

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 5, 1967

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster) in the absence of the Member for Elmwood, introduced Bill No. 106, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2).

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is here now and I think he wanted this Bill to stand in his name, and with leave of the House can it stand in his name rather than in mine?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may, was introducing it on behalf of the Member for Elmwood at that particular time.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood) introduced Bill No. 107, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 103, an Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I wonder if I might direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where on my right we have 100 Grade 8 standing students from the St. Joseph's Academy. They are under the direction of Mrs. Desaulniers, Miss Keelan and Miss Labelle. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

On my left we have 30 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing, from the Kleefeld School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Verne Hildebrand and Mr. Ben Klassen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon. On behalf of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Committee of the Whole House.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, QC (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Resolution which is on the Order Paper and standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House. Committee proceed.

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act by providing, among other matters,

(a) for the payment of benefits to the spouse or estate of a person who dies after he has reached the age of sixty years and who has fifteen years of service;

(b) for the retirement of a person from the civil service on full pension at the age of sixty-five years; and

(c) for the retirement of a person on an actuarially reduced pension at any time after he has reached the age of fifty-five years and has fifteen years of service; which may require additional payments to be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. McLEAN: This matter comes in by resolution because, to the extent that the proposed changes in the Civil Service Superannuation Act are acted upon by members of the staff, it will require expenditures of money from the Consolidated Fund under the arrangements under which this fund operates, and I will be prepared on second reading to give a full explanation of the three proposals which are set forth in this resolution.

It would not be possible to tell to any exact figure of the amount of money that might be required in any particular year for the purpose of these changes, because of course it is not

(MR. McLEAN cont'd).... possible to forecast the number of persons who might be able to and who might, in fact, take advantage of the provisions. The important part of the matter will be the explanation of the changes in the Act itself which will come, as I have said, on second reading.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, on item (c) for the retirement of a person on an actuarially reduced pension at any time after he has reached the age of fifty-five years; could this be used to forcibly retire someone?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, no, this would be a matter which is voluntary on the part of the employee only.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two at this time in connection with the proposed resolution, and I appreciate very very much that it is just a question of an introduction of the resolution because of the fact that it requires additional payments to be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund, but the question of pensions is one that has received some consideration by members of the House, and some of the propositions that the Minister has suggested will be contained in the Bill that will of course follow the Resolution, are appreciated and will be well received. However, as is well known, that when the Bill is before us it is rather a bill of a nature that is self contained or only refers to certain aspects, in accordance with the resolution.

Now for instance, on item No. (a), it is that the payment of benefits to the spouse or estate of a person who dies after he has reached the age of 65 and has 15 years of service. I have had a considerable number of widows of pensioners appeal to me to have consideration given to extensions of their pensions, or continuations of the pensions of their late husbands beyond their demise, at least to 50 percent of the pension that the former employee was receiving. I would like to ask my honourable friend whether this actually means that insofar as (a) is concerned; for instance, supposing a former member of the Civil Service was on pension with a 10-year guaranteed pension, and that ten years had expired of the guaranteed period and the civil servant had become deceased, under (a) will the pension then be carried on, continued on to the widow of the deceased?

And then -- I can understand (b). It seems to me -- the retirement of a person from the Civil Service on full pension at the age of 65 years of age -- it seems, if I understand correctly, Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the present Superannuation Fund regulations that a person must elect for a guaranteed pension on the basis of the last ten years. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister has considered or will be considering an option clause in the legislation that will be introduced so that the civil servant retiring on pension at age 65 may be able to elect to take the greater amount of a ten or a five year basis on which the pension is computed, because we are all aware of the fact that within the last five years, although not to the degree that should have been, nonetheless salaries of the Civil Service have increased somewhat, and if it's only on the last ten years, as I understand the legislation is at the present time, that the pension is arrived at, I would suggest that if the legislation hasn't been printed in accordance with (b) that the Minister consider changing the period of time in which the amount arrived at will be decided upon to give the option of five or ten years in the Pension scheme.

Then insofar as (c) is concerned, an actuarially reduced pension at the time the person has reached the age of 55 years and has 15 years of service, I imagine this would deal with a person who may, because of physical disability or something else along that line, is forced into retirement at the age of 55 or it might be somewhat along the line of the suggested pension for MLAs based on a certain age and reduced pension.

I would also like to know from my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary what consideration, if any, has he given -- and I think this is proper for me to raise this at this particular time, Mr. Chairman -- to the question of portability of pensions. This matter has been to the fore in this House on a number of occasions, and if I recall correctly, the former Provincial Secretary, now the Chairman of the Centennial Committee, did give an undertaking to me on this matter a year or so ago that it was under active consideration of the government and in due course possible changes may be made insofar as portability of pensions may be concerned. I would like to know from my honourable friend whether the Bill will, among the other matters to be considered in the Resolution, take care of the question of portability.

So I would like to know these few answers. Possibly the Minister is not fully aware at the present time of the significance of the questions and may say await the Bill. I would like again, Mr. Chairman, to have the answers that I have posed to my honourable friend the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... Provincial Secretary. I would like to know whether the widows of pensioners who are now widows of pensioners recently deceased, will be able to have their pensions continued as the result of the legislation introduced by my honourable friend as well. I appreciate the full consideration of the proposals will have to await the Bill but I think the questions that I raised at this particular time are worthy of answer of my honourable friend the Minister, or the Provincial Secretary.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I just have a few comments. I notice that this resolution will upgrade the pension or have the pension started at an earlier age. I also notice that there is a resolution on the Order Paper coming up under the Minister of Education on Friday next where you have a similar situation prevailing and that you also will be upgrading those. Are the upgradings that are taking place identical in these two bills, and also how does the Federal Government's pension plan compare with ours? Is this bringing it in line with the Federal Parliament and other legislatures in this country? I think this would be of interest to know.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, dealing first with the points raised by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and referring particularly to clause (a) in the resolution, I would point out that this is not retroactive in nature and would have no bearing with respect to widows of deceased employees who may be presently receiving pensions. This would only be applicable, it only has relevance in relation to future deaths of persons employed whose widows might be entitled to a pension under the circumstances briefly set out in this resolution. So that the quick answer, the clear answer is that it has no bearing with respect to persons who are presently widows and who may be in receipt of pension under the plan.

With respect to clause (b), this has no bearing on the question of whether it's the best of five years or ten years or any -- there is no change involved here and obviously no option available. This refers to simply a reduction in the retirement age from 65 1/2, as it is at the present time, to 65, and it goes no further than that. But associated with that, the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked a question about portability. That is a matter which is in the hands of my colleague the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and it is a matter which has the concern and the interest of the government and under which certain plans and proposals are underway, but insofar as portability is concerned I do not have in my capacity as Provincial Secretary, nor is there anything in this bill that deals with the subject of portability.

With respect to the questions asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Social Credit Party, I think that I could say that the provisions here are similar, as will be indicated when you have the bills before you, with the Teachers Retirement Allowances Fund. Now it's not absolutely identical but it's as close as reasonably can be the case, and I'm not qualified really to express any opinion about the comparisons with the Federal Government Pension Plan but I would be of the opinion that by and large the general provisions of the pension arrangements as they apply to provincial employees are those that apply in the case of the federal employees, except that - I'm touching on the question raised by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party - I believe their period of calculation is shorter than that which is applicable under the Manitoba plan at the present time.

MR. FROESE: One further question. Is provision made in the estimates to take care of these increases?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, ... one point that the Honourable the Provincial Secretary that disturbs me, with reference to the portability of pensions. My honourable friend the Provincial Secretary indicated the question of portability was in the hands - if I heard him right - of the Provincial Treasurer. Now is this a departure? Because as far as I'm aware insofar as superannuation funds and the civil service, it's been solely in the hands of the Provincial Secretary in the past. Now it's hard enough, may I respectfully suggest, for one to extract from one Minister how a particular fund operates without having to go through two of the honourable gentlemen, and it's my impression that the questions of superannuation and pensions in other jurisdictions are carried through by the Provincial Secretaries or their like functions. Now maybe my two honourable friends there can point out the error of my thinking but this has been the way I understood it in the past, and when I raised the question of portability I'm sure it was the previous Provincial Secretary, when he sat in the seat now occupied by the Member for Morris, gave me the assurance of the consideration of the portability of pensions, and not the Honourable the First Minister in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I

(MR. EVANS cont'd)..... could answer. My honourable friend will remember I introduced the measure into the House at the beginning of this session with respect to portability of pensions. I then subsequently, with the Leader of the House, withdrew the measure, and then on subsequent occasions I have answered questions for my honourable friend about the subject of portability of pensions. I tell him now it is my subject and I am preparing to bring forward a measure which I don't believe will be in time for this session.

MR. PAULLEY: Does not my honourable friend agree with me that when he considered these matters it was in his former capacity as Provincial Secretary, because my honourable friend at the time he referred to, Mr. Chairman, was not Provincial Treasurer. He has only recently, as far as I am aware, donned the mantle of the custodian of the Treasury in Manitoba after the Honourable the First Minister abdicated that position.

MR. EVANS: Well, it was during the current session that I did so and in my capacity as Treasurer.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to check with the Minister on a matter that's been brought to my attention by some of the retired people who are presently receiving pensions, and I recognize the difficulty for the Minister in this regard but also the difficulty for the people who are on the pension - that is, people who previously were employed by the department or by any of the utilities and receiving a pension based on the income that they then received and finding themselves in a very difficult position, largely as a result of the increase in the cost of living. Now I prefaced my comments by saying I recognize the difficulty, but is there any consideration being given to this matter of people who are presently on pension, and has the Minister received any representations in this regard; is he likely to be considering some amendments?

MR. PAULLEY: On this very point, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Leader of the Liberal Party is raising it now; that makes two of us on this side. I raised the question to the Honourable the Minister on asking for an Order for Return the other day, and I'm sure that I join in the interest of the Leader of the Opposition in this very point, and possibly at this stage the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer or the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, whoever is in charge now with pensions, might be in a position to answer.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the matter which is raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party. It's a problem -- it is a matter which has many attendant problems and all I can say is that we are aware of the problem. I wouldn't say that I personally have received any particular representations but nonetheless I'm aware of the matter because of course it's frequently raised in this House, and to that extent it is a matter that is before us for consideration, but no part of this bill deals with that particular matter. And I can't sit down, Mr. Chairman, without thanking the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party for the confidence which he has expressed in me with regard to portability, but it has always been the responsibility of the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I don't care who takes the accolades for looking after this, but for goodness' sake will whoever is responsible for bringing about some measure of portability in pensions, for goodness' sake get off of their rear ends and get to work. It's been too long "under active consideration."

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'll do it with my top end.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Minister a couple of questions so far as (b) of the resolution is concerned. Is it the plan that this retirement at this age will be compulsory? In other words, does it take the place of the present retirement age that is compulsory except in cases that are specially dealt with by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? And what is the corresponding or comparable present age of retirement- is it 65 1/2 as at present?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, yes the present age is 65 1/2. The 65 will be compulsory to the same extent as 65 1/2 is with all the attendant provisions that exist at the present time, and this legislation - I'm anticipating legislation at the moment - will come into effect when persons are eligible to receive the full benefit of the Canada Pension Plan which will be payable at age 65 and that will be in 1970. It will be recognized that because of the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan that require persons to be retired in order to receive those pension payments, that retirement under the Superannuation Act would be advisable and has been requested, and we are agreeing with it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Provincial Secretary

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).... will have to submit this next question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer because it's perhaps related directly to his department. The Honourable Minister properly mentions the connection here with the Canada Pension Plan. Was it not assumed that when the payments started to be made into the Canada Pension Fund or program, that some at least corresponding reduction would be made in the Civil Service Superannuation payments, and has that occurred?

