

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Monday, June 29, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information with regard to the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation:

(1) A breakdown of the basis of payment of commissions, per diem, and/or expenses of all types for Agents who sell Crop Insurance.

(a) at 31 March, 1969

(b) at present

(2) The same information as in No. 1 above for the Adjusters.

(3) A breakdown of the amount paid to each Agent who sold crop insurance in the fiscal year 1968-69 and 1969-1970 in commissions, expenses and other payments and the total amount paid.

(4) The same information as in No. (3) above for the Adjusters.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I don't believe there's any problem in accepting this Order, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure, but I would gather that because of the fact that there is federal involvement we may have to seek for permission but I'm not quite certain of that.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 94, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Bill No. 94. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when dealing with Bill 94 the Minister of Labour, who introduced it, indicated that it was a major improvement over past bills or past expropriation procedures, and I would agree that it is an improvement; there's no question about that. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we still have some distance to go in order to make expropriation procedures fair to both parties. It seems to me that even under this Act the advantage still lies with the expropriating authority rather than being equally distributed between the person who is being expropriated and the authority.

Dealing first with the question of the pre-hearing, it seems to me that it is not the pre-hearing or the pre-notice in the same terms as what had been discussed here previously in the House and what I believe should be done, and that is that prior to any kind of action of expropriation I believe that the expropriating authority ought to prove that it needs to expropriate. In other words, prove the case that they must proceed in the way in which they are proceeding and that the works that they have in mind are actually necessary. It seems to me that at the moment really all that happens under the present proposed Act is that there is a notice sent to the individual and he has an opportunity to appeal, but limited opportunity, and really that the expropriation has taken place, because what is going to happen, as I understand the bill, is that the notice will be filed with the Land Titles Office.

Now the moment that that notice is filed at the Land Titles Office that property is in effect frozen. There is then a notice on that title which will prevent the individual from moving that property to someone else. It is in effect frozen property and it could stay in that category for a very long time. Now I would prefer to see the expropriating authority indicate to the individual that it intends to expropriate, then have a hearing - with nothing placed on the title at that point - have a hearing to prove that the expropriating authority must in fact proceed in the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . way that it is.

It seems to me that the time allowed to the owner should be at least as long as the time given to the expropriating authority in every case, and as I read it now, Mr. Speaker, I think the expropriating authority has 120 days but I don't believe that the owner has the same length of time. Now if that is not correct then I would appreciate hearing from the Minister, but I think here again we should put the owner in at least as favourable a position as the expropriating authority itself.

Now when we come along to the procedure of someone who objects, Mr. Speaker, I think here again there should be some consideration of changes. As I understand it, the Land Titles Office would appoint an -- or rather the expropriating board would appoint an inquiry officer. This inquiry officer makes a report -- (Interjection) -- the A. G. 's Department. Now he makes a report which admittedly is binding on government -- that's good; it's not binding on the other individual which obviously is a fair system.

However, the report of the inquiry officer goes back to the confirming authority itself and this is the same body as the expropriating authority in the first place, because if you look at the Schedule in the Act I think it is clear that the confirming authority in every case is really the original expropriating body. In the case for example of the Metropolitan Corporation, it's the council. In the case of a school division, it's the school board. In the case of the Crown, it's the Minister. And so, Mr. Speaker, we find that really it's a report back to the same individual who has to make the final decision, and this is not fair to the person being expropriated. If we are going to have a proper impartial analysis, then obviously the report should go to another body who is not involved at all. All we're doing here is we're having a report go back in essence to the same individual or the same body that is proceeding with the expropriation in the first place.

It seems as well, Mr. Speaker, that we should put into the Act whatever interest rate we would like to see applied. As it stands now, it is a rate to be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. It seems to me this again gives the advantage to government, because whenever we put it in those terms the tendency is for the interest rate to lag behind what actual interest costs are. I would prefer to see us put directly into the Act the wording, for example, "at a rate equivalent to the latest short term borrowing of the provincial government" or "one-half of one percent above the current rate, current bank rate" or "at the current bank rate" or whatever terms we want, and I'm sure here that the A. G. 's Department could find some term that would be suitable. I don't think it should be simply left to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, because I suspect then that we would end up by having an interest rate which is very much lower than what is the going rate at that time, through very often no fault of the government but because it is simply impossible to keep up to date at times with the interest rates. It seems to me that this is unfair once again to the person being expropriated. There is no reason that monies owing to that person ought not to carry the current rate of interest.

It seems as well to me, Mr. Speaker, that the individual being expropriated, where there is considerable delay in payment or argument about the payment, should have the choice to either demand payment as a lump sum, or if it is over a period of time, then in a series of payments. Once again here, if there have been lengthy delays -- and we know of some, for example the Birds Hill expropriation where the time lag was very very long -- the interest factor can become a substantial amount and there's no reason that an individual again should be penalized by having to take that interest in a lump sum thereby making some -- it could be making some major changes in income tax coverage. Again, if it is not the owner's fault, the lengthy delay, there's no reason that those payments could not be spread over a period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the bill going to second reading; it is an improvement. I think further improvements could be made, and I think all the way through the principle that should guide us is to place the owner, the person being expropriated on at least an equal footing with the expropriating authority. In fact if we are going to lean in any direction, we should lean in favour of the owner because we have to recognize that by and large the owner does not have access to the same legal facilities as does the expropriating authority, that the costs to the owner are a much bigger factor than they are for the expropriating authority and we should in every case lean as far as we can to give the original owner every protection that we can, recognizing that it is the case of the state, in its various forms here as an expropriating body, the state that is taking action for the general good, but nevertheless one individual may suffer or a number of individuals and we should bend over backwards to protect them.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour and Minister of Government Services) (Transcona): If no one else wishes to speak on the expropriation bill I have one or two comments that I would make, and of course I would be closing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate very much the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has received the general support of the Assembly. The Official Opposition indicated their support of the bill going to second reading and I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose. It may be that we have a slightly different interpretation as to the effect of the pre-expropriation hearings. It's my understanding that unless a good and just reason for the expropriations are established, the expropriating authority may find themselves in a bit of a predicament if after an inquiry the independent appointee of the A. G. 's Department recommends against expropriation, I would suggest that the expropriating authority would be in a pretty precarious position. However as I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that it may be that I'm interpreting the Act slightly different than my honourable friend.

As far as the interest rate is concerned, I'm not just quite sure whether or not it should be as my honourable friend mentioned about interest rates being placed in the Act itself. When he first spoke of the question of interest rates I was mindful of a number of bills that have been amended from time to time because we did include a specific interest rate and the fluctuation that has been taking place. However, my honourable friend did mention that possibly it could be put in, instead of a precise interest rate to start with which would require change, it could be tied to some index or formula for change, and I certainly will have the people who assisted in the drafting of this Act take cognizance of the remarks of my honourable friend.

I agree with him that we should do all in our power to see that the party whose property is under expropriation gets a fair deal and that the expropriating authority is fair and reasonable. That should be the intent of the application of the Act and I think, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend would agree with me that that is really the reason, after many years of discussion, for most of the suggested changes within the Act.

So I want to assure my honourable friend and members of the House that when this bill goes to committee I will undertake to have the drafting personnel and those that are expertise in this particular field of endeavour present to answer any questions.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to introduce our guests in the gallery. We have 25 members of the Sidney 4-H Club from Sidney, Manitoba. This 4-H Club is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this morning.

GOVERNMENT BILLS (Cont'd)

MR. PAULLEY: Would you mind calling 134, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, Bill No. 134. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to keep my remarks relatively short at this stage of Bill 134 because I think I have a couple of times this session expressed my concern over the manner in which this bill was going to be presented to us, and the fact that it has come in this way hasn't changed my mind and I don't know that there is any point in me expressing myself all that strongly again. The fact that it had been the intention of the government last year to have had the Committee on Privileges and Elections sit and to consider the matters contained in this bill and other matters of the Election Act, would appear to indicate that they have made up their mind that they know best again and that they have considered the matter and that they believe that they have figured the be all and the end all of the matters that are in the Election Act at this stage.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Act, may I say I would suggest to the Attorney-General who has one other Act before the House in terms of the Local Government Election Act, that while the Election Act is open that we consider again the matter of eligibility to vote in terms of the Manitoba Election Act. During committee the other day I suggested that I thought it would be a good idea to have uniformity, where possible, in terms of those eligible to vote with the Government of Canada, the Local Government Election Act and The Provincial Act, and now that the Act is open and having noticed that the Government of Canada

(MR. WEIR cont'd) has within the last three or four days passed their Act, and with the Local Authorities Election Act before us in Committee of the Whole, I would suggest that we might very well have a look at it to see whether we can have it as uniform as possible in relation to the eligibility of voters voting in an election.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the main principle behind this bill, I think there's probably unanimity in the House. I think that the main principle behind the bill is an attempt at control of some kind or another in terms of election expenses, and I think that there's pretty well unanimity in the House in this matter. Whether or not the formula that has been devised is the right one or whether it's not, I'm sure can prove itself over a period of time and there may even be people that are in a position to make some suggestions in it. My concern is the variety of types of constituencies that we have in Manitoba. For instance in terms of my constituency, I think that the amount that is there would certainly be completely adequate in terms of the operation of an election campaign. I'm really only in a position to speak for the one type of an election because it's the only one I've had any experience in. -- (Interjection) -- I haven't tried River Heights and I haven't tried St. Johns, although it's an interesting thought - it's an interesting thought at some stage of the game that a fellow might just want to do that. Well, I might just want to do that. I also haven't tried Churchill or Rupertsland, I haven't tried any of the other types of constituencies that we have in the Province of Manitoba and certainly the means of getting around, the means of adequately carrying on an election campaign in the same way, in the same way as in the matter of adequately representing the constituency once you're elected, that there are some significant differences with the Province of Manitoba. But the principle that's behind the bill and that one I agree with wholeheartedly, is the matter of either using this formula or attempting to identify another one or something else.

