

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, January 24, 1967

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if you would be good enough, Sir, to call the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Education, Item 1 (a) -- passed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we start this, I'll be very short but I'd like to make a comment. I think that I should. First of all I'd like to ask the Minister to explain this White Paper. I'd like him to tell us a little more about his proposal as far as using television in the field of education.

A few years ago I brought in a resolution and the Minister of Education at the time was not too interested; in fact he wasn't interested at all. He had made a different statement and I remember that I found this one in Hansard on Page 448 of that year. He felt that the station that operated the education was not too favourable and he felt that this was a ridiculous thing to bring up because there were many more things that had much higher priority. Now I felt at the time that we should be on the ground floor. I felt that we should take advantage of the assistance, the help that the CBC was ready to give; brought in the fact that New Brunswick had been fitted by the tune of at least \$1 million a year and we weren't doing too much on this. Now I asked the question of the Honourable Minister last year and he was quite evasive. He didn't say too much. A few days after he finished his estimates there was a big headline in the paper that the government might start its own network, and then we were told that this was -- it seems that it was a fair thing and that they were trying something that would be a pilot project and if this was successful, well then we would hear from them again.

Now just a few days ago - we have a new Minister of Education now; we have a new Deputy Minister; and I hope that things will be more progressive, that they will change. I see that Dr. Lorimer says that he feels that we'll have more and more television in the field of education, and if some of you had a chance to read the Time magazine of January 13th last week or so, although it was the American edition, they had a couple of pages on this college, this new college, a part of the University of Toronto, the College at Scarborough, and they explained there where at least 45 percent of all the education was done by television. They explained then that certainly nobody intends to replace the teachers but it is felt that this is the coming thing with the shortage of teachers and with the cost, that we should be on the ground floor. They say that this new college was literally built around this television studio. So I hope that before we leave this estimate, I think that the Minister owes us that, to give us a little more. This is something that it will be very important in future, and not too distant future I would say. This is something that we have advocated and if the government has had a change of heart I wish that the Minister should tell us.

Now I will not say too much on the White Paper. I for one -- it would be ridiculous to say that I don't think that this is a step in the right direction. As the Minister admitted himself there might be some mistakes, some things to change. There is no doubt in a program like this that this will have to be done, but this is something that by and large pretty well all the members - I don't think there's any point in saying that one member is from a party and not of the others - but pretty well all the members in this House have been advocating this, have been asking for change. We have had the Michener Report and the Fisher Report and they've been asking for some change like this.

But, and I won't be long on this, but I do not have the right to let this thing go without bringing in a formal protest for the forgotten people of this province, the people that are attending private schools. This is something I know that nobody likes the subject to be brought up and

(MR. DESJARDINS con't). . . . I can confess that I don't like it myself, but I think that I have no alternative but to bring in again this subject where a certain group of people are forgotten completely. We are spending here just for the primary and secondary school, not even considering the grants from the Federal Government for University, we're spending about \$95 million and there's not a cent that's for certain people who must pay the taxes. These people are forced to either act contrary to their conscience - and I'm not saying they're right, I'm saying that these people have a conscience and their conscience dictates to them that they should attend these schools - either they follow the dictates of their conscience and are penalized, and they're really penalized, or they must act contrary to what their conscience tells them to do.

Now I want to bring this thing back. It has to be mentioned at this time because we've got to realize that every step forward that we are making in education is widening the gap between the students attending private schools and the other. We cannot close our eyes, sweep this under the rug, try to bring in something like shared services and then say this is finished. We've borrowed time; we're going to have another 10, 15 years. This is not right. I don't think that we should be partisan in that or start it again in name calling, but this is something that we should look at because right now we are spending more money, education is getting to be quite expensive and if we keep on the way we are it'll be practically impossible for these schools to finish. So if we want, if this is what we want to close it, if we are not ready in this centennial year to eradicate prejudice in this province, if we feel that the people of Manitoba are not ready for this, I would say that at least if we can't eradicate prejudice let's do away with hypocrisy and let's close these schools because the people can not keep it up and they are, no doubt that they are in certain instances, and it'll be more pronounced - it'll be something that'll be more pronounced and they will be getting inferior teaching. They will not be able to meet the demands for salaries for new teachers; they will not be able to get the proper buildings and the proper labs and so on; and this is impossible.

So I won't prolong this, but I could not, although this is not a subject that I -- this is something that I am fed up with in this House. I have been bringing this for many years and have been fighting a lost battle but I haven't the right to let this thing go. This should be a great day for Manitoba. There is a lot of good in this paper but we are -- we are closing our eyes on a minority, we the Members of this House, and this is a black mark against the Roblin government and against every member in this House and against the people of Manitoba, if the reason is that the people are not the majority, and this our centennial year is not ready to accord the rights, to give the rights to a minority here in this province, and let's not kid ourselves that we are actually giving these people their rights, their liberty of keeping their schools open, because you can not do that if they are going to suffer and if they are going to be deprived economically the way it is being done now.

So this is a formal protest on this part of the program to the Minister, because he has the responsibility. I'm not too hopeful there will be something changed, but this is not something that will be forgotten in Manitoba. This is allowed to keep on to the disgrace of Manitoba and I think we will have to be careful from now on when we ask more money from the Federal Government when people in all the provinces can move from one province to the other and they can listen to the dictate of their conscience except here in Manitoba. This is a problem I know and we are all guilty, but the responsibility stands with the Minister who brought in this paper and who does not see fit to bring any - any relief to these people who are oppressed by the majority here in Manitoba.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, one of the important areas in the White Paper which we have sort of heard spelled out, although I am still not clear on the Minister's figures, is the ratio of students to teachers; and another problem I think that any Cabinet Minister has as a member of any administration is that he often sees things in very large terms and does not really get inside and see how they work out in practice. For example, it might have sounded fine a few years ago to talk about 30 students in an elementary classroom as being a sort of an ideal size and 25 in the secondary level, but when you get into actual practice and you have to work with this number of students the problem becomes a little different.