MR. McLEAN: Well, it hasn't occurred yet because I don't think that anyone has as yet been eligible to receive payments under the Canada Pension Plan. I'm not certain, Mr. Chairman, that it would be possible to provide that information. I believe it would take some research to do so.

MR. CAMPBELL: ... already making payments into the Canada Pension ...

MR. McLEAN: Yes, you are, but you will remember that the two plans are integrated and that out of the six percent contribution made by the employee that portion which is required to be contributed under the Canada Pension Plan is taken and paid over to the Canada Pension Plan authority, whatever it is, so that the requirement from the employee is the same six percent as it was formerly and the two plans are integrated and will of course be integrated when the payments are received from both sources.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, we have before us the estimates for the year into which we have now entered, and I notice that the Civil Service Superannuation Fund plan is still larger than a year ago and there is also a payment under the Canada Pension. Are both required in order to meet the objects of the two plans? Surely they merge, don't they?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the payment that is shown as being paid by the province to the Canada Pension Plan is the employer's contribution, which is quite separate and apart, of course, from the money which is required from the Consolidated Fund in order to pay pensions, and the rise or the increase in the amount is our calculation of the amount of money required during this, now, the current fiscal year, to pay the provincial portion of pensions to persons who are in fact on pension at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution, and has directed me to report the same.

#### IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might interrupt the proceedings for a moment. I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the area on my immediate right and welcome on your behalf the Honourable Robert Stanfield, the Premier of Nova Scotia.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 105, an Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could my honourable friend indicate when we may be receiving, if indeed he has received, the report of the Manitoba Economic and Consultative Board for the previous year?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, that question was put to me the other day and I gave the answer at that time.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend could give the answer today? I'm not concerned with what answers were a few days ago. I'd like to know an answer in -- because I was maybe not here at that particular time.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll be very glad to give my honourable friend the information. The report has not yet been received and I undertook to find out when it might be expected.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the interim has my honourable friend made any move in order to obtain the information as to when it might be expected?

MR. ROBLIN: I've just answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: All my honourable friend's answer was, Mr. Speaker, that he undertook some days ago to do this. I asked him if in the interim he has done anything about it.

MR. ROBLIN: ... anything to report I'll let my honourable friend know.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I can assure my honourable friend I'll be asking the question tomorrow.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Some vegetable growers advise me that they were led to believe that they could expect the report of the inquiry into the Vegetable Marketing Commission, and my question is: could the members of this House expect the report before the week-end?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Commissioner has now either completed or just about completed his final report. I've given instructions to him to have sufficient number of copies printed because of the considerable number of people that are interested in receiving this report. However, I don't expect these copies to be available to myself or to the House until on or about May 15th.

While I'm on my feet I would like to answer a few more questions that I'm owing the House. They've been piling up, questions that have been asked to me or my capable colleague, the acting Minister of Agriculture. The question that the Member from Gladstone asked about the crop insurance, as to whether or not whether he had a crop insurance coverage for a farm at Neepawa and Morden, I believe, were his examples, where he had suffered loss on one farm would the acreage on both be taken into account. The answer is no. The crop insurance has a simple or arbitrary thirty-mile limit on this.

A further question that the Member from Gladstone asked was with respect to the Hog Marketing Commission, the following day or on March 28th, pardon me. The answer to that is that I want to remind the House of the resolution that was taken on the tenth day of February, 1964, with respect to this matter, on which we stated that a vote would be held within 24 months or not later than 36 months after the introduction of the present voluntary Commission. It is our intention to abide with this resolution and we will call for this vote to be held within this time specified. I say this, aware of the fact that at the moment there is no particular call for it; in fact, quite the contrary being the case. While it is quite true that there are plans for expansion of facilities by the Hog Marketing Commission, no firm steps will be taken in this respect until after such a vote is proceeded with.

One further question that the Honourable Member from Burrows asked the other day was with respect to an ad placed by my Department in the papers calling for Cooperative and Credit Union -- or Cooperative Supervisors - Supervisors of Cooperatives. I feel that my honourable friend is perhaps somewhat oversensitive about this matter. There is certainly no reflection of any kind meant. The positioning of the consumer aspect of this ad is simply that this is primary producer co-ops that we are talking about in the north, fishing and pulpwood, and where we have only a very small amount of consumer cooperative work being done. This is the only reason for its positioning in the ad. With respect to the use of the word 'designated' perhaps the word 'isolated' could have been used. There are certainly no areas designated in any way as to where or where not cooperative work can be carried out. It was simply, again, to indicate that this particular job or position called for people working in the north with our Indian and Metis groups that are under my Department in the 20-odd cooperatives that we have up there. Thank you.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did I understand the Minister right when he said that we would have the report before May 15th?

MR. ENNS: On or about the fifteenth.

MR. PAULLEY: ... assure us that we will be in the House on May 15th?

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, further to the matter of the report from the Marketing Commission. The Honourable Minister mentioned that he has not yet received the final report. Does he mean, then, that he has received some interim reports?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders, may I lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order No. 17 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition; and Return to an Order of the House No. 48 also on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce? The Honourable Minister made a statement, I believe yesterday, in respect of the effect of freight rate increases on the Province of Manitoba and thereof, of course, the economy of the Province of Manitoba. I wonder if my honourable friend has copies of a statement that he made that he's prepared to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... distribute to members of the House, because it does appear to me some conflict in the statement of my honourable friend.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party spoke to me yesterday. It is not in conflict. I do not have a statement but I will prepare it and I will distribute it to him.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Sir, have you anything further to report on the 1970 winter hockey games that are to be awarded to Canada this year - or whether they're coming to Manitoba?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can speak to that question. There is nothing further to report at this time. The Department of Tourism and Recreation are, or shortly will be, in touch with those who are primarily concerned with it to advance the claim of Manitoba for the staging of those games in Manitoba during that period.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question. I'm sorry, I had addressed it to the wrong person. Are you aware, or are you not aware that in all probability the games will be awarded about the middle of May to one of the provinces?

MR. LYON: Thanks for the information.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, ... that the Minister did not accept my invitation of making this a nonpartisan and take advantage of the member from this side of the House who is a vice-president of the CAHA. I think that he should. It's not too late.

MR. LYON: ... Mr. Speaker, what my honourable friend is talking about.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think your Leader will explain if he hasn't.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture for the information that he supplied to the House a few minutes ago, but a supplementary question in respect to the crop insurance. Are there no provisions at all in the Act in consideration of a higher premium, say, to dispose of or do away with this thirty-mile limit because gee, this seems to me to be a real hardship in event of a loss - or could be. So the question is: could you not by way of a higher premium eliminate this particular clause?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would have a tendency to agree with the Member from Gladstone that the crop insurance program, while we think it is doing an excellent job, has room for improvement. It should have room for improvement at all times. This question is the one that's asked most often by farmers when they congregate, the problem of individual field coverage is not available at least where fields are separated by perhaps five or six miles, or whatever it is. It's a difficult administrative problem. This is being considered from time to time but there is nothing in the works at this time to change any of the present regulations.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can address a question. I don't know to whom it should be directed, either the Provincial Secretary who is charged with civil service, the Provincial Treasurer who is charged with the finances of the province, or the Honourable the Attorney-General who is charged with the responsibility of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. It deals with negotiations which I understand are taking place at the present time between the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba and the Government in respect of wage increases and working conditions. I wonder if one of the three honourable gentlemen could indicate what is the situation at the present time in respect of negotiations and when might some firm offer be made, or indication of an offer, on behalf of the government to the civil service in respect of wage increases, and when negotiations might reach a period where a firm proposition might be considered by the employees concerned.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the collective agreement which was entered into between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the Government of Manitoba, negotiations have been progressing, I believe satisfactorily, and certain proposals have been made which are presently under consideration. It would not be possible to say when a final decision in respect of them will be made.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could my honourable friend indicate whether or not a firm and final offer has been made to the employees?

MR. McLEAN: Well that's a matter that's under negotiation and consideration at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: My question was, Mr. Speaker, if I may in all due respect ask my honourable friend whether a firm and final offer has been made by the Government of Manitoba.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the answer is no until we've made a statement in regard to the matter.

MR. PAULLEY: That's all I wanted to know.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Has the government made any decision yet as to whether they are going to give any financial consideration to the districts who voted against the school referendum on March 10th last?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): ... previously, I'd prefer to deal with the matter when we come to Bill 93 on second reading.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order to raise. I understand the answer that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce gave to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party to be that when he had the information that he would furnish it to him. I want to ask you once again, Mr. Speaker, if you will direct that in these cases any question that is asked in the House here and an answer is given, it is not to be given just to the individual asking it, but to all the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood the Honourable Minister to say that he would have copies made and they would be distributed to the House. I could have misunderstood him, but that's what I thought I heard him say.

MR. CAMPBELL: ... will tell us, Mr. Speaker. I understood it to be to him. So long as it's understood that it's to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Minister would clarify this matter.

MR. SPIVAK: It will be distributed to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSON: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 10 on the motion of the Honourable Member from Elmwood.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Has there been any change in policy in regard to nurses training schools in regard to capital construction grants and administrations of them?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that there is one nurses training school in Manitoba that this has been taking place; that the Department of Education is now -- it's been circularized by word of mouth that this is in Brandon, that they have taken over the building of and administration of the Nurses Training School in Brandon.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health. This is in respect to an Order for Return that I placed some -- well, to be exact, on February 16th in respect to the provincial contributions to Alcohol Foundation and Harbour Lights and so on, and he replied the other day that he had answers to four of the five questions but that the fifth had to be forthcoming from the Attorney-General's Department. Would he be prepared to supply me with the answers to four of the five at this time? And then the Attorney-General could bring his in at a later date. I have a particular reason for wanting the answer to the four at this stage.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Order will be answered all in one piece. It's up now from the Attorney-General's Department into my Department and the answers are being typed.

MR. GUTTORMSON (St. George): I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. In view of the depressed price of muskrat has the Department given consideration to reducing the royalty?

MR. EVANS: I want to thank my honourable friend for giving me notice the other day of this subject. I am looking into it and I hope to be able to get some further information later on. There would be a good opportunity to discuss it on my estimates which will be up soon.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Could he advise us whether the Manitoba Government or any agency of it was party to the contract bringing the Monkees to perform in Winnipeg at the Arena last weekend?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker - no.



ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. George, THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following details of any appraisals made or being made on the property commonly known as 270 Osborne Street North:

1. The date on which the appraisals were made.
2. By whom the appraisals were made.
3. The qualifications of the appraisers at the time the appraisals were made.
4. Whether in all cases the appraisers were accredited appraisers.
5. What the basis of payment was, (fee, per diem, or what).
6. How much was paid for the work.
7. The description of the property appraised.
8. What appraisal values were indicated for the land and building.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I am confirming it - this is my deaf side.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. A true copy of the delivery slip form used by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission for C.O.D. orders of beer, wine and spirits delivered to the purchaser's residence.
2. A true copy of the delivery receipt form used by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission for cash orders of beer, wine and spirits delivered to the purchaser's residence.
3. A true copy of the delivery slip form authorized by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission for use by other suppliers for the delivery of beer to the residence of a purchaser.
4. If there is no prescribed form in No. 3 above, the information prescribed by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to be contained in a delivery slip used by a vendor of beer.
5. Procedure followed by one authorized to deliver liquor of any kind purchased from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to comply with legislation governing the sale and purchase of liquor is complied with.