The one matter that does concern me is the matter of the declaration of the sources of revenue, not so much by parties but insofar as individuals are concerned, for two reasons. One is I've been one who has believed that the elected representatives should not know from whence the source of running the operation of the party was concerned, that a variety of things can happen - and I'm not going to go into all of the details at this stage of the game in terms of the knowledge of elected people in knowing - but there's a principle I think even stronger than that that concerns me and that is one of the strongest rights that we've had as individuals - and we've got a Privacy Act before us at this session, we've got a Human Rights bill before us at this session - and one of the rights that people have had for a long time is the right not to disclose their political interest should they choose not to do so, and there is a principle contained within the bill that says that if you contribute to the extent of any more than \$100.00 you're in a position of - in essence, you're in a position of indicating your political interest unless you have done so in equal amounts or in greater amounts than \$100.00 to more than one political party, which I suppose you could declare your independence by making sure that your amounts were all the same to all political parties. But I see a difficulty in terms of this thing from a standpoint of the privacy that has been inherent in our political system throughout the ages.

So, Mr. Speaker, without going into any more detail at this stage of the game, I hope to have a look myself at the eligibility of voters of the Provincial Act before we get into committee and to have a better understanding of it. I hope to have an opportunity of giving some additional thought, more than I have had at the moment, to some of the clauses that are contained within the bill and I do establish now the concerns that I have and the reasons for them in terms of some of the sections of the bill, and we can probably have a little more freedom of discussion when we arrive at committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I think that Bill 134 is a measure that is very important and one that can be and will be supported by members on all sides of the House. I think really that it deals with a very broad principle, and that is the question of the importance of finances in the electoral process. I also think that this bill, although it is an important measure, only really scratches the surface and that there is a need in the future for more legislation and a greater examination of our whole political process, because I think that one has to ask oneself whether political democracy can actually function or be meaningful in a system whereby money plays such an important role, and in a system wherein there's practically a monopoly, or there is in fact a monopoly of the means of the mass media in our

(MR. DOERN cont'd) society by one or two major parties, and I speak in particular of the press which in Canada is predominantly Liberal, and secondly, I suppose Conservative; and also the importance of being able to purchase and consequently control, through the purchase of time, the radio and television media, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this poses very serious problems for the whole democratic process.

Bill 134 attempts to deal with the larger problem by limiting the expenditures of individuals and political parties, and this has been tried before in Canadian history and has in my judgment failed miserably. One only has to look at some of the classic scandals in Canadian history to realize that it is extremely difficult to enforce legislation along these lines. For example, some of the classic scandals in the 1890's in Quebec and the famous Beauharnais scandal of 1930 to '31 indicated very clearly that there was no relationship whatsoever between the expenditures that candidates declared and the candidates' actual expenditures.

The amounts of money that are spent in political campaigns are extremely unbalanced and are rising with each year. We only have to look at our neighbors to the south to realize that to be a serious contender for the Presidency one has to spend five or ten million dollars to get your campaign going; to run for the American Senate probably now runs in the hundreds of thousands, if not in the millions of dollars. One can look at some of the expenditures. I have a clipping for example from the 1966 federal election which dealt with the expenditures of people in the Province of Manitoba, and I think it's a well known fact - and I do not challenge the electoral expense claims of anybody that I refer to - but I think it's a well known fact that candidates have a tendency to underestimate their actual expenditures and that many of the expenses that are actually encountered and many of the funds that are actually raised are in some manner disguised or played down, because it is felt that it is

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if he's acquainted with the fact that it is not the candidate's responsibility insofar as his expenses are concerned, by law.

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry, I don't understand your question. Would you repeat it?

MR. BILTON: It is not the candidate's responsibility insofar as his expenses are concerned, by law at the moment, it's someone else.

MR. DOERN: You mean someone else raises his money and files his expense sheet.

MR. BILTON: You stated that the candidate -- you made reference to expenses and what the candidate might do and what he might not do.

MR. DOERN: Well, as an example, Mr. Speaker, in the 1966 election the range of expenses in Manitoba was rather striking.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Just on a point of clarification. Did the honourable member say the 1966 federal election? I wonder if he could tell me what date that election was held in 1966.

MR. DOERN: I have a clipping dated March 29, 1966. Perhaps that's '65. Is that right?

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't recall an election being held in 1966.

MR. DOERN: Right. Well this is my old clipping so it's obviously the '65 federal election. It's headlined: "Sherman is the Top Spender," and lists the expenses of the honourable member, some \$27,540, and the expenses range from that high of \$27,000 spent by the Conservative candidate in Winnipeg South to the Liberal candidate who spent some \$23,000, down to figures -- well, I see a small figure here of Portage-Neepawa of Charles R. Turner of \$24.96, and of course some candidates spent only in the thousand dollar range. Harry Shafransky, a candidate in St. Boniface, spent \$1,900 compared to 11,000 for one of his opponents and 12,000.

Mr. Speaker, to me, when one attempts to tackle the problem of election expenses, then to me it is only a partial measure to do so by controlling the maximum limits of expenditure. I believe that one has to approach the question differently, that is in some form of election subsidy for free time television or certain mailing privileges to attempt to equalize or underwrite some of the costs of these ever rising campaign expenses. I would like to in that regard quote from the recommendations, one of the recommendations of the report of the Committee on Election Expenses, a federal enquiry which I think was one of the best. Their second point bears this out. They have a list of recommendations. I won't read them but they are all in that line and the second point is as follows: "A degree of financial equality should be established among candidates and among political parties by the extension of certain services and

(MR. DOERN cont'd) subsidies to all who qualify."

I would like to give as an example the Quebec legislation, which I believe was enacted some four years ago, whereby they first of all limit the expenses of individual candidates to 60 cents a head on the first 10,000 voters, 50 cents a head on the second 10,000, and 40 cents a head on the number above that. And then, assuming that a degree of support is indicated in the election for those candidates, they are eligible for refunds of the order of 40 cents a head for the first 10,000, 30 cents a head for the next 10,000, and 20 cents above and beyond that. That of course is a subsidy from the public, and some members will say, well that costs money and this, that and the other, but I say that the present system is full of very serious inequities and that there is no escaping the responsibility on the part of the public, the individual, or anyone else in supporting the political process or the democratic system. It's for everyone's benefit, it is not for the sole benefit of the candidate or the political parties involved, and so consequently it seems to me an obligation on the part of the public to financially support the political parties.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length but I think that covers the main points that I wanted to speak on; namely, that Bill 134 is a useful measure - and I'm speaking only really of one particular portion of it - I think it's an essential measure but I believe that it only scratches the surface.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill going to committee. I think in general terms that I certainly support the principle behind the bill. I see some problems with some of the details in actual functioning but I think we could more appropriately discuss these at the committee stage.

The revelation of funds is one that has been discussed many times in this House and many times outside this House, because of the fear of people that political parties will be dominated by those who put up the money to conduct party affairs. Well I know for one, Mr. Speaker, having had the responsibility of leading a party for eight years, that that has never been the case during my term of responsibility, because at no time was I even aware what the source of money was. It was a clear-cut rule for me and for my predecessors, and as far as I know for my successors as well, that this money factor was completely divorced from the leader for the very reason that the leader does not want to be in any way either subject to influence or even supposed to be subject to influence by others. I can say quite honestly that at no time did anyone ever approach me on the basis that they would like my support for some measure or opposition to a measure because of any financial support. That has never been the case. Personally, I do not see the need for the rule and yet I know in the public mind there is a deep concern, so I'm prepared to support this because I think that in general terms it would put the public more at ease and assure them that what I believe does happen now is in fact the case.

I'd like to point out however, Mr. Speaker, that it has to be in that case complete disclosure, and here I fear the disclosures or the difficulty of disclosures of what we might term personnel. Now it's quite easy to say any money that is donated must be accounted for. That's easy to account. But what about staff that is supplied, Mr. Speaker? Here's where I think my honourable friends on the government side now have got a major responsibility, because as I recall it, it was quite common during election campaign for substantial staff to be supplied by some of the labour unions who are supporting my honourable friends, and where people came from outside the province to work here - and it's fair, I'm not saying it's not fair - all I'm saying it's got to be accounted for in exactly the same way, because otherwise, if you put on the one side monetary contributions must be reported but on the other side the staff contributions need not, then it is not fair.

The Bill does say revelation of every donation in kind and I presume that that means staff, but this is very much more difficult to account, very much more difficult to say that so and so is in fact being paid at this stage by a labour union, when he can say no I'm on holidays. My view of holidays is to spend them in Manitoba in election campaign; that's how I like to spend my holidays. Well then how does that then become accounted for?

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the bill, I think it's right, but I want to see, when we're talking about disclosure, that we have total disclosure, that all of the facts come out on both sides. Provided that we are insured that this is going to be done, then -- (Interjection) --yes, certainly. Your question?

MR. GREEN: The Member has raised an interesting question. I just want to know, because I'm interested, there are young people, let us say, who came from Toronto to help in

(MR. GREEN cont'd) somebody's campaign and some came from Newfoundland to help in my campaign, what would we do about that particular situation. These, I think that I can tell the honourable member these are legitimate people who wanted to come and work in the Manitoba campaign, as I want to inform him my son went to British Columbia and spent his holidays working for the Leader of the New Democratic -- and they lost - it didn't help them.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think that the question of the House Leader exemplifies the problem of disclosure and this is why I want us to be as fair as we can to everyone, all parties, independent - anyone who is in the political process and not to load the disclosure feature on the one side only. We might have then to say that a list of all people outside the province who have come to work during the course of the election campaign and their occupation outside the province ought to be revealed or something of the sort, otherwise, we are going to end up with a situation that people who might want to participate in the campaign but can't because of their occupation and participate by giving money are discriminated against those who can afford time and really it boils down to the same thing. So I support the bill; I would like to see us discuss in committee, the question of full disclosure of staff, personnel, as well as money, and see how we can put into the Act the provision which will ensure that we are being fair to everyone concerned.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to add to this bill as we deal with it this morning. I support the principle and the idea of the legislation. I think in some of the rural constituencies of the province it's been quite evident for a long time that we are always looking for ways and means to help us put our campaign on an equal level with that of an urban constituency, because it's quite evident when I come to an urban community when an election campaign is being held I see more signs in a square block than I see in my whole constituency. Of course, if you compare an urban -- (Interjection) -- No. If you compare an urban constituency with a constituency such as I have, which is 200 and some odd miles from my home to point B over in the other corner, and put posters of an urban nature in that, you wouldn't even find them, you know, it's so vast; or go a little farther and put them in Churchill constituency - you know, there's got to be I think a real serious look at this so that there is some equality of advertising.