I also wish that the Minister could get out more from his office - I'm not sure in my own mind how often he does get out or how acquainted he is with the workings of the actual classrooms - but I wish that he could see the sort of thing that happens to some of the new teachers coming into the profession and how they get stuck with courses; how they get stuck with the lack of variety; how they are given so-called frill programs like physical education and guidance, at least that's how it seems to be considered in some quarters; how there is a definite lack of preparation

(MR. DOERN cont'd) periods for teachers; how these teachers must go one period after another, one class after another, and this is extremely hard on the individual and I think it is extremely hard on the students. A student takes a tough 40 minute period at the beginning of the day in mathematics and then it is followed by a tough period in physics. By that time he's had enough but has to continue on for the rest of the day.

I wonder if the Minister is fully aware of the work load that teachers have, a fantastic workload that seems to be increasing every year with the implementation of new courses and new programs. Talk to an average person, he says, "Oh teachers really have it soft. They work 9 to 4; they have two months off in the summer and they have ten days at Easter and ten days at Christmas." That's the way it looks; that's the way it appears on the surface. Well the job is really 9 to 4 - at least that's the so-called framework - but that doesn't tell us about the paper work the teachers have; it doesn't tell us about the staff meetings, the Manitoba Teachers Society meetings, the extra curricula activities, the school dances that you have to supervise, the parents' nights you have to attend, the student counselling you are expected to do, the professional up-grading you are supposed to get involved in; it doesn't tell us about the preparation and marking of tests; it doesn't tell us about the preparation and marking of regular assignments; and it doesn't tell us about the preparation and marking of examinations. These so-called holidays at Easter and Christmas are little more than a period in which the teacher marks his examinations, and now of course we have new courses and new techniques and the teachers are supposed to keep up. This is, I think, very hard on the new teacher and very hard on the old teacher, the person who is getting near retirement, who has taught the same old course for 5, 10, 15, 20 years and suddenly has to do a complete change of pace, a new concept and new material. Well it is part of our job, it is part of a teacher's job, but it is not easy and especially since I don't think sufficient time is being given. We have made improvements, the Minister has given some time for in-service training, but I think we have a long way to go.

Now the Minister talks about the democratic right that he's giving on this referendum and I'm afraid that that is a misnomer. I think it's rather clear from what has been said and what we've seen on the White Paper that the government believes that the single district division should be implemented, and we in the New Democratic Party believe in the single district division in principle, but the government has so stacked the cards that anybody who is going to vote against this referendum will be heavily penalized. There is no choice to the people in rural Manitoba because if they don't vote for the single district division - which I support and which we in this party support in principle, which the government supports - if they don't in fact vote for it they are committing economic suicide, and yet the Minister says they have a democratic right to vote for it. It's like giving a person the democratic right and he can choose the way he'll die. Maybe he doesn't want to die, but you say would you prefer hanging or the gas chamber, and so the Minister is giving, in a sense, although the consequences are pleasant in the sense that the results are progressive, but he still isn't giving them a choice.

I've been looking up a few figures and it seems that in Manitoba we're spending a pretty high percentage of the total budget on instructional services, the teachers' salaries etc., and I think it's a figure that might be as high as 70 percent, but if you look back in Manitoba in 1926 we are spending the same percentage, so in some ways - in some ways in 40 years we haven't really made that much of an advance.

Now there are two very important questions that I would like to pose and I just wonder whether the Department of Education is grappling with these problems. First, what are the aims of education in Manitoba in the 20th century, in 1967 on; and secondly, how to you translate these aims into courses of study. So first, what are the aims of education in Manitoba in the 20th Century. If we go south of the border to our neighbours in North Dakota and Minnesota, they are planning - and they are sort of a comparable society to ours - they are planning for up to 70 percent of their high school students to enter university, and in Manitoba we are planning for 25 percent for university entrance.

Now I don't know how these figures are reached. I don't know who determined these; I don't know how they come about. I don't know whether the Minister sits down with a crystal ball or whether he talks to the president of the university or whether he talks to his research department - if I could use a loose expression like that - but nevertheless we arrive at a figure of around 25 percent for university entrance.

Now here's where I make the point that I will talk about if necessary to the Minister whenever I see him, and if necessary at every possible opportunity, the point that we need a department of research, or at least we need a research arm, we need an independent or a

(MR. DOERN cont'd)..... semi-independent research group. We don't have it now. And with the department of research, if I could refer to it as a department, these people could determine these figures in relation to our needs and goals. For instance, they could look at our human and our natural resources and they could determine what our needs are and what our goals are.

Now for this purpose you don't put an ad in the paper as the Minister's department did last year, and you say we want a top research person and we're willing to go as far as \$7,200 a year. Well maybe that's not a bad salary. I don't earn that kind of money but nevertheless if you want a top research person, say with a Ph. D. and some experience, you're not picking him up for \$7,200. And so the Minister gets somebody to fill the job. I don't know how qualified, but really I don't think it's too professional an approach. We need economists and statisticians; we need a psychologist or two in that department; and maybe we need a sociologist or an anthropologist to look at things like the Indian-Metis problem. We need professional people who reek of their discipline. We don't want people who have had a little bit of experience; we want people who are real pros, who have the professional academic qualifications and have some experience. Let's face it, I think we're going to have to go outside of Manitoba for these people. The tragedy in this province is that people with tremendous talent and Ph.D. qualifications have to leave Manitoba. I'm thinking of a friend of mine in particular. He can't stay here because he has to get a job and there are no jobs for him, so he's thinking of going to Ontario. Well we can't afford to lose these kind of people but we're losing them, because we're not hiring them. We're not offering them any possibility of staying here.

The second point is how do you translate these aims into courses of study, and that of course is a more complex factor. We are now using American programs in Mathematics and Science, and these programs were developed at considerable capital expense. You don't develop a new program in Physics or Mathematics with a half a million dollars. You do it with millions and maybe with dozens or hundreds of people and expensive research. Now we don't have to compete on this level. Manitoba can't cough up the kind of sums they can in California and we cannot really be in the forefront of this kind of research, but we can have experiments in application. Maybe we can use their so-called pure-research and adapt it or adopt it to our conditions. The American courses are tested under what might be described as ideal circumstances. For instance, their teachers who implement these programs are used as guinea pigs, often have at least one degree and probably have Masters or a degree in education in addition. They have lavish funds behind them. They have all kinds of consultants, and the students that they test are inevitably the upper middle class college-bound students, sort of upper class students who live in San Francisco and he just goes to university. His decision is: what course shall I take? His decision isn't like many students in Manitoba whose big decision is: should I go to university? can I afford to go to university? And then given that, then they say what course should I take.