If I may Mr. Speaker, there is an error here and with leave of the House could I have this amended by deleting the last three words "is complied with".

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, my reason for submitting this Order for Return is that there has been publicity recently which seems to indicate that the provisions of the Liquor Control Act either are not adhered to too strictly or perhaps the provisions in themselves maybe lack allowing for that to happen which is not meant to happen in accordance with the provisions of the Act, mainly the delivery of liquor to persons under 21 years of age, and the purpose of this resolution is to provide the members of this House with the necessary information for us to peruse and study and take whatever further action we may feel may be necessary to prevent this sort of thing from recurring.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accept the Order for Return. I presume that throughout questions 1 to 5 the honourable member is seeking information relative to delivery receipt forms which I presume do exist, relative to home deliveries of liquor to private purchasers rather than to licensees.

Mr. HANUSCHAK: That is correct. Item 5, in particular. We're primarily concerned about delivery to homes. We are not concerned with delivery to banquet halls or restaurants or hotels.

MR. LYON: I am quite prepared to accept that, Mr. Speaker. With respect to his brief comment I can only say that as was answered by the First Minister the other day, that this matter is under investigation by the Liquor Control Commission who learned of it first through the medium of the newspaper to determine whether or not there is any validity whatsoever to the news story. We don't know if there is any validity to it at all.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough first to call the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we start off on the detailed study I wonder if it would be possible for the government to indicate at this time what are the likely next departments to be under study. I think the last one we have at the moment would indicate to us is Provincial Secretary, leaving four departments unallocated.

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mines and Resources will follow Municipal Affairs, Industry and Commerce, Provincial Secretary, Attorney-General, Provincial Treasurer, Executive Council and Legislation. I believe that completes the list.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, when will we go back to Health? We're not finished with Health yet.

MR. LYON: ... complete Executive Council and Legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Urban Development and Municipal Affairs, Department XVI. I thought I had better announce it; it's a long time since we have been in Supply. Resolution 104, 1. (a).

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development) (Cypress): Mr. Chairman, before we start on this I think I should take this opportunity to reply to some of the questions which were asked me when we were in session on this portion of it before.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked me about some of the large increases in assessment in the municipalities of Rhineland and Stanley. The two municipalities, as he knows, were re-assessed in 1966 and the previous re-assessment had been in 1955. During that 11-year period land values have increased, as I am sure the Honourable Member from Rhineland realizes, and that the increase in the land values in these two municipalities has been very substantial. This increase in value of course is also reflected in the new assessment. He mentioned that there were a relatively few number of land transactions. Well, the assessment is in fact based on land sales that have taken place over a period of a number of years, and in these two municipalities that he mentioned, some 450 land sales were used as a basis of establishing value levels, and these 450 sales represent a total of over some \$6 million worth of farm lands, so I think that he will realize that they did in fact consider many parcels of land in arriving at this assessment.

He also mentioned the equalized assessment in the municipality of St. Paul, East St. Paul I should say, and asked what was done in the interval between the 1955 assessment and the 1966 assessment. Well, during the interval between re-assessments, the equalized is adjusted to bring the equalized assessment of each municipality to a uniform and equitable level.

Now he also mentioned the assessors in this province, and one of the statements that he made was that he wondered if the assessors really cared. Well, Mr. Chairman, the assessors of this province go out throughout the country regardless of time or place. In my opinion, they are doing a very good service in explaining their functions and the mechanics of assessment, and may I say the many people to whom I speak throughout the country, they tell me that there are two things they fear - taxes and death, and they associate the assessors with taxes a great deal of the time and when they meet with our assessors they find that they are not only working to explain the function and mechanics of assessment but that they are also good public relations men, and I think that I must challenge the statement of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, because I do believe that they are good public relations men along with carrying out their duties as assessors.

He also asked to what extent do we consider productivity in assessment. Well I might turn the question and ask him how do you measure productivity, and in my opinion productivity is just a little hard to put your finger on it because of the fact that if you do have a poor farmer, does this necessarily reflect on the productivity of the soil or of the value of the land, and so

(MRS. FORBES cont'd).... the productivity portion depends on who is the farmer in this particular case, I would think.

But obviously there are problems and this was made so apparent, I think, with the meeting that we had with the representatives of the nine municipalities a few days ago, and of course it points up the value of the proposed committee that was suggested. And while I'm speaking of this proposed committee, the Honourable Member for Selkirk made the suggestion that we have a select committee and I suggest that probably we might use the Municipal Committee which we have. The Honourable Member for Selkirk again suggested that this was probably a large committee and we might do with a smaller committee to get on with the work, and I think it has a great deal of merit; and I understand that the Whips of each Party have selected from their group members of the Municipal Committee which will be meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock where we might plan our strategy to know what we might do in this field. I think we should act as quickly as possible because it is a serious situation and we want to give every assistance we possibly can.

Coming back to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, he also suggested that Courts of Revision should have greater powers. Well, Courts of Revision have full powers now to alter or vary any assessment in value, and whenever there is an appeal to them they have this full power at the present time, and I feel that they are complying with this and using the power they have. He did mention here, however, that he thought that many of these Courts of Revision were a farce and I have to take exception to this because I must say that these Courts of Revision are constituted by the members of our councils and I really don't think that he just meant that because I think the members of council try to make these Courts of Revision just what they are supposed to be. The assessor is there only to assist; he isn't a part of the Court, it's the councillors themselves, and I really think that they are doing the very best they possibly can.

He also mentioned to us that there was one example of land that had been subdivided and that they found their assessment very high here - some farmer, I believe, who had subdivided his land. Well now, I cannot comment on the purpose that this individual might have had in mind, that's a matter for the individual to decide; but however, I would say that the assessment is based on the use to which the land is put as it exists when the assessment is taken, and if he's finding any difficulty that he hasn't been able to develop his land then I think he should in his court he should consider whether he wants to leave the land in this way or turn it back to farm land, but he has a chance to appeal to the Court of Revision and if he isn't satisfied there, then of course he has a further appeal to the Municipal Board and I think he should take advantage of that.

The Honourable Member for Carillon in his comments on the provincial take-over of roads, I know that he knows that this should have been presented to the Minister of Highways, but however, I think what he is trying to say is, or trying to point out to us, is the effect that this take-over has on the municipality, and this of course extends to his remarks on drains too. Now I agree with him that this varies from municipality to municipality, and those municipalities which, well probably are not, shall I say, as well organized as other municipalities, don't seem to be able to cope with the situation and I think we should aim in our department to give them all the assistance and help we can. However, I think if he looks at the provincial take-over of roads on the broad picture of what it means to all Manitoba, that by and large that picture is good, and going through the country the taxpayers of the country speak fairly highly of it, with few exceptions - and you'll always have this because you can't satisfy everybody - but it has received fairly wide approval.

Now, he also gave to me a comparison of grants, provincial grants to municipal grants, and I'm going to have a look at this when I have a little more time, but I'm not so sure that he has a comparable basis, because I think in the instances that he gave to us it was on a cost-sharing base and now it's on a straight 100 percent contribution. However, I will have a look at that and I will speak to him personally about it again.

He mentioned the revolving fund and asked what had happened in this case. This study, as you know, was undertaken in 1965 following the assembly of all the available figures from the municipal statements of 1964, and at that time the average rate of interest on municipal investments amounted to 4.97 percent, whereas the interest rate that the municipalities had to pay to borrow money for the issuance of debentures was about 6.5 percent. Now, of the \$16 million cash resources of the municipality, almost 47.1 percent of that was cash in the bank. Well, since this study was taken there are two or three things that happened. First of

(MRS. FORBES cont'd).... all, the Municipal Development Fund was instituted and this enabled municipalities to finance two-thirds of the cost of their projects at 5-3/8 percent interest with a 25 percent forgiveness factor, and as far as we know, however, this fund will not be continued.

A second point; most municipalities in 1968 were able to purchase bank deposit receipts at rates ranging over 5 1/2 percent depending on the length of time the money was placed in the deposit receipts. Now this has the advantage of earning a reasonable rate on surplus money on a short term basis, and it's not feasible to promote the revolving fund at this time because of the short term money markets.

And a third point, this revolving fund was recommended by the Fisher Report but at the time it was rejected as out of hand by the municipalities.

The Honourable Member from Carillon also made some remarks about a map that Saskatchewan has, showing the assessments marked out on it which he found very handy. I was quite interested in this because I wondered whether the map showed all the municipalities or just individual municipalities, and the honourable member was kind enough to send me a copy yesterday and I note that it's by municipality. This is a good thing and I let the honourable member know individually yesterday that we have this type of thing in Manitoba too. Our Assessment Branch provides the council, and each member of council has these maps and I think he guards it as a prized possession, and I'm sure that we'll be able to provide a copy of one for the Honourable Member for Carillon; and any other of the interested members, I am sure if they saw their council members they would be able to find these too.

Now the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, in speaking about probably a conflict of interest that the Mayor from Assiniboia had as a member of the Boundaries Commission, well I must say that I noticed a considerable amount of newspaper publicity regarding this fact, or the fact, rather, that Assiniboia was seeking city status, but it's my understanding that this proposal has been dropped. He also extends this question regarding a conflict of interest to the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission. Well, a conflict of interest arises when a person takes a step which brings this conflict into play, and I'm not prepared to accept any random comment that there may be or there appears to be a conflict of interest. If the Honourable Member has any evidence of this, then I ask him to produce it for me in the proper form.

And re the Boundaries Commission, may I respectfully suggest to the honourable members of this Assembly that I'm most concerned as to the comments that some members of the Assembly have expressed which cast aspersions on the integrity of persons on the Commission, and in my opinion the only way we can judge the integrity of the Commission is by its actions, and on this basis I'm prepared to judge the members of the Boundaries Commission because they were appointed for their municipal experience, for their experience in education, with regard to location and with consideration of ethnic groups and their interest, and, most especially, they were appointed for their abilities, and I am one who is quite prepared to wait until we see them in action and the results of that.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentioned the question of leaseholders which I had inadvertently forgotten to mention in my last report. As he knows, leaseholders can vote now on municipal elections as electors and they cannot vote at present on money by-laws because such by-laws of course require a vote of the rate-payers, and this is a serious matter and I know the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has mentioned this before too. This matter is under consideration and we hope that we will be able to give you an answer on this.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks also asked me if the province was paying full grants in lieu of taxes. Well, the province pays full grants in lieu of taxes up to a maximum of five percent of the total levy of the municipality. For the Government of Canada, it pays full grants in lieu of taxes with certain exceptions such as self-contained defence establishments, the CNR where title is held in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Hudson Bay Railway and port facilities. The National Harbours Board pay grants in lieu of taxes according to a formula that came into being by the port cities' committee of Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, and in 1965 they were only paying 50 percent and last year they were paying 62 1/2 percent. This year they are paying 75 percent; next year they'll be paying 87 1/2; and by 1969 they'll be paying 100 percent.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned that the task of councillors - and I'm sorry he's not in his seat just now - but he mentioned that the task --(Interjection)--

(MRS. FORBES cont'd)... I didn't see him, but I see him now. He mentioned that the task of municipal members was more difficult and more complex than it used to be and I certainly agree with him on this, but he suggested that there should be a guide book of what you can do and what you cannot do. Well, I think they have that guide book now; it's The Municipal Act. And I realize that this is a large Act and I know that there's a great deal to study and it'll certainly take experience along with studies of these men, but I really feel that this is their guide book and an abbreviated form might only get them into trouble. I think that we'd better say that their guide book is The Municipal Act. Councillors surely recognize their responsibilities with all these responsibilities having to be listed when they take their oath of office. I really think that most of them know when they take their oath of office what they are getting into, and I sincerely hope, as I know he does, that they will be given the time and the opportunity and the experience so that they all become well acquainted with The Municipal Act.