The views of the Honourable Member for Elmwood were mentioning the press is biased, well he maybe didn't use the word "biased" they are slanted toward the other parties, other than his political. . . Well, that's maybe another problem then. It's very difficult to deal with it. I think maybe I could stand here this morning, Mr. Speaker, and say that I feel the press is against me, because they very seldom print anything that I say, but that's understandable Mr. Speaker, because how many newspapers would be sold in this town by a rural member saying something in an urban Metro community such as Winnipeg? You'd have to be an outstanding person to draw their attention and of course these are problems that we have every day but it's very difficult to deal with the press at a time of an election but no doubt, when we get to the committee stage, we will make a stab at it and I hope that we are guided accordingly.

There's several sections of the bill that I don't really understand too well. I think the names on the ballot section, I think the First Minister will possibly explain that to me, what he means in that section, name on the ballot, the occupation on the ballot. I wonder, you know, what kind of a ballot are we going to have if we put all these things down which basically I don't think has that much bearing on a candidate. I think the candidate himself and his efforts in his campaign and what the people think of him, not his occupation or his political party, is basically what counts, because I think historically across this great country many outstanding men are elected by being who they are, regardless of you know, they could support a political ideology or their occupation may be important but the fact that you put it down on paper, you think -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we are talking about the one bill here of human rights and we could get into a real jungle of discrimination or is it discrimination? So possibly the First Minister, when he does explain this section, will give us his views on it.

And the other sections, the Central Campaign committee and the Central Campaign Committee agent, the authorization of election material, those sections I certainly would like the First Minister to give me his views on it, or what his interpretation of this bill is. I am wondering how I could, if I happened to be on television, which happens very very seldom, but if I did get an invitation, say in Yorkton and there I was, how could I get authorization to say something when somebody else raised a point in the debate? Are you going to walk around with

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.). . . . a whole bunch of authorizations in your pockets as to what you can say and what you can't say? I exaggerated the point Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure the First Minister will explain what he has in mind in the section.

I also support the views of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose about the staff and the counting of people moving back and forth from one province to another in support of certain people or certain political groups; this will be I think one of the real challenges of the committee to try and come up with a fair solution so that we can - I have no quarrel with people coming in from outside jurisdictions and supporting the candidate of their choice or their political party of their choice but once we start documenting it and trying to keep everything as equal as we can, we are going to have to be very serious when we consider this matter in committee. The section, advertising without consent, I think and then certain disclosures, those sections in advertisement I would hope that the First Minister would let me have his views on those two sections. I just don't understand, I understand parts of it but I don't think I understand it in the same view as he does. I have no quarrel with the limitations sections of the bill, but I do items not considered as expenditures; I wonder again how we are going to document that control.

Churchill constituency again is an example of where air expenses, your chartered air expenses; Swan River is you know - a large constituency, so is Roblin constituency so he's going to have in Churchill certain rights for air transportation. I couldn't use air in my constituency because there isn't that many landing fields, but I've got a huge constituency so therefore if some constituency is going to be allowed \$500 for chartered aircraft, well, maybe mine's not quite as big as his but it's darn near or maybe half as big, so therefore I should think that the candidate in constituencies the same size as mine, he should be entitled to a percentage of that 500, even half but well I understand the idea of the section because candidtaes in the large - Rupertsland would be another one where it's such a vast area that the candidate has to cover but nevertheless there are others that, you know, it's just a little different, maybe half, not the same as an urban society where you could cover your whole constituency on foot in a matter of an hour possibly, so I think possibly the First Minister in his wisdom will explain what he means by that section, or possibly in the committee we can resolve that section of items not considered as expenditures. But with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill on second reading and look forward to the debate in committee.

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

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you go to Bill 119, please.

MR. BILTON: in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. Bill No. 119.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to make any lengthy comments on this bill. I would like to reminisce a bit however. I would like to suggest that at the last session or the first session of this government, the last session we had, I suggested in one speech that the teachers of Manitoba should be permitted to retire at an age earlier than 65 and without having a crippling decrease in their pension allowed to them, if they did retire before they reached 65. I'm glad to see that this bill, as I understand it, permits retirement with much less loss to the teacher who retires before the age of 65.

I would also like to suggest that there is another item in the bill which I find quite palatable and that is the section which deals with the calculation of benefit index. I am happy to see that we are getting to the stage now when we are relating things such as pensions to the cost of living. If I understand this section correctly, there is going to be a relationship between pensions allowable and changes in the consumer price index.

I do not wish to criticize this bill, I think that as a teacher it makes it very difficult of course for me to criticize the bill but as a Manitoban I also find it's a good piece of legislation. I must confess however, that I haven't studied it as thoroughly as I would have liked to and maybe I could have found something undesirable had I really looked for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'll add my comments at this time with respect to Bill No. 119 and in general this has been discussed on either the Minister's estimates or the Throne Speech debate, at which time I indicated then that we endorsed the move which would allow teachers to retire, at an age earlier than 65 without the severe penalty which they have had to take and in fact this legislation, I guess was probably underway prior to the change

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.). . . . in the government a year ago and as a matter of fact, I was hopeful a year ago that we may be able to introduce this so certainly in general terms we support it. We seem to get reminded across the way if there has been any legislation in the works, and I would suggest that this one was in the works for some time. The problem always was, when you ran into the internal politics of the situation, was how you were able to negotiate it for the teachers and not for the civil service. I trust that the government has been able to work its way around this.

The one aspect of the bill that concerns me that I would hope that we might be able to look at further is with the cut-off date, the effective date being the 30th of June, 1970, the government is going to have conditions where a person with relatively little seniority and in terms of years of experience and at a date considerably less than 65, will be drawing a larger pension than someone who unfortunately retired last year. I was wondering if there is any sliding scale that can be worked out that would ameliorate any of these difficult situations because I am sure that the Minister or staff are well aware of particular cases in the last year or so where people have had to, by virtue of the rapid changes in education, found it necessary to get out of the system and are going to be suffering a considerable penalty relative to a person who falls under this June 30, 1970 date. What I'm suggesting is that the Minister attempt to work out some sort of a sliding scale that would work away from this very large change that occurs June 30, 1970 and perhaps phase it over a 2 or 3 or 4 year period or perhaps more, whatever appears to be justified and make some slight changes so that there is a break-in period because I think he is going to run across innumerable cases, where someone is being penalized by the precipice that occurs June 30, 1970 and I am sure that there are probably examples where this has been done.

The other question that I wanted to direct to him was the impact of this on the Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund and whether steps have been taken to bolster the fund in light of these changes with the knowledge that even prior to bringing in changes such as this, the fund was in need of some changes on the recommendation of the actuarial people at least, who were calculating interest at a rate which was quite low, something around 3 or 4 or 5 percent and indicated that the fund needed more capitalization. -- (Interjection) -- Is it 6 1/2 now? Perhaps the Minister could indicate whether sufficient changes have been made to satisfy the actuaries on this because I am sure that the added drain on the fund, as a result of this change, will cause even more concern to them. So with those two basic points, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to endorse the principle of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, if I may introduce our guests in the gallery, 75 Grade 4 students of Beaumont School under the direction of Mrs. Vargo, Mrs. Winning and Mrs. Grice. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this morning.

GOVERNMENT BILLS (cont'd.)

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few remarks to the bill because I have been asking some questions of the Minister the past while due to certain problems that have been drawn to my attention by teachers in the constituency who have found that their positions are not as secure as they were twelve months ago and now find that their qualifications are maybe not to the standard that the department or the Board may wish. In other words there are possibly others with better qualifications and this is, of course, one of the challenges of life. It doesn't matter, I suppose, what our occupation would be, we all have somebody possibly that has more skill, more talent, and of course it's teachers who have, over the years, given a great deal of talent and service to the teaching profession and find that one in particular - two years to go for her pension and she finds now that her services are no longer required, I'm told. So this bill, I think I do, I support it, I'm well aware of the fact that it is a draft bill within the hands of the former Minister for some time and while I don't fully understand it completely, I haven't - no time to look at it during the weekend - but this is a step in the right direction - is that what the Minister of Agriculture said with regard to the Operation UPLIFT?

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.). . . . The only thing, I hope it's not the negative approach that we had to that problem. But it allows teachers to retire voluntarily and I think in the committee, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister could get word to some of those that are directly involved so we could hear the views of the teachers with respect to this bill. I again would support the views of the Member from Riel with regard to that sub-section (1) where June 30th, 1970 we may in committee have to possibly take a look at that section maybe; that deadline might be too soon and possibly we should review the fact of whether a later date might be better, but with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill and hope in committee that some of the teachers will be there with us and explain their views with regard to this, especially some of those that are in the period today where they find they're having a difficult time to hold their position or maybe have had notice that their contracts will be terminated as of June 30th. With those few remarks I support the second reading.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise and not to oppose the bill. However, I have not perused all the various sections of the bill so whatever approval I give is a qualified one so that I may raise issues when we get to committee stage. Certainly I approve of retiring the teachers at an earlier age and not have the severe penalties that were in the Act before. I certainly subscribe to that. I do hope that it will not take too many teachers out of the profession unnecessarily, especially the good ones that we have and I know we have many good teachers in Manitoba in our schools at the present time and certainly I would not want to deny them the right to retire at an earlier age as will be allowed under this Act with a much lesser penalty.

I have not checked the Public Accounts as to the accounts (A) and the other accounts as to just what the position is. Maybe the Minister could tell us what effect this will have on the Pension Fund and whether at some future date the levies might have to be increased. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything further to say at this time. I think the other matters have been covered by the previous speakers so I will let things rest at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member of Youth and Education will be closing debate?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, answering the Member from Rhineland, he need not fear good teachers leaving the profession unless they so desire to. This is permissive legislation and certainly teachers who are enjoying their work, who are well up on the system where they want to stay in the system, the school board wants them, there's no compulsion to retire at all. This simply makes it possible for teachers who feel that they aren't doing justice to the job and who feel they want to retire, to retire more gracefully and with greater ability to continue to exist than they have up till now.

