the same as they put mine in when I went to Ottawa for the convention. This is the privilege they have. So, I want to make it clear to the members of our own party that at no time did I ever mention anyones name and I hope they take it for what its worth -- (Interjection) -- Not even the Liberals, no.

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

MR. MOLGAT, Division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A counted vote was taken, the results being as follows: AYES, 26; NAYES, 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the words "and representation allowance" be struck out of Item 5, No. 1 (a). I will not be very long on this. I think this was covered before. This as you will see makes this \$18,000 a full salary and will do away with the \$3,000 tax free. I will not give my reason again for this, I think that it is clear. There were two things that we objected to, the way this was done and also this business of tax free. I don't agree with the Member from Brandon when he says that they have a lot of expenses. I think that we know and that he knows also this is not the case because this is paid already. I don't intend to speak at any length on this. There is only one thing that I want to make clear - not apologize just make clear because I stand behind everything that I do and say in this House and if I'm wrong I'll admit it.

I tried to be very careful to say that I didn't ridicule anybody's position in this House. The point that I was trying to make - talking about personalities, the point that I was trying to make was that they were not, the people that are cabinet ministers, and I explained that they didn't have to be, that they were ordinary people representing other ordinary people and have to have common sense, and they weren't necessarily trained, they did not become experts from one day to the other.

So this is a red herring that the Attorney-General brought in. I did not - the only personality that you can accuse me of saying in my speech was when I was asking the Attorney-General, who wanted to answer, if he could look at himself in the mirror and vote, give himself \$3,000 tax free and I'm not afraid to repeat this. And it's also wrong for the First Minister to insinuate that I said "just a housewife" as if I had no respect for housewives. And he knows that's wrong. I was trying to make a point that the cabinet ministers were not qualified that they should not be compared to leaders of industry and so on.

So, I repeat again that it is the method that this was done, was the main thing. We finished that, we lost this motion. Now this motion will do away with this evasion of tax and do away with trying to mock the people of this province here by raising the tax and then the cabinet minister having at least \$4,600 tax-free which is more, I repeat, which is more, quite a bit more than the average salary here in this province. As far as the cabinet salaries - the Attorney-General was supposed to answer me and I did mention that we had two issues here, that there was the issue of trying to justify the salary and then the way it was done and so on, and he didn't talk about the second part that was the important part. He just tried to answer, to justify the salary and he brought in the ridiculous point that the Cabinet Ministers should be

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . paid the way he tied his shoes or the way he wore his tie and so on. But, like my colleague said, this was a red herring that he was trying to bring in and he wasn't too successful. Again this motion it does nothing else but make this \$18,000 -- we lost the vote on this -- this is what they want to pay themselves, they were backed by the backbenchers, and I ask the backbenchers if they're ready to go to their constituency and say we agree these people should have a way - it's not the intent of the law mind you - but we'll give them a chance of getting another \$3,000 tax-free, no income tax on that even though they're raising your taxes and they're bringing this tax and they call this the tax with the ability to pay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable member was out of order speaking before the motion has been accepted by the Chair. However looking at the motion I believe it is in order.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A counted vote was taken the results being as follows: AYES, 26; NAYES, 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the salary, under education. We have had this White Paper now for a few days. I wasn't in the House last Friday when it was tabled and I only had it in my hands since Monday morning to go through it and evaluate it in order to know just what program the government is offering in the way of education.

My question is are we going to get value for the increased expenditures that are to take place in Manitoba under this new program. I am sure what we will see is another round of increase in teachers salaries as a result of the higher grants that will be offered, so that education will cost more in this province as a result, regardless of whether we are going to get more value.

In speaking this afternoon I want it understood that I personally am fully in favour of improving education in Manitoba wherever possible and certainly I'm not a defeatist and I feel that we can make improvements if we're going to do it the right way. But I have my doubts whether sufficient consideration has been given to this White Paper or whether the department are not telling us all. And maybe both is the case, because I feel that there is not a real definition of the Foundation Program as such. I think it is far too vague and after hearing a number of the other members speak and then the Minister giving his reply, I thought that the reply was very weak and evasive as far as explanations were required.

Then, too, I feel there is too much left to regulations that will come in later on that are not spelled out, at least not in the White Paper. Too often we have passed liberal Acts and then later on find that the various boards placed on very large restrictions and that you don't have the legislation that you thought you had when we passed them in the House.

There are new concepts and principles embodied in the White Paper. One of them I am very leery about, and that is that you place a maximum on the special levy for education, and as I read it, the Board that will have control over this can do this very thing. This is a principle that has never been endorsed by the trustees of this province in the past. This is one thing they've evaded and tried to keep away from. They have steered away from it during all these years.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member said something which is not so. There is no maximum on the special levy. Can he not read that White Paper? It's a candid statement of fact.