So the problem is, how do you apply the San Francisco research, the American research, to Manitoba? Is California identical to Manitoba? So what we should really do here is we should specialize in what we might call applied research rather than pure research, or a more sophisticated form of applied research. For example, there is not just one new Physics course or one new Mathematics course. There are new Mathematics courses and new Physics courses and we might choose not only among them, but we might choose parts of each course perhaps. We might even use some of the old Mathematics program. But I think what we do is sort of sit around the table and look at three alternative new programs and pick one. Well, if we had real research we might be able to come up with something better. What we require is a great deal of testing, which I suggest is not being done; we require a great deal of objective observation, which I suggest is not being done. The person who does the objective observations in Manitoba is mainly the classroom teacher. I was selected on one of these. I never had any training to become a professional objective observer. I look at a student and he seems to be awake, so I conclude he's awake. Maybe if you a -- what is it -- an electroencephalograph machine and attached it to his brain, it might prove that he was really asleep but he appears to be awake. We can only assume we're getting certain kinds of results. This is where the psychologist comes in and the sociologist and so on.

Now a very big factor that I think is being ignored in Manitoba and in many places around the world, and especially in North America, is mental health. Now this is a great factor. All these professional professors, they get together, they whip up a new course, they put it into a very tight discipline for the brightest students and then we get all these courses, we put them all together and we say to this poor little student, "here, learn it." Now the sum total of all

(MR. DOERN cont'd)..... these factors might be very bad for the individual student, and we have students in our high schools and our elementary schools who are cracking up. They are under tremendous pressure; they are taking tranquilizers, seeing psychiatrists, can't sleep at night and so on. Same with the teachers. I say mental health must be a primary goal of education. I would like to hear what the Minister says about that. He's a Doctor. He knows something about health and he knows something about education. I would like to ask him: Is this a top goal of education in Manitoba or is it secondary, or isn't it considered? Since I see that my good friend is actually writing, I want to emphasize this one point again. Would he please answer me in regard to research. Would he tell us what kind of research is being done in his department. We're spending 61 1/2 Million this year. How much on research? Ten thousand dollars? A tenth of one percent? a hundredth of one percent? What is it? It's practically nothing.

Now I am going to try and hurry as fast as I can to keep my remarks limited, but I could talk at some length. Thank you gentlemen. Do the Liberals permit me to go on? --(Interjection)-- A couple of hours? Thank you very much. Now one of the reasons this department of research should be partly autonomous or partly independent is that there are political problems, and this is where this half of the House comes in. The problem is if the department experiments on new courses, we are the opposition and it's our function to criticize, and the question is, can you have real experimentation when the opposition's role is to criticize? This is why it must be somehow or other independent so that the department is not afraid politically to experiment.

Now I know that the Minister is going to tell me that we have all kinds of research done in Manitoba. There's the Manitoba Educational Research Council, but I might tell him that it is voluntary, that they have few funds, they have no permanent staff. He'll tell me that the department does research, but they only conduct a few minor studies every year. In essence, they do nothing. They look at exam results. They have hardly any staff - what, one or two people. The Winnipeg Division does a bit. They have a Director of Research, and assistant, and a couple of clerks, and they have done some excellent studies. The Faculty of Education is primarily directed at training teachers and has little time for research. They have one man they just hired recently and he is to do research.

Now I'm going to conclude by looking briefly at the rural area, because here the government built, in a burst of energy and a burst of vision, if I might use that conservative term, a host of four room high schools. They came in, they said, "Man, education's in a mess". They slapped up a whole bunch of four-room high schools all around the province, and I think now we can see that it wasn't the wisest possible way to approach it. Why? Because the small high school cannot offer a variety of courses. It's as simple as that. A four-room high school - and we have these little four-room high schools - they cannot offer the University Entrance Course, the General Course, the Commercial Course, the Vocational Course and so on, so if a student in a small district wants to go to his high school and say go to university, the trustees may have decided, as they have in some areas, to give only the General Course. So what does he do? He gets on a bus and he goes sixty miles to a high school where he can get this kind of course.

In other words, we're back in the old traditional way that a student must go to the school. This is the kind of thinking I think we have. What we should be looking for now, is we should try to bring the school to the student, and this can be done by such things as television; it can be done by such things as programmed learning and another thing, we could have possibly teachers moving around as opposed to some of the students moving around - perhaps a specialist could move around. I think Winnipeg's going to do this with music. They're going to have music specialists going around. That's not a bad idea. One of my friends who is pretty clever with words said -- I said, I don't like the term "itinerant teacher", and he said, "Well, call them the 'peripatetic pedagogue'."

Well, to conclude, we know that all this costs a great deal of money, but for progressive education I think the people of Manitoba are willing to pay it. They want value for their money, but I think they know that if they have the right program and the right implementation, they'll put that money up.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q C. (Selkirk): be on Item No. 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 (a).

MR. HILLHOUSE: 1 (a) - still in education. Mr. Chairman, the motion which I am about to make is not new nor is it unique except only insofar as it relates to the reasons prompting it. On numerous occasions in the past this motion has been made either to show displeasure at a

January 24, 1967

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).... Minister or at his program. Such is not the case here. For the Minister, I have the highest personal regard both as an individual and as an administrator. Unfortunately, however, he must share a responsibility for the acts of his government in holding the people of Manitoba in contempt. The contempt to which I refer is the action of this government in increasing the allowances, salaries and expenses of its Ministers by Order-in-Council passed under the authority of Section IV of The Executive Council Act. That increase was enacted immediately following a provincial election, wherein one of the main issues was the extravagance of this government and the high taxation with which the people of Manitoba were confronted. That issue, Mr. Chairman, was largely responsible for the small majority which this government received in being returned to office, and it is my considered opinion that had this government during that election advised the people of Manitoba of their intention to increase Ministers' salaries and allowances to the extent that they were increased, they would not be sitting on the right side of the Speaker tonight.