The effects on the Pension Fund which was mentioned by a couple of members - this will not be a further drain on the Fund as pointed out by the Member from Riel. There will be an input of money by the province into the Fund to assure that the unfunded liability doesn't grow beyond what it is today. I think this is what the Member for Riel was trying to ascertain. So these are worked out actuarially and I don't claim to be an expert on these things; I simply accept the figures that are given to me and they say it requires an input of money to sustain the fund at the present level and that's what exactly will be done. So the Member from Rhineland needn't worry that the Fund getting in a worse position.

I'm not quite sure I follow the Member from Roblin when he talks about certain positions of some of the teachers who are being threatened and I really can't see how they're being threatened because of this particular bill. This is a bill dealing with retirement; it has nothing to do with teachers whose contracts are not being renewed or anything of that nature. I don't know what he has in mind. This is a bill dealing with the pensions, it's the end of the TRAF Act and unless he has a particular group of teachers that he's concerned about or he's heard from, I wish he would talk to me personally about it. So far as the views of teachers at committee, I can only tell them that the Manitoba Teachers' Society is aware of this bill; they have been consulted all along as we worked on it; they certainly don't oppose it. I'm sure they would rather we went even farther, as a matter of fact, but they certainly don't oppose it. Whether they will appear at Law Amendments on this bill I don't know, except perhaps to suggest that maybe it should go beyond what it is today. But by and large the MTS is not going to be there to speak against the bill. So again I'd like to offer to the Member for Roblin the suggestion that if he has the particular group of teachers, one or two teachers who have a particular problem, to see me

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . personally rather than to try to find out about them through this bill because I don't think this Pensions Act is going to answer his questions at all. So with those few remarks I hope it goes to committee and we'll have the answers there.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): May I direct a question to the Minister of Education? Will there be people from the Pension Fund at the committee hearing so that we can ask actuarial questions of them?

MR. MILLER: They will be, Mr. Speaker. I'll arrange to have the -- not the entire staff but the expert staff at the hearings.

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

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

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot said, Sir, on Bill 17 and I do not intend to take up too much time on this bill. Bill 17 has been described by members of our caucus as one that shows what the present government is trying to do and I would like to say that in this fashion that Bill 17, if the government pursues what Bill 17 says and uses it the way they have given intention or the way they say they intend to use it, it will cost the taxpayers of Manitoba more money than they'll ever realize.

Now Bill 17, the Honourable Minister of Industry got up the last time it was spoken of and read a section off in The Development Fund Act that was put in by us. Nobody disagrees with that, Sir, it's there basically to be used if and when anybody else, private industry will not come in and do the job. So we can't say that it's not there and the present government agreed, that if that clause being there when the Development Fund was passed, but here's what you're going to be up against, Sir. If the government spends all kinds of money developing in the north and as the First Minister said there may be somebody who makes the find that hasn't got the money to develop it, fine, I agree, develop it but loan him the money. Don't go into it for an equity reason because here's what happens. You will have your money tied up in a project up north. You will spend all kinds of money up there. And it costs a lot of money to develop resources; it costs a lot of money to do everything that it says you can do in Bill 17, winning, etc. It won't return any profit for a while, Mr. Speaker, it can't and basically you never do have a profit until everything's paid for but you can pay so much per year. I'm not that foolish to say that you don't have a profit, you can pay so much per year but you don't own it until you've paid off the debt it takes to build it. So therefore the people of Manitoba will have money tied up in a resource development up north and then when you want to really have another one you find that you should go into another resource development, where do you get the money then? You don't tie up \$50 million, \$40 million, \$70 million for so very long and you don't get it back, you sure as heck don't have it sitting around, it's all tied up and you have to turn around, you have to tax the people again to keep going into government resources, government industry.

The other thing that happens, Mr. Speaker, is every time the government decides by Bill 17 or any other way to take an equity as we have seen in companies at the present time, and, heavens, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is one that should be trying to protect the business people that are in this area now and stop them from going, should be in a real battle with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or the First Minister or any of the Ministers who want to do anything like Bill 17 to scare private industry out of the province, as I say should be fighting with them about it. But he stands up and he is beating his chest like the great ape or something of this nature and he's saying they're lining up, they're lining up, Sir, he says practically to come in and have the government participate in our business. That's another thing that's going to cost. It's going to cost the taxpayer of Manitoba to the advantage of the businessmen like you've never seen before. The businessmen in this area, when they take a look at this kind of a situation and I don't bet that they're not lining up, there's no doubt in my mind that any man who wants to have 25 or 35 percent investment by the government and doesn't have to pay back interest because it's equity, it's not a loan and the only way he pays you any money, Mr. Speaker, is if you make a profit, and what businesses make a profit the first few years who take loans of let's say up to \$2 million because they're usually readjusting factory-wise, machinery-wise, etc., what business is going to be paying any interest and I doubt very much if we'll see any profit for the first couple of years. You know I have met these people and they're walking around smiling so I say there's no doubt in my mind that there's a line-up at the Minister of

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.). . . . Industry and Commerce's office. In fact, I think the businessmen will probably outsmart our Minister of Industry and Commerce all the way along the way in this respect.

MR. GREEN: They sure outsmarted you people.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh. Let me tell you. The Honourable Minister says they outsmarted us. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, fine. CFI. Harry or if the honourable member-- CFI, let's talk CFI, let's talk anything but let's talk loans. I'm really sorry the Honourable Attorney-General isn't here at the present time. He's had eight years of the best experience in loaning money that anybody ever had, called the Revolving Fund of the City of St. James-Assiniboia which loans money to the people because it was accumulated, the people pay it back over 10 years' period but they pay interest. Now I say to the honourable member, Sir, if he has \$3,000 sitting in the bank and I say could I please borrow it and he said, well I'm not using it, you can have it but at least pay me what it's earning, I'd be very surprised if anybody wouldn't say that if they were going to loan. Banks do it and everything else.

So we're talking loan and when the building of CFI you're speaking of is finished and it's on stream, it's paying back a loan, whether the private industry make the profit or not, and it's paying back interest. So let's not talk about any examples, let's talk loan versus equity and what it costs the people of Manitoba.

Certainly if the bill - the Honourable Minister of Finance said, well he didn't know whether we needed it and the Minister of Industry and Commerce read off things that they can do now, take it out, and design it the way it was originally designed for Moose Lake or forestry in general; up to \$150,000 was what was originally planned or -- when I say originally planned, it never even got to any other caucus, but here when we get to the government, the NDP Government at the present time, they present Bill 17 in a form that makes them next to God, without coming back to this Legislature. And I say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amount of money it takes to develop an area like Northern Manitoba is not available from the people of Manitoba without taxing them to the point that they just can't stay here.

Anybody that knows anything about Northern Manitoba at all knows that it's not unlike a little bit of the Belgian Congo. It's probably one of the toughest countries in the world with lakes, rivers, streams, trees, forests, swamps and everything else, and there's resources up there by the carload. It's the future of our province, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if private industry isn't allowed to go in and help develop, we won't have the money to do it. You'll tax the people -- and when I say private industry isn't allowed, Mr. Speaker, I qualify it by saying private industry will not go in and compete with businesses that are owned and operated by the government. The tax structure is against them and everything is all wrong.

Again, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, you will not have enough money to develop in the north your resources the way that you say you're going to do it under Bill 17. You will not be able to continue to buy equities in companies the way that has been shown at the present time, and you can do it under Bill 17 really as long as it's a product that has any relation to a resource in Manitoba. You will not be able to do all of these things unless you tax the people more money, and, Mr. Speaker, you will not be able to have private industry come in and work with you.

You are taking, you are taking the interest on the people's money and not returning it. The people of Manitoba deserve to have interest paid on all monies which are loaned or put out in any way, shape or form. If you loan money to private industry you receive interest. The minute the government goes into it there is no interest. The minute you start buying equity there's no interest and there's no guarantee of profit, and the government has no right to take anybody's money in this province and gamble. And that's what you're doing, you're gambling more than a bank does when they make a loan. You're gambling with the people's money of Manitoba and you have no right to do it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, they don't have any right to do it and I suggest that the government take a very close look at this because you'll be in deep so fast up to your knees you won't know whether you're coming or going, and the only people that are going to sink with you, with this type of attitude, are the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): Would the member permit a question? Would you have given your Cabinet the same advice if and when they would have brought in the same bill?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The only way I can answer that, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- No, I'd like to answer it. I would give anybody that advice any time, anywhere, any place,

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) because of my knowledge of what can happen and my experience with revolving funds in the city I've been in.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I take it I'll be closing debate, yes.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want the honourable member to know that we will not be voting for an adjournment on this this afternoon. Bill No. 25 -- Excuse me, Bill No. 130.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 130. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the main provision of Bill 130 is to remove the requirement for the signature of a land owner to be on the plan of subdivision which may include his land or part of his land. I understand that the main requirement for this is that a plan of subdivision can be drawn up and get to the stage of going to the municipal board. I understand that beyond that a hearing would be called in which any individual affected would have the opportunity to make representation so that the plan of subdivision could go to this stage without asking for a signature.

There appears to be some advantages in this arrangement, although at this stage I personally don't know whether there would be reticence on the part of legal people who may have been involved in many of these cases on behalf of individuals. But in the event that such a reservation does exist, I trust that it will come out at the committee stage, and therefore at the second reading of this bill it appears appropriate for this to now go to that committee stage. Thank you.

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

MR. FROESE: Again I haven't been able to check out the various bills or the Acts concerned. Am I to understand that this bill applies in regard to town planning and that where any land in rural areas is subdivided this will -- does this Act apply? I would like to know that, because if it does then I'd certainly object to what is being considered in the bill.

