

I N D E X

Friday, June 26, 1959, 2:30 P.M.

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Report of Select Standing Committee, Municipal Affairs, (Mr. Ridley)</u>	317
<u>Introduction of Bill No. 76, Urban Trustees, (Mr. Lissaman)</u>	317
<u>Questions:</u>	317
Mr. Desjardins (Mr. Carroll), Mr. Guttormson (Mr. Willis)	
<u>Order for Returns, Mr. Peters</u>	318
<u>Committee of Whole House, Third Reading of Bills Nos. 7, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 28,</u> 29, 31, 33, 34, 36.....	318
Third Reading of Bills Nos. 46, 47, 48, 50, 60	319
<u>Second Reading of Bills Nos. 58, 45</u>	321
No. 70	325
No. 71	326
<u>Adjourned Debate, Motor Vehicle Insurance (Mr. Paulley) and Amendment</u> (Mr. McKellar), Mr. Schreyer	328
Mr. Alexander	331
Mr. Strickland	332
<u>Adjourned Debate, Farm Implements Tax (Mr. Ridley) and Amendment (Mr. Roberts),</u> Mr. Shewman (Amendment to Amendment)	334
<u>Adjourned Debate, re Ambulance Service (Mr. Wright), Mr. Weir</u>	335
Mr. Desjardins	338
<u>Committee of Supply, Interim</u>	339
<u>Committee of Supply - Evening Sitting</u>	
<u>Treasury, Administration</u>	342
Taxation Branch	347
Insurance Premiums	350
Insurance Branch	350
Miscellaneous	352
Grants to Municipalities, etc	352
<u>Provincial Secretary, Administration</u>	353
Queen's Printer Office	356
Manitoba Gazette	357
Civil Service Commission	358
Civil Service Superannuation	363
Civil Service Group Life Insurance	366
<u>Education, Mr. McLean</u>	366

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, June 26th, 1959.

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon all members on the Municipal Affairs Committee received a note that we would be sitting at 1:30 P.M. Tuesday. Due to uncontrollable circumstances this has been cancelled until further notice. I hope that's agreeable to everybody.

MR. MILLER: Speaking on that point, I must confess I was on Municipal Affairs Committee this morning but the hour was so unusual that I proceeded to arrive here at 10:00 o'clock when it was all over.

A MEMBER: Oh we got along fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Treasury, Item No. 1.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few observations to make and a few questions to ask on this point. I might say that I was very impressed with the statement given by the First Minister in his capacity as treasurer. I was impressed too with his suggestion of the savings that the Department of Methods - is it? - achieved. Pardon? Organization Methods. I think the First Minister said that in one department of government alone there was a saving of some \$58,000.00 -- in the Department of Queen's Printer.

The question I would like to ask him is whether this is an anticipated saving or an actual saving, and if it is an actual saving in the year's operations, whether or not the reduction or the savings will be reflected in the various appropriations of the various departments. He suggested too, and I think this is a projected saving, in the operation of government cars. I think he suggested that there might be -- that there's a study under way whereby the question of pooling cars might be looked into, and in that department alone there was an anticipated saving of \$1,000,000. In addition to that, through calculation of the population of Manitoba, there was another anticipated increase in revenue of some \$500,000.00. I wonder if he'd be kind enough to give us a little more detailed information. And I wonder too whether he would agree, - there's no doubt that he and his colleagues on the treasury board were greatly impressed by the report of the sub-department of Organization and Methods, - and I wonder whether he would like to have a committee of this House be similarly impressed and afford an opportunity for a committee of this kind to be given the reasons and the arguments for these actual or anticipated savings.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the fact that the honourable member must bear in mind is that we are dealing with the estimates of the coming year. These are the figures that the -- any statements that I made last night are reflected in the estimates for the coming year. Some of these changes that have already been in effect for say several months, have already started to show up insofar as last years' business is concerned. But my honourable friend is very familiar with the system of estimating, that the departments come in and the various estimates are put before the committee that happens to be examining them, the treasury board or whatever it happens to be, and that the savings that may be made or the appropriations that are approved are distributed throughout the whole estimates. And on the question of printing for example, many of the matters that I referred to arise from standardization of forms. Now, in itself that's a very simple idea, but when applied to a large service like ours, it's worth a great deal of money. And standardization of forms, changing in the methods of ordering and matters of that sort, will result in substantial savings when spread over service as large as ours. So that the question that he asks, that answer is yes and no. In some of the matters, which have already been put into effect, savings have commenced to be realized, in others, they are just starting now and will be in the course of the next fiscal year. When the Public Accounts Committee meets, if any member wants to ask any member of the Treasury Board any details about these matters, they'll be perfectly free to do so.

MR. MILLER: Just another question, Mr. Chairman. What I asked too is whether the anticipated saving in the various departments due to the saving in the Queen's Printers Department are reflected in the estimates?

MR. ROBLIN: The answer is yes and no. In connection with the Queen's Printers the answer is yes. In connection with some of the other matters which have not reached the stage

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . where I would like to - when these were prepared some few months ago, they're not included in them and they will be shown up when our final year's accounts are over. My honourable friend knows, of course, that the figures in this little booklet here were prepared last November, December, January, they have not been changed since. Many of the developments have taken place since then, however, so that they'll show up at a later time rather than in these figures. So these figures may in some instances over estimate the actual expense.

MR. MILLER: are then, Mr. Chairman, that the individual ministers will call our attention to any reduction in the appropriations affecting the Queen's Printer in anticipation of the anticipated savings?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I don't think that I can give him that assurance because as he knows, in practically every subdivision there's printing all the way through. It adds up to some \$200,000.00 or \$300,000.00 throughout the whole estimates, and the saving of some \$50,000.00 is scattered through the whole lot of that. So I would ask him just to take note of the fact that out of the total of the printing and stationery requirements which are spread throughout all the government departments, the saving has been totalled as well. But it will be spread through every department's figures.

MR. MILLER: There's one other question, Mr. Chairman. In connection with the salaries that we're considering. I asked the Honourable the First Minister the salary of the present Deputy Treasurer. The answer was \$12,000.00. Now, I notice at the end of the estimates there's an item of \$965,000.00 "Increase of Civil Service Salaries". When could we get the breakdown of that? Should we wait till the item? because I anticipate that the deputy ministers and the senior officials and indeed all ranks of the Civil Service will participate in this increase. When can we get the breakdown of the salary range as proposed under the distribution of the \$965,000.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think practically all grades do share in the increase except the Deputy Ministers. As I mentioned last night, and I think I made it quite clear last night that they are not included in this salary increase that has been put through and that they will, I feel, - that probably separate consideration will have to be given to that situation in the near future. The nine hundred odd thousand dollars, of course, is the grand total of the estimated value of the increases through all departments. The figures shown at the present time in the itemized statements contained in this book, do not reflect those increases. At the time this was made up we had to -- the negotiations with the Civil Service were not completed and it was not considered advisable at that time to work back through all the estimates that had been previously prepared to add on 50¢ here and a \$1.00 there, and all the rest of it to distribute that sum. And in any case we thought that the House would probably like to see the grand total anyway, so it's shown separately.

Now, when the Provincial Secretary's estimates are up and -- he's out representing the province at a function tonight - he's been warned not to be late, when he comes back and I expect him soon - when his estimates are up on the Civil Service I'm sure that if he hasn't got the information with him, he can give the House the entire breakdown of the salaries that affect every department of the administration. The honourable member will be aware that the Civil Service Commission prepares a complete little dossier, or whatever you want to call it, of all the changes that have been made. And that, of course, is the basis on which they work. It's the basis from which the grand total is calculated and we'll be very happy to place that information at the disposal of the committee.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave the impression that I'm opposing any increase in the compensation to, particularly in the senior officials of the government. I realize that it's very difficult to retain the services of outstanding people at the salaries obtaining, and I don't want to leave the impression that I for one -- as a matter of fact, I always have been for high salaries for those who work.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we got into the question of the Interim Supply last night, I had raised the point of the departure of Mr. Anderson, and both the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition had an opportunity of paying tribute to that gentleman, and in the scuffle I didn't get back to say a word or two myself.

As is well known we of our group have not as yet had the pleasure of forming the Government in Manitoba.

MR. MILLER: Not yet and never will.

MR. PAULLEY: As yet. But I would like to say this. Well, we almost formed the Official Opposition, Mr. Chairman, which is the first step across the way. And so far this year the indication has been recorded, at least in some newspapers local if not elsewhere, that in effect thus far at least we have given the appearance of being the Official Opposition.

Now, what I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in regard to Mr. Anderson, simply this. That at all times that our members -- the members of our group had any dealings with the gentleman we found him ready and willing to co-operate with us and to give us any assistance that he could give us. Particularly that was true when we had the Public Accounts under scrutiny. And I'm sure that our group joins with the other two gentlemen that I've mentioned, in regretting the departure of Mr. Anderson from our Civil Service. I did direct a question, either the First Minister didn't feel that he should answer it or didn't make note of it, in respect of a successor to Mr. Anderson, as to whether or not his successor may come from within the present ranks of the Civil Service or whether it may be deemed advisable to go outside the present ranks and advertise for a person to fill the position. Possibly the First Minister feels that he shouldn't answer that question at this particular time and I can appreciate if that is the case.

But in connection with the salary increases that are listed - the total amount that's listed in the back of the book - I was somewhat dismayed to hear the remark of the Honourable the First Minister when he, I think, made the statement that the deputy ministers were not included in the increases and that possibly something would have to be done in order to give them some increase. I don't know if the government, of course, has anything concrete in mind or under consideration. But I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, and quite often we are condemned, shall I say, because of some of the views that we take in respect of this so called free enterprise system that some people think we're living under. But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that in the position of deputy minister - and I think we had quite a discussion on this a couple of years ago - that the province may be losing -- and partly in the case of Mr. Anderson, is losing valuable public servants who are well qualified in their respective positions as seniors in departments and deputy ministers. And I think, Sir, that one of the reasons that we are losing them is because of the salary range that is being paid. Now, I certainly do not agree with exorbitant rates of payment for one's labour but I do think that in our public service, in our Civil Service, that if we are going to hold in our service men of outstanding ability and qualifications, that we'll have to give very, very serious consideration to coming up in the salary range at least somewhere comparable with that that is being paid or offered by those in private industry who see in these men, men of high caliber.