MR. FROESE: We're setting up a Board that will have control of costs.

MR. JOHNSON: Not over special levies. In that White Paper, that's clearly outlined.

MR. FROESE: Over the past years we've given consideration to county systems and so on and these are always rejected, and one of the very reasons for the rejection was this very point, that up until this time trustees have been able to set up their budgets and these were passed on to the municipalities and they levied the proper moneys and the councils did not have any right to restrict these moneys so that education would get the necessary funds needed, and I might say that people up until this time, the local people, have had the say. If they felt more money was needed in their locality for certain purposes they could levy the same and they would get the same.

Under this new proposal - and I'm sorry that we haven't got the Bill with it because I

MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . . think the Bill itself might explain a number of things that are rather vague in the paper itself - but as I see it and from the referendum that will take place, this will be the last vote that the people, the individual people in this province will have on education as such other than electing division trustees.

Up until now people, especially in rural Manitoba, wherever you had school districts could discuss education at their annual meetings and give advice to their trustee boards as to the policies that should be followed and what should take place in their own particular communities. Once this Bill goes into effect we will no longer have any more annual meetings; people will no longer have a say as they have at the present time. There will be no forum for discussion of this type.

Then too I find that there will be the elimination of money by-laws and here I think the NDP has given quite a few recommendations this year and I don't doubt that they will be embodied in the next year's policies of the government because this is what they've been doing for the last number of years. First - Bill 39, Bill No. 16, and now with the new proposal. It's exactly what they've advocated and certainly this matter of eliminating money by-law votes is one that they recommended. I think setting up a board as is visualized in the White Paper is fraught with danger and I think you've had examples in the Hospital Commission. We've had troubles brewing in that department and I hope we don't have the same thing happen in education.

Now further, through this proposal we will be killing the volunteer effort that we have had in the past in this province by people in society who have helped us and who have given a lot of their lives in service.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . making very broad statements that have got a very serious impact on a very important vote about to come. Answer one question. Does he feel that the eleven existing single district divisions, namely Winnipeg, has no School Board with any voluntary effort -- (Interjection) -- by the people and they'll continue to be so.

MR. FROESE: I didn't interrupt the Minister when he spoke and I hope that he will be kind enough not to interrupt me while I'm making mine. I will be happy to answer questions after I finish, because we don't have too many minutes left this afternoon.

I just wonder with the added responsibilities that division trustees will have to take on whether there will be increased indemnities for these people. Nothing is spelled out in the White Paper and surely I think as a matter of fact, that there should be increased indemnities paid for these people because I think that we will find it very hard to get the right people to do all the work that will be required of them if these new one district divisions come into force. There will be a lot of work involved in the change-over and in the administration, the responsibilities that they will have to take on, and I just wonder whether we will get the right people to do this because this will require so much effort and so much work on their part, and whether the people that have been doing it up until now will have the time and can spend the time for this purpose. I would like to know from the Minister some time during the discussions how many of the divisions have indicated that they will have an increase in the number of their particular division board and how many of them will have the maximum number of trustees that the Act allows for. I hope that we can get this information later on sometime.

Then in going through the paper I think a lot of the provisions that are there could have been given to the system that we presently have without the centralization. I don't believe in centralization to this point that we are going into in Manitoba under education. Certainly if the present schools that we have in rural Manitoba, the elementary schools, are to be retained, I don't see so much value in centralization, because if these schools that we presently have are to be retained then why not keep the people who are responsible at the present time. On the other hand, it will mean vast expenditures of money for elementary schools in this province.

I think it only proper that I bring out one particular matter that transpired at a meeting that was called for the purpose of giving information to trustees and teachers in our community. I attended that particular meeting and one official, I think it was a department official, made two sweeping statements which I felt were in my opinion highly inaccurate. These were to the effect that the referendum has nothing to do with deciding on closing small schools, and also, that the referendum has nothing to do for voting for or against the larger schools. These were the statements that were made, and as I already pointed out, I think they are highly inaccurate, because in my opinion this is the very essence of this referendum - of this centralization - that many of these smaller rural schools will be closed and that education will be

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . centralized. I think we have a very good example in Bill No. 16, because as I understand it, this is government policy. This is why we're going to have these large elementary schools, and in most cases not less than eight rooms - elementary schools - so that you will have one grade for each teacher. I have no quarrel against it if you have the population in a certain area, but certainly if you go out to a large area in order to get the enrollment for such a school, I do not approve of it.

MR. JOHNSON: Wasn't the honourable speaker at the Manitoba Association of School Trustees Convention when I spoke? Did he get a copy of my address?

MR. FROESE: I don't recall getting a copy of your address but I might have one.

MR. JOHNSON: Well I'll send you 25 copies and I would ask you to read it please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would be a convenient time, having regard to the hour, to move that the Committee rise.

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

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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