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

MR. FROESE: . . . these bills on second reading without the Ministers being present. I don't think it's quite fair because questions have been asked I know on other bills and no answers are forthcoming because the Ministers concerned are not in their seats, and I certainly want to register my protest on this matter.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order in the honourable gentleman's remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill 43, I have a very few brief remarks to make. In general, the dissatisfaction on our side of the House with Bill 43 has been expressed. I can say quite frankly that the vast majority of the legislation that has been presented by the government has been legislation which has found endorsement here, but Bill 43 is not one that has won its way to the appreciation of members on this side of the House.

The particular reason I think that it has not found endorsement here is that quite a number on this side of the House now do have experience on government side and we see some practical reservations about the provision of legislative assistants for Ministers. Quite frankly, from a practical point of view of the requirements of the Minister, I think there are some pretty distinct advantages to him in having assistants which he may draw for particular reasons from various sectors, but to say that these assistants should be drawn from the political side is a claim that I think is very seriously open to question. And personally having had some recent experience in a Minister's office, I can't see any particular advantage to the operation of a department in having two political people in each of the departments.

Now I can understand in the federal scene where you are serving 20 times the number of people as we are in Manitoba and having a much larger sized department, a much larger size Cabinet and a much larger size of caucus, where some requirements may be fulfilled by the appointment of Members of Parliament as House secretaries or whatever the term is that is

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.). . . . applied to them. But in this particular case where we find a government of 28 members which the present government is, or 29, and where 22 of these will be filling responsibility other than their legislative responsibility in fulfilling the role of government, it can't help but open up the question as to whether perhaps this is not too much and that we should perhaps get back to the original function of a member of the Legislature which is to serve the people of his constituency as far as possible and to bring himself up to date on the many issues which face not only his constituency but also his province, but to narrow him off into one particular aspect of government interest, whether it's the Water Commission or Telephone Board or Hydro board or one of the three or four legislative assistants which service one particular department, seems to be in serious question.

As a matter of fact, if the members are short on income and this is a way of providing supplementary income to MLA indemnities, then the logical question is what about the other members of the House who number 28. They have no supplementary income serving any particular requirement of government. If in fact the problem is that the income at \$7,200 per member is too low for him to exist on and he has no other income to supplement that, then there should be a review of MLA indemnities across the board and then the MLA's can fulfill their full and meaningful role of representing their constituents and of keeping themselves well-briefed on the many issues, not particular issues of one department but of the many issues across the entire spectrum of government.

To single out a proportion such as this, which is going to mean that 70 percent of those on the government side are going to be accommodated with supplementary income, I think, Mr. Speaker, has just gone probably too far and perhaps the government should even review whether there should be members of the Legislature on the existing boards such as the telephone and hydro and so on which was established by the previous government. If it's a problem of MLA indemnities, change the indemnities but don't expand the role of the elected member into the administration of government.

This is the basic point that we've been trying to make on this side, that if you have to do some more patchwork to keep individuals satisfied from a monetary point of view, which certainly must be one of the motivations for this move, then you should look at the entire Legislative Assembly. Personally, I can say without any concern for the political repercussions that I don't think members of the Legislature are paid sufficiently. I think that they should be paid more. I think their role, as I have found it, is one that should be pretty well a full time role if they're going to do their job adequately, and I would not attempt to embarrass the government if they were to bring in a measure that would increase the indemnity to the members of the Legislature, because at \$7,200, if a member of the Legislature is to attempt to fulfill his role adequately, he does have expenses that a normal household doesn't have. The indemnity is in fact considerably less than that, and the way it's split up at \$4,800 is a pretty fair assessment of what his income would be compared to a normal household, and this of course does not allow him to adequately do his job in the community that he lives in and in the areas in which he has to operate and the people he has to deal with on behalf of his constituents.

So I would suggest that rather than the provisions of this bill, the government have a look at the MLA indemnities and the real responsibilities of a person elected to this Legislature.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks that I'd like to put into the record with regard to Bill 43. I find it very difficult to understand why the First Minister would bring this very controversial bill in in the dying days of what is already a very long session of the Legislature, a session whereby most MLA's could be out doing their thing with the Centennial projects that are going on in the province. I find myself not in support of this type of legislation. I also wonder maybe the First Minister could explain to the House why Bill 43 sat on the Order Paper for the many weeks, in fact maybe months it sat on the Order Paper and wasn't introduced into the House until, as I say, the dying days of this session, because I think the people of Manitoba should have an opportunity to take a good hard look at this bill and possibly give us their views.

I meet it in some aspects with the mixed feelings that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface met it. While he may have been in the confessional booth there when he was putting his remarks across to the House the other day, he said in fact that he wouldn't vote for this bill which I find very interesting, because I find, especially this morning when we were dealing with Bill 134 there where we're trying to control the elections of this province and get everything

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.). . . . documented and down in black and white, and here we are in Bill 43 giving the First Minister and the treasury extra wide powers which could be political.

It's very hard to resolve in this bill what these executive assistants will be doing. Are they going to be spending the extra time at the expense of the taxpayers being political or are they going to try and improve Manitoba and some of the difficult problems that we have, and in closing the debate the First Minister will possibly lay down hard and cold what are these executive assistants going to be doing if we grant them the powers that are in this bill.

I support the views of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose with regard to this bill in many ways, Mr. Speaker, because we have today thirteen members of the Cabinet and four who are on boards and commissions, and then the Speaker is involving the Deputy Speaker, so anyway the formula that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose brought to the attention of the House the other day, we already have 22 out of 28 members on the government bench who are getting remuneration in some form or other above their regular indemnity.

So I would think that rather than move into this position where government could in fact pretty well control their whole back bench by swearing in the executive assistants - I don't know if there would be an oath - I'm wondering possibly if the First Minister will be giving some ideas of what these executive assistants will -- the rules they'll have to live by, but I would think that we should be very careful with this type of legislation.

Governments today I think have more control than the average citizen wishes them to have. We hear complaints almost daily of government overpowering the average citizen in many ways while we are trying to control it by legislation, but to grant more powers to governments by Bill 43, I think the Manitoba citizen should be brought into it some place, into the committee or we should be given his views rather than have this bill come in so late. I would even submit, Mr. Speaker, that I would be prepared to go around and hold regional meetings in my constituency with the First Minister or some of the members of the treasury bench and let the people of Manitoba give us some views on this matter at this time. If it's going to cost us more money, the taxpayers, I think they should be given a chance to express their views on it and possibly regional meetings between now and the next session would be a simple way of us finding a solution so that we'd come in here, not with a political ideology but rather with the hard cold facts of what the people of Manitoba would want.

So I don't personally think that it's necessary at this time in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, as I read the bill, that the First Minister is asking for the keys to the treasury to supplement the indemnity of some of his backbenchers who, like me, possibly are finding that a session as long as this one is very expensive. You live in Winnipeg five days a week and pay your expenses, pay the expenses for the people at home who are looking after your business, which I'm one of those who must do that, you find that you are overly taxed financially to represent your constituency, and if in fact the First Minister wanted to study that aspect of the problems that MLA's have in this province, I think it would be a much more sensible one than just looking after those on his own bench. I think that there are other MLA's that maybe should be considered as well as his own. I think the Member for Churchill, the Member for Flin Flon, the Member for The Pas and the Member for Rupertsland, they already get \$1,500 additional indemnity over and above what the rest of the rural members get, and if this is something that we want to study, I'm all for it and would support the First Minister with a study of that nature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the powers that are being asked in this bill are far too wide and it seems to me Section 17 covers the waterfront. The government may have the right idea. I think this matter does need study, I don't think there's any quarrel with that, but for the First Minister to, you know, suggest that four more on the back bench should be given the duties of legislative assistants at this time is possibly just not the right time. I know the government is always looking for more power or more ways to pat those on the back that sit on the back benches of government. I sat there for some time and was grouching from time to time because I couldn't take part in the debates, that the treasury benches are supposed to guide the legislation and that, so basically it's rather an inactive life. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I was quite active on private members' days if the Honourable Member from Transcona will remember, but nevertheless we had the calibre of men on the front bench who could pilot the legislation through without a backbencher like me getting up to give them a hand.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . previous First Minister, the Honourable Dufferin Roblin, just saying like -- going like this to some of the backbenchers.

MR. MCKENZIE: He was the First Minister and his job was to run the province the best way he could with the support of the back bench. Well, we did have our views in caucus and we let him know in no uncertain way how we felt, but nevertheless when we left the caucus room there we were, that was our position and that position we followed in the House, which is much different, Mr. Speaker, from the government that we have today, for we find -- likely the ones that are going to be selected as these executive assistants who stand up and read written questions to their Minister and their Minister already has the answer in his hand. I'm sure they're really jockeying for these positions over there, and there is only one that I know -- (Interjection) -- actually the only one that has actually stuck his neck out and said he's going to be one is the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He's in, he says, he's not even going to vote, so possibly the other three will let us have their views, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- I would like to be one, but I doubt very much if the First Minister would consider me due to my political background. Well, it's possible that I wouldn't read good enough, Mr. Speaker, that would be one of the problems, or maybe -- in my days on the back bench I asked my questions of the treasury bench in caucus, I never asked them in the House. I think that was a privilege that I had. Nevertheless, we're getting off the track with regard to this Bill 43, Mr. Speaker.

So with those few remarks, I'm most concerned that this bill is before us in the dying days of the session. It's a very controversial bill as far as I am concerned and I can't see how I can possibly support it. I think we are giving powers much too wide to the First Minister. The one section, as I say, covers the waterfront, and until we get more information as to who these executives shall be, what is going to be their powers, are they going to be sworn in the same as the treasury bench or are they going to be access to the Cabinet material and all the various things that goes with this, Mr. Speaker, I just can't possibly support it in second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I thought about this bill for some time and, unlike the Member for Roblin, I'm not worried about covering the waterfront; I'm worried about covering the financial front. The waterfront looks after itself most of the time.

Quite frankly, I believe I approached both Premier Roblin and Premier Weir at the time that I was in the Conservative government. I have spoken to, I believe it was Premier Schreyer, that I felt that there should be some thought given to executive assistants -- and I don't believe I used the word executive assistants, I believe I used the word assistants to the Ministers that did have heavy loads or two or three departments to cover. At the time I had always felt that the members within the city itself were the probable ones that could better fill positions as assistants to the Ministers.