I think it is a truism to say that not only here in Canada but across the line and other jurisdictions as well, that within the ranks of the Civil Service men are trained in the performance of tasks, they exhibit their capabilities, and after they have been devout in their various or respective spheres, private industries are only too willing to make greater offers to them with the net result that there are losses, which in many cases are severe losses in the public service of many governments. We've seen it at the municipal level; we've seen it at the provincial level; we've seen it at the dominion level. And I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that I would suggest to the members opposite, the First Minister and the Treasury Board, that serious consideration be given to this and while we are going to make provision for almost a million dollars in respect of salary increase to our general Civil Service, that a lot of consideration should be given to the deputy ministers and the senior officials in order to retain them in the service of the province.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member has taken a very broad view of the situation of which I am in agreement and we will be looking into that important matter between now and the next time we meet. Regarding a replacement, we are going to try and get the very best possible person we can. I don't think I should say any more at the present time on that subject.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I gave notice when we began the consideration of these estimates that I would have something to say in the nature of a complaint against the format of the present estimates when we got to one of the regular departments, because I felt that it does not give this - this copy of the estimates does not give the information that was given in the former way of setting up the estimates, and I think the change here is not a beneficial one. As

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . a matter of fact, I think that it was much better the way we had it before, because while I'm not suggesting that we should carry through all the salaries that are paid and the positions that are occupied here, and no doubt some consolidation is advisable there, but I think that one of the ones we should keep there, if for no other reason than to point up this matter that's under discussion now, is the deputy minister's salary. I don't think it should be lumped as it is in this case with 31 others. And I would suggest that when the next estimates are made up, that we revert to the former practise and show the deputy minister's salary separately, and then that we also utilize a practise that obtained a few years ago - I think it was carried right through all the time - I'm not certain of that, but certainly it was obtained for some years, of showing the total salary at the same time, because there are some officials here, some senior officials, where their salaries are paid from more than one appropriation and not all the salary shows in the one place. I think that where that is the case, that the practise that we had some years ago of showing the total salary is proper and gives the full information. In that connection I (Interjection) yes, well it has been for years. And in that connection I'd ask the Honourable the First Minister if it isn't a fact that in this particular case there has been a payment in addition to his salary as deputy minister. Is that

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but it is not paid from the estimates of the government, so it does not appear in the estimates of the government.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right, but I still think that the total salary should be shown in those cases, because his salary as deputy minister shows and comes from the appropriation and there's nothing, even though that is the case, in my opinion, to prevent the total salary being shown just as in other cases. I'm not objecting to that practise at all. I think in this case it is quite warranted but I do think it should be shown here. Now on this question of . . .

MR. ROBLIN: But the other salary that this gentleman draws has nothing to do with our budget. You can't, I don't think, carry that principle outside the budget that's before us now. I quite agree with my honourable friend, that if double salaries are being paid under this budget, they should be shown. There are none that I'm aware of, but there may be that various people have incomes or salaries from other sources that are not in this budget. That happens to be the case in this instance. But I wonder if my honourable friend really wants me to show that in here or whether he is really saying he wants to know if there's double salaries in this budget.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I mean that we should have before us the salary of the deputy minister, as it is in this case, and then in bracket after it as was shown formerly, total salary - so and so, so much.

MR. ROBLIN: Provided it is in this budget, yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: But even if it isn't in this budget, my point is that this House has a right to know and the public has a right to know how much money the different individual are getting. It's true that it is published in some form but not many people see the public accounts to get the salaries of other people there, and I'm not suggesting that they should all be put in the estimates now.

MR. ROBLIN: This wouldn't appear in the public accounts either.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, that's true, that's true, but there's no problem of accounting in here because the additional salary would simply be shown added to the \$12,000.00 and then only the \$12,000.00 would be carried over into the margin to be added in with the appropriations here; and then it would be evident to everyone in the House that it came from some other source, because otherwise the amount of the extra salary would be carried over to add into the salaries. My only point is that with the senior people - particularly, that these salaries should be shown - the total that the individual is receiving.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll consider that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, well I make it quite honestly because I think it's right, and I think it's proper that we should show the salaries separately of senior people in this way. And I don't need to keep raising this on every one of the departments, but I certainly would say the same thing about the deputy minister in the next department and the Civil Service Commissioner and people of that category in the Civil Service. Now, on this question of salaries generally, I agree that some of our senior officials have realized for some time that they could have received larger salaries in other lines of business. That was mentioned by both the First Minister and me last evening. We know of offers that this particular individual has had, and others of the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . senior Civil Servants, and I recognize and I certainly appreciate the fact that it is to a large extent dedication to public service that keeps some of these people here. On the other hand, I think we have to once in a while, and we're talking about salaries, remember as well what the taxpayer is doing for these people too, because these are fairly high salaries and in addition to that these folks get a taxpayer contribution to their superannuation which is quite substantial, and the higher the salary the more substantial is. Just now we're engaged in passing the Group-Life Bill which will be another contribution.

Then there's a factor as far as these salaries are concerned - it's one of the factors that has operated more in recent years - that the height of the income tax has had something to do with wiping out to quite a large extent, the difference between the very large salary and the medium salary. Not that it completely wipes it out by any means, but when you take the income tax bite out of an extremely high salary, and then when you add in the contribution that is made to a pretty high salary by the taxpayers through the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, and now with this other one - small, it is admitted, but still a consideration, you find that there is a tendency for even pretty high-salaried people who are offered still much higher salaries to take those things into consideration. And that's one of the great justifications, I think, for having Civil Service superannuation as we have here of such generous proportions. Don't let anybody suggest out that it isn't generous. I have nothing but good to say about this particular individual and the other deputies. We're mighty fortunate in this province in the calibre of our senior Civil Servants. - mighty fortunate. I wish I'd said this while he was out of the room and not before he returned here because, and I've mentioned it before, we've got one of them sitting on the floor of this House beside you, Mr. Chairman, that is one of the really good Civil Servants in this province. The amount of work that that particular individual does through the years is simply unbelievable, and he would be the first to admit or to declare, and so would Stuart Anderson, that we've got a lot of others of them. We're very, very fortunate in the calibre of those good top people that we have. And goodness knows, I'm as sorry as anybody to see any one of them leave, but on the other hand - and I have no objection to their wages being raised more in line with prevailing rates elsewhere, I think that is necessary - but on the other hand, I wouldn't want from the remarks that have been made by my honourable friend here to have the impression go out that the government in Manitoba doesn't deal pretty generously in the way of what we might call "fringe benefits" with its Civil Servants too, and that applies to the greatest extent in these high salary brackets.

Now, I have only one other thing to say at the moment and I don't want to ask my honourable friend the First Minister to anticipate the budget. If he says that he's not prepared to give this information at this time, if he wants to leave it to the budget address, then I don't think I would be prepared to press it at all, but I think the members of the House would appreciate it if he would be inclined to give us before the introduction of the formal budget speech a memo of all the borrowings and funding and refunding of the Government of Manitoba since this present government took office. I know that properly belongs in the budget address itself and I know that that's the time that it can be spoken about very fully and appropriately, but generally speaking, and I would expect that this session would be no exception, the budget debate itself has been limited in this House to very few speeches and they're formal speeches. They're not informal in the way that we have it in Committee of the Whole and Committee of Supply and some of us at least would like to have that information in advance if it can be furnished.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I will admit that is part of my budget speech and I would prefer to withhold it until that time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'm not going to press it.

MR. G. MOLGAT: (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, while we're on this matter of the deputy minister's salary and I certainly want to agree completely with the comments that have been made about this particular deputy minister, he was certainly one of the finest Civil Servants in the Province of Manitoba, and the question I'm going to ask is not at all with particular reference to this person. It's just the general range. What other payment does he receive from his other appointments?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Anderson has been appointed a member of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board which pays him \$6,000.00 for being a director of that board so that his total salary from the government is \$12,000.00 and from the Hydro-Electric Board is \$6,000.00.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't intended to say anything because I think that the leader of our group expressed our thinking with regard to this question, but I do think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does raise a point which I think we have to keep in mind. I don't - it's probably true to say that not too many of the top officials will have left, or are likely to leave, and it may be that if they do, as in this case, if there is somebody in this department who can fill the position even at the salary which has been paid - that if somebody in the department would move up and be satisfied - but I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has given thought to what kind of person you can get in this top range if you haven't got somebody in the organization? Turn back to the Comptroller-General, who gets \$12,000.00 a year. I imagine it is a pretty small department. If he were to leave, could you get somebody to fill the position at \$12,000.00? I'm certain that you couldn't and I'm thinking - and my experience has been at the municipal level, but the City of Winnipeg is paying substantially more to three or four of its top officials and I think they are just like we are. They also have to account to the taxpayer and the taxpayer in the City of Winnipeg also looks at these much higher salaries than the ordinary person is making and wonders about it. But when you think of getting good people, I think you have to be prepared to pay, not what private industry is getting, I would doubt that any amount that the province might have been prepared to pay would be anything like what Mr. Anderson is likely to be getting from the company he is going to, but at the same time after all we have a budget of some hundred and twenty million - odd and it is actually going to be administered in the final analysis by, in detail by the top Civil Service. And it seems to me that the First Minister said that they are giving it thought and I think this is one item that we ought to be, if we err at all, it would be good business to err on the side of generosity not on the side of being too.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 (a) Salaries - Passed. (b) Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals - Passed. Resolution 9 - Administration - \$209,180.00. Passed. Item 2 - Taxation Branch - (a) Salaries - \$79,795.00.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, is this the branch that deals with the collection of taxation for our various departments, such as the gasoline tax, motor vehicle taxes and the likes of that that comes under this?

MR. ROBLIN: This department collects some of the taxes - not all. It is mostly concerned with gasoline tax and amusement tax.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, that's the point that I wished to raise. I know that some considerable period of time ago, that there was quite a lot of controversy going on in respect to the collection of taxes on diesel fuel oil. I'm wondering if the Minister or the First Minister would give us a statement as to the present situation. Have they overcome the difficulties that they were encountering at that particular time? And also, has the government given consideration to a revision? It may be going to be done in the budget, and I'm not trying to pre-judge the budget or visualize what may be in there, but I just throw this out for comment or for consideration, whichever the way the First Minister wants to take it. I think that it is a fact that the use of diesel fuel is becoming more and more prevalent. I think it's also a fact that in the larger pieces of mechanism and vehicles that are using our highways that diesel fuel is the fuel that is being used on those vehicles. I think also it is a fact that the relative return to the treasury of the province from the source of the tax is far less with the users of diesel oil than it is with gasoline, and I am wondering whether or not that we in the province aren't overlooking, not only a source of revenue in itself which we are anxious to receive, but overlooking the fact that due to the situation of these higher weighted vehicles and the damage that they are likely to be causing, and I believe are causing to our highways, that the return per vehicle for the damage that it does has now reached the stage where, through the use of fuel oil or diesel oil, that we are not getting a proportionate return to the treasury for the uses for which these trucks are being placed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I can give my honourable friend some information in connection with plugging the loop-holes in the diesel oil tax collection arrangement. Some few months ago it was brought to our notice that allegations were made that we were not able to collect the diesel fuel tax from the people who ought to be paying it and that there was substantial evasion going on. An investigation was made into that and we came to the conclusion that there was quite likely some weight in that statement and that we should look into ways and

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . means of tightening up the collection system. When we discovered those facts, we then called together a gathering - now I'm relying on my memory here and I trust that I'm giving the correct information of the Committee as far as my memory goes - we called the people who collect the tax now together and we called together other people who might collect it under different arrangements, and we came to the conclusion that very likely we would desire to modify the collection system in some respects. Now I'm just trying to recall whether that change required an amendment to the legislation - I rather think not. I think it merely required changes in the regulations and that changes were made varying the system of collection to make it a little more water-tight, and my recollection is that this new system, if it hasn't been approved, it is going to be approved by the people who administer it, and it will be in effect one of these days when all the necessary arrangements are made. But we did find it necessary without giving the member the details, which I frankly admit I can't be certain about, I can tell them we did find there was some loop-holes and we believe that we can plug them.

Now dealing with his second point - the rate of taxation. He apparently is recommending that we consider an increase in taxation for diesel consumers for the reasons stated. Now I do know that the other jurisdictions have taken action in that respect. My recollection is that the Province of Ontario in the last year or so did increase its diesel taxation rate because it felt that it was not getting a fair return when one considers the rate of consumption of diesel fuel as opposed to gasoline fuel in the operation of internal combustion engines, and I think everyone is aware that there has been a pretty wide switch to diesel engines, particularly in the larger type of vehicle. Well now, naturally I can't make any comment as to what the government's intentions are in this respect and my honourable friend would not expect me to do so, I know, that we'll just have to leave that matter stand there at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that some of us would perhaps like to go on record with regard to the kind of action that was taken in the Province of Ontario, because I hope that if the government is looking at that system at all that it will look at it mighty carefully, because for the life of me I can't see why the consumer should be prejudiced by doing something - by having something done to a hauler whereby he himself thinks he can cut down the cost of operation. Why should a government start to equalize the thing -- the situation (Interruption) .. Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: Equalize it through taxation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes!