Now I do not argue, Mr. Chairman, that the government did not have the power to enact this Order-in-Council increasing the Ministers' salaries and allowances, nor do I challenge the fact that some of the Ministers in this government are entitled to the amount of compensation which they are being paid. That is not the issue here. The issue which I raise is the manner in which this raise was effected. In my opinion, it showed an absolute contempt for the people of this province. Now in this day and age politicians have a very poor public image, and it is my submission, Mr. Chairman, after being in this House for 16 years, that if we have a poor public image, it's simply the reflection that our own image makes on the people of this province, and the only way to correct that is by acting towards the people of this province in a manner which is worthy of them and which is worthy of us, and the sooner we show that frankness to the people of this province and show the people of this province that we are really acting in their interest and not in our own interest, the sooner we will retain or recapture the image which we should have.

Now, none of these considerations deterred this government from its course of action, and when one considers the increases one is forced to conclude that the intention was to "make hay while the sun was shining." I think these increases bear repetition. Before the increase went through a Minister was receiving a salary of \$12,500. He was receiving an indemnity of \$4,800, or a grand total of \$17,300, of which \$1,666 was tax free. With the increase, \$18,000 was the salary and allowance given to a Minister; \$4,800 was the indemnity - there was no increase there - making a grand total of \$22,800, but his income tax exemption which was not taxable at all was raised from \$1,666 to \$4,666.

Now that increase and exemption was granted to them at a time when the Premier of this province was ranting and raving in Ottawa for not getting enough money to carry on the business of this province. It was granted at a time when the taxation of this province had to increase due to the state of the finances in which we found ourselves, but yet these Ministers had given to to themselves what I term a pension in the amount of \$3,000, and the people of this province will have to pay the shot for the added extravagance of this government. Now when we consider the fact that this \$3,000 plus this \$1,666 is ostensibly tax free because of the expense allowance, we overlook the fact that a Minister is given a car, he's given his expenses, and he is given a staff to carry on his work, so why - I know it's allowable under the Income Tax Act - but by what logic or by what reason can you consider that that additional \$3,000 which is given to a Minister should be tax free. In my opinion, the only way that it can be catalogued or described is it's in the nature of a gift or a pension which is not taxable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in spite of what I have said, I might have been inclined to treat this matter in a more charitable way, but recently when the estimates of this House were tabled I found that the government had included in those estimates an increase in the indemnity that was to be paid to my Leader and an increase in the indemnity that was to be paid to the Leader of the NDP. Now I have no objection to either of these gentlemen getting that increase. I think they're entitled to it, but the thing that struck me was the way that this increase was brought to the attention of the members of this Legislature. In my mind, it amounted to a subtle form of blackmail. To me, it was nothing more or less than an effort on the part of the government to silence opposition to the increases which they gave themselves in their Ministers' salaries and expenses.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to be silenced by that subtle, subtle method, and I intend when the occasion arises to express my views and opinions on the increase that my Leader has been given. I think if we study the history of increases of Ministers' salaries in

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).... this House, particularly during the years that the Honourable Member for Lakeside was First Minister in this province, and if we even consider or study the increases that were granted by this government up until this last increase, I think we'll find that all of the increases that were granted to Cabinet Ministers took place at a time when there was increases granted in indemnities, and I think too we will also find that those increases in Cabinet Ministers' allowances, etc., were granted at a time when the House was in session.

Now I appreciate the fact that under Section IV of The Executive Council Act it is not necessary for the government to obtain the approval of the Legislature to granting an increase in the Ministers' salaries, but I submit that that practice should be changed. There is nothing to prevent this government, after the prorogation of this House - and let us assume this House is prorogued on the 31st of March - there's nothing to prevent this government on the 1st of April from enacting another Order-in-Council under Section IV of The Executive Council Act and increasing their salaries all over again. There's nothing to prevent this.

Now I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in the interest of establishing with the people of Manitoba a better public image, and in the interest of real responsible government and real democracy, that an amendment would be made to The Executive Council Act placing a Cabinet Minister's salary in the same position as that of the indemnity paid a member of this House. I think it should be voted on in this House so that the elected representatives of the people of Manitoba can discuss it, and the people of Manitoba will know that through those elected representatives their voice is being heard.

In the meantime, and until such time as I think up the amendment that I am going to bring into this House, I wish to move this motion: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move that Item 1 (a), Minister's Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance of \$18,000 be reduced to the level of the 1966-1967 appropriation of \$12,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, it would be perhaps expected that I had an opinion on the observations that have been made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk in respect to this matter, because as the Leader of the government I am prepared to take full responsibility for what is done, as it is my duty to do.

I think the first question that members of the House should ask themselves is to whether or not they have any control over this particular matter, and I think the answer has been given by the honourable member who moved the motion, that the House decides by its vote in the estimates what the salaries of Ministers shall be, and he has expressed his opinion with respect to this particular matter and the House and this committee will in due course vote upon the subject, and bring it under parliamentary control as indeed it should be under the circumstances.

The question to which I would like to address myself in the first instance is whether the Cabinet Minister should get a salary of \$15,000 plus an expense allowance - representation allowance as it is termed - of \$3,000 and his indemnity, and I think there are a number of ways of looking at this question. There are some people of course who feel that all politicians are paid too much and there's some people who feel that Cabinet Ministers generally speaking have a pretty easy time of it and probably aren't worth what they're getting anyway, and that's an opinion that may well be held. I don't subscribe to it, and I also don't subscribe to the theory that it is good government in any sense of the word to pay less than what the job is reasonably worth, whether it's a Cabinet Minister or whether it's a member of the House or whether it's a member of the civil service. It just doesn't make sense to pay less than what the job is reasonably worth, and it seems to me the point at issue is whether the amounts that are recommended to be paid the Cabinet Ministers are what Cabinet Ministers under present day circumstances are reasonably worth in this province considering what they have to do.

The first thing that I would like to say is that the budget of this province is now some \$350 million. It's a very big operation indeed. I would like to say that there are scores of civil servants who were getting, when this raise was made, far more than any Cabinet Minister gets in the province here - a good number at any rate - and I should also say that at the same time that this increase was put through by Order-in-Council some \$1 million of the public funds, without any authorization of this Assembly let it be said, was also put through to increase the salaries of civil servants in the higher ranks, for the simple reason that if we didn't do so we wouldn't keep them - \$1 million against the several thousand dollars that the particular increase in question here relates to.