He says that there's conflicting advice coming from the government and my Deputy Minister - according to the report in the Portage la Prairie Graphic, was it? Well, of course, I'm not responsible for what the paper states but I did hear the address of my Deputy Minister and I did not hear him say or advise municipalities not to use consultants. One of the things I would like to stress that he did say, and that he did include in his comments, was that municipalities should not attempt to use the Municipal Clerk where it was necessary to obtain legal advice, and I think we probably can't stress that too much. However, I assure you that this must be a misunderstanding and I'm quite sure there is no conflict in advice coming from the government or from my Deputy Minister.

I was asked about Metro's request for higher remuneration, and since the Metro Council has raised this matter we have it under consideration and I'm sure that Metro has it under consideration too from press reports just this last few days. The Honourable Member for Gladstone made remarks or comments about the various commissions, and he was interested to know the cost of these commissions. Now the 1953 report was a joint government-municipal report and this commission was to study the problems of local government at that time, and it included the study of Metro. As a result of that commission, the former administration created the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission which centered its studies on the problem of Greater Winnipeg at that time. Now this was established by the former administration and I think probably he might get the cost from the Honourable Member for Lakeside but I am informed that that cost was approximately \$55,000. However, I stand to be corrected on that and he may get further information from the former administration. The present government, acting on the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission Report, established the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg and it did, in 1962, appoint the Metropolitan Review Commission which recommended variations in the Metropolitan Government. Now if the Honourable Member from Gladstone would get into the files of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, he could find the answer to that because there was an Order for a Return on March 29, 1965, and that information is all contained in that Return. The municipalities of the province created the Municipal Enquiry Commission to study the problems of local government. This Commission did finalize its report and make recommendations, but it was limited in the amount of research that was done and the report was, in fact, a report to the municipalities of the province and not a report to the government, and this was paid for in full by the Union of Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association so the Honourable Member would have to get the cost from them. The government appointed the Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance, and this Commission reported and made its recommendations in April of 1964, and here again I think he has to look into the files of the Honourable Member for Portage because he had an Order for Return and this information was given to them on March 29, 1965. Therefore, I think the Honourable Member for Gladstone has at his disposal the information that he requested. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for the replies that she has given. I notice her reply particularly in the matter of the Boundaries Commission. When the Bill was originally introduced for this Commission, Mr. Chairman, I think that it was agreed on all sides of the House that this Commission would have one of the most important functions in determining the future of the Province of Manitoba insofar as its local government and its regional development as well, and that quite obviously such a Commission would have to be composed of the very best people possible.

The Commission, I think, will have two problems; one, arriving at the right solution for the province, and then the other one, having that solution accepted by the people of the province.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... That matter of acceptance, Mr. Chairman, is one of the important elements in this because it's all well and fine to come out with some answers but unless those answers as well have the acceptance of the local areas, unless the various villages and towns and school districts can agree to this, it will be very difficult to impose the conclusions of the Commission.

We know that in many areas there are conflicts between various towns and between municipalities, and these are the normal things we can expect. These conflicts are not going to lessen, Mr. Chairman. The decrease in population in rural areas in particular is putting a tremendous pressure on many of the towns and villages who are afraid of their existence. They're afraid that they are going to disappear. And so the work of this Commission is vital. Its acceptance by the local areas is vital to the success of the final report, and this is why, Mr. Chairman, I have been critical of the manner in which the government proceeded to set up this Commission.

There have been a number of statements made here in the House, but these were not the only statements, Mr. Chairman; there were statements made at the time that the Minister proceeded to appoint the Commission. We have shown what, in our opinion, is conflict of interest. The Minister replies today saying, "Well bring me a specific proof and I will do something about it." Mr. Chairman, I don't think that that is our responsibility. The situation is this, however, Mr. Chairman, that the manner in which the government has proceeded to appoint the Commission, in my opinion prejudices the work of that Commission because by making this Commission too much of a political commission, by making it a commission made up of people of an obvious political party, I think the government has put that Commission under a cloud insofar as many people in the province, and that the very people whom we want to accept this Commission as being an entirely impartial one, one that is not connected with any political party, one particularly that is not connected with the government itself, that it is essential that the Commission have that total impartiality in that the decision of the government last summer, Mr. Chairman, to load that Commission with ex-candidates of the government was wrong insofar as having the results of that Commission acceptable, and that is the weakness in the operation.

They may come out with good conclusions; I don't know. I'm not going to pre-judge the work of the Commission. But I think it would be doubly difficult to have their conclusions accepted because in the minds of many people across the province it will not be an impartial decision or study, but one that is connected to politics and one particularly that is connected to the government itself. How can the government say that it has no connection with this Commission when five of its candidates are members of that Commission itself? The government has left itself vulnerable, in my opinion, in this case. The opinion of a lot of people is that this Commission is dominated by the government, and I can't think of a surer way of making its conclusions suspect. And that, Mr. Chairman, is my objection to the whole thing; that it will be extremely difficult to have those conclusions accepted. And, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, there is only one thing for the government to do in this case. It made the mistake last summer of proceeding on a political basis. I recommend to the Minister now - scrap the Commission! Scrap it completely and let's start off from scratch.

There are good people on the Commission, I don't question that; but it is going to be extremely difficult because of the original mistake to have it acceptable now. Let's not get ourselves involved in that sort of a situation. We have just been through the school referendum and we saw the effects, which I think were highly because of a political situation. Let us not get ourselves involved in this case in that sort of a problem, because this Commission does have a vital role to play. The proper reorganization of our local areas is going to be difficult to accomplish. Let us not saddle that with the added problem of having a commission that is not acceptable.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I recommend to the Minister: scrap it right now and let us start off from scratch with a properly impartial commission, not connected to politics, and one that can have the support and confidence of the people of Manitoba which this Commission does not have because of the original decisions of the government to make it a political commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the statement made by my Leader. The Minister did not give the proper or the adequate answers in this question of this Boundaries Commission, I think that it is wrong for the Minister to insinuate or state that we have accused the Chairman or any of the other members of wrongdoing because

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... this was not -- I was very careful in stating that this was not that we hadn't made these accusations at all. I stated the same thing, the same as my Leader did here today, about the political commission and then I talked about conflict of interest, and the Minister skirted around this quite daintily a few minutes ago. I don't think that it is a responsibility of the members here to police these commissions and so on. We have that even in many Acts that there can't be any conflict of interest and the idea is to make sure that you don't get people that will be placed in this predicament. This is the important thing.

Now the answer was very simple as far as my honourable friend was concerned. She said, well, about Assiniboia, that was true but now they're not interested. Well you had a situation right there. What would have happened if Assiniboia were still interested in getting this status? Now the statement that I made about the Chairman of the Commission was that all right he stated very clearly -- and I give him credit for this -- that he would not -- that he did not wish to have this as a full-time job and he is established here in a law practice and he already has done this kind of work, and I sent the statement which was in the newspaper a month or so ago, earlier in the Session, I sent this to the First Minister, where he was appealing for clients in front of these different municipalities and different councils and so on. And this places him in quite a delicate position.

It doesn't mean that I'm accusing him of doing anything wrong but this has been a political commission. The only thing that we said, the only thing that we said is that there wasn't one member -- we were asked for proof and the honourable member brought in an affidavit of one member that talked out of turn, and we're not the only one that do not like this idea because I'd like to quote from Hansard on Page 1233 from the words of the Honourable the Minister of Education, and this is what he had to say: "If a member of this Boundaries Commission had said something to the Honourable Member from Neepawa, or he's overheard it or knows of this person, I'll be the first one to demand his resignation on the spot." This is what the Minister of Education said at the time. So I don't think that he agrees that this should be -- this kind of conduct becomes a member of the Commission; and this is the only statement that we've made.

Maybe the Minister of Education will tell us what he feels now that he's had this affidavit after making this statement. But it's not right for the Minister to pretend or insinuate or give the impression that we are accusing the Chairman or the Mayor of Assiniboia and so on of wrongdoing. This is not the case at all. We said that there could be, and they certainly seem to be in a position to have a conflict of interest develop. And this is too important a Commission, especially in the fact that there were the three points, the way this Commission was appointed. We have an example. The Minister said a few days ago, well sure, you want people that have had experience. We have the best example when we concur with the appointment of the new Governor-General. This can be done, but what I said at the time is that five defeated candidates, two or three very well-known organizers of one Party, and this is supposed to be independent. Independent I guess would mean in comparing it to political. This is why the government doesn't want to get in. And the Commission is composed of all members of the same political colour and how can this be independent? This is the case -- this is what my leader said today and this is what I'm saying. This is too important. You know what happened on this vote of the 10th and you said yourself, the members of the government said all right, this was a protest, and all the newspapers and so on said this was a protest. Well you're going to have the same thing. I don't think that you have to be stubborn about this; this was a mistake. Admit it and we won't talk about it any more. Scrap it and start from scratch or you're going to have an awful lot of trouble and you won't have the cooperation needed to do a job.

..... continued on next page

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, there's an item that I would like to raise just briefly on the Minister's salary because I don't know where else to raise it, and that is in respect to this Bill 100 that was before the Law Amendments Committee last year, and I understood the former ...

MR. LYON: ... Minister's salary? I've been out of the House a couple of times but I just presumed that we had passed the Minister's salary and I heard (a) say passed now and (b) passed. I just wondered ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I'm only going to ...

MR. DESJARDINS: You could say (c) passed too but he's been standing up ... attract his attention.

MR. LYON: I'm not trying to inhibit my honourable friends. Estimate time is their time. You know, my time is your time, but we have been on this item some considerable length of time. The 80 hours are fast going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) I had Item (a)--passed, and (b)-- I was on (b) and I think that we're still on (b). (b)--passed ...

MR. STANES: Mr. Chairman, I don't quite know where we stand here. I'd like to say a few words on Metro. I have been waiting for the first item before it passed. Well can I speak at some other place or have I missed it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've already passed (a). We're on (b) now (b)--passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: On (b) Mr. Chairman, would the Minister give us the Deputy Minister's salary in this case, because I have been asking for a long time to have the list presented to us that is usually given to us early in the session. Up to date it has not been supplied and so I'll have no alternative but to ask the Departments that come up. Could we have the Deputy Minister's salary in this - under Administrative Salaries?

MRS. FORBES: The Deputy Minister's salary here is \$17,000 and I'm - there was an increment on the 1st of April. I haven't got that with me, but I can give it to the honourable member.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is in addition to the \$17,000? Thank you very much. Could we have that later? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed; (e)--passed; 1--passed. Resolution 104 passed. Resolution 105. Item 2 (a)--

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me when I could raise the question about one municipality - the actions of one municipality contaminating the water supply of another? When could I raise that?

MRS. FORBES: The Minister of Highways is for Water Control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed

MRS. FORBES: If you have any question I would be glad to take it ...

MR. JOHNSTON: This is with respect to municipally operated lagoons. Isn't this a municipal responsibility?

MRS. FORBES: I can't hear you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Lagoons. The effect of one municipality's lagoon affecting another municipality's water supply. Is this not a municipal question?