MR. ROBLIN: You've got a good point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, that's right. It is a mighty good point in my opinion and it is one that we were - when I had the position that the Honourable the First Minister now has, we were approached on that subject and I must say that the consideration that we gave to it was all against doing it, and I certainly wouldn't recommend that that be seriously considered.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, is the First Minister considering changing the percentage of tax - the different categories that pay diesel tax, fuel tax?

MR. ROBLIN: I really can't answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I think it is budgetary.

MR. PAULLEY: I would just like to make a brief comment in answer to my honourable friend to my right, Mr. Chairman, that there are I think two or three considerations to this. One is the fact, I think, that the - and I can partially agree with him, but in some light it may seem as though we are prejudicing an individual who goes ahead and develops or gets new machinery and light equipment that uses a more economical fuel. But I think that we should seriously take under consideration the other point that I just briefly touched on when I was speaking of this matter which is simply this, that in the development of that particular internal combustion motor, that the gross weight of the vehicle, while it is true are restricted to some degree under our highway traffic regulations, but more and more are we finding evidences of them on our highways and not only on our provincial highways, and while it may not be a direct concern to the government, but we're finding more and more of them being used in our cities and towns which are the responsibility of the municipal authorities where the restriction may not be there. In other words, more damage is being done to our roads as a result of this advance in mechanization, and I think this factor should be taken into consideration. Now while it is true that the Provincial Government does collect the revenues through the taxation - gas

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) taxation, and diesel fuel taxation - that if it is a more equitable rate of taxation as between the two, the Provincial Government may find its finances in a better position in order to make even more generous contributions to municipal governments to assist them in keeping up their roads too which are becoming damaged more and more as we get heavier and heavier pieces of equipment, which are in many cases only made possible because of the change of the mechanism that drives the vehicles.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I do want to make myself clear on this point because I've a great respect for my honourable friend's opinion and I certainly don't disagree with him about the potential wear and tear on our roads because of the increasing weight of these vehicles. No question of that, and I'm all for seeing the government do whatever is necessary to see that the licenses - the vehicle licenses, are made so that they carry their proper share of that cost, and to restrict the weight limits, if they find that necessary, to what the roads will carry. And now, of course, that my honourable friend the Acting Minister of Public Works is building these stronger roads - stronger roads - all these stronger roads, I suppose that they'll be able to increase that weight limit greatly. But all of those things I'm in complete agreement with. Raise the licenses, the vehicle licenses, as high as is necessary to make them pay their just proportion, but for goodness sake don't do it by a tax on the fuel which is a discrimination against the man who, in his own opinion, whether he is right or not and I have no wish to enter into the controversy as between the diesel-user and the gasoline-user, but something that in his own opinion is more economical for him.

And the other point that I want to make is that this trucking system, and certainly it carries a potential of difficulty for the highway system, but on the other hand it is the one real competitor that we have for the railways in keeping down the freight rates here, and we want to keep that always in mind when we are raising the licenses or the gasoline tax or the diesel tax or anything else because that's the sheet anchor to the windward for the consumer here. We in this province are people that are hit the hardest of any part of Canada in my opinion on freight rates because we have to ship out the things that we grow and we have to import a great deal of what we need, and freight rates have cost this province a tremendous amount of money and if we didn't have the trucks and some water traffic, thank goodness, I hope that the Seaway that Her Majesty and the President have officially opened today, I hope that that will contribute still more in that way -- but let's not do anything that will prejudice the consumers position with regard to the goods that we must export and import.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has raised one or two very, very interesting items in his last remarks. Now, a railroader myself, I think I should say a word or two to my honourable friend in respect to this question of competition. Now we on the railway are doing our utmost - when I say "we" I'm only talking as just the little fellow that goes in there the odd day and books off during these sessions -- but the railway as an industry are doing its utmost to not only meet the competition of the trucking industry itself, but to provide far better service than the trucking industry has been able to do. I would refer, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members of this Committee to many recent reports of the progress that the railway is making in the trucking industry itself; that many hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent by the railways to build suitable cars on which trucks can be transported over long distance under the "piggy-back" system that they have in order to eliminate the necessity of long truck hauls from the east to here and in-between points. And in that, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the railways are doing a great service to the high-ways system, because more and more as weeks go on we find these great trucks being taken off of the highway, put onto the railways highway, namely the rails which incidentally of course, the railways maintain and build themselves at their own expense. Now I know after that remark my honourable friend is going to say, "but who pays for it but the user," which is perfectly true, but the situation still remains that that is all reflected in the cost that the railway itself has to pass on, and I would suggest that the railways are taking steps in this regard. As a matter of fact, I understand our competitor the C.P.R. are now the owners outright in one case, I believe, and others have a great financial interest in some of the larger trucking firms in the eastern part of Canada, and if memory serves me correctly, it was only recently that the trucking industry down east protested because of the fact that the railways were attempting to develop to a greater degree transportation of these large cabooses or box-cars or whatever you want

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . to call them by piggyback" rather than on highway. So I think, Mr. Chairman, when we raise the question of railway and trucking that it is only proper for me as a railroader to say to this House the railway is cognizant of many aspects of the high cost of transportation of we here in Manitoba, and are endeavouring to take steps to see if they can be lowered and made on a more competitive basis with our trucking industry, because we must remember this, that there is an advantage to the trucking industry that the railway once held, and that is in the high-priced merchandise of small amounts. That was where the greater revenue formerly went to the railway, which they have now lost to the trucking industry.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, maybe -- I'm not going to continue this debate with my honourable friend - but maybe we had better just review the circumstances as to how we got into it, and it was just because we started on gasoline tax and diesel tax and then we went from there to this. I say only this, that I am all in favour - all in favour of what the honourable gentleman says the railways are doing, and I'm sure they are doing it. I'm all in favour of that. I'm all in favour of competition between the two of them. All I am saying is let's have efficiency in all methods of hauling and let's not interfere with that efficiency by discriminating in tax against somebody who thinks that he can improve his efficiency.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to very briefly say that the government recognizes that both trucks and railways are equally indispensable to the operation of the economy of this province, and our policy, insofar as we have anything to do with the matter, will be to be as fair as possible to both and to protect the interest of the consumer in our actions, whatever they might be.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of gasoline tax - this is going back now to about three or four years ago when my Honourable Friend the First Minister was sitting I believe in this seat here, and one of his members who I will admit is no longer in the House, brought up the question of the colouring of gasoline and the matter of the rebate on the farm gas. And as I recall, at that time this honourable member was suggesting that the farm gas should be coloured. Being fair to the First Minister, I will admit that he didn't agree with him at that time. I just wondered whether his views have changed on the subject.

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Chairman, my views are what they always were. I don't think the government contemplates any such action as colouring gasoline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals - Passed. Resolution 10 - Taxation Branch - \$90,895.00 - Passed. Item 3 - Fidelity, Hold-up, Burglary and Safe Insurance Premiums - \$8,400.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it might just be a good idea for the Honourable the First Minister to give a word to the new members as to what this constitutes.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to do so. This appropriation covers the Fidelity Bonds, Hold-up, Burglary and Safe Insurance policies that the government operates. A full statement of these was given to the House on March 18th last, Sessional Paper No. 12, and any member that wishes to enquire further in the matter will find the information there. If there is any further question on this point that I could answer now I will be glad to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3 - Passed. Item 4. Insurance Branch: (a) Salaries, \$24,065.00 - Passed. (b) Company Inspections, Office Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals, \$11,000.00 - Passed. (c) Insurance Premiums, \$40,200.00

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there is quite an increase there. Is that due to this particular year in which certain premiums fall due or is it due to an increase in the coverage?

MR. ROBLIN: I think there is a number of factors in here. Undoubtedly the ones my honourable friend has mentioned are among them. Probably the biggest one is increase in premiums; that would be the main items I would think, in this item.

MR. CAMPBELL: Increase in costs?

MR. ROBLIN: Costs of premiums yes. And I'm sure there are some more vehicles included although at this point I haven't got any figures on that.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, are there buildings and such included in that, that were formerly carried by the Government's Insurance Fund?

MR. ROBLIN: No Sir, these are entirely motor vehicle ones.

MR. MILLER: Entirely motor vehicles?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, contingent liabilities.

MR. MOLGAT: Well surely, Mr. Chairman, this must indicate an extension in coverage because it is almost double. That would not be just an increase in cost of premium would it?

MR. ROBLIN: It is up --

MR. MILLER: Are these all annual or are they the same as in ordinary insurance? Three years or just annual?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe this is an annual premium though I can't state that positively.

MR. MILLER: If it is automobile, I imagine it is annual isn't it? Does that mean an increase in the number of vehicles covered?

MR. ROBLIN: Let me give you this information that I have here. This insurance represents no change in the policy that was previously carried out. It is a fleet insurance policy and includes public liability, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00; Property damage, \$5,000.00; Passenger Hazard, Fire and Theft. Collision coverage is not included. We are carrying the risk ourselves in that respect. The fleet totals 1,024 units and that is the number of vehicles that are covered by this, I see, I have this information here.

MR. MILLER: Is that an increase over last year? Of how many vehicles?

MR. ROBLIN: I haven't got the figure for last year. I expect there is an increase. The Hospital Service Plan and various other increases in previous years will account for some increases in vehicles. Any increases that are involved in the expansion of services would be of that nature. I think the Hospital Service Plan is the one big department which accounts for the big increase in the insurance premiums in this respect. Certainly it is an important one at any rate. The premiums are

MR. MILLER: Would the Honourable the First Minister give us that information when he has it?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes I will, Mr. Chairman. The premiums are considerably - are on a considerably lower basis than private insurers are able to contract for, mainly for the reason that it is bulk insurance. It covers the whole fleet and therefore we get special rates in that respect.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is sort of a group insurance.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: But even so, with the debate that is in progress in the House at the moment, if the opponents of the resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks are going to have to make good arguments on their side of the case I would hate them to have to face the proposition that there has been that much of an increase in premiums. I wouldn't think that that's the case and perhaps some one of the gentlemen who have declared to the House that they are in that business would be able to tell us if there is anything in the nature of that because with all the number of increase in the fleet, which I have talked about some myself, I wouldn't think that it would be enough to anything like make up that difference.

MR. ROBLIN: I thought I had the explanation with me, but it appears that I haven't but I can certainly get the details for the Committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Possibly, Mr. Chairman, we may get more support for our resolution now.

MR. CAMPBELL: You might.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, could the First Minister tell us at this time whether or not it was the policy of the government of last year to assume responsibility for coalition? that is to say the

MR. ROBLIN: No that was dropped I think in 1956 or thereabouts.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of 1,024 vehicles with the coverage that they've got, it just averages around \$40.00 a vehicle and I don't think that is a very high premium for that type of coverage.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, they've surpassed that.

MR. M. E. MCKELLOR (Souris-Lansdowne): In many cases in the last year the rates have increased 30% for that type of coverage. But it is still in my opinion \$40.00 a vehicle is very cheap insurance for 50, 100 and 5 plus fire and theft.