I don't know what my reaction was at that time, or my thoughts were at that time as to whether they should be paid or not. I believe that probably if I'd been asked, which I wasn't, I would have said that maybe they should have some remuneration for this, but there was in fact real reason I believe, and I believe that the Ministers in the Conservative Party who were in government at that time realized that they could have used assistants in many ways. I believe that the assistants should come from the backbenchers who are outside the realm of this building and who get, if I can say it now, the grass roots feeling of the people, because I've always felt that when MLA's become Ministers of the Crown they do get too close to their desks, too close to being executives, which in all probability they never were before in all their life, they find that their work crowds in on them, they tell me they work long hours; but what bothers me most of all is that they're insulated and isolated from the feelings of people. They know what goes on within their party, they hear representations from people that are within their particular party, but by and large they can find that the isolation between themselves and the man on the street, it isolates them further, I suppose, the longer they stay in office, and this of course if because they become more involved in their executive work.

I had hoped through the years that there would be some hope that executive assistants could stop this erosion between the government and the people within the state which they govern, and I think that probably the best and surest direction will come from MLA's that first of all have to be voted into office. They're the ones that have more of a political touch and a feeling as to what the people want because they're not civil servants who are sure of their job for the rest of their life but they're ones whose job depends upon their ability to do what the people want them to do, and I think that this is what the government is for because we're working for the people, whether we are on the government side or whether we are in opposition.

I can clearly recall attending one of Saskatchewan's sittings, and if I was not mistaken

(MR. BEARD cont'd.). . . . their assistants - I think they called them secretaries or whatever it may be - moved down with the Minister during his estimates and that there were two of them then available, one to look through the big book and one to give the answers. If one couldn't give the answer the other did. This was in committee. As I watched, it seemed to work very good. Somebody had the answer most of the time and the opposition seemed to be satisfied with it.

Now if you extended this one bit further, you would find that the Minister then had the option of either being a politician one day or an executive. If he had somebody that knew as much about the department as he did, then he can either carry on the executive work or else go out into the field and find out what the people want, and I think that really we in opposition look to government to make sure that they are doing what the people want, and I think that when we're here to try and put forth the case as we see it in respect to what would be best for the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I see really nothing wrong with assistants to Ministers. I recognize the fact that in minority governments you would possibly end up with a job for every backbencher, but it will encourage the backbenchers I suppose to do their homework a little better and I suppose that would be the ultimate for any backbencher in any government, to be more a part of government, because I know, as well as the Member for Roblin knows, the frustrations of sitting in a government caucus and discussing the things and coming out of it as a team, but you're hurting inside because you had to put that front forward, or your best step forward and say we feel that this is the best for Manitoba when deep down inside you had opposite feelings in respect to those things that the Cabinet were bringing forward.

I think that it would help offset the strength of Cabinet coming into a caucus, and when they come into a caucus if they come in in strength saying this is what we feel is right, then they control caucus very closely, if not in numbers, in facts that they bring forward to caucus, and quite often I think you find that opposition members who do their homework know more about a bill than caucus members do when it comes to the floor, and that is where you find the frustrations of being a backbencher and not being really knowledgeable of what is going on in government. If the government and their caucus come closer together maybe we'll get better government. I think, as the rest of the members of opposition, that the ability of government to use this bill to pay people and pay people's expenses is something that is very new and it is a departure which we should look closely at.

But once again I don't really see in the bill where it says that they must use government members, and it may be that if we lobby enough on it then the First Minister may feel that he should choose some opposition members when he starts some of these committees and boards and such on that we're all so fearful that are going to come about all of a sudden. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not preaching for a cause for myself. But I don't think that necessarily this is all evil and all bad. I think that each of us recognize the fact, either as government or opposition, that we are not really enthusiastic about bringing before the public the fact that we too want more money, and I don't believe that this is the reason why this bill was brought to this House.

But the fact is, I think, that it would give government the opportunity that if in fact there were cases where government had to use MLA's, that they would have the right to pay them and to pay their expenses. I would just take for one example, going back to the Northern Task Force, where many of the members pointed out that while our expenses were paid, in many cases we were working three days for one day's pay, and I suppose this is what we knew before we were appointed to the board, but when it doesn't involve travelling time and there is discrepancy, then I suppose the government in their wisdom could in fact use this bill to fill in those gaps which they found they have overlooked from time to time.

I don't expect, or I wouldn't hope that this government, any more than a Liberal government or a Conservative government, would take advantage of this type of bill to feed back to the members that amount of money that would be necessary to make up the difference between what a politician receives and what he feels he should get. I think a politician is appointed mostly to those boards and commissions, and as Ministers, as the First Minister feels his ability to fill those positions. I think that there is a case to be put for this.

I think that if the government is going to go ahead with this then we, as opposition should be saying to them, then for goodness' sakes for the health of the government and the help of our conscience in opposition, that the expenses and the payments, salaries, etc., that arise

(MR. BEARD cont'd.). . . . out of this each year be set forth in committee and shown how that money is spent, because if we're on a committee individually then we have to put an expense account in for each committee we're on and each day that we're on that committee. I don't think it would hurt any MLA that is appointed to a committee to go ahead and make this expense account out as they have in the past - and admittedly I say this with tongue in cheek - the Assistant Clerk looked at me because I'm one of the worst at putting in my account, but it was probably just my conscience that was bothering me. I think that if they are going to get that extra money, if they are going to spend it, then why not use it in this manner in which all can see where this supposed hidden payoff is going to be used and then we can tell and we can tell the public how we feel that it's being misused. Of course if government do not feel that they are misusing it then they shouldn't be afraid to show us how all these monies are being spent.

By and large I support the principles behind it. I say I have supported them for many years in respect to assistants to some of the Ministers, not necessarily all of them, but some of them have required assistance and if they are not going to get it this way they are going to get it through having their option to have political appointees. They can have deputies, assistant deputies, etc., and this is of the civil service type and these again are people that are locked in within this building and within the bureaucratic type of thinking that goes on. While we all must recognize there are two types of thought, one is how it should be done in here and what the people want, and I think first of all that we as politicians should be finding out what the people want and then coming back to the people in this building and saying well this is what the people want; now you find a way to do it; and with this bill, just perhaps this may bring government a little closer to the people if the government choose to use the powers in the bill properly. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it may surprise some of you that I do not share the same alarm as others over the legislative assistants. However, I did make suggestions earlier in the session that I felt there are some departments that are heavier than others, and one department in particular, the Department of Health and Social Development, I felt was far too large for one man to handle and I made the suggestion that we should maybe have two Ministers. In answer to that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Social Development objected quite strongly - he felt the two phases in that department were closely integrated and in some ways I'm inclined to agree with him. Maybe if this particular department is not split into two then I see some justification for additional help for the Minister in that particular field. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that help should be in the form of a legislative assistant or whether it should be probably an assistant minister, who would be working 12 months of the year 364 days of the year, I'd give him Christmas Day off, because the amount of work that is in that particular department now, and the way this government is proceeding, the economic conditions that are worsening in this province, I can see in the field of social development or social relief, an insurmountable burden being placed on the shoulders of the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about this at this time, and I think the Member for Churchill had a very valid point when he said that the back bencher is the voice of the grass roots. I don't know if the Ministers in this Cabinet are aware of the situation that exists in many constituencies at the present time, as compared to a year ago. I have letters, I'm constantly receiving letters from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would say that over 50 percent of those letters are pleas for some form of social assistance, whether it be through old age assistance, disability pension, or through the social assistance field. Mr. Speaker, this concerns me, so in this one particular field if the Cabinet in its wisdom feel that this department should not be split, and if they are not willing to appoint an assistant Minister of Health and Social Development, then I think there is nothing wrong with the appointment of a Legislative Assistant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if they do use the form of a legislative assistant as recommended in this bill, I would presume by the inference in some of the clauses that this Legislative Assistant would still be operating on a 12 month basis. I draw that conclusion from the one section where it mentions time and manner of payment, where they say that the payment would be on a pro rata basis. But here, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that perhaps the First Minister has not considered the whole question of payment of members in a complete program, because I

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . would ask the First Minister if Legislative Assistants and Cabinet Minister are paid on a pro rata basis, why not other members of the Chamber? Why not other members of the Chamber? I don't know whether the First Minister has considered this possibility or not, but I think it's a justified one. I know as a farmer, my income is not a monthly income from the farm, the major portion of my income is on an irregular basis; my payments as an MLA are on an irregular basis and this places me on an irregular status with my banker. I think there is some cause for the consideration of a pro rata system of payment for members and I would urge the First Minister to consider that quite seriously.

But, Mr. Speaker this brings up another point - and maybe the First Minister should not be considering this. Somehow, Mr. Speaker, I question whether it should be the responsibility of the First Minister, the Executive Council or even this Chamber, to consider the pay that members of this Legislature should receive. I am one who subscribes to the theory that it should be an impartial body outside of this Chamber and if the First Minister is willing to consider that proposal I have heard him state on other occasions where he is quite favourable to that suggestion; and if this is the case, Mr. Speaker I wonder why this bill is brought in at this time.

I firmly believe that the question of remuneration for members of the Legislative Assembly should be the responsibility of a judicial body or somebody that is removed from the field of political influence, somebody that will deal with the question on the merits of the position of a member, taking into consideration the amount of work that a member does in this Chamber, the amount of work that a member does outside of this Chamber and the responsibilities of that member to the people that elect him. I think due consideration should be paid to the expenses that that member incurs or the expenses incurred by that member in his activities in this House and outside this House. I know it would be difficult to assess the position that occurs with some members living in their own home twelve months of the year and other members who have to forsake their own home and live in hotel rooms, the relative distance from their place of residence. Mr. Speaker, I for one would not want to discuss this question in this Chamber or indeed in a committee because I don't think that my opinion could help but be prejudiced in some way or another; so I would urge the First Minister to consider this seriously and I would sincerely hope that the First Minister would withdraw this bill and set up a committee as quickly as possible to study the whole problem.