MRS. FORBES: Yes, I believe that would be a municipal question, if it's on lagoons. If you want to raise it now, I will take it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, in Portage la Prairie last June one of the Aldermen who is the head of the Waterworks Department had in his report the fact that in the previous winter the Brandon lagoon had overflowed into the Assiniboine River and there was danger of pollution of the Portage la Prairie water supply and to overcome this problem the City of Portage la Prairie had to spend more money on chemicals. It is my understanding that they had written to the Department of Health and also the Department of Municipal Affairs to ask for either a ruling or else some assurance that this situation would be corrected. Has the Minister anything to report in this regard?

MRS. FORBES: Re the Brandon lagoon. This is still under consideration and we haven't a final report on that one and I am not prepared to know what the Minister of Health has on this if anything. I will take this question though and I'll attempt to give the Honourable Member for Portage a report on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed. Resolution 105 passed. Resolution 106 Local Government Districts. 3. (a) ...



MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under this item I wonder if I could ask a question regarding the unconditional grants. I recognize that it's not the item itself but because of its effect on local government districts, the unconditional grant becomes one of the important items in some of the local government districts of revenue for various local activities, such as road building and so on. Is there any intention of changing the Unconditional Grant, reducing it, increasing it, or changing its distribution in any way?

MRS. FORBES: I don't have any note here as to any change in that but here again I'll have to try and give you an answer on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed. Resolution 106 passed. Resolution 107. 4. --(Interjection) --

MR. MOLGAT: Well I think this is the proper place for this to come, Mr. Chairman. It's a complaint that has come to me which I think is fairly widespread in the province. This is with regard to the taxation of buildings on Crown lots and the discrimination that occurs between Crown lots in, for example, the Whiteshell Park and those outside. I have received a number of complaints about this and I think we had some discussions previously in the House but it doesn't seem to have been settled, in any way.

The complaint I have at the moment for example is from an individual who proceeded to get from the Department a Crown lot in a municipality, the municipality of Lac du Bonnet to be exact, and for this he has a rental fee of \$30 per year from what he tells me. This is his annual lease on a 20-year basis. He then proceeds to build a cottage upon the property and it's not property that he owns, it's simply on lease, and he receives an assessment from the municipality. Now he tells me that he receives no services at all from the municipality. He does not make any use of the schools. In fact, it's strictly a summer resident permit so he presumes that he's not allowed to live there during the winter. He gets no other services of any kind but does get an assessment and is taxed by the local authority. Some very few miles to the south of him in the Whiteshell, he tells me on the other hand that people there proceed to get a lease from the government on Crown land again but it's not organized territory and there are absolutely no other costs charged in that area at all. He gives me the example of someone being able to build a \$50,000 house on a Crown lot in the Whiteshell, obtain all of the services provided in the area - and they are numerous. He lists for example, paved roads, garbage collection, electric service, beaches, drinking water, parks and all the rest, and pays a net fee of \$30. No further assessment whatever. Now these, and there are many in this category, feel that there is discrimination here between the two different locations and yet with no additional service insofar as the individuals. Now is there any means of getting around this? The people who complain feel in view of the fact that they do not own the land that they should not be assessed and when they consider what is being done in an area immediately adjoining that there is discrimination.

MRS. FORBES: The honourable member will note that this really comes under the Lands Branch and Parks Branch but however, we are knowledgeable of this too and I know that they have it under consideration. I think probably the Minister would agree with me that they are looking at it and it affects us to some extent too, but it is under the Lands Branch.

MR. MOLGAT: I take this up then when we reach Mines and Natural Resources? Is that correct?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could be helpful. It's split between, depending on whether the lot is in a Provincial Park then it comes under Tourism and Recreation. If the lot is on Crown land not in a provincial park, it comes under the Lands Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources; so the subject could be raised under Lands Branch as well.

MR. MOLGAT: Well this is regarding lots, Crown lots in a municipality, -- (Interjection) -- outside of a provincial park.

MR. LYON: Lands Branch.

MR. MOLGAT: Lands Branch. All right.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, this government has established the fact that they are disciples of the Michener Commission recommendations and I'm wondering whether or not it is the intention of the Department to now tax farm buildings as recommended by Michener? That would be question No. 1. And No. 2, is it the intention of the government to increase generally and across the board the assessment on farm lands in the province?

I have often said, Mr. Chairman, that I have a great deal of confidence in the assessors by and large and have often said in the House that there is a definite relationship between the assessed value and the actual or the real value. If there wasn't a relationship there would be

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . no purpose in assessing at all. Now the relationship in regards to urban property in Neepawa, and I think this goes for most of the towns in the province, is around 50 percent. That is the assessment placed by the assessors on homes, and to a great degree businesses, in Neepawa, represent from 40 to 50 percent of the real value. What is the relationship in this day and age on farm property?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister gave some information before on questions that I had previously put or put on an earlier occasion. However, I am not satisfied with the answer in connection with assessment, especially in connection with the equalized assessment that takes place in between assessments. We've heard that assessments had not taken place in an interval of 11 years. How do you arrive at the equalized assessment in this interval? What formula is being used? And what criteria do you use in arriving at the equalized assessment in between these periods? This is what I want to know, because the school tax, the general levy is based on this equalized assessment and I want to know just how this is arrived at?

MRS. FORBES: In replying to the Honourable Member for Gladstone when he asked if it was the policy of the government to tax farm buildings, the answer is no. He also asked something about the difference in the assessed value and the real value. Well, if I got what he meant, was that is there going to be a general increase in farm land assessment across the province. Well I think we must certainly leave this up to the assessors. If they come up with the advice that there should be an increase, well then we will face it. If there is a decrease well we'll face it. This is up to the Assessment Branch and I'm sure he wouldn't expect anyone to know whether there would be an increase across the province like that. The Assessment Branch will look after it.

In replying to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the salary of my Deputy Minister from December 1st to March 31, 1967 was \$18,000 and effective April 1st, 1967 it will be \$19,000.00.

The question on unconditional grant, is there any change contemplated in the grant. There is no increase provided for in estimates. We didn't extend all of our grants provided for in last year's estimates therefore our grants remained the same. There's no suggestion of an increase being provided for here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed. Resolution 107 passed. Resolution 108, Municipal Services . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . probably be the one on which I might raise the question of Bill 100 and its over-all effect on the various municipalities in the province. My honourable friend the Minister I believe was in Law Amendments last year when this whole question of Bill 100 was debated at great length and the Minister of Municipal Affairs moved in Law Amendments that the "bill be not reported," and he gave as some of his reasons, the fact that we would be creating precedent and he wanted to have a long look at it before they would move in this direction. Now Bill 100 just simply asked permission of the government to put a by-law before the people of Neepawa that would allow them to build a clinic, a medical service building, and if the government passed the bill the next move would be that the Town of Neepawa would propose a bill, have a referendum and then the people would decide and if everybody all the way down voted in the affirmative then they could proceed to build one.

There is a rumor - and I hope it is only a rumor - that is circulating around in certain areas of the province that the real reason that the government defeated the bill in Law Amendments and the fact that the Minister, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs moved to kill the bill in Law Amendments was because I made a very inadequate presentation on behalf of the Town - that's what they say, that I scuttled the bill and it went down the drain. Well there are some members in the House that certainly were in Law Amendments on that day and Maitland Steinkopf, a former Minister said that my presentation was more than adequate - that's what he said, it was more than adequate. Now, they're saying this on one hand that it was simply because my presentation was not good and that's why the government defeated it. On the other hand, they're saying that if it had been brought forward by a member of the government they would have quickly approved of it.

Now this raises another very important point in our whole field of democracy as far as I'm concerned, and so with that in mind I wrote to the former Minister before he was defeated and asked him point blank concerning this whole problem of representation in the House and government policy, and he said, and I should quote I think the last paragraph: "It is quite correct that I stated that all municipalities . . ."

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I know we're all quite interested in my honourable friend's apologia or whatever he's talking about with respect to a matter that came before the House last year, but I really question whether this has anything whatsoever to do with the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It has a great deal to do with the policy of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I don't know whether they've got anything to do with the estimates on this point, and you can call it point of order or estimates or whatever you like. I have a letter from the Minister of Health in respect to the whole issue, can or can not municipalities or Crown corporations proceed to build medical clinics in their town. Can they or can they not? -- (Interjection) -- All right, let's talk about and let's find out whether they can or whether they can't. And if my honourable friend the Deputy House Leader or the House Leader has not got a copy of a letter dated August 5th last from the Minister of Health, then I could supply him with a copy, because he too points up the whole problem here, the whole problem of municipal corporations that probably as Neepawa did want to proceed to build a clinic and find themselves not with the authority to do this. And I suggest to my honourable friends opposite that with the advent of Medicare, probably there'll be a lot more towns and municipal corporations that will be required to do this, to build clinics to provide accommodation for the doctors and medical staff that are coming. So I simply ask what is the policy of the government now in respect to this? What is the policy? I think it's a very important one, a very important one.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is precisely the point, but I do believe this question that I'm going to propose now enters into the area of service or research. I'm particularly thinking that the time is fast approaching when we again are going to be involved in firecrackers and going to hear in the papers and on the radio that someone has been seriously injured and usually it's children; and I do understand that the Manitoba Urban Association at its mid-season meeting passed a resolution to the effect that this should be brought to the attention of the Provincial Government. I'm also further informed that this presentation was made to the Premier by the executive of the association that the sale of firecrackers be banned and that provincial legislation be done in this respect.

Now I understand that some of the local governments already have this by-law but others that have been seeking it have been informed that this is not the proper way to do it, by the Deputy Minister. Now I may be wrong in this, but this is the gist of what I was informed. I also understand that many Fire Chiefs and the Fire Association are against the use of firecrackers. I'm just wondering if the Minister could answer whether any consideration is being given to this and how soon we can have some action on this particular item.

MRS. FORBES: In referring to the Honourable Member for Neepawa concerning Bill 100 and medical services at Neepawa, I think that the honourable member must certainly know that last year I was not in attendance at Law Amendments and I didn't have the benefit of the knowledge that he has. However, the only question that comes to my mind just now is, why haven't you presented another Bill this session - it comes to my mind but I don't know whether you have an answer or not; but however I think that I would have to be more informed on this before I could even attempt to answer your question and I did not have the benefit of Law Amendments last year.

In your question asking the assessment relationship for farm lands - this is also the Honourable Member for Gladstone - farm land to sale value - 27.43 percent based on an average for a period of the years 1962 to 1966 was used.

And in answer to the Honourable Member for Rhineland in his question, a formula to compute equalized assessment in these in between years. This involved a detailed analysis of each municipality where assessments are compared to sale values. A relationship is established where it is found that assessment as related to sale value is at a level which is significantly below the average for the province, then an adjustment is made. If you would like to have a more detailed account of this I'll be happy to supply it for you and probably we could meet with the assessors so that you might become more informed on it and myself also.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend the Minister for the comments made and now the question that I would like to put to her is this. Will she undertake to make a study of what was proposed last year and come up with some clear-cut alternatives to the proposition that was made a year ago, because I have been trying since April 22, 1966 to get a commitment from my honourable friend the Minister of Health. I sent him a two-page letter asking him for alternatives because the First Minister said on April 22nd last that Neepawa could proceed with a medical building. I wrote a letter asking under what

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . conditions could they proceed - I'm still waiting for an answer. So, so long as my honourable friend will assure me that she will during recess make a complete study of this whole problem, because it's not only a problem for Neepawa, and come forward with an amendment to The Municipal Act next year that will provide for what Bill 100 was asking for, then I think that's all that can be done at this late stage in the proceedings; so as long as I have that assurance from my honourable friend, I am sure it would be helpful not only to me but to all other members of the House.