MR. CAMPBELL: But it is nothing like as cheap as \$23.00 per vehicle last year. If the -- it was \$23.00 last year.

MR. MCKELLAR: I think was - I never checked on my rates but I was talking to the

(Mr. McKellar, cont'd.) . . . talking to the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Agent at Wawanesa and he said the same car that he was insuring last year for \$28.00 is \$43.00 this year. So that is an indication of the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) Interest on Trust and other Special Funds - \$14,300.00; (b) Refunds - \$70,000.00; (c) Payments re Soldiers' Taxation Relief - \$15,000.00.

MR. PAULLEY: What does this item on refunds cover, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, a wide variety of things where the government may levy a tax or a tax may be paid and afterwards a claim rendered. It might be any one of the various taxes that we levy.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, it just occurred to me and this thought has been going through my head every year ever since I came into this House and that is this; the members ask questions on almost every item in the estimates, the Ministers have a book there to which they refer and give the answer. Now I'm just wondering if it would be possible to furnish the members with some explanatory notes they could use when they are going through the estimates. It might do away with the necessity of asking a lot of questions and would give us a better understanding of what is involved in these various items. I don't want the government to disclose to us any secrets but any questions we ask here, they simply refer to their little book. It's all indexed, they give us the answer, the information is public so why not give it to the members and try and save us a little time and we can tackle this matter a lot more intelligently than we're doing now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13 - Miscellaneous - \$99,300.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just one point there, Mr. Chairman, I noticed that Item (d) under 5 as compared to last year, Item (d) has been dropped. I suppose it has been transferred to another department?

MR. ROBLIN: Would you give me the name of the item?

MR. CAMPBELL: 5 (d) - Town Planning.

MR. ROBLIN: Town Planning has been moved to another department. I think you will find it in Industry and Commerce.

MR. CAMPBELL: And the suggestion that I was going to make was: Wouldn't it be a good idea in the estimates for the one year at least to still carry the (d) with nothing beside as is frequently done so that it shows for the one year. There would be no need of carrying it the second year but to show that there has been some thing transferred there in case we don't have the other estimates with us. Then the same with Item No. 6 because the whole item I believe has been moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7. Grants under the Unconditional Grants Act to Municipalities, Local Government Districts and other Local Areas - \$2,506,833.00.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that this item is not increased from last year. When this policy was instituted in 1957, it was instituted at the time when we did not yet have the D.B.S. figures for the population of Manitoba and we voted an amount of 2 million dollars lump sum to be divided by the population with the result being the municipalities would get the sum represented by their population on the basis of the division. It meant for 1957 that each municipality got \$2.39, I believe, for every resident of that municipality. Now last year we changed that policy and we increased the contribution to \$3.00 per person and based on statistics we had at that time, we estimated that we would need 2-1/2 million dollars. This year we have no increase although there is an increase in the population, especially, we have been told last March that the government has found 10,000 people and now apparently it has reached 15,000. Now that's recently but last March I think the figure of 10,000 was mentioned. And apparently yesterday, although I wasn't present in the House and I didn't find it in Hansard - I didn't read it all through - but the Free Press carried a story that the Premier, the First Minister stated that the Treasury Board has found another 15,000 people in Manitoba and that D.B.S. has accepted that population. So I cannot see how this amount is not increased at least if the same policy is to be followed at \$3.00 per person, it should mean an increase of some \$45,000.00 somewhere. Will these people get it, or will the municipalities where these people reside get this money, or will the amount be short -- or was there an error last year -- was not all the money spent? I would like an explanation.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm really surprised that the honourable member is surprised. Because

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . after all I dare say he had quite a hand in drawing up the legislation. The legislation makes it perfectly clear that the grant is calculated on the last preceding census. And then if the next census shows a change in the population of that area, then the grants are made retroactively to cover that increase. That's provided for in the statute. The amount that is put in here is in accordance with the statute and if increases occur in the population of various localities, and they certainly will be occurring - there will be shifting all around of various sorts, then at the next census that is calculated back and a bonus or what you might call a back-payment is made to the municipalities who are concerned. A deficiency payment - my colleague suggests.

There is another interesting feature in the Act and that is, if the population decreases, we do not ask the municipalities to refund us any money. But that matter will be taken care of when the next census comes around and the calculations are made.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I understand that the payments are based on the statute but to my mind I think that it would have been proper to put the right estimate of expenditure in this column. There's nothing in the statute which says you cannot put the proper estimate of expenditure on this item.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, my honourable friend is well aware that we don't intend to make that extra expenditure this year. Those expenditures will not be incurred until such time as the next census is available to us. He wrote the statute.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The statute says that when the population is - there - increases, the amounts would increase to the municipalities where the people are in the course of the five years between the census.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend is well aware that in the preparation of estimates, you don't estimate this year for something which you are going to spend next year or the year after. You have to wait until those facts are known and then you put them in your estimates.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, just for further clarification on that point. The next census will be 1961 if I remember correctly - is that the proper time?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think it's '61.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, at that time, then will there be a back-payment to any municipalities that have gone up.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right - an adjusting payment.

MR. MOLGAT: Dating back until now?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, it's on a sliding scale. They assume that the increase is proportionate and they run it back that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Total Vote for the Department - \$2,989,873.00. IV - Provincial Department - The Provincial Secretary. Item 1 - Administration.

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, before we start with this department there were questions by the Honourable Member for Burrows last night and from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member from Burrows asked the question about the cost of Hansard. Well, the total cost for the special session of 12 sittings, that's the session last fall was \$5,570.22. The average cost per three-hour sitting was \$300.93. The total cost for the second session of the 25th Legislature - 13 sittings - was \$4,013.83; an average cost of \$214.38 per three-hour sitting. The average cost has been reduced from \$300.93 down to \$214.38, even though the cost of transcription has somewhat increased. It is entirely due to the printing - the change in format - and secondly the use of the present smaller type print.

I think the second question was the list of contracts under the Item - Printing and Binding. The Winnipeg Saturday Post Company, Limited prints the sessional bills and the final bills and the pamphlets of individual accounts. Henderson Directories Limited does the binding of the Statutes and Journals; Wallingford Press Limited - the Votes and Proceedings Journals; Empire Printers Limited - The Orders of the Day; and the Comet Press Limited - the Public Accounts, Individual Accounts; and the Universal Press Limited - The Manitoba Gazette. Tenders for Legislative printing are called for by advertising in the daily newspapers every December for the following calendar year, and the above list of printing firms were all chosen because they were the lowest tender in each case.

Now the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition wanted to have a list of the Hansard circulation. The free delivery in Greater Winnipeg - the daily newspapers, the radio stations,

(Mr. Boulic, cont'd.) . . . T.V. and government officials, libraries, and by mail we have the daily and weekly newspapers outside of Winnipeg, the government officials, the Members of Parliaments, and I must for the benefit of the House here add that there is absolutely no discrimination for any Party following -- the 14 members of the government get free Hansard. There's no discrimination whatsoever. That's 86 copies and then in the Legislative Building the members, the press gallery and government officials - 104, and the first item by the way was 33. The paid circulation-subscriptions - 194, and we have an average counter cash sale of about 11 for 428. The paid circulation, by the way, for the previous session was 102, it has now gone up to 194.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. Administration.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thank the Honourable the Minister for giving us this information, Mr. Chairman, so that we can take it that as far as what might be called 'private individuals or the lay public' - 194.

MR. BOULIC: That is 194 paid circulation. Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks.

MR. WILLIS: Business is up almost 100%.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's a pretty small number though.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at the session held last October I introduced a resolution regarding the stubs on cheques. At that time the House adopted it unanimously and the Minister assured me that this is a government of action and it could be done very quickly -- and the constituents advise me that there's no stubs on cheques yet. Could he tell us when they're going to implement the . . .

MR. BOULIC: I can answer the honourable member that they are coming.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When though? This year, next year or . . .

MR. BOULIC: Why didn't you do it, when?

MR. GUTTORMSON: That doesn't answer my question. When is this government going to do it.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's a good point. The fact is that we didn't do it 'when'. We never promised to but my Honourable Friend the Minister promised at the last sitting, even at the fall sitting, I believe, that it would be done immediately.

MR. BOULIC: I didn't promise that they would be in before this session, but I promise they will be in before the next election.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would expect that.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Just on the Provincial Secretary -- I don't know whether this would be a good idea or a bad idea. I just want to throw it out for the consideration of the Committee. I have found on many occasions dealing with application for old age assistance, blind pensions and the likes of that, that quite frequently we have encountered difficulty finding a Commissioner of Oaths readily or conveniently to sign the papers without going to a Notary Public or somebody of that nature. Now under the Municipal Act the Mayor or the Reeve of the municipality has certain powers of a Commissioner of Oaths. Now it may not be a problem particularly to us in the urban areas, but I've had some comment from some of the rural members that it may pose a greater problem there. And I'm wondering whether or not a suggestion to the Provincial Secretary and to the Administration of a somewhat similar arrangement insofar as the M.L.A.'s are concerned, being granted automatically on their election or on taking their seat, given the power of a Commissioner of Oaths.

A question was raised the other day about a considerable number of election officials, particularly in connection with the taking of the schools' division vote, where it was necessary to make them Commissioners of Oaths for that purpose. And as I understand from the Attorney-General that that was only for a short period of time, I am wondering if consideration couldn't be given to this point that I'm raising. I feel that in some instances, and possibly many of them, that it could be of service to the member of the legislature if they had that authority.

MR. BOULIC: We will take that into consideration.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the other day I asked the Attorney-General about the reason why there were so many Commissioner of Oaths published in one particular issue. At that time he told me that it had something to do with the school vote. Did the government

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) pay for those - each Commissioner of Oaths issued or did the individuals pay them themselves?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question. There was no charge or no fee for those commissions that were issued. A special order was passed exempting those persons from a payment of any fee because the commissions were issued for the strict purpose of the education referendum. And, of course, the commissions will be revoked now that the purpose for which they were sought is finished.

MR. McLEAN: I make one further word of explanation to the House that only those who were not already commissioners were appointed. We made very careful to ascertain those who were already commissioners and only appointed those who were not and who had required to be appointed to carry out their duties in connection with that vote.

MR. MOLGAT: I take it then from the statement of the Honourable the Attorney-General that those will not be standard two-year appointments. They are no longer in effect now?

MR. LYON: They are in the process of being revoked.

MR. SPEAKER: (a) Other Salaries - \$32,825.00.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say in two sentences that as my Honourable Leader has said, if members of this Assembly were given the privilege to act as Commissioner for Oaths upon their election, then it would remove a rather awkward situation and make things more convenient in serving the constituents. If any members on the treasury bench see any reason why this couldn't be done, I wonder if it would be possible to advance any reasons why this couldn't be done?

MR. LYON: That would deprive the Provincial Treasury of altogether \$114.00. Now I would imagine that each member of the legislature would find himself qualified, if he were to apply and pay the two dollar fee, he would find himself qualified, and I think myself and the Provincial Secretary would be only too happy to issue the Commission upon receipt of the fee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is the Honourable the Attorney-General sure that in that case it could not be interpreted as being a contract with the Government?

MR. ROBLIN: A nice point.

MR. LYON: A neat point -- Covered the same as JP's.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the other salaries -- I just raise the point that if the ones who are responsible for making up the estimates would take under advisement the question of seeing that the Deputy Minister's salary is on the next occasion set out separately from the others. It's the only one here that I'd like to see separately.