However, if that is not the case, there are some particular items in this bill that do concern me. There's the question of expenses, the manner in which they are going to be treated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Provincial Auditor. There's a question here in the wording which says "reasonable expenses". Now Mr. Speaker, if the expenses of one member on the government side might be considered reasonable by the Lieutenant Governor in Council but the identical expenses of a member of the opposition could conceivably be considered unreasonable. I would sincerely hope that such would never happen but it's quite possible, and if they are going to consider the expenses of a member I think that they should be spelled out clearly in the Act, so that every member of this Chamber would know what expenses are claimable and those that are not.

I think that the First Minister should think seriously about this and if a committee could be established outside of this House - and this I think Mr. Speaker is the most important point - that it be a committee outside of the House that considers the whole question. I have considerable misgivings about some of the sections. However, I hope in committee that some of these particular questions can be discussed in detail. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Bill No. 111. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I did check the bill and although I wasn't quite finished however, I will proceed with some of the remarks and some of the questions that entered my mind in going over the bill. The first one is on Page - Oh, we're not allowed to refer to sections but there's a question that I will raise if not now later on, in connection with group foster homes.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

Then too, in treatment without consent, I rather question the advisability of not informing or giving notice, even if it were not consent, to the parent or guardian where a serious situation arises. Treatment could mean an amputation of a leg or some other thing and certainly it would be my opinion that in such cases the parent or guardian, at least the parent should be given notice even though the consent would be taken away but I think notice should be given so that in this respect I think an amendment during the committee stage would certainly be in order. At least that would be my firm opinion on that particular matter.

I don't know how to proceed on the bill without referring to some of the sections in the bill because the provisions therein in some of the sections certainly, are subject to question as far as I'm concerned. The matter of reimbursing the agency in cases where a child is returned to the parent or guardian, under this bill there is a provision that the cost within have to be paid by the parent or guardian for bringing up the child thus far and what is the basis as far as cost is concerned? I would like to have some idea what is the cost to bring up a child in these institutions. What a bill for, let's say three or four years, a child being in institution going back to the parents - what would the parent have to pay? I certainly would be interested to know just by passing some of these provisions, what the responsibility will be as far as repayment, and will this be able to be done on time? Will this mean an outright payment? I don't think there is any provision there for continued payment or adjusting payments. Certainly I would like to hear from the Minister on that score.

We are also deleting or taking away the determination of the court to determine religious faith and here I still feel that -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? It's in a separate bill? Well maybe the Minister can give me an explanation on this point so that I needn't go into this. Certainly I will not do so on the understanding that we will have a further explanation on this.

Apparently there is provision here for agreements to be made which will terminate after a twelve-month period and a further extension can be made or another further agreement for six months and so on. These may be quite in order. I would like to hear from the Minister the experience in such cases. No doubt a number of the children have been placed in foster homes. I think in recent years that a number of the children that were held in Portage have been placed in homes in southern Manitoba and some of these as a result have been attending some of the schools out there and certainly I would appreciate hearing from him on this point as well. Reports will have to be made to the director. Then there is also the daily rates under section 19.1(8), if he could give me further information on that provision I'd be very happy to hear from him on that one, so that we need not necessarily do this to all of it in committee.

The matter of setting up a Review Board I think is a good one. I do hope that when this Board is set up that we have lady member representation on it because I feel this is very important. I would hope that these people would be chosen with great care and that we have people on that Board who are considerate in making the various decisions because I feel that it is going to be a very important Board and they will have to make very important decisions which will have, no doubt, lasting effects on many of the children that will go through their hands. While I do not object to the legislation in principle, I do hope that great care will be taken and that proper decisions will be made. Mr. Speaker, after hearing from the Minister in closing the debate, I may raise some further points when we get to the committee stage. Thank you.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 25, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Bill No. 25. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in the bringing in of The Contagious and Infectious Diseases Act. At the outset, I would like to say that this is a bill I think that is of importance to the farmers who are in the production of livestock in the Province of Manitoba. On looking over this bill, and I note in the few comments that the Minister had to make in introduction of second reading where he indicates that the industry are concerned and interested in the bill that is before us, I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the industry are aware of the nature of the bill. One of the things that I notice in the bill itself is that while the diseases, the infectious diseases that we have in animals is a very important one

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.). . . . to the farmers or the production of cattle, it also creates a real burden in some cases to these farmers. When the government, if they're going to bring in legislation to take control of these contagious diseases, I note that the municipalities can pass a by-law whereby they can make compensation to the farmer who may be unfortunate in having his cattle affected. I'm not so sure that this is the best thing. I think that if the Provincial Government are taking upon themselves this responsibility, I believe that they should take also the responsibility of making compensation to the farmers if they are hit by these contagious diseases and infectious diseases.

The other thing that I'm concerned about - and it's going to be spelled out as I understand in the regulations and is also very important - and I want to say to the Minister that I am wondering what are the contagious and infectious diseases that he may have in mind. I would like to just quote briefly of one example, if I may Mr. Speaker, where I am familiar with a disease they call rabies, rabies that cattle that are affected by and it has caused some very serious concern to some farmers. This bill, if it becomes law, gives the powers to quarantine say, livestock and if I may use to illustrate an example where a farmer may have a number of livestock, he could have hogs in the same area, hogs that might be ready for market and the cattle beasts could be infected with rabies. If the inspector comes along and says these animals have to be quarantined and these hogs might be ready for market, they may have to be quarantined for a month and this could be a real serious financial burden on that individual farmer. Also in the bill it states that inspectors could be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and I'm wondering whether these could be individuals who are familiar with the diseases. I just want to say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that we have agriculture representatives I think that could be of assistance in this area to the veterinarians who are established throughout the Province of Manitoba. I think when we get to this bill in committee that there'll be a number of questions on these areas that I would like to question on the Minister. The definition as it refers to in the beginning of the bill and certain areas, other sections of the Act I think Mr. Speaker, could be clarified.

I am wondering also when he states that the industry is concerned about this - and I agree in this respect - but I am wondering if they are aware of all aspects of this bill. When I think particularly of the costs that it may be to the municipalities, I'm also wondering are they aware of this bill, the municipalities throughout the province, because many of them have informed me that the costs that they are now having to bear is becoming so burdensome that I believe that if it was known to them that they would have to share this cost, it could become quite unbearable. And so Mr. Speaker, with these reservations in mind, I certainly want to see this bill go before committee where we can question it further as to how these various Acts are going to be operated. Mr. Speaker, with these few words I commend the bill at this time.

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

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to both the Member for Morris last week and the Member for Rock Lake today, questions being put, concerns being expressed about some of the powers of the Act and indeed in the regulations. I simply want to say that the key word with respect to the powers given to municipalities insofar as compensating people for loss of animals as a result of the application of this legislation is the word "may". Now I would assume the natural course of action that will take place, if we in fact enter into a problem in a given area or situation, is that the municipal people may be approached by the farmer or farmers concerned with respect to their disease problems. They will likely be asked for compensation if their animals are going to be destroyed and that subsequently if you notice in the bill, Mr. Speaker, there is also provision for compensation or grants to municipalities and districts on the part of the province, so that the natural thing would be that if the municipality, after it was satisfied that it had a situation that warranted government financing, would approach the government of Manitoba, the Minister, to either reimburse or to get concurrence before they decided they want to pass any by-law to accommodate that kind of a situation. In essence it provides for a great deal of discussion, flexibility and liaison with the local authorities throughout the province. It isn't intended to impose, as the bill points out quite clearly, that municipalities must do this; it's only where they feel that there is some legitimate claim that as far as they are concerned they are prepared to recommend further and it really becomes a grant from the province in the end, if it is decided it should be done. I agree there is a bit of discretionary power here.

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)

I trust that any Minister would be most cautious in the application of the bill but in essence I also have to point out that it is a responsibility to quite a significant degree on the part of the producer to make sure that his facilities are disease-free and indeed that he is not contributing to the problems of his neighbour or his community. I think there is some onus on the individual to carry out practices which prevent diseases in animals, so to that extent I don't accept the fact that it is entirely a provincial responsibility.

Where there is a massive problem in a large area I think that the logical way of handling that would be for direct provincial action to try and control the disease that sets in, but where it is in small individual cases I don't know that it is going to require the application of government services or financing. Each problem will have to be decided on its own merits and for that reason the word "may" is very important in the Act.

I think it's important to recognize that no one should intentionally, after they have discovered that they have a disease problem, should neglect that problem and indeed should be allowed to further contaminate the community through the lack of application of proper clinical procedures and so forth.

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

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill 122, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. Bill 122. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 122, the Personal Investigations Act I think is a good one. Certainly it has merits that legislation be brought in to regulate investigations that are and have been made over the many years. However, I think we have to be very careful too, in what we put into the legislation. I certainly would like to see under the definitions, defining "code" because in the report it is referred to codes and abbreviations that might exist on the various reports and if not properly explained, it is not quite fair, in my opinion, and this certainly refers to the disclosure to subject of personal files. In regard to the disclosure, we find that the request has to be made and then there is provision for witnesses to be present. Am I to understand because of this that files or copies of reports will not be given to a person who wants a disclosure if it's on himself?

I don't know; the Minister is not present again. I don't know whether I'll get a reply before we close the debate on this and Hansards are slow in coming out. I don't really see the purpose of us speaking on some of these bills because the last Hansard we have is from Thursday and certainly before these bills are finished on second reading today, and the Ministers are not present, they don't know what questions we are raising. Therefore I doubt whether there is any purpose in us even discussing some of the bills here today as we are doing.

I would certainly like to know whether the person requesting disclosure of a certain report will get that report because under a certain provision in this Act, you can have a witness and you can make notes. This, in my opinion, seems to be that if a person wants to know the contents of a report, he will have to go in accord with the different sections under 4(4). It has to be strictly during business hours and so on and I am rather worried on this point. Does it mean that he will be allowed to review the report only and that he will not get a copy? Then too, in my opinion the damage can be done already as far as this person is concerned. The person in question can add an additional report of his own and this report has to go out but in my opinion, the damage is done and will have been done in many cases so that there is probably very little point in trying to dispute a certain report that has gone out. I think we should look at these provisions very, very carefully so that people will not be hurt as a result of the legislation that we are passing here.