MRS. FORBES: I can assure the honourable member that I will look into this and will study the situation in conjunction with the Honourable Minister of Health, but I certainly can not give him any assurance whatsoever to bringing forth any amendment. That will have to wait the results of the study.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan asked me about the sale of firecrackers. I forgot that when I was on my feet before. This was given consideration and I think that it will still receive some consideration, but we wondered here whether, as I recall the instance when it was brought before us last Fall, if we start legislating the fact that you can't sell firecrackers where does it all end? And as a result this was something we thought required further study and it is being looked at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 108 passed. Resolution 109 passed. Resolution 110. 7. Municipal Budget and Finance. (a) . . .

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, I believe under this particular area the concern of a lot of municipalities at the present time, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we're rapidly approaching our limit of our budget date and I'm wondering if the Minister will take into consideration due to the various factors that have come into being this year of an extension of the budget date from April 15th to say, May 15th or some date of this type.

A few days ago, I guess a week or so ago, I asked the question in regards to how municipalities would claim for their rebates and there seemed to be some differences of opinion as to how this would be done. I know that she would like some suggestions and I would like to give her one that I think would meet with the approval of municipalities in particular, that once the tax roll is made up if the secretaries of the municipalities could make a claim for the total roll and it could be credited on the tax notices as they went out and everybody would see and would expedite the whole matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed. Resolution 110 passed. Resolution 111. 8. (a) . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we're now discussing the item of the Local Government Boundaries Commission and I feel that this is an area where we can make in effect a saving. We have several commission reports gathering dust at the present time and I feel we could well do without the Boundaries Commission, and I therefore move that the amount of \$227,914 under Resolution No. 111, Item XVI 8. - Local Government Boundaries Commission be reduced to nil. -- (Interjection) -- Let's keep a dollar? Okay, I'll change it to a \$1.00. Be reduced to \$1.00 then.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put I would like to ask the Honourable Minister some questions regarding that amount of money. I notice that the salaries are only \$18,000 yet I believe in news reports there was one salary alone that was \$18,000 and there was a part-time salary of \$12,000. I wonder if the Minister would detail the salaries because I don't think that is right. Also what salaries were paid last year, that is in 1966, or part of salaries. And also how many meetings has this Commission held and where were they held and were there any recommendations handed in to the Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this motion appears to me to be inspired by some of the criticism that we've heard in the House with respect to the Boundaries Commission and with respect to one of the members in particular.

Mr. Chairman, we in this Party have approved of the fact that a Commission should be established to inquire into and examine this problem. The report of that Commission will have to come back to this House and the House will have to give its consideration to the recommendations of that report. We think, we have stated and we still state that this appears to us to be the proper way of deciding on the issues that will be involved, that it will be too difficult for the House to spend its time in considering the matters that will have to be considered by this Commission.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we think that it's unforgivable on the part of the government to permit the Commission to continue on the basis of its present membership in view of the allegations that have been brought forward and I would say that they have been in fact admitted by a particular member on the Commission. And we think that part of the difficulty that is being caused with regard to this matter is the weakness of the government in permitting the Commission to exist in its present form despite the apparently uncontradicted evidence that has been brought forward by the Member for Gladstone. But we can't agree, Mr. Chairman, that because the status of one member has been challenged, and quite properly so, that the Commission should then disappear; nor can we agree that because some appointees happen to be former candidates for the Conservative Party that the Commission is open to question.

I would ask the Chairman to note that almost every judicial appointee, when commented on politically, is referred to as a political appointment, that these people are appointed because of either being previous candidates for political parties or as we have had happen in this province and in others, they've been previous members of the government, previous Cabinet Ministers, have had some previous association with the Party appointing them - and the Member for Lakeside pointed out that there are no New Democrats on the Bench and that's probably because they haven't been in office yet. Well we, of course, are hoping to correct that, Mr. Chairman. But nevertheless, the entire judiciary could be objected to on the same basis that the Liberal Party has objected to this Boundaries Commission, and the same is true if one member of the judiciary, as has unfortunately happened recently, one member of the judiciary was found to be someone who had to be subjected to an inquiry and it appears, although we won't comment on that, that his status to hold a position in the judiciary is in question. We don't suggest, Mr. Chairman, that thereby the entire judiciary should be dismissed because a member did something by virtue of which his status to hold judicial office is questioned.

So we can't, Mr. Chairman, support the elimination of all of the salaries that are going to be payable to this Commission which is in effect the elimination of the Commission itself. We agree with the idea that this matter should be referred for study. We agree that it should be referred to a Commission of this kind for study. We agree that the Commission should report to the Legislature, that its findings should then be subject to debate and adoption by this House; and we agree that if the status of any member of that Commission is open to question that that should not reflect against the Commission but should reflect against that member. And frankly, Mr. Chairman, we think that the government has not acted in a strong manner on the allegations that were brought forward by the Member for Gladstone which apparently not only are uncontradicted but are admitted by the person in question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I purposely didn't take any part in the discussion on the Boundaries Commission debate that came up earlier because it seemed to me that the Minister who had to defend these estimates was placed in a very difficult position because it's the First Minister of the Province or some of the Ministers that were responsible for the administration before her incumbency of this office that should be in a position to defend the membership of this Boundaries Commission rather than the present Minister. I am not even certain that she was in office when the Commission was appointed. I'm not sure on that point. But whether she was or not, the person who in this House has to defend the charges that have been made against this particular Boundaries Commission is the First Minister of the Province. He has to take responsibility when a Commission appointed to do such an important job is loaded up with people who are acknowledged to be partisans of the government.

This is a matter, Mr. Chairman, on which I have spoken before and on which I feel keenly, but I was not going to take any part in the discussion until this particular motion was moved. Now that it has been moved I think I have to declare myself. I so often agree with the logic of my honourable friend the Member for Inkster, but I simply have to correct him on this point though because I understood him to say that the criticism that has been directed from this group towards the Commission is because of the action of one particular member, with respect to one of its members, one of the members of the Committee.

It's true there was an accusation made, and I consider a very serious accusation made against one member of the Committee, but the reason that the members of this Party take the position that we do is not only for that reason but it's a protest toward the government doing this sort of a thing - and it's time that the government stopped it. And as far as I'm concerned I'm prepared to vote for the motion that's been proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . on the strict basis that this is a deserved rebuke to the government for continuing in its arrogance and its complacency to do things that are not only contrary to the public interest but they're absolutely in disrespect of public morality in matters of this kind. They've had this pointed out to them time and time before. And it's true what my honourable friend the Member for Inkster says, that all of us, all government have been guilty at times of appointing people who are personal or political friends rather than others. I've said in this House before I think this is only human that you see that happen once in a while. But when my honourable friend or anybody over there talks about us during our time having appointed Commissions that are comparable to this I'd like to list a few of them.

My honourable friend the Minister this afternoon mentioned two or three. She mentioned that one that was appointed in 1953. This was a committee to investigate municipal matters, not as big a job as the one faces at the present time I admit, but it's a pretty important job that they undertook to investigate; and that committee was composed of a half a dozen members of the Cabinet of that day plus a half a dozen representatives of the two municipal organizations, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association, appointed by themselves, and it didn't cost the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba one dollar except that that was contributed by the two organizations that I speak and the salaries that were paid to Cabinet Ministers anyway. And the Secretary of the Committee was a civil servant of the Province of Manitoba at that time. And it did a good job. It did a good enough job that it recommended increasing the assistance to the municipalities of the province by something like three and three quarter million dollars; so much so that my honourable friend, the present First Minister of the House, sitting on this side, referred to the munificence of the government in making this money available to the municipalities, but said that it was depreciated currency because it was tainted political money because of being paid to them shortly before an election. Well if there's anybody now in the House who should be an authority on depreciated currency because of what governments do in appointing partisans, or spending money just before election it's my honourable friend.

And then we had the Investigating Committee that my honourable friend the Minister spoke about. On that one we put the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg -- not a friend of this government -- the Mayor of the City of St. Boniface who was a friend of this government; the Mayor of the City -- it wasn't a city then, it was the Municipality of St. James -- the Mayor of St. James who was not a friend of this government; the Mayor of -- no, not the mayor at that time, he was the councillor I believe of West Kildonan -- who wasn't a particular friend of this government and I don't think anybody has been too -- (Interjection) -- of all governments, yes. Yes, I think of all governments. He never declared himself. And we had a representative from East Kildonan. A completely non-partisan committee, Mr. Chairman. But I'd like to mention one or two of the others -- and I admit the tremendous importance of the Boundaries Commission that we're talking about today. It is of great importance, but that's all the more reason why care should be used in appointing the members of it. We put fourteen members on it, too many in my opinion to start with, but fourteen, and to have five of them, five of them who were former candidates of one political Party, this is flying in the face of political morality, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's time that something was said about that kind of thing.

Perhaps two other Commissions could be mentioned that I would say were of equal importance with this one. One was the Committee on Education -- and who were put on that one? I may not be able to recall all of the names offhand but there was Dr. McFarlane, a former Deputy Minister of this Province, but he had left this province to go to the East and I don't know today what his politics were and I'm inclined to guess that they were not favourable to the party in office at the time, but I just do not know. Mrs. Wood of Brandon I think was politically favourable to the government of the day. Dr. James Cuddy was definitely friendly to the people who are now in the government here. Brother Bruns -- I don't know Brother Bruns' politics. I have no idea. Is that all the members of the Commission? Stephan Hansen -- and I never did know Stephan Hansen's politics but he was an Icelander and Icelanders are generally intelligent people, so I expect he was a supporter of the then government. But there are some exceptions to that rule I must admit. A completely non-political commission.

And then we have the Bracken Commission. That's another one that dealt with a question that I think could be compared properly as being of somewhat equal importance though certainly in a completely different matter to this. And we went out to try and get the right kind of people because we recognized the difficulty and the importance. And that's what should have been done in connection with this Commission. This is important. It is difficult and that's when you

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . shouldn't be paying your political debts. You should be getting the best people to do the job. I would say that there are only two people -- and there are two, if you want me to I'll name them -- there are two people in my opinion on that Commission that deserve to be ranked with the ones that we've mentioned, the ones that we put on commissions. Only two out of the fourteen that I would put in that rank. Because who did we get for that so-called Bracken Commission? We got Mr. Bracken himself who had if you want to use the term, deserted the political party that we belonged to but he was a man who had a tremendous experience to draw upon. We got a lady from up in the western part of the province, Mrs. Whiteford if I remember the name correctly. I would expect that she likely was, I didn't know her well but I expect that she was friendly to the government. We got Major-General Riley, one of the senior citizens of this province and one of the most highly respected and not a supporter of the government of that day. And who else did we get on that one? We got Cliff McRae, either the sitting president or a past president of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and Dr. L'Heureux of St. Boniface. Now Cliff McRae was probably in provincial matters friendly toward our side, in federal matters he was certainly friendly toward the other side. My guess is that Dr. L'Heureux being an extremely intelligent man and high-class citizen was likely a friend of ours. But these were people who were fit because of their standing in the community and the experience and character and ability that they could bring, and judgment, that they could bring to the job. And the thing that's wrong here, Mr. Chairman, is not so much what's wrong with the people on the committee, a good many of them I don't know, and when I made the remark a little while ago that I thought only two of them could be classed as being in the calibre of the folks that I mentioned, I certainly exclude the ones I don't know, because I shouldn't be passing judgment upon them. All I can say is that of the ones that I know that I would put two in that category.