We'll take a look at this question of what the job is worth. At the present new arrangement the pay for Cabinet Ministers in Manitoba is about medium in the country with respect to the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd).... major provinces. We are considerably below Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia; we are above Saskatchewan and Alberta. This is the new system that we are operating under now, not the old one. Federal Members of Parliament who do not have Cabinet responsibilities or a full time occupation in their job get \$18,000, one-third or \$6,000 of which is tax free. Take a look at the other people in the public employ in the Province of Manitoba and see what the salaries are paid there. The Chief Justice, both of them -- \$25,000; the Judges of the Court of Appeal and Queen's Bench - \$21,000; President of the University of Manitoba - \$28,000 plus certain perquisites such as a house I believe; Chairman of our Public Utilities - \$20,000 in the Telephone System and \$19,500 in the Hydro; the Chief Executive Director of Metro - \$23,133; the Director of Metropolitan Streets and Transit Division - \$21,034, and here sits the Minister of Highways at his old salary, and now his present salary is comparable to the Director of Transit in the Metro situation; the Winnipeg City Engineer, the Finance Committee and the General Manager of the Winnipeg Hydro - \$21,500. The General Hospital is even more than that, and here sits the Minister of Health who is responsible for a good many things including the General Hospital. The Superintendent of Winnipeg Schools - \$22,000, and we want to reduce the salary of my honourable friend to a sum that is considerably below what is paid to the Superintendent of Schools of Winnipeg. The Administrator of the Winnipeg General Hospital - \$25,000. As an interesting comparison, airline pilots - if they are jet pilots - \$28,000 to \$35,000.

I read in the paper the other day that Mr. Grant, who provides a good deal more entertainment I daresay than any single Cabinet Minister is likely to do, gets \$40,000 on a 5 year contract, which is a little better than anything I can claim for my colleagues and I. So we have a man that runs the United Way - the Minister of Welfare take note of this - \$20,000, and the salaries of people like the President of the Canadian Congress of Labour - I don't know why he was picked out for this comparison, I'm sure he's worth every cent of it - he gets \$20,000. Now by and large --(Interjection)-- well this particular statistic was gleaned, let's say.

By and large, Mr. Chairman, I am not referring to the leaders of commerce and industry; I'm not talking what a doctor might make; I'm not saying anything what a reasonably first-class lawyer might make; I'm not saying anything about what a good entrepreneur or a business executive might make; I'm not saying anything about the salaries that are paid to people who run corporations worth \$350 million a year, to say nothing of the Hydro and the Telephones which are also certain responsibilities; I'm talking about public servants, by and large, right here in this city and province and it seemed to me, and I may be wrong, and members can have their opinion, but it seemed to me that it was not wrong to propose that Cabinet Ministers in this government should be paid with some regard to the salary and the remuneration that was paid to other worthy public servants here in this province of ours.

We did not suggest for a minute that they should be paid salaries such as are paid to some other Cabinet Ministers in the nation, nor salaries that were related to what one might expect to get in private business or in private practice. That's out of the question. I did not take into account what well might be entered into the ledger, the fact that these men who sit around me, and it was the same in other days I suppose, are mostly young men with family responsibilities and who have no security of tenure. These other public servants of which I spoke are under a pension plan, and on reasonably good behaviour they are going to hold onto their jobs for the rest of their working life. There is no such guarantee, nor should there be by any means, to politicians. We have to take that as part of the game, the rough and the smooth, but it doesn't mean that we should take substandard salaries at the same time. I think there should be pay for the job, and I think pay for the job was what is provided in the arrangements that have been made.

Now, Sir, I'm not going to prolong this debate by any further extensive defence of what has been done because I don't think it needs it. Of course we are not popular when we increase our own salaries, and of course it is not, and I speak from personal knowledge, at any time a very pleasant thing to do because some folks always say, as my honourable friend took occasion to say it, "feathering their own nest." I don't think that's right. I think that what we have tried to do is to get some kind of a rate of pay that is reasonable for the job.

I was interested to read an editorial in the Manitoba Co-operator about this subject - wrote it when it was a red hot issue in September - "Salaries no Crucial Issue"; and they went on and I must say they gave much the same kind of an argument that I am giving here tonight. It's perfectly true they didn't like our doing it the way we did do it, and that's open to criticism. I don't deny it; it's a matter of judgment. Maybe it should have been done some other way, but

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . I maintain that the amounts that were set in these salaries under the circumstances are not unreasonable. They are reasonable pay for the job involved. If members wish to criticize us for doing it when we did do it, I can give the explanation that I have already referred to, and that is that at the time we were raising the pay of all the senior civil servants in the government, or almost all of them, to amounts which were treading right on the heels of their Ministers - in many cases higher than their Ministers - and it seemed to us that as we were making this change at that time it would be well to include the Ministers in the operation at the same time and that's what we did. Now we haven't been very popular for doing it and people are entitled to their own opinions about it. I respect other people's opinions, but I am not going to apologize for it and I am not going to back down on account of it and I am not going to vote for my honourable friend's motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us knew some time ago, away back last September, that we were going to have a discussion in the Legislature on this matter of the salary increases that were granted to the Cabinet by Order-in-Council. As a matter of fact, the proposition introduced this evening formally into this House by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, in essence, was introduced into the public scrutiny by myself a few hours after the increase had been announced.

MR. ROBLIN: May I interrupt you?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly.

MR. ROBLIN: There was one thing I intended to say to my honourable friend for Selkirk and I thank my honourable friend for allowing me to make this addition to my statement. I think it is fair to say that the Leaders of the opposition parties were not taken by surprise. He spoke of blackmail; I really don't like that reference. The Leaders of the opposition parties were not taken by surprise with respect to the arrangements that were made. I would say no more about the discussions between us because that is confidential, but I think it is not out of place for me to say that they were not taken by surprise.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I trust that if my honourable friend makes that statement, and he says it's not confidential, then I will be allowed to say exactly what happened in that matter, and I would hope that he would allow me to do so because if he makes a statement I want to explain clearly what the matter is, but he has broken a confidence.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor. I desisted in favor of the First Minister for a point of clarification and I think, Mr. Chairman, that possibly I might be able to continue and say a word or two. I will not refer to the matter raised just recently in the last moment or so by the Honourable the First Minister. He is correct when he states that some confidential discussion did take place between the Leader of the Opposition and myself and himself together with the Honourable the Attorney-General and I leave it at that for the time being, but if it becomes necessary or advisable to continue along that line then I will.