MR. MOLGAT: While we're on that point, and with all due respects to the Deputy Minister of this department, and not wishing to discuss personal details, in his presence, nevertheless would it be possible to have the breakdown in this department. It was in the figures last year.

MR. ROBLIN: No change.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, \$3,960.?

MR. BOULIC: \$5,500. -- The Deputy's salary is under this department.

MR. MOLGAT: Supplementary to that question. What other salaries are received and in what appointments?

MR. BOULIC: One that I know of, we passed last night in Legislation of \$4,500. as Clerk of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1A, passed Item (Interruption).

MR. CAMPBELL: Two or three other jobs. . . . I presume the

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going back to Commissioner of Oaths -- I didn't get a chance to get in and suggest to the Honourable the Attorney-General that if he's concerned about the two dollars or the four dollars, or whatever the case may be for four-year tenure in office, may I respectfully suggest to him that our indemnities be decreased automatically by that two dollars in order that the Treasury is not suffering.

MR. CAMPBELL: Only on request. I would stay with my principals on that -- only a signed request -- no union shop here.

MR. PAULLEY: We can't get a dollar out of you nohow.

MR. CAMPBELL: Speaking of the salary of the Deputy Minister in this case, I presume it is up to the maximum now, is it? In total.

MR. ROBLIN: You could probably ask the deputy - he is sitting right there.

MR. CAMPBELL: He's not allowed to reply in here.

MR. PAULLEY: Whisper to the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: B, Supplies, Expenses, Equipment and Renewals \$14,830.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, again without wanting to embarrass the Honourable gentleman in this matter, the total that I make from the reply that I got from the Provincial Secretary is \$5,500. under this appropriation and \$4,500. on another, which to me makes a total of \$10,000. Now that isn't up to the normal standards of a Deputy Minister.

MR. MILLER: That \$540 as chief Electoral Officer.

MR. CAMPBELL: He must have another couple of jobs left -- that's not enough to keep him goingwith elections coming only a couple of times, or three times a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution XV - Administration \$55,655. Item 2 - Queen's Printer Office (a) Salaries - \$7,860. (b) Operation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under the Queen's Printer Office I understood last night from what the First Minister said with regard to the Treasury Board that the Queen's Printer Office had been analyzed by the Organization Methods. I see no decrease in the costs in the Queen's Printer Office. Could the Provincial Secretary outline to us whatever changes were made in that department what savings were found and so on.

MR. BOULIC: The advantages will be found in the other different departments to which the Queen's Printer sells its stationery or printing or whatever it is. There will be an advantage to all departments.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that the proposed saving of \$58,000. is to be distributed between the various departments, and yet we see an increase in the estimated receipts recoverable of \$22,000 -- \$22,000. plus \$58,000. is \$70,000. I'd like to have an explanation of that.

MR. BOULIC: I'll get all the facts for the Minister -- for the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... (b) 1 Salaries - \$56,900.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, now, on something like that -- the minister tells us he'll give us all the facts but when do we get all the facts?

MR. MILLER: Before the next election.

MR. BOULIC: Yes, yes, it'll be much before that -- Tuesday I would imagine, Tuesday sometime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 - Supplies (Interruption).

MR. MOLGAT: Well, will this item be left open then, or will we come back to it, or when do we get the information and how?

MR. BOULIC: If it was agreeable that I give the answer like I did tonight about the other facts -- about the other questions of last night.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think Mr. Chairman, that this is a case though where the answer itself might elicit some further discussion, and I think in this case it would be advisable to have the item stand, because there is some -- quite frequently the answer itself will be debated, and consequently I think this one, we should ask to have stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. Supplies and Expenses - \$213,200.

3. Less-Estimated Receipts Recoverable from other Appropriations.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, this is the one that I'm asking the Minister to allow to stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean the whole one? The whole vote.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's a small

MR. ROBLIN: If the Minister -- if we passed the item in a formal way tonight and the Minister brings down a statement, the Government will certainly not be anxious to cut off any discussion there might be on that statement. So I assure my honourable friends that they'll have a chance to make any comments they like when -- when the information is brought down.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I might just refer to previous procedure, I know that on previous occasions, whenever the Opposition asked that an item stood over formally, that there was no objection.

MR. ROBLIN: No, we have no objection to that.

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, I think the Item 2 could be passed because after all, all we are asking to pass here is an amount of \$7,860. for the Queen's Printer -- the other part

(Mr. Boulic, cont'd.) which we are asking to stand doesn't -- we don't have to vote any money for it.

MR. ROBLIN: If they want it to stand, I think, we won't object to it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think it would be better to have this one stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which is to stand?

MR. ROBLIN: Item, Vote 16 to stand. The whole

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3. Manitoba Gazette (a) Salaries \$5,670.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us any indication if he has with him of the net revenue from the sales and distribution of the Gazette?

MR. ROBLIN: That really comes in the estimates of Revenue, Mr. Chairman. We will give it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b).

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us a breakdown of what actually is printed in the Manitoba Gazette, like in the matter of Regulations and Orders-in-Council and so on. What is printed and what is not printed?

MR. BOULIC: What was that question again?

MR. MOLGAT: Well basically the question is this. Are all the regulations passed by the Government, printed in the Manitoba Gazette, and are all Orders-in-Council passed by the Government printed in the Manitoba Gazette? If not, why not and where is the breakdown?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the only regulations that are printed in the Manitoba Gazette are those regulations required to be printed under the sections applicable on the Regulations Act, and that sets out that only regulations of the legislative nature are required to be registered with the Registrar of Regulations and subsequently printed by the Queen's Printer in the Manitoba Gazette. There are certain regulations which are deemed to be of an administrative nature, such as the establishment of Public Health Districts or Health Unit Districts and so on, which as the matter of course over the past years have been printed as a matter of information but generally speaking the rule of thumb and it's a rule of thumb laid down by statute, is that only those regulations which go to the Registrar of Regulations for registration are required to be printed, and then in some cases there is permission under the Regulations Act to exempt the printing of certain of those regulations if it's felt that they are too cumbersome or too long and so on. I don't recall certainly ever in the instance of the present Government, and seldom during my familiarity with the former Government that they ever used the section which permitted them not to print legislative regulations.

MR. MOLGAT: What about Orders-in-Council? Are they printed in the Manitoba Gazette at times, or never.

MR. MILLER: No.

MR. MOLGATE: Under no circumstances?

MR. LYON: Regulations -- legislative regulations are schedules to Orders-in-Council and only the schedule is printed. I've never seen a case of an Order-in-Council being printed unless it contained a schedule or regulation in the schedule to it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, further on that point. I'm thinking for example of the question asked the other day by the Honourable Member for St. George, in the matter of fishing regulations. Now I presume that that would not be printed in the Manitoba Gazette. Now how would the honourable member in that case be made aware of the change of that nature?

MR. LYON: I can't presume to answer on behalf of my colleague the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources. I would only venture the opinion, and it's only an opinion at this stage, that the regulations in connection with the fishing industry in that particular field are of an administrative nature, that is probably it permits the Minister by order, by administrative order, to do this. You must also remember that certain of these regulations come within the purview of the Federal Government as well, but I couldn't answer with any certainty at all as to why that particular set of regulations would not be printed.

MR. MOLGAT: So through the normal course, then, there would be no means by which a member could by following the Manitoba Gazette be sure that he keeps up-to-date to any changes in regulations and so on.

MR. LYON: Well it depends, all regulations as such, and again I repeat, which are a legislative nature, do appear, must be filed with the Registrar of Regulations. It is true that

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . there are a number of other administrative acts which are sometimes done by Order-in-Council which might appear at first blush to be of the legislative nature; that is why we have in our minds at probably the next session of the House to establish a committee, a permanent committee of the House, which will be able to review Orders-in-Council of this nature in order to permit the House to see that the cabinet or the government of the day are not going beyond the bounds of the legislation under which they operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17. Manitoba Gazette. Item 4. Civil Service Commission (a) Salaries \$53,850.00.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few observations under this item. My Leader mentioned the fact that this is another case in which the salary of the Civil Service Commissioner should be mentioned as formerly, because he is of Deputy Minister status and I think as such, should be listed separately. What I wanted to say is that we in Manitoba have been very fortunate in that we have had for some considerable length of time an excellent Civil Service Commission. Tribute has been paid to one of the Commissioners and I want to join members in the tribute paid to him. I was familiar with him when I occupied the position of Provincial Secretary and can say that he was in that capacity as outstanding as in the capacity which he presently occupies. I also want to pay tribute to the other Commissioner, permanent Commissioner, Mr. Merlin Newton who has been most effective in seeing that the high quality of the Civil Service has been maintained. And I also want to mention the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, both present and past, and I'm very sorry indeed that the present Minister of Mines and Resources isn't in his seat, because I would want to pay a tribute to him as well. At the time, I remember, when I occupied the position of Provincial Secretary I had the great privilege of recommending his appointment to Cabinet, and that is yet another indication Mr. Chairman of the non-partisan approach of the previous government to filling these very important positions. And I hope the present government will emulate that example.

MR. PAULLEY: What do you want to be Wally?

MR. MILLER: Oh Senator, Senator. Now, I want to direct a few questions to the Minister in charge. I mentioned the question of salary increases - an amount of \$965,000.00 when Treasury Estimates were under consideration and it was indicated to me, that the proper time was when the Provincial Secretary's estimates were under review.

MR. ROBLIN: I was just wondering I don't

MR. MILLER: Well I think that just possibly

MR. ROBLIN: What does the honourable member think? He's

MR. MILLER: Well, I think we would get - I don't think that there'd be any objection but I would like to first of all get some information from the Minister as to how the amount was arrived at, the question of distribution, when that distribution will become effective - I notice that under the item it says by Order-in-Council. I would like to know whether it's on a percentage basis, on overall percentage basis, or a differentiation between the top people and the lower echelon.

MR. ROBLIN: If it would help my honourable friend in the discussion we would be very happy to table the details on this matter and then he could have that in his possession for discussion either on Tuesday if he wants to do it then, or when the item comes up because I appreciate it's a little bit difficult to discuss it without that information. I would be glad to let him have it.

MR. MILLER: Thanks very much I'd be very happy to accept that suggestion.

MR. PAULLEY: Appropo of that, does the First Minister, Mr. Chairman, mean that he will make available to us the present schedule of all of the categories in the civil service, and I'd like to make this suggestion and then we could really take a look at it. I understand, that there are schedules of salaries for the various categories and grades in different classifications -- and have they compiled - I know they're in existence now under the present salary schedule, and I presume that there will be one after the allocation of the nine hundred odd thousand and I'm wondering if they could be made available to us, to the two groups, in order that we may be able to take a good look at all of the salaries that are being paid in all the categories because, if you don't mind Mr. Minister just for a second - that while at the beginning of the evening I made reference to some of our senior officers in the civil service, I think too that we should take a close scrutiny at some of the others, the lower paid ones. Because

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . of the fact they don't attain greatness shall I say, I'm sure that or feel sure in my own mind, without any basis but just a general knowledge of the transfer of employment these days, that there may be many categories of the lower priced help and civil servants that are moving because of that. Now I'm not . . . the First Minister nods his head..

MR. ROBLIN: Well you know our system.

MR. PAULLEY: I would like him to give us an answer then to the effect that none of our civil servants in the lower echelon are leaving us because of salary problems.