But the mistake that is made is made by the government. To begin with they put fourteen on where you don't need as big a committee. If you want more, you get it in the way of assistance to the committee, and thank goodness, no not thank goodness, but in all conscience enough money is provided here for supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals, enough money is provided there to go outside the Commission to get your experts. And that's where you can go. What you want on the Commission is men and women of character and standing in the community whose very presence there will command respect; and what you do when you put on people that are open to the charge of political partisanship is that you immediately break down that respect. It is a first essential of the public having confidence in a good job being done. And the fault there is the government, and it's the First Minister and the senior Cabinet Ministers -- and this isn't the first time that they've done this -- and I just feel keenly enough about it and I'm just conscious enough of the job that we done that I support wholeheartedly the position that my Leader took a little while ago, and that is, you've got away to a bad start. It's the government's job, the government had better recognize it now because this Commission will never do a job in this area because of what has been done by the government. Not because of them themselves, because there are no doubt capable people there among them, but because of the attitude that the government has displayed, and this isn't the first time that they've done it. Scrap this Commission. Start over again, and in the meantime, just because of the way I feel about this and because of the censure that I think the government deserves I'd vote for the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I feel keenly enough about this matter that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has now spoken on twice, to make some contribution to the debate myself, because I feel just as keenly the other way, as he apparently feels in espousing the so-called principle that he does, before this Committee, because if you were to carry through to its logical conclusion the principle that he asks this House to accept, namely that a person who has once run, whether successfully or unsuccessfully for public office, should not be then available for a position as an appointive member of a commission, then I suggest that you undermine completely the whole political edifice of our country.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did I say that?

MR. LYON: Yes, because . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend knows I didn't.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend then said . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Is he going to withdraw what he said, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYON: I'll tell my honourable friend what my impression was. I marked his words down.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm not talking about your impression. You said what I said. Now withdraw it.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend said that you should not appoint people to appointive positions who had run for public office because there was a taint of partisanship to them. That's exactly what he just finished saying.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's not exactly what I said.

MR. LYON: He said it breaks down the respect if these people are open to charges of political partisanship. And what can you draw from that? If there's going to be a breakdown of respect if you appoint such people, then obviously he is saying you should not appoint people who have some political connection or who have run for political office. My honourable friend from St. Boniface I believe contributed to this debate some time ago and made almost the same comment, almost the same comment. And I suggest that this is a very interesting principle, a very interesting principle because in every provincial election that we have, we have something like what? - 200 candidates, citizens of Manitoba, who for one reason or another offer themselves for public office in this province, and I don't think that that offering of public service should be demeaned in that way that it is being demeaned in this House by the Member for Lakeside or anybody else for that matter, because I think it is a wrong principle. I do not feel for one moment that anyone should accept or could accept or will accept the proposition that a man who has offered himself for public elective office, whether it be in this Legislature, the House of Commons or whatever, should be stopped thereby because of that offering from ever serving on an appointive commission thereafter, because that essentially is the proposition that is being offered by my honourable friend from Lakeside. And I say this is not right, this is wrong. Presenting one's name for election to public office should never be a disability to accepting an appointive . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask my honourable friend a question? (Yes) If I were espousing that proposition in its entirety would I have then submitted the name of Mr. Bracken as one of these people that I was proud to have appointed to a commission?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend can - I think he sees the error of his ways and he's trying to withdraw - but the principle that he is enunciating is precisely what I have said and this is it, if he doesn't realize it then I'm sorry, but this is what he is saying - people who have offered themselves for elective office in this Legislature are tainted and people who are on a Boundaries Commission or whatever commission if they have a partisan stripe to them at all are tainted people and people for whom the public can have no respect. I do not accept that principle. I think that public office is the highest office that a citizen of this country can aspire for, and I do not think that just because a citizen has offered his name to run as a Conservative, a New Democratic Party member, a Liberal or a Social Creditor that he should thereby be estopped in the future from ever serving in any other position. And that is essentially what my honourable friend is saying, because he is saying that because we have former candidates of one party or another party on a particular commission or any other commission, that this is not right. That this is - what is it? - buttering up the hog or something like this.

This is a great theme of his. He talked about this with respect to the Water Control Commission earlier in this session and I won't get onto that matter because that debate is closed. I can understand I think my honourable friend's feeling this way, because he came from a political generation of the Progressives where partisan politics as we understand it and know it and practice it today was regarded as being a bad thing and I don't have to quote him from Professor Morton's history of Manitoba because Professor Morton elucidates that theory, that philosophy of the Progressive Party of which my honourable friend was a distinguished member and they just did not believe in partisan politics. They did not believe in the clash of partisan ideas. They did not believe that the parliamentary system or the parliamentary government required this kind of clash. While I disagree with that point of view I respect my honourable friend for holding it and I say I think that that is the genesis of his view for saying today, some 47 years after that, or 45 years after that government came into office that he still holds to the view that partisan politics is not quite what it should be. I don't, and I don't think that the people of Manitoba today feel that way. I think that that view was something that was held at the time by a number of people but it has passed, long since passed, and it's not good enough today to say that because a person has a partisan label on him that he is not fit to serve in an appointive office.

I do not accept that proposition because this is the kind of a principle that no legislature



(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . or no government could ever accept. The people on this Boundaries Commission are they for ever and a day to be prescribed, limited, from being appointed to any government commission because they once ran as a Conservative? Is somebody who ran for the Liberal Party to be prescribed and limited if that party should ever come into office again from being on an appointive commission because they ran as a Liberal? What sort of a nonsensical doctrine is this?

I say that I feel keenly about this, Mr. Chairman, and I participate in the debate for that reason, that this is not a proposition that could be accepted by this House, that it is not the kind of political payoff or patronage that my honourable friend is trying to point it out to be, because if that is the case, why then we had best look and see what's being done in other jurisdictions and make a determination in this regard here and now. I don't accept it as a case. I think that a person who has either served in elective capacity or has run and been defeated is probably among the peers who should be considered for appointive office from time to time, because he is a person who has come forward and said I am willing to serve in a public capacity, and I don't give two particular hoots what his politics are, because I have a basic respect for a person who runs. I have a basic respect for a person who runs for public office, even if he is, I think, misguided enough to run for my honourable friend's opposite, the Official Opposition. I still say that they are trying to serve their community, misguided as they may be in their Party philosophy. Because if we are to accept this proposition as the Honourable Member for Inkster quite properly tried to point out to my honourable friend, what happens to the Bench of this country? Practically every appointment that is made would fall into this terribly tainted category that my honourable friend talks about of being men and women of standing in the community, he says; we want these people but we don't want any of those candidates. No, no; these are not people of standing in the community. He says that appointing defeated candidates or appointing people who have offered themselves to elective office -- and these were his words. I had to write them down. I couldn't believe them. "A disrespect on the part of the government for public morality," if you please. "Contrary to the public interest," if you please -- that's what he says -- because people who have offered themselves for public office are appointed to a commission.

I do not accept that doctrine. I don't think any right-thinking person could accept that doctrine. I come back to the Bench. I know men who are Liberals, Conservatives, have been extremely active partisans in their lives, some of them candidates, some of them members, appointed to the Bench and they are the luminaries on the Bench. These are the people who adorn and who grace the Bench and who provide the kind of a judicial atmosphere that this country can be proud of. Are these people to be deprived, under this theory that my honourable friend enunciates, from serving in an appointive capacity, serving their fellow citizens? Nonsense.

I'm not going to name names; I don't have to, because there are Liberals and Conservatives, close friends of my honourable friend, who have adorned the Bench in this province and who have served the people of this country exceedingly well, and I do not think that their partisan background was a disability in any way nor was it the kind of a taint on their background that would cause them to be non-judicial or to cause a breakdown of respect for them or for the judicial system to which they are appointed. This just is not the case.

I accept the fact -- I accept the fact that defeated candidates or that former members of the House or of the House of Commons or a Senator or whatever can be appointed by a government to serve in appointive capacities. I think this is right and I think this is good and I do not think that it should be attacked from all corners for some petty political advantage, because this is going to break down the kind of public service that you want from people in this country. My heavens, we have enough trouble getting good people to run for public office let alone having them maligned after they run for public office because they are still willing to make some contribution in the appointive field.

We've mentioned the Bench. I remember a Minister of the present Federal Government who was defeated in the last election and immediately after was appointed to the Presidency of the Dominion Coal Board and I defend that appointment. I think it was a good appointment, but under my honourable friend's proposition, oh, no, he's tainted; he can't take that appointment. I remember a man who ran for the Liberal Party in British Columbia in the last general election. He is now a Deputy Minister in the Government at Ottawa. I defend that appointment. I think that's a good appointment. -- (Interjection) -- Tom Kent. I don't think there's anything wrong with Tom Kent being appointed to the position that he was, but under my honourable

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . friend's proposition, that's not right; he's tainted; the public could have no respect for him.

I remember a man - I remember a man whom my honourable friend appointed to a Commission in this province, a provincial commission. He was a Liberal. He was a good man. He subsequently ran federally for the Liberal Party in Manitoba. He was defeated. He now sits on the Board of the Canadian National Railways and I defend that appointment. I think that is a good appointment and I would hate to see that man kept out of public service, but if we follow through the theory and the principle enunciated by the Member for Lakeside, that's what would happen.

I remember - I remember a former Cabinet colleague of my honourable friend from Lakeside, later a defeated candidate, who is now serving in a federal appointive position with the Board of Grain Commissioners. I defend that appointment. I see nothing wrong with that appointment even though it is a partisan appointment about which my honourable friend wishes to rail. Of course it's a partisan appointment but he has a role to fill and he does a job. Is my honourable friend going to say he's not doing a job? Of course not.

I defend the appointment of the last Senator from Manitoba. He wasn't even a defeated candidate. He was a political organizer for the Liberal Party but I defend his appointment because I think it was a good appointment. It offends the rule of my honourable friend from Lakeside, yes, but it's still a good appointment and I suggest we prove thereby that the rule holds no water. It's nonsense.

I remember the former Liberal member for Winnipeg South. I see she was appointed to a federal position the other day. I defend that appointment. I think she is a woman who can make a contribution to public life, but under my honourable friend's proposition she couldn't take the job because she's tainted; there's no public respect for her.

I see in today's paper where a former Minister of Justice is going to be appointed to the Quebec Bench. I think he will be a good judge. He is retiring from the present Cabinet. A political appointment, yes, but I defend that appointment. I think it is a good appointment. I think the principle that is followed in that appointment is a good one. I think he will make a good judge, but according to my honourable friend from Lakeside, no, he wouldn't make a good judge at all because he's politically tainted.

The former High Commissioner to London, a former member of the Pearson Cabinet, a distinguished Canadian, public servant, now the Ambassador at Large for EXPO. Political appointment? Yes, of course it was. But a man capable of doing the job? Yes, of course he is. The fact that he was a former Liberal member of the House is no reason why he should be cast to one side and say: Oh, it's too bad, you're tainted; you can't serve the public any more; but according to my honourable friend that's what should be done about it.

One of the most distinguished Governors-General of this country was a defeated Liberal candidate. Is my honourable friend going to say that he shouldn't have been appointed to that highest position in Canada because he had a partisan stripe to him? We are shortly to have a new Governor-General who was formerly a political-elected person and was a defeated candidate. Is my honourable friend going to say that he cannot serve with distinction in that job? I'm sure we all agree he will, and his background as a defeated candidate plays no part in it whatsoever. Of course he should be available. We should cry to the moon in our happiness, in our joy, that people of that stature are willing to be appointed to public appointive offices.