I want to say however, Mr. Chairman, I don't know quite whether I heard the Honourable Member for Selkirk correctly or not, that the question of any salary - it's not an increase because I never received a salary previously to the proposition now before us, or will be before us sometime during the session. As leader of the third group in the House, I have never received any additional emolument even though members have suggested in the past that this should be done. So I want to say to my honourable friend there is no increase as such, it is the start of a new venture as far as I am concerned and I trust and hope that I didn't hear my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk correctly, or interpreted him incorrectly if I took down in my notes the inference from my honourable friend that I was susceptible to blackmail.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to correct the impression the Honourable Leader of the NDP has on that score right now. I never suggested for one moment that you were influenced in that way, but I did suggest that that was the meaning I got out of the government's action, because the first I heard of any increase being granted to my leader or to you was when the estimates were tabled.

MR. PAULLEY: As long as my honourable friend and I understand each other that there was no inference that I might be influenced in what I say in this House in respect to salaries or insofar as my affiliations or objections to government by the fact that the estimates may contain for the first time an item for the Leader of the party of which I represent, not me the individual, but the leader of this particular party.

I want to say at the offset, Mr. Chairman, this is not new. I have raised objections in the past, and do now, with the method by which the salary increases were awarded. My

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... honourable friend the First Minister a few moments ago spoke of the salary increases as a proposition he proposed, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is exactly what he should have done. Had he proposed an increase in salaries to his Cabinet Ministers and laid that proposition before this House, then I think that the whole matter would have been considered in a different light than we are faced to consider it this evening.

I think this is where the Minister, the First Minister and the government erred. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I'm not sure whether or not the figure of \$12,500 as now suggested by the Honourable Member for Selkirk for Cabinet Ministers or the present allowance of some \$18,000 per Cabinet Minister is correct. I agree with the First Minister that on a comparative basis it seems that the proposition of the \$18,000 is in line, and in saying this, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if this is to be considered a salary for the Cabinet Ministers, then the whole sum total of the amount should be placed on a taxable basis as it is for any other individual insofar as their salaries are concerned and that there should not be any endeavour to have a portion of that over and above the apportionment in the indemnity made tax exempt.

Now I'm not sure that the government has justified its position in the increase. We have had nothing officially laid before us, Mr. Chairman, either at the time of the awarding of the increases or since the House first sat, on the part of the government to say to us with candor, our Ministers were underpaid by comparison with what we think that they should be paid. Nothing before this House at all. I think that the First Minister this evening when he was giving to us a list of positions and the salaries paid to some of those positions was on a reasonable ground - a reasonable ground when he suggested this - and I think that it is an accepted thing in society today that a person should be paid in line with their positions and their responsibility to society.

I don't suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Education, and it's maybe unfortunate that this particular motion first arises while we're dealing with his estimates, and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I'm concerned taking part in this debate at this time, I mean no personal affront to the Minister of Education as such. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if I read statistics correctly, that if my honourable friend was prescribing medications to the Honourable the leader of the New Democratic Party, he would be receiving a greater salary than he would be if this reduction came about or possibly even without the reduction.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would never charge the Leader of the NDP.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I am happy that some of your colleagues have so fixed him up so that he can stand up here and talk.--(Interjection)-- You'll find out before the session is over my honourable friend that I have recovered from some of the ailments that you trusted that I had permanently. --(Interjection)-- I might say that as far as the undertaking fraternity is concerned, I have an understanding with one of my constituents, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that I have a cut-rate insofar as his chapel is concerned, but I doubt whether I'll be needing it either from the Honourable the Minister of Highways or my constituent to

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that as the Minister said that he would be able to do this free, I also offer to give our service free, but with a time limit.

MR. PAULLEY: I note, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend puts a time limit, and there is an old saying--no, I hadn't better say it - "If I live long enough to do something to you, or over you", and I guess this wouldn't be parliamentary, but it would be understood. But apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I take the line that the government did not justify - they've made no attempt to justify it to this House. We fought an election in June; the government turned out to be almost in a near minority position. They lost support, and I think that it was incumbent on the government to come before this House and discuss this matter with us before they - quite within their rights legally but not morally - awarded themselves the increases which they did. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that jeweller from Thompson, Joe Borowski, was fully justified in coming down here and making his protests as he did against the salary increases, when by comparison you consider the dollar an hour minimum wage we have in the Province of Manitoba at the present time and the relative huge increases that were awarded by Order-in-Council. This matter has been the subject of much public consideration. I am sure that it will be a matter to be further considered by this committee, Mr. Chairman. Sufficient for me to repeat once again, we don't and did not like the methodology used by the government in awarding this increase. We thought and still think that they should have waited until the calling of a session to come before us, to have included - as the Honourable Member for Selkirk indicated - within the estimates that we're dealing with at the present time, the increases so that we could have

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) considered them as a legislative body.

And so, Mr. Chairman, may I state the position I am going to take in respect of the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I am going to support his motion as a method of protesting the manner in which the government awarded the increases to the Cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put -- I'm sorry.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I hope that on this occasion I will be allowed to speak. We have a motion before us to reduce the Minister's salary to what it was formerly before the increase took place. We also heard the First Minister's explanation of the why and wherefore, and I personally do not feel that this rush was warranted. Just because they gave increases to other people was no reason in my opinion to give themselves a big increase. I think they definitely should have waited until the House met. Since the House hadn't met so far since the new government was elected, I think the opportunity should have been given to members of this House to express their opinions on this very important matter.

Now I have quite a number of grievances, because I find that there are too many secret deals pulled off by leaders of the various groups, and I am not being informed or consulted in any way. I think this is very regretful and I think that this should not take place. All the other members have access to this information once they've had discussions, but I am not in that particular group so that I have access to that information. I am being kept out of this and I don't think this is fair. In fact, I think it is shameful of this government to have actions of this type where I am shut out.