MR. ROBLIN: I can't say that, but I think my honourable friend knows that in connection with all the categories below a Deputy Minister we do operate on the principle of comparable rates of pay, and that every so often, - I think it's every year, - we take an analysis of comparable rates of pay being paid in this area, or if it's not a rate which has a non civil service classification we compare with other provinces, and we bring our people under the rank of Deputy Minister up to the comparable rates of pay insofar as we are able to do so. That's negotiated with the Civil Service Association and that's the way the scale is arrived at; so while I certainly wouldn't undertake to say that nobody leaves the government service because they don't feel they're paid enough, I would say that we do feel that we have a pretty fair system in operation. Now it must be said that this isn't our idea, this has been going on for some time and that's the basis of the change that was made.

MR. PAULLEY: Well that's fine, Mr. Chairman, and all that I'm asking for is that information being given to us. It may be asking too much to give the old schedule and the contemplated schedule of wages . . .

MR. ROBLIN: We can give you the changes anyway.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes but to start that before we know what the changes actually mean we should have the salary ranges which are being changed in order to be able to analyze and scrutinize them.

MR. ROBLIN: My colleague advises me that the schedule contains the old rate and the new so that should give you all the information.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we are primarily interested in the more senior group. There's another question that I would like to ask the Minister though, and that is - have there been any changes in salaries from the time the government took over and now -- outside of these proposed increases?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Honourable Member for Rhineland is now talking about the Deputy Ministers.

MR. MILLER: I'm talking now about any salary changes, changes in range, changes in classification, which means an increase in salary from the time that the government took over and now. Outside of the \$965,000.00.

MR. BOULIC: There is always some readjustment; or employees have the right to appeal their classification and they do sometimes, and if it is found it is the proper thing to do their salaries are readjusted. And while I'm speaking I would say that I concur entirely with the opinions of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in his saying that we are fortunate in having Mr. Merlin Newton as Civil Service Commissioner. I agree entirely with that, we are very fortunate indeed to have men of that calibre on the commission.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there's another question I would like to ask. There was some discussion about the increase in the civil service proper, increase in civil servants since this government took over. Some figures were mentioned. I think the Honourable the First Minister stated that there was some slight exaggeration in the figures mentioned during the campaign and in this House at the spring session. The question that I want to ask is what are the actual figures?

MR. ROBLIN: We will undertake to give you that.

MR. MILLER: Well, I think the suggestion was that we should wait until the estimates of the Provincial Secretary were up.

MR. ROBLIN: When that point was raised last night I undertook to provide the schedule on the request of the Honourable Member for Burrows showing that information by departments.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could I ask how soon that will be available because

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I hope quite soon -- We're not going to stall them.

MR. CAMPBELL: I quite understand that. I wonder while I'm speaking if I might ask

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) the Honourable the Minister -- we realize that there are those adjustments and what might be called appeals for salary increases and changes of classification and so on. But in addition to those, are there some cases where whole groups have already been raised, or reclassifications?

MR. BOULIC: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the answer to that is that last fall there was what we called a crash program in the Department of Health and there has been at that time an adjustment upwards of salaries.

MR. HILLHOUSE: an adjustment that was made in respect of the employees of Mental Hospitals as well?

MR. BOULIC: Yes.

MR. HILLHOUSE: And wasn't that made retroactive to the 1st of January this year? And when did the actual first pay increase? When was it made and paid?

MR. BOULIC: I will have to take that as a notice of question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the Minister - was that the only department where a group or groups had their salaries raised?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, I think there was also some adjustments in the Attorney-General's department.

A MEMBER: Any more? -- Any other department?

MR. BOULIC: Not that I know of.

MR. MILLER: Could the Minister furnish us with that information as well?

MR. ROBLIN: contained in the grand schedule, Mr. Chairman, because any changes that were made then were not made again when the new adjustment was made which is effective April 1st of this year, of the new fiscal year, so that the figures that will be brought down to show the new changes will incorporate any changes that were made previously.

MR. MILLER: Well am I to understand then that where adjustments have been made and salaries raised, that those people will not come under the portion of the 965?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, that is right. They won't come in under the new rates.

MR. ROBLIN: They can't get two rates -- that's what we're trying to say.

MR. MILLER: Oh, good. Mr. Chairman, another thing, the Honourable the First Minister stated that he will make the information available by departments, the increase in the service -- in the number?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Will that information be available when we come to the major departments? Say the next one?

MR. ROBLIN: I hope to have it next week for you.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): of that, would you also include - I presume you have in the past included part-time civil servants as well. Are you intending to do that, Sir?

MR. ROBLIN: No. The figures that will be brought in will, I think, be the figures of establishment. There are several different ways in which they could be counted up. I think the proper way would be by establishment and I had some conversations with my advisor when this point was gone into this morning as a result of the point that was raised last night, and my impression is that the figures being brought in will be for the established positions, part-time workers are obviously not included in that; they fluctuate very much and I don't think it would really add much to the discussion to have that particular piece of information.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, information as to the established positions and the number of vacancies in the establishment. The positions that aren't filled but established?

MR. ROBLIN: No, the figures that I will bring down will be -- what my honourable friend is trying to find out - I imagine, is the changes that have been made in the civil service strength recently by this administration. So I think the fairest way to give that information is to show the old establishment and compare it to the new establishment.

MR. MILLER: But I am also interested, Mr. Chairman, in the number of vacancies -- in the number of unfilled positions.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, that information can be brought down, but I certainly won't undertake to bring it down next week - but I can give the establishments quite quickly.

MR. MILLER: But Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Minister in charge of the department will know that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the Honourable the First Minister has promised to bring down, then as well as that, we understand correctly I hope, that there will be information furnished as to salary changes that have been made up-to-date; and as to individuals or groups and the same with classifications, if classification ranges have been changed, that those would be included?

MR. ROBLIN: Let me be clear on this. We are going to bring down as soon as we can the establishment comparisons from this year and last year. That will give the House - that will give the committee information regarding the number of civil servants that have been, for which positions have been established by reason of changes in policy. I think that's what has been asked for. The second thing that we will do is to bring down the new salary schedules by categories. When those are worked out, we don't work on names as I'm sure the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition knows -- we work on the various categories established by the civil service. And I understand that the information, the table attached to the order will show the old establishment and its range and the new one and its range, so that you will be able to look up any particular classification -- say Forester (1) and see what it was and what it's going to be -- for every classification that the government has. Now I believe that is the information that we have available. It's what I am going to try and bring down for the Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that's quite right, Mr. Chairman, but it is perfectly obvious that the information that we are wanting to get -- and I for one have no reason in the world to cloak it at all - we are anxious to find out what is the increase in the civil service. I have said publicly, I think it to be right, that the policies of the present government naturally will need a large increase in the civil service. I have said that I think I see the start of that already. Now what we're wanting is not only the establishment, the comparable establishments as put into effect by the former government and any changes that have been made, but also the number of people. Now quite frankly, if we had an establishment -- taking foresters as an example - if we had an establishment of foresters, so many in the one class and so many in the next - we would like to be able to tell whether this government as of the very most recent date that they can get the information has more or less foresters in class (1), class (2), Class (3) and class (4). Because quite frankly what we want to do is add them up and tell the public whether we are right or wrong.

MR. ROBLIN: Certainly, I think to get on the point that was raised at the election, what I propose to do is to take the reasoning that was used then, that as well as the other information that I promised, to take the reasoning that was used then, adding up the number of civil servants here, comparing it with the figures given in the previous one and reconciling them, and that I think will show the point that was at issue during the election campaign.

MR. CAMPBELL: We are more interested, I speak for myself, I am more interested in the number of people that are now employed and the number of people that were employed before rather than the establishments themselves - because even in 'our time' let alone the 'present time' there have been variations as to whether in the estimates (and my honourable friend mentioned this) as to whether we showed the full establishment without all the positions being filled or whether we held it down to the ones that were then filled. And those can make differences in the figures.

MR. ROBLIN: I believe I could get that

MR. CAMPBELL: What we are primarily interested in is the number of people.

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, that's what we're interested in. If I recall correctly the mathematician that started all this figure during the election was my former colleague, Mr. Swailes, and I think he brought up the total to some 717 or 771. (Interjection)

MR. ROBLIN: Well, if that's what's wanted then, let me bring that information down, if the other information is just so much work up here, we won't bother with it - but if what you would like to get is what the Leader of the Opposition has just expressed, then I think that can be obtained for him and I'll get it.

MR. CAMPBELL: But we want both, Sir. I'm most interested in that one but neither one is fully complete without the other and I don't think it's very much extra work to get the one when you are getting the other.

MR. ROBLIN: Let no one suppose for a moment that we are not hiring more civil servants in the Government of Manitoba. Of course we are. A great deal of our policy was

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . based on the fact that our predecessors didn't staff the public service properly, and if we haven't hired them we are certainly going to do our best to hire them as soon as these estimates are put through, to provide the quality and the quantity of men in the various branches of the public service that we believe are required. We are not trying to hide behind any smoke screen or to pretend that we are not increasing the civil service. Of course, we are, and we are doing it because it is the proper thing to do.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well that's my honourable friend's opinion and that's the point that we want to get here, but we are entitled to our opinion as to whether the government is moving too far too fast in these matters, and we intend to put our side of the argument before the public too. And we want to get the figures and we are not suggesting that my honourable friend is hiding anything. The very fact that he thinks maybe there is something to hide, that's his suggestion, not mine.

MR. ROBLIN: It's the imputation.

MR. CAMPBELL: I didn't make the imputation. I said quite frankly -- it was no imputation -- I said quite frankly, what we are wanting to get. We said there would be a big increase. We want to see the size of that increase.

MR. ROBLIN: Sure.

MR. MILLER: There is another matter that I want to raise, Mr. Chairman. In appropo of what the Leader of the Opposition says, I certainly have no intention of defending the government, but I think he would be the first person to criticize the government and rightly so, if for example referring to the education, the field of education and the field of health and public welfare where it is proposed that we spend millions more, he would be the first one to object, and rightly so, if the government, any government didn't hire the people to see that the money was properly spent. Surely if these programs are going to be put into effect, no matter who the government is, you have to have the people to administer the job and to see that the money is properly spent and adequately serviced. I don't think the fact that there is an increase in staff means very much. If we are going to have services, whether it be a hospital or -- I am sure when the former government set up the hospital plan that it meant an increase in the civil service. You couldn't operate a government hospital plan without a staff. I don't know how many it is but I am sure it was a pretty substantial number. It would have to be, and the same is true of any other service which it is proposed to extend, and I think this is the matter which we should look at. The fact that there is an increase in staff doesn't bother me providing the staff is doing the job which is proposed to do. That's the important point.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's quite right and my honourable friend, that's the position he takes and that generally speaking his group has taken. And that is what the former member Mr. Swailes said when he quoted his figure of 700. He said "I don't object to that at all" and of course he doesn't. And my honourable friends say, increase the staff by all means, sure and give them good wages and keep boosting their wages up, and let the poor old taxpayer pay for it. Sure, that's the thing. Well, I'm not objecting to them taking that stand, but I certainly do object to them criticizing us for raising the point.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this matter I have to speak on doesn't pertain to the department. I just thought I would inform the House that you can't beat the Scandinavians, that Ingemar Johansson is the new world's heavy weight boxing champion. He knocked him out in the third round and he knocked Patterson down seven times.

MR. MILLER: I had the experience. -- What I want to know is whether or not the various Ministers made provision for the number of established positions even if they are not filled, in the hope that they can fill them. I remember the advice of the experts in the past 'had been'. You know that we all experienced some great difficulty in filling certain positions. We couldn't get the people regardless, they were simply not there. I might mention the fact that at one time we couldn't get engineers. They were very, very scarce. Now then the budget director with whom we consulted, of course, to get our estimates in shape, asked the deputy and the minister "Can you get these people?" -- In cases where we had made provisions for payment of these people, if we could get them. What is the practice followed now?