I remember a former campaign manager for the Liberal Party of Canada - a former Commissioner of the football league for 54 days or whatever it was - he was appointed to the Senate of Canada. Under my honourable friend's injunction he would never have been appointed to the Senate of Canada because that would be a partisan appointment, a bad one, he's tainted; he is the kind of person that men and women cannot have respect for because he is a former candidate for a Party.

I can remember a former Minister of Agriculture in the Pearson government at Ottawa who is now in the Senate of Canada and who was appointed by the present government at Ottawa. A bad appointment? No, I think Harry Hays has a contribution to make to Canada still even though he is a defeated Liberal candidate. So how can we say that this proposition of my honourable friend holds any water at all?

Hazen Argue, a member of the Senate of Canada, not a bad appointment. I might get some arguments from my friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party on that score. When you really get in trouble is when you appoint a former NDP'er to a Liberal position. That's when you really get into trouble. And one could go on - and I'm only talking about recent

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . appointments, recent ones that come quickly to mind - and let me say here and now, Mr. Speaker, in mentioning these people or in mentioning their offices, I do so not with any sense whatsoever of demeaning them, not one bit, because I praise them for making themselves available for appointive office. I praise them in turn for making themselves available at one time in one role or another for elective office because I think that is a high role for a citizen to offer to his community and I do not think that that role should be hacked away at and should be demeaned for the sake of making it appear that people are turning out the old pork barrel, as my honourable friend would probably phrase it, for the sake of looking after your political friends. It's much bigger than that. It's getting people who are capable of doing a job, and thank heaven they're willing to offer themselves to continue to do a job.

So I say to my honourable friend I could not disagree more profoundly with him. I find it difficult - I really find it difficult having as I do the respect I do for my honourable friend from Lakeside who has sat in this House for forty-five years, to think that after that length of time he could make the kind of speech that he makes here today, because it just does not hold water and it is not right. The principle he enunciates is not right. It is not one that can be subscribed to; it is not one that I will ever subscribe to; and it's not one that this Legislature should pay any attention to and this vote should be defeated.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, everybody knows in the House who has been here a little while how my honourable friend the Attorney-General can produce red herrings at will and drag them all around the place and this was a highlight, I think, of his performance because this was exactly what he was wanting to do. The fact that he misquoted me completely at the very start to the extent that I had to challenge him and correct him doesn't make his performance any the less admirable. He does a good job on this sort of thing but I'm not prepared to let him get away with it, much as he would like to leave it at that stage, because I'm prepared to debate this with my honourable friend just as long as the House sits and on the basis that he wants.

My honourable friend knows that what I was saying there was not that people that had been candidates or had served in public life in any way were not fit for appointment. What I was saying was that a government who so evidently picks them out because of their partisan leanings is the one that's to blame and that's what's done in this case. This isn't a case of some one person who has been a member of a Cabinet or a member of the Legislative Assembly or has run as a candidate being appointed as a judge or even as a football commissioner or anything else of this kind. This is not to say -- I have admitted myself that I don't pretend that in the times that we were in office that when appointments were to be made that I was not inclined to give preference to a political friend and a personal friend providing the qualifications were equal. This is human. We're all this way.

What I'm talking about is a government that deliberately loads a commission of this kind with people who it's just giving jobs to, and, Mr. Chairman, this is why my honourable friend the Attorney-General would like to divert the discussion to another field and that would be to enumerating all the many people that have been appointed to judgeships and to other senior positions. Of course they are, and while a lot of those I do not approve of, I do not draw the line so tightly as my honourable friend would try to have you believe. I do not say that they're tainted, that they're qualified. I say a government is tainted. I say a government is tainted when they do this sort of thing and do it consistently and do it regularly, do it time after time after time. I have not protested too greatly until this year when it's continued with not only great regularity but with increasing frequency. The Ministers who have been defeated there - take the Portage la Prairie one, Christianson; take Smellie; take the rest of them - they go to jobs right away with no special qualifications.

MR. LYON: Is that wrong?

MR. CAMPBELL: It's wrong when you do it so consistently that you lead the public to believe that it's done for that purpose.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, would my honourable friend permit a question? If that is wrong here, is it not equally wrong in Ottawa, in Vancouver, in Edmonton, in Regina and every other province in Canada, where defeated Ministers, defeated candidates are appointed by every government of every political stripe? If it's wrong here then my honourable friend must be saying it's equally wrong in Ottawa. Is that not true?

MR. CAMPBELL: It would be equally wrong in Ottawa, in Regina, in Edmonton, in Vancouver, in Victoria, in every place else it would be equally wrong as it is here if you appointed a commission such as this one and put five defeated candidates on it. It would be

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . . equally wrong no matter who did it. This is what is wrong in this case. You've got a job that's a very sensitive job to do, a difficult job, an important one, you recognize the importance of it and you decide to appoint a commission, and you immediately raise the question in the public mind by putting on five defeated candidates.

I claim that does recognize a breakdown in political morality. It's the government that's wrong, not the people who take the jobs although they shouldn't perhaps take them if they had the fullest respect for public morality either, but it's the government that I'm criticizing, not the people that are on the Commission. If the people that are on the Commission are as capable, as experienced, as well-equipped to do their job as my honourable friend the Minister suggests they are, then good luck to them, but it still is a mistake as far as the government is concerned and it handicaps the Commission from the very start.

The thing that should be done is what my Leader has suggested, that this Commission should be disbanded and start afresh. The reason that I speak with such heat upon the subject is because I have seen this tendency not only practised time after time after time by this government but it is actually growing, and we have before us a couple of bills now - I can't name them offhand - where I see that they're getting prepared to appoint another couple of boards and commissions. This is going to the extreme and it's the government that is to blame, and that's why I was glad that my honourable friend the Attorney-General got into it to at least try and defend this practice, and he defends it of course by saying that I take a position that I do not take. I blame the government rather than the people concerned. I would still suggest that of the ones that I know on the Commission, they are not of the calibre that should be appointed to such a difficult position as this, but that is a minor criticism compared to the one that I attach to the government. The government is flying in the face of the public feeling in this kind of matter when they use the taxpayers' money in order to pay off political debts to some of their friends, and there's been too much of that by this government.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General goes through a whole long list of people, both the Federal and Provincial, who have been appointed after a partisan career in politics and he says: "I defend that, I defend it, I approve of it." It's evident that he approves of it; we have lots of evidence. He doesn't need to stand up here this afternoon to tell us that he approves of it. If he hadn't, he would have left that government.

MR. LYON: Does my honourable friend not approve of the names, Sir, of the positions that I mentioned? Is he opposed to any of the ones that I mentioned that were appointed by the Liberal Party at Ottawa?

MR. CAMPBELL: I didn't get my honourable friend's question.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit another question.

MR. LYON: Oh, sure - sure.

MR. GREEN: This question may be unique in that I'm really seeking information. I'm not trying to make a point. You mentioned that in previous years that the attempt was made to appoint people of outstanding calibre in the community and you referred to people in the Party opposite and your own Party but you never referred to anybody in this Party. I just wondered whether anybody in this Party was appointed in those years.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just recently, Mr. Chairman - I'm going to follow the practice of my honourable friend the Attorney-General now and try and keep my friend the Member for Inkster from asking me any more embarrassing questions by sort of buttering up a little bit - I would say that just recently a couple of members have come into the New Democratic Party that I think would be entitled to consideration in cases of that kind, and it simply re-enforces my point, however, that the first consideration....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee come to order, please. Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, I beg your pardon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we've had a pretty full discussion on this Boundaries Commission. We have a resolution before us here and it's almost 5:30. Could we not bring this debate to a close?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this resolution if I might.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wasn't quite finished, Mr. Chairman, but if it's your opinion that I have sufficiently demolished the arguments of the Honourable the Attorney-General, which really didn't need any demolishing for everybody recognized that they were just red herrings and nothing else, then I'll be willing to give way to my honourable friend for Seven Oaks.

MR. ROBLIN: ... I have a chance to intervene in this debate if we're going to have a vote fairly soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the NDP was on his feet a few moments ago. Do you wish the floor now? -- The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I would like to speak on it just for a very few moments. I was pleased to hear the Member for Lakeside admit that he too was guilty of the same sins that he now accuses the Conservative Party and I don't doubt they're both guilty. On the other hand, the question before us really is whether a Boundary Commission which has been appointed should be disbanded completely and this is really the resolution. As the Member for Inkster pointed out, we cannot subscribe to that. It is a Commission that has a job to do, it must be done, it's long overdue as everyone agrees. Now I would go along certainly with the suggestion that the appointments should have been made in another manner than they have been made. I would like to have seen a different choice in many instances. However, that's done.

I think the issue though that the government has not answered and has not yet faced up to is the question raised by the Member for Gladstone originally many weeks ago, and at that time I was one of those that challenged the Member for Gladstone to bring in an affidavit to support his charge, because at that time I said it demeans this House to hear this type of charge without any supporting evidence.

Well, he brought in supporting evidence. He brought it in, and the Minister of Education - at that time when it was first brought out by the Member for Gladstone - also got to his feet and agreed that it should be investigated if there was evidence. The evidence is in and is very clearly in. It's supported by affidavit; it isn't denied by the person against whom the allegations are made, he agrees that this is so; and if for no other reason than to remove this cloud on the Boundary Commission, to make their job easier - because this is a sensitive Commission dealing with a very sensitive problem - when they bring the recommendations into this House - we know there is going to be a hassle, we know this because there are partisan feelings in this matter and that there always will be, so don't make the job more difficult for the Commission - when they bring these recommendations in, let the members of the House feel that at least they were partially fair, an attempt was made to be fair.

But when you have a member of a commission who admits to making stupid statements, and they are - I'll just classify them that way - then I feel that he has given up his right to sit on that commission because anything that might come out of it is then tainted by this asinine type of remark that he made, and I think this Boundary Commission must be above that. I don't think we can at this time go along with throwing everyone out and starting afresh, but surely in the case of this one man, against whom a charge was laid and against whom the

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) . . . . charge has been proved, I think the government has every responsibility in this to remove that man and at least take some of the taint away from the Commission. Their job is difficult enough, God knows, without imposing this further burden on them.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I ask the member a question? If he agrees that the selection wasn't right, that the government did not proceed in the right way to make the selection, doesn't he feel that it is going to be dangerous to allow this Commission - because the Minister has refused, apparently he has refused to do anything about it, and although the Minister of Education has also stated that he would suggest that this person should be fired on the spot, nothing has been done - does he feel that it's better to go ahead with this kind of commission without confidence of the public?

MR. MILLER: I'm going to limit myself to the one individual. I agree with you. As far as I'm concerned, I would vote a censure against the government if they do not remove this one individual, but because it has developed as long as it has, I think at this stage to dismiss everyone from the Commission would be wrong. I think we're dealing with the one case which has been proven and which the government should act on.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the member feel that, apart from this member that he referred to, that this is an independent Commission?

MR. MILLER: No, I said that I don't agree that the members were chosen properly. I agree that there should have been a far broader base to this Commission than there is. However, it's a fait accompli. It's done, they have started their work, they have already made some reports, and at this stage I don't think it wise to start all over again and hinder the work of the Commission and set it back for perhaps months.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . will allow a last question then, would my friend say . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I would move the committee rise.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.