This not only happens when meetings of this type are held, it also happens on other occasions. We have the matter of the appointment of committees. The other day I was approached in connection with the Standing Committees, but on Special Committees I have yet to be consulted by this House, or by the government of this House as to what shall take place. This hasn't happened to this day, in all the eight years that I have been in the House, and I think this should be corrected. Certainly, I have a right as a member of this House on information of this type and what should be done. I have also been abused a number of times. Even in the short period that this House has sat I have been abused a number of times when I have given consideration to the government in allowing them to proceed in matters and giving consent, and then find that I am let down. I feel very bad about this and certainly when a motion of this type then comes in, I cannot help but support it because I have to protest some of the actions that have been taking place. I have no one to speak on my behalf so I have to speak for myself, as much as I hate to do this. But certainly I will vote for the motion as a protest, as also the leader of the NDP has indicated.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister when speaking to this resolution covered a number of points and then subsequently got up and made a special point after, tending to indicate that there had been a deal. This was a clear inference that the Minister tried to leave. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one thing clear. I don't make deals. I have never made any deals and I won't make any deals when I'm the leader of a party, and there was no deal made. That was a clear inference that he was leaving. My honourable friend brought up the subject. I have made it a point in the past, when a matter is discussed in confidence with me, I treat it as a matter of confidence. My honourable friend wishes to bring it up today, then I think I shall make the record clear.

He, as is his custom, invited me to his office along with the Leader of the NDP prior to the session to discuss sessional matters. My honourable friend the member from Rhineland says he should be invited and I think it's a fair claim on his part to do so. I didn't issue the invitation. In the course of that discussion the Leader of the House indicated that - in passing might I add - that this was going to be one of his possible proposals, the increase to the Leader of the Opposition to the level of a Cabinet Minister. This meeting, Mr. Chairman, was presumably somewhere towards the end of November or the early part of December. I don't have my 1966 diary with me otherwise I would have the complete details as well as the memo of the notes that I made when I returned to my office, because past dealings have indicated to me the value of making such memos. So the statement was made that this increase would be proposed and I said at the time that the problem insofar as myself was concerned was not the question of salary but the question of staff.

I will not go into the details as to other matters that were discussed as they don't directly concern me. The Leader of the NDP can speak about that himself. That was the one and only conversation I had on this subject. There was no subsequent conversation with me;

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... there was no deal; there was no acceptance on my part and no definite commitment from the government that it would do so. That was the sum and substance of the conversation. I might add that my honourable friend had with him his colleague the Attorney-General at that same meeting. That, Mr. Chairman, is the whole discussion that took place on this matter, and I want to make the record absolutely clear that there was no deal, and there won't be any deals as far as I'm concerned.

Now let's return to the specific discussion at hand. Mr. Chairman, I have never heard a government who speaks so much and a Premier who speaks as much about priorities as my honourable friend does, and I agree with him. One of the main functions of government today is that question of priorities, because it doesn't matter what we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds of places where we should be spending our money. There are demands upon us at every turn. I can look across from me, the chairs on the far side and around on my side, every member of this House can think of any number of places where we need to do more and where we should be doing more. And so surely the matter of priorities is one of the great matters before us in government. Mr. Chairman, I can't understand a government that feels that its first priority on being elected - and barely elected might I add - that its first priority then is to raise its own salaries. Now what sort of business is this. It's sheer mockery, mockery to the people of this province, mockery to the backbenchers on the far side, and I'd like to know how many of them were consulted before this move was made, how many of them approved of this motion.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the problems that face us in Manitoba, when we look at the needs of our province, when we look at Manitoba in relationship to the other provinces in Canada, we have to be realistic about our position. The First Minister can say that we are below Ontario, below Quebec, below B. C. so far as salaries to Cabinet Ministers. We're also a long way below those provinces, Mr. Chairman, in average income to our citizens.

Now I don't argue the point that if you're going to have people do a proper job you have to pay them properly. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to look realistically at the figures that were being paid in the Province of Manitoba. The Cabinet Ministers of this province - I believe there are 12 of them, I haven't counted them recently, it's a fast growing operation at times - are dealing, the First Minister says, with a budget of some \$350 million. Mr. Chairman, in Ottawa there are some 25 Cabinet Ministers, and as Cabinet Ministers they are being paid less money than the Cabinet Ministers of this province, because the Cabinet Ministers in Ottawa as a salary get \$15,000, as an expense account, \$2,000.00. Cabinet Ministers in Manitoba as a salary are going to get \$15,000, and \$3,000 expense account. I am speaking now of the Cabinet Ministers salaries. That is the exact figure. The other that they get is as a member of the House, true, in the same way as the members of the front row here get the same thing as their backbenchers or the backbenchers on this side. And so, what are the federal Cabinet Ministers dealing with? Well, a budget of \$9 billion. So if my honourable friend wants to discuss it in terms of the amount of budget, the amount of responsibilities, if he wants to go further he can compare it to the American, where 11 Cabinet Ministers in United States at a total salary of \$35,000 administer \$135 billion worth of public affairs.

But I think the real comparison, Mr. Chairman, must be made to the situation in the Province of Manitoba itself, and whether when we have a minimum wage of \$1.00 per hour, and whether when we have people in this province -- I meet with these people constantly in my daily activities. I think of taxi drivers - and I referred to this just recently - taxi drivers getting \$50.00 a week salary, if they're lucky; another \$15.00 a week in commissions and tips, having to live on that and support a family. When we look at the average income of people in this province, I can't think of a government that would apply its priorities immediately after election to the raising of Cabinet Minister's salaries. The proper place to discuss it, Mr. Chairman, is in this House. I think the problem with the government of this province is that it's lost touch with the realities of this province, and I think that when a certain member on the far side of this House who didn't run in the last election but recently made statements that the present government of Manitoba is run by a small clique of monied people who are completely out of touch with what the people in this province really have to face, made a very true observation. And that, Mr. Chairman, is what is facing this province.

My honourable friend can say all he wants about what other people are being paid. The fact remains, Mr. Chairman that the people who pay these things are the average taxpayers in this province and when we think that we have a plethora of governments in this province from school boards, to municipal, to Metro and a provincial government, and at each level we're

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... adding on more of this type of expense, I say to the government, review your priorities, because surely this one is totally out of line.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to apologize to Mr. Froese, I didn't realize he was standing and I really hadn't intended to participate in the debate, but in view of the fact that the medical profession and the undertaking profession had already been spoken for, I wanted to make the position of the legal profession quite clear and that if Mr. Paulley approaches me to draw his Will he'll have to pay for it.

MR. PAULLEY: I withdraw my offer.