MR. ROBLIN: The practice, -- this a general budgetary question so I suppose I ought to answer it as Treasurer. The practice is that the departments are given their establishments

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . and their estimates are prepared on the basis of their establishment whether or not that establishment is actually filled. Now one has to remember that there are certain peculiar circumstances in connection with our activities in this respect because we proposed a number of new policies which required new people, and yet we did not think that we should go ahead and engage as a general rule, where we could possibly manage to avoid it, hiring these people until we ceased to be a minority government for one thing and to get the approval of the House for a second. So there are a number of positions that have not yet been filled that are included in the estimates but we have no reason to think that our establishment will not be filled as soon as the House approves of the policies and the estimates that cover them. So there are a number of posts for which financial provision is made where nobody is a present at work.

MR. MOLGAT: It seems to me that the last time we were together in session the Provincial-Secretary gave us a breakdown at that time of the civil service, the number of employees each year, and then he gave us a breakdown last June and also last February. Could he give us the same figure as of to date?

MR. ROBLIN: Haven't we just covered that point?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, now, but he had that readily available last time right up-to-date. Does he not have that now? Does the government not keep a day by day token?

MR. BOULIC: I had the sheet but I had to use it during the election to counter that over statement of and I find that it's not here.

MR. MILLER: He made several copies and handed them to his colleagues.

MR. CAMPBELL: the only thing you guys lost in the election.

MR. ROBLIN: I can think of someone that lost a good deal more than we did though, and he isn't too far away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) Supplies, Equipment and Renewals. (c) Workmen's Compensation Board, assessment re accidents to government employees \$35,000.00.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain how come there is a drop in the figure? Is there not the same coverage?

MR. BOULIC: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was a carry-over of \$13,441.25 from the previous year so we think that \$35,000.00 plus the carry-over is more than ample to cover the compensation.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what classes of employees or civil servants are excluded, if any, from the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, rather than make a mistake, I would sooner give the answer next time we are in committee.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll undertake that then.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, I noticed in last year's estimates that you had an item here about the civil service examination expenses and I notice it's not on this time. I don't know if it's overlooked, or are there no examinations contemplated?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, the civil service examinations are included in the total amount of \$18,500.00 Examination expenses come to \$1,000.00.

MR. MILLER: for advertising and I think that's also included under the \$18,000.00. What is the amount for advertising?

MR. BOULIC: Advertising is included, yes.

MR. MILLER: What is the amount?

MR. HAWRYLUK: It was \$10,000.00 last year, Sir.

MR. BOULIC: Advertising - \$12,000.00.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 18. Civil Service Commission - \$107,350.00. Item 5 - Civil Service Superannuation Act; \$776,000.00.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this item was formerly carried under Provincial Treasurer and I'd be very happy to hear - there's quite a substantial increase there. Have the benefits been increased? Could the Minister give us an explanation? The basis of contribution, the government contribution and everything else?

MR. BOULIC: The basic contribution is \$684,000.00. \$73,052.00 are the 4% interest that is paid by the government on the \$1,826,300.00. That's an amount due from the Province

(Mr. Boulic, cont'd.) . . . of Manitoba and is paid in two equal semi-annual instalments of \$36,526.00. An additional amount required to take care of increased membership and of other allowances or gratuities - \$18,948.00, making a total of \$776,000.00

MR. MILLER: Would the Minister be kind enough to explain to the committee the benefits and the formula for the pensions.

MR. ROBLIN: It's all in the legislation. It's in the Act - the blue book there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Read the Act.

MR. MILLER: I know. I'm speaking now on behalf of the new members, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, if I was handed a copy of the Act I could read the Act for the benefit of the members.

MR. MILLER: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister do read the Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this item of civil service superannuation, we in the ranks of labour, have been proposing or suggesting in various jurisdictions that we should have portable pensions. I'm wondering whether or not it might be worthy of consideration for this government to undertake or attempt to have discussions with other jurisdictions of a similar nature. I have noted in recent months, and recent years as a matter of fact, quite frequently there's a transfer of civil servants from one jurisdiction to the other. I understand that some of the newer civil servants that we have here in Manitoba, I believe, came from Ottawa. I'm wondering whether the First Minister or the Minister in charge of this department would care to comment on that, whether any thought has been given in any other jurisdiction to that, because they're still in the service of the public. I'm thinking primarily of changes from provincial jurisdictions to federal and vice versa rather than inter-municipal and the likes of that for the time being. But I'm wondering if there has been any consideration or whether the First Minister or the Minister has thought of an idea of that nature, because I'm sure that with transfers it would be advantageous to the employee and it might also be insofar as the provincial administrations or where ever the case may be.

MR. BOULIC: I have just very recently taken that part - that superannuation - maybe the First Minister could answer that one better.

MR. ROBLIN: The question has arisen. It had arisen several years ago and was turned down by the administration in those days. I think their argument was that it was a one-way street, that everyone was leaving Manitoba and going some place else and they didn't "cotton" to the idea of the government's share of this superannuation fund being transferred with a new employee, and I must say that it is a consideration. We have no change of policy to announce on it but we are in the course of negotiating with the Civil Service Association in respect of this whole superannuation fund and it might be that some changes will develop in the course of that examination. It hasn't begun yet, it is merely in the negotiation stage.

(Continued on next page)

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a very few remarks to make on this subject but as the honourable members can see, it is a very substantial amount - three-quarters of a million dollars in round figures. I think it may be interesting to recall that it's exactly -- exactly, I think, 20 years ago that this system was instituted and I got the Clerk of the House to look me up the Act this afternoon to check that time and I'm quite sure it was 1939. I thought that perhaps an amount was stated in there, but in the limited time that I had to glance it over I didn't find the amount that was put in as the estimate for that year. The accrued liability is mentioned but the amount of the annual appropriation, as is mentioned in this year's group life, I didn't see it if it is given in there. But my remembrance is - and I'm speaking from memory on this, that it is in the neighborhood of a hundred and eighty-five or ninety thousand dollars. And I remember also the debates that, if I had had time or thought of this in time, I would have looked up in the library to find the press record of the debates of those days, but I remember very distinctly that the sponsors of this idea at that time told us that in their opinion that this would grow very little in the future. And mind you, 20 years ago is a time that we hadn't yet entered on the real big depression but, of course, the civil service was a lot smaller than it is now. (Interjection). Pardon? No vision perhaps, but they really told us. The actuaries did the same thing, that this was a program that would save the government money in the long run, because there had been previously a system of annuities that did not rest on an actuarial basis, and the advisors of the government at that time told us that that was growing so fast and, rather indiscriminately, that it would engulf the government, in time, with a tremendous expenditure, and not being on a sound basis would make them a lot of difficulty whereas this program, so said the experts, would not grow so very fast, and they put in certain safeguards for that reason. One of them was the length of time that a person had to be a member before they got their own contributions back and some other safeguards as well.

Well now, it has grown from much less than \$200,000. according to my memory to where it is now practically three quarters of a million. And I notice that this in this last year - has grown by, according to the estimate and it is an estimate of course, \$186,000. Now I think that that is one of the best answers that we can get to my honourable friend who was talking a little while about that he doesn't mind at all the increase in the civil service. He views it with complete equanimity but some people, the ones that are in charge of the treasury benches here, I think must take note of the way these various services are growing and what they are likely to continue to do in the future because the tendency has been, all through the years in this fund, never to cut down in any way the benefits; always to increase them. If the actuarial evaluation showed a surplus there, it was always to increase the benefits to the civil servant and never to cut down the amount of contribution that the government would have to make, and I suppose that that's a tendency that will likely continue in the future, so I just once again call attention to the way all of these services, good as they are in their initial instances, have a habit of growing and the taxpayer pays them all.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, might I ask my honourable friend that while he was making the comparisons of the amounts for superannuation between twenty years ago and now, did he also make a comparison between the amounts payable to legislators at that time and now?

MR. CAMPBELL: We didn't use to have as many sessions at that time. Anyway, outside of that I don't think the comparison is so greatly different but certainly you could

MR. PAULLEY: on a percentage basis I would suggest to this and on the services that are rendered.

MR. CAMPBELL: I haven't figured it out. I'll take my honourable friend's word for it.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was referring to what I said and I don't think I said that I viewed it with equanimity. All I said was that if we were providing services that we would have to have people to administer them. As far as this is concerned I make two observations - I am not an expert on this Act but I presume that the fund is based partly at least on the basis of percentage of the earnings of the employees, and if they have gone up naturally the amount for the superannuation fund goes up. The other point I want to make is this, Mr. Chairman, that of course the pensions we pay our employees have gone up; so have the pensions which private business and industry are doing and I don't think we are doing any more nor should we do any less for our employees than other industries and other governments are doing for their employees.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I accept the honourable gentleman's correction. He didn't say that he viewed it with equanimity -- I guess I was paraphrasing there. What he really said was that he was all in favour of it.

MR. BOULIC: Maybe to help in the discussion, Mr. Chairman, I could add this, that contributions by employees in the province are based on the age of the employee at the time he makes his first contribution to the fund according to the following schedule: twenty years and under, males - 4 1/2%, females 4 1/2%; 21 to 24 is 4 1/2 and females 5%; 25 to 29, 5% and 6% for females; 35 to 45, 5 1/2 and 6 1/2 for females; 46 to 55, 6% and 6 1/2%; 56 and over, 7%; so I would think that that is where the increase is coming.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there hasn't been any change in the forfeiture clause recently has there? Or I might say I think it requires legislation.

MR. BOULIC: There hasn't been any changes that I know of.

MR. MILLER: It still remains at two years?

MR. CAMPBELL: and I don't think, Mr. Chairman - those percentage of contribution have not been changed, have they?

MR. BOULIC: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6, The Civil Service Group Life Insurance.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there is an appropriation here of \$50,000. Now in committee yesterday when we were discussing this Bill the annual maximum the province would be involved for would be \$150,000. This, I understand, would be for a part year only. When is it anticipated that it would be ready to start?

MR. BOULIC: Mr. Chairman, in answer to this question, this \$50,000. would be for the full year as was explained yesterday. The Act, by mentioning \$150,000. makes it wide enough for boards and commissions to join in but the part - the civil service part would be \$50,000.

MR. MOLGAT: I regret that I had to be out of committee for a period of time yesterday. I presume I missed that and I did not hear the explanation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. V. - the Department of Education.

HON. STEWART E. MCLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, since this government took office almost a year ago there has been a great deal said in this Chamber and elsewhere on the subject of education, and it would really not require any lengthy comment from me this evening prior to the consideration of the individual items in the estimates and the questions and discussion that would take place. I presume that if I said very much the Honourable Leader of the C. C. F. would make the same comment as he did when I last spoke on the Throne Speech debate in March, that I was simply rehashing the original speech that I had made last October.

Two comments, since this is the first occasion that I have to make a more formal address on the subject of education since the Throne Speech debate in March, have to do with some matters which were stated at that time, and this affords me an opportunity to make a correction if one is in order. The Honourable Member for Radisson as he then was, now the Leader of the C. C. F. Party, complained that I had overlooked giving credit to the Leader of the C. C. F. Party for the assistance which he had given during the time of the school division at Brandon. It is quite true that I did overlook complimenting him on that occasion, and while it is unfortunate that he is not a member of the chamber here present to hear what I have to say in that regard, I should like to make good that omission and to express to him our appreciation for his assistance on that occasion.