These are two of the more important points of the bill that I question. I do not want to oppose the bill at this particular time, because I feel that some regulations should be brought in so that reports of this type can be made and be distributed and yet kept confidential as far as the party on whom you're reporting is concerned. Therefore I certainly am for disclosure but I certainly will have further questions to put to the Minister in committee, since he is not present here today.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, 121.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. Bill No. 121. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, rather than having it stand, I won't call it at this moment. Call 127, I'm sorry. I didn't notice that the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. Bill No. 127. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got any remarks in particular with regard to this bill. I did some research in my constituency on the weekend and while opinions are divided regarding the drinking age, there is no quarrel with the age of majority in other fields. There are some concerns in respect to the lowering of the drinking age to 18. Some of the problems that we face in Roblin constituency are basically the ones where Saskatchewan today - 19 years of age is the legal age for drinking there and of course, we have all the young Manitobans who can enjoy that privilege, going into Saskatchewan. There's no problem with that but we would then in Manitoba be in a position where we could accommodate those of 18 in Saskatchewan who can't enjoy that privilege in their province, so in committee no doubt we can discuss this, Mr. Speaker, and possibly resolve what's best for Manitoba and I am sure possibly Saskatchewan. With those few remarks I look forward to seeing the bill in committee, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FROESE: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 121, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. Bill No. 121. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On perusing this bill, I find that really there is nothing in here, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't already covered by other Acts. However, there is something that does concern me, Mr. Speaker, and this is a second part to the bill and this is the establishment of a Human Rights Commission. Under the establishment of a Human Rights Commission, the Lieutenant Governor in Council has the authority to constitute a Human Rights Commission. We don't know how many members will be on that commission; we don't know who the chairman will be; we don't know what the qualifications of the men who hold positions on this will be; in fact they tell us very little about this Human Rights Commission. Yet Mr. Speaker, the whole point that the First Minister made in his speech was that he was going to establish a Human Rights Commission, but we don't know the membership, the number of members, the amount of pay they will receive, or anything about that commission.

It does state in here the responsibilities, the functions but there is one thing when it starts dealing with complaints, it says that the Commission itself may inquire, without any complaint, without any registered protest by anyone, they can inquire on their own into any phase of the Human Rights field that they desire or they can act on written complaint but they don't need it; they can inquire themselves. But after they have done all this work Mr. Speaker, there is one little thing that to me is almost amusing. It says that the Minister on the recommendation of the commission, may issue whatever order he deems necessary - the Minister may issue any order he deems necessary. Mr. Speaker, if we have a commission, here we have the Minister with the power to do anything he wants, whether there's a commission there or not, so that I question the validity of the commission or the validity of the establishment of the commission if the Minister is going to do it anyway. He doesn't have to abide by the recommendations of the commission, he can do whatever he wants so I don't see that the establishment of a commission is going to serve any useful purpose if the Minister is going to be allowed to overrule it if he wants or ignore it, or act without the consent of the commission. When this bill comes to committee I am sure that there will be many more questions asked but at the present time I have some grave reservations about this particular bill.

We had legislation that covered every phase that is covered in this bill under The Fair Accommodations Practices Act and The Fair Employment Practices Act. However, both these are now going to be repealed and we are going to have the commission set up without any final powers but entirely at the discretion of the Minister. With these few words Mr. Speaker, I'll await the passing of this bill to committee stage, where we can have greater discussion on the clauses of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKENZIE: . . . I would like to draw to the attention of the First Minister with regard to this bill. Human Rights, of course, is a real concern to many, many people at all times and we are tackling a very difficult problem or difficult thing to put down in black and white. Where does your human rights start and where does it stop? I was thinking the other day of one whereby I would like to put an ad in the newspaper that I need somebody of a Metis or Indian background to work with me in my constituency. Now that would be discrimination, wouldn't it? So that as I say that's only one of the many, many problems.

The one section that I would like to draw the attention is 10 (2), the form of complaint. I would think in there in committee that the Minister, the First Minister could maybe give the MLA's a chance to get a copy of that written complaint that would go to the commission. There's another form of discrimination, why should the commission get a copy of the complaint when the MLA's couldn't have it, or the Minister. If in fact, that could be added in that section I think it would be helpful, so that we would get some wider views on the complaint so that when it was registered to the commission a copy of it could be mailed to the MLA from whose constituency the complaint was lodged. Maybe the First Minister could give us some views on that in committee.

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

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

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

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 132, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Bill No. 132. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence to have this matter stand. I'm not quite prepared yet. (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 137, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 137. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 137, an Act to amend The Milk Control Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there are two points that are important as far as the bill is concerned, one has to do with the question of giving additional powers to the Milk Control Board. At the present time the Milk Control Board does not have sufficient authority to give them the necessary powers to ascertain all the statistics in terms of the movement of milk products within the province. They cannot determine quite precisely enough the volume of milk that is moving into different channels and this has a significant bearing insofar as the price, for example, that is paid to milk producers depending upon where that milk is shipped or for what purpose it is used. It is our feeling that this is something that should have been in the Act a long time ago. It's not that revolutionary that I don't think we will have any opposition to it. At least I would be surprised if there was. It's a matter of getting more accurate statistics insofar as the fluid milk and the manufactured milk is concerned, the volumes going in each direction. As you know there are two different prices on each category and without having the power to find out the actual volume going in each of those two areas it is very difficult to determine the effectiveness of the Milk Control Board insofar as producers are concerned. This is something that has been asked for for some time and I feel that it should be a right of the producers to know just precisely where they stand in this regard.

The other aspect of it has to do with inspection. The government has been looking at ways and means of consolidating the inspection services under one authority. As you know right now there are three or four different agencies that are involved in milk inspection. The City of Winnipeg is involved, the Department of Health is involved, the Agriculture Department is involved. What we are trying to do here is to bring it under one roof. Now it may not be that it will come under Agriculture but if it does - after studies which we are undertaking at the moment provide some recommendations - it may be that the powers will be needed under The Milk Control Act to give the Milk Control Board these essential powers. Now it could be that this may not happen, that the Department of Health may assume all the responsibilities for milk inspection, but all this is giving us permissive legislation so that in the event that it's decided that the Milk Control Board should be the authority, that we will consolidate all our inspection under that authority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I had been looking at the bill just prior to the time it was called and I was attempting to relate it to The Milk Control Act to determine just what the purpose of the amendments were. I was unable to find them. It didn't seem to me as though the amendments were that significant but sometimes when you're looking through a bill the significance escapes you at first glance. I rather think that the intention of the legislation, as outlined by the Minister, is desirable; whether it will be achieved or not is something that will have to be seen. The additional powers that the Minister is taking, as he explains, is intended to give the Milk Control Board greater authority in accumulating data and statistics vital to the dairy industry, and I rather would think that this is a desirable feature.

One of the great difficulties in the dairy industry is that it is a complex of industries within one industry and up till this point it's been very difficult and I think perhaps one of the great problems within the dairy industry has been the inability of the various segments of that industry to work together to have five or so component parts: the fluid milk industry, the concentrated milk industry, the cheese manufacturing and those that manufacture cream or butter. On no occasion that I know of have the various component parts of that industry been able to agree on anything, and what might be good in the way of legislation for one group has always been to the disadvantage of another. As a consequence it has been extremely difficult to effect any measure of control and any measure of benefit to the industry as a whole, and I'm inclined to the view that I doubt very much if there's going to be any rational policy that can be developed unless the industry themselves decide that they're going to work as an industry rather than separate parts going all different directions. I'm not sure that the same thing applies in the Province of Manitoba but I do know that in the eastern provinces of Ontario and Quebec in particular, where the dairy industry is the major industry in that area, they have little, if any, control over their own industry. Each time there is legislation contemplated there are five different briefs submitted from five different parts of the industry all asking for different things. It's created a situation where rather than effecting the control themselves, the distributors or the processing part of the industry has managed to exercise almost complete domination over the dairy industry, and much to the detriment of the dairy farmer himself.

One case in point is the question of surpluses where the processing industry, because of the nature of the contracts that are let out to dairy farmers, have been able to - almost at will - determine what size of the surpluses, the surplus quotas that will be delivered by any one of the particular farmers. When the processing industry has the authority to determine what a quota will be and what percentage of that quota will be surplus milk as opposed to fluid milk, you arrive at a situation where a farmer has no control over the decisions that he must make on his own to determine the operations of his own farm. In many cases the surplus that was asked for by the processors ranged in the nature of something like 40 percent of the total quota for which the farmer receives somewhat less than half the price under the contract, an abominable situation, and one that created most of the difficulty that we experienced during the years there were such great butter surpluses, that the industry were simply taking that milk at half price, processing it by churning it and then making butter which went into government storage for which the taxpayers of this country paid. It'll only be when the dairy industry themselves recognize and realize how important it is that they unite as an industry and pool their milk if they are going to be able to effect any control over the quotas that are going to be given to the processors and to the ultimate users of fluid milk. The health regulations now are such that whether a farmer produces for the concentrated or the fluid milk industry is of little consequence. In most cases the health regulations are almost the same and I have never been able to quite understand why a farmer producing for a -- oh, I see it's 12:30, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the honourable member may be able to continue with his debate at a subsequent sitting. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: ... make it as of that motion. It is the intention of the government that Public Utilities Committee will sit at 8:00 o'clock this evening and I would take it that the honourable members would prefer that the House not sit at the same time which would mean that we would have an afternoon sitting but no evening sitting and 8:00 o'clock with the Public Utilities Committee.

June 29, 1970

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the House Leader ... about the plans for tomorrow. There are many of us who would like to make alternate plans. If the Public Utilities Committee are going to be sitting, then many of us would like to do something than just sit around here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to tomorrow, my impression is that there will be a regular day with the possibility of a slightly abbreviated afternoon. The evening would be free because of other commitments and we may close earlier by a half hour at most in the afternoon but otherwise it will be a regular day of House sittings.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.