And then the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who occupied the position which I now have, suggested that perhaps I was being critical of him in failing to express the appreciation which he felt was his due for the work which he had done in this department. Now I have not been one to particularly criticize what was done before. I have had, and have some very strong opinions on how the Department of Education was conducted and that's part and parcel of the democratic process, however, I would agree with him when he says that all was not wrong with education. That is perfectly true and my comment would be that we have obvious differences of opinion about some matters of policy which, as I say, are part and parcel of the democratic process. I am certain, however, that he conducted the affairs of his office according to his beliefs and did so in a most diligent manner. And also with respect to the staff of the Department of Education it is perfectly true, as he has pointed out to the chamber on a number of occasions, that

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . they are a good staff, in fact, I would claim for them, Mr. Chairman, the distinction of being the best department, with all due respect to my colleagues in the front benches, the best department in the Government of Manitoba, and that department was built up in some measure, at least, during the time that he held this office. And again to say that they have certainly been required to extend themselves to the utmost in the last twelve months and I would like to acknowledge that they have acquitted themselves in a most creditable manner. They are all, in the senior positions at least, men and women who have come to the department through the ranks of our teachers and who have a very profound understanding and knowledge of the educational process and work of the department, and they have done a most admirable job for education and for the Province of Manitoba.

Now, as every speech that I make in connection with education begins by referring to the fact that the previous government had appointed a Royal Commission on education - they brought in an interim report in September last making certain recommendations and particularly with respect to school administration and school finance. Those recommendations were in the main accepted and made part of the new plan for education in this province and enacted in the form of legislation in the special session of the Legislature in October last, followed by the campaign to have the school divisions accepted throughout the province. There is no need of my referring particularly to that because everyone is familiar with the campaign that was conducted and the result of the vote and the referendum that was held. That was followed by the election of the division trustees in the divisions which were formed under that plan, and I would like to say that I personally and all of us associated in the Department of Education are pleased at the high calibre of men and women who have offered themselves for service as trustees in the school divisions. Many of them have had considerable experience as trustees in local school districts and experience in the field of municipal administration and they bring to their task a very high degree of responsibility in the public administration of this new system of school administration. They recognize, as I am certain all of us do, that the success of the plan depends in very large measure upon the way in which they are able to conduct the business of the school divisions during the first year of operation, and I am pleased to report to the House that the plan is working in a most excellent manner. Many of the problems which people feared have failed to materialize and the operation of the plan is being accepted well and has not caused anything but favourable comment in all of the parts of the province where it was accepted. As the House knows, upon the declaration or the order declaring Seven Oaks a school division, we will have 41 school divisions in the province. There is one school area, the Dauphin-Ochre school area, and four proposed divisions where the plan was rejected at the time of the vote in February.

One of the features of the referendum which was held, and particularly the initial operation of the plan, has been the way in which the school inspectors have assisted in ensuring that the plan began operation in as smooth a manner as possible. This was made possible because of the fact that from the very beginning we took the school inspectors into our full confidence. They were familiar with the plan from its very initial beginning and were and are well trained in all of the implications and requirements of the administrative changes which were associated with it, and particularly did they assist the new division boards in their initial work and are working closely with them. In our establishment we have provided for six additional school inspectors who have now been employed, or at least in a sense employed - approved although not on staff until the 15th of August and that will enable us to have a school inspector assigned to each division with the exception of one or two cases where one inspector will have two divisions to look after or one division and part of another where the geographical territory concerned is not too extensive. And I again would like to acknowledge the assistance of the school inspectors in this whole exercise and in the way in which they have given themselves to ensuring that everything went along as smoothly as possible.

The Royal Commission on Education brought in only an interim report and they will bring in, in due course and I would imagine before too long, their final report. That final report will deal with many other aspects of education such as curriculum and teacher training and all the other associated aspects of education. And it must not be thought that the school administration and school finance are necessarily the only things which are concerned in education because we must not only see that we provide the necessary money but we must also see that we provide a good education in the way of the best possible curriculum and that we have the best possible

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . teachers for the boys and girls of the province. We will look forward with interest to the final report of the commission and no doubt we will be having something to say about their report when next we meet in this House.

Some of the various items of the changes that have been made will come up as the individual items are considered. We have made some slight adjustments in the operation of the Department of Education with a new alignment of the senior officers and the responsibilities which are assigned to them, with a view to lightening to a certain degree some of the responsibility and work that some of the members of the staff have been carrying; and also to have the department operate in as efficient a manner as possible. It will involve insofar as the department itself is concerned, the inner service, I believe the expression is used, the addition of five persons to the staff. It is of interest, just while I am speaking in a general way, to note that the total expected amount of money to be spent in this current fiscal year will be some \$30,000,000. - over \$30,000,000 - a substantial increase over that spent in the last fiscal year and just ten times as much money as was provided for in the estimates of the year 1947, indicating the substantial increase that has occurred in the public cost of education and that is only referring to monies that are provided from the provincial treasury and says nothing about the monies that come for educational purposes from municipal taxation. I think that it imposes a very heavy obligation upon all of us, not only those in the Department of Education but all of us as citizens of the Province of Manitoba, to see that that money is well spent, and it is the determination of the Department of Education to see that that is done. I am one who feels that in many respects the subject of education falls outside the ordinary bounds of political affairs, and that it is one matter upon which all of us should have only one objective in mind, that is, the provision of the best education we can for the boys and girls who are our charge in this important matter.

MR. PAULLEY: I think we all appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Education and found them very informative. I rise, not to debate with him at this time or discuss the matter with the Committee, but in view of the fact that it's twenty-five to eleven now and a number of us have been in the building since before -- well before 9:00 o'clock this morning, I'm wondering whether it would be agreeable for the Committee to rise and report on the happy note that the Minister has left with us.

MR. ROBLIN: I was brought up in a hard school. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was in my position for the nine years that I was in the House, and he used to adhere to the plan that it was a good idea to try and keep regular hours here if we were to get the work done with any kind of expedition, and I remember that I used to kick against the pricks when I was over there and he used to enunciate this philosophy. I thought perhaps he was a little harsh, but now that I have some responsibility along with my colleagues in seeing that these estimates are proceeded with in a reasonable way, I can understand some, at least, of the reasons which made him take the view that he did, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is only a few minutes but it will enable us to have several contributions, I trust, to the debate between now and 11:00 o'clock, and having stuck it out this long, I encourage my honourable friend to stick it out to the bitter end.

MR. PAULLEY: I was always under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the slogan of my honourable friend the First Minister was that "I follow Dief" not that "I follow Doug," and I remember quite well in the former years that he argued this point or suggested this point most vehemently on occasions, and it's surprising to me what happens to individuals when they walk across the floor of the Legislature. I'm somewhat surprised and disappointed in my honourable friend because I remember him on many an occasion when he was over here on this side along with us on this particular question, pleading and arguing about the question of research, and we haven't got this and we haven't got that, "you've got your experts in the department that are able to compile all of this stuff for you; you show no sympathy for us poor fellows in opposition," and all this that and the other. Quite frankly, Mr. Premier, I'm surprised at your statement and while I had another word on the end of my tongue which I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you'd call me to task for, but I ask the Honourable Minister in all seriousness, just review the past, don't follow Doug. Good Lord, you've told the electors of Manitoba that you're not going to, for goodness sake don't suggest to us here in this Legislature that now, after all you've said to the 800,000 people we have in Manitoba, you're going to start following him now!

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, there's a lot of critical things said in the House at

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) times and I'm always prepared to take my share of them but a fellow's got to draw the line some place and my honourable friend here who often has pretty doubtful things to say about me, he can continue to do that, but one thing I won't stand for is being tied up with "Dief" and "Duff". If he's going to get me into that company he and I are going to be very cross at one another from now, but I would want to way to my honourable friend the First Minister that if he can find one occasion, one occasion in the ten years with some special sessions thrown in, if he can find one occasion during the time that I was in his position where we met within the first three weeks on both Saturday afternoon and Friday evening as well, then I'll support him completely in the stand that he takes. I'm sure he can't find one occasion where in the first three weeks, that has happened, because for the first while we invariably, as hard as I admit I am, and I don't apologize for that because I always felt that it was right to get on with the business of Manitoba, but even with that being the case I always listened in the first few weeks of the session to the pleas of my honourable friends, all of them almost on this side, and I don't think you can find one case when in the first three weeks that we sat both Saturday afternoon and Friday evening. I mean Monday afternoon.

MR. MILLER: If I may please say a word, Mr. Chairman. I believe that I'll have to make some contribution to this debate.

MR. ROBLIN: If I know my honourable friend he should be good for 20 minutes.

MR. MILLER: I don't think that I could finish at eleven, and I would appeal to the Honourable the House Leader to listen to the pleas of my honourable friend the Leader of the C. C. F. Party. Maybe, if I may, I'll remind him that on one occasion at least when the estimates of the Department of Education were up, I accommodated him not once but three times with the full consent of the House because he wanted to make a contribution and, quite frankly, I would appeal to him to let the Committee rise and report on this occasion.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I must admit one thing, and that is, the view is considerably different from this position than it was before. I must say the view is much improved from this position from where it was before, and I'm quite happy to be taking the view from this part of the House. I'm familiar with all the arguments that are being raised here tonight because we have heard them before, but I'm(Interruption). . well, perhaps I did too good a job at it because I must say my honourable friends are very convincing. I will say, however, that I don't recall ever objecting to having to sit until 11:00 o'clock, it's when it got to 11:00 o'clock and we were told to pass an item or else we would continue to sit. Those were the times at which the streams of oratory from all parts of the House were inclined -- would well up and I quite understand it. I think we should quit at 11:00 o'clock. I'm sure that's the case, but I must say that I'm going to -- I think I'm going to allow myself to be persuaded by what I've heard. I'm going to do so on the gentleman's understanding that we won't be troubled with filibusters as sometimes happens when we're in the Committee. I know that no member really appreciates that no matter where they sit in the House (Interruption). Oh well, I had some provocation in those days because I can't ever remember my predecessor in this office responding to the appeals on the other side with any degree of interest. However

MR. PAULLEY: That's why I asked you to reconsider.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I want to say this. My honourable friend was so convincing about his Dief, Doug and Duff proposition, that I felt that perhaps I should pay attention to what he says and if the Committee wishes to rise and report, I have no objection. I must say that the Dief and Duff combination is one that's been worked to death and doesn't bother me at all because I think that perhaps there's merit in the association, but I kind of think that it's entirely unfair to the Leader of the Opposition to work him in on the trio, because I want to assure him and assure the House that he has absolutely no place in such a combination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we ask the House if it wishes to rise - I don't know -- this is making history I think -- I don't know from where it came, but when something comes to the Chair you're supposed to read it. It may be a very vital message, but it simply says, sensational news item: Johansson from overseas knocked out the Champion Patterson in their fight tonight at New York. I don't know why this was sent here unless the inference was that we should send a telegram to the fallen Patterson inviting him to come to Winnipeg to witness a few rounds in this Chamber, because if he did he might have a few suggestions given to him how he can win victories by the knock-out route. House rise, call in the Speaker.

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

MR. ROBLIN: This is no precedent, Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay by me, Duff.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn and I do hope that I'll see you, Sir, and many members of this House at the Brandon Fair on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been (Interruption).

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, I thought that had been agreed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you would be so kind.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, Tuesday afternoon.