..... continued on next page

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, the debate before us is to reduce the Ministers salaries to the previous level and then the principle would be taken up in the Legislature. Now it seems passing strange to me that when the estimates were prematurely released to the newspapers last week that this was a feature story that our leader was getting this huge increase of \$12,000 and the Leader of the NDP was getting a \$6,000 amount for his work as Leader of the Party, and in those stories, although I can't speak for the Leader of the NDP Party, it was indicated that our leader was happy to accept this, or words to that effect, and I would like to know when this information in the estimates was given to the paper if someone from that side indicated that our Leader was that happy to take it, because he certainly didn't say it to anyone in the press, yet it became a feature story. And while this will make the Honourable the First Minister, make his hackles rise, I'm suggesting to him that he is a very very clever politician, and he knows how to exert pressure, he knows how to get people into a bad light if at all possible, and this is what looked like happened on that occasion. The timing was perfect, the timing was beautiful. The Honourable the First Minister could sit back and leave our Leader decide how and when and what he should say in reply to this.

Now, he stated earlier, the Honourable the First Minister, that his cabinet had made this decision back in September and he made no bones about it, he's going to stick with it, if I understood him correctly. He made no bones about it that no matter what happens in this House he's going to stay with that decision. In other words, it shows his contempt for this Legislature.

At the time that the Roblin administration introduced the pension legislation, the famous pension legislation in 1965 to compensate his ministers for their terribly hard labours in their field, at least he had the candor at that time to have it presented in the House, and it was debated - and it was a pretty tough debate as I recall - but I admired him at that time for at least presenting it in the House. Well if it was right then, why isn't it right now? It was defeated in the House, or rather I shouldn't say it was defeated, he withdrew it, which is the same as a defeat. He thought better of it. He didn't stay with it then as he says he's going to stay with his cabinet minister's salaries increase now. So I wonder why the departure from the principle of '65, although it was ill advised --- I think everybody knows that now -- but why the departure of the principle on this pension legislation introduction in '65 to his cabinet ministers' increase in '66. He has told us that it was their decision that there had to be an upgrading of salaries for senior civil servants and cabinet ministers - all of a sudden in September of '66. There was a session earlier in the year - it ended in May. Was not the need then? Was not the cost of living on the way up then? Could it not have been discussed then? No, because there was an election coming; because there was an election coming. I'm sure he knows in his heart that had he proposed the increase in the House before the election, I know he wouldn't have proposed an increase of about 50 percent, which is what it works out to -- from 12.5 to 18 and part of the 18 is tax free. And at the same time responsible leaders in our country, both provincial and federal, are calling on leaders of industry and leaders of labour unions to exercise some restraint in the matter of increases in wages to try and relate any increases to productivity. Can my honourable friends say opposite that they related their increase to productivity? Probably they can with press releases, but about the only positive action they have taken since June 23rd is the increasing of their own salaries. And am I correct in assuming that they made it retroactive for three months? Is that right? I think it is.

And I said before that the Honourable the First Minister is a pretty clever politician and he knows how to exert pressure. Well he's exerting some pressure on his own back bench, I would suggest, when he puts in the estimates an item for a minister without portfolio. He has a full cabinet now of what? -- 12? I believe the United States - they call them secretaries down there - I believe they run 131 billion dollar budget with 10 secretaries. So here we have in the Province of Manitoba with less than a million people and a budget of 350 odd million, we have 12 cabinet ministers. And there's something in the estimates now for one without portfolio. So what are the 20 or the 19 backbenchers saying to themselves right now? I'd better stay in line, it could be me. Isn't that right? Isn't that right?

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. JOHNSTON: Isn't that right? You've silenced them with what I call a bribe?

MR. LYON: Are you preaching for a call?

MR. JOHNSTON: No I am not. It won't be that kind of a call that I'll be sitting there ever.

MR. DESJARDINS: You'd get it if you would shut up.

MR. JOHNSTON: So, I'd like to quote some statements made by one of the ministers in this government, and this was December 19th, the statements were made I presume. The newspaper is dated December 20th and it's a Canadian Press report. This minister is very upset because in Ottawa they brought in a mini-budget to finance the supplementary allowances to the old age pension. And what did he have to say at that time when he was asked if he had any criticism to offer? And I quote. This is the article: "The Federal Government has created an unfortunate situation by implementing tax increases when the report of the Carter Commission on taxation may recommend new and dramatic changes in taxation methods. Sidney Spivak, Manitoba Industry and Commerce Minister said Monday night. He said, 'the extra \$30.00 for needy pensioners would also contribute to further inflation. It is obvious that the budget has not been prepared for anti-inflationary reasons but rather just to raise money', he told a reporter, 'but the side effects will definitely be inflationary'. How can someone who has taken a \$5,500 increase for himself a couple of months before talk this way about people who are living on limited incomes.

So, Mr. Speaker, when this comes to the vote, it's going to be very interesting to see how the 19 or 20 would-be ministers on that side vote. After all there's pressure on them, I know it, and we will await this vote with interest.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen representing three different categories have made themselves known and offered their services -- the Minister of Education as a medical doctor, the Member for St. Boniface as a funeral director and my friend from Inkster as a lawyer. There's a fourth category. I happen to be a member of the Board of the Funeral Planning Association, which advocates simple unostentatious inexpensive funerals . . . and if it is the desire of the House I can have application forms for membership for each one of the members in here tomorrow at the session at 2:30 o'clock. I might as well put in a little plug. The membership for this Association is only \$3.00, that's once and for all, whether you are ten years old or a hundred - (Interjection)- or a cabinet minister.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one correction. In my very limited experience sitting in the House there is a tendency on the part of the opposition to continually attempt to confuse the issue before the House in a very unclear manner. They make one statement and then bring in something else and then try and tie it together in some very loose way for the purpose of attempting to gain for themselves some recognition. -(Interjection)- Oh I can explain and I will, as the House proceeds in time. I will now in connection with the statement that was made. The Press report was inaccurate; I did not make that statement. Let me make my point, I stated in the examination by the reporter or the question by the reporter, that in my opinion at the time the mini-budget was presented, there was a suggestion prior to that by the finance minister, that in terms of the budget it would be tabled in the House and brought in the House at the time and it would be brought in as a measure that would in fact relate to the economy of the country at the time. It would either be a deflationary measure and it would in fact, at the same time realize sufficient monies to be able to pay for the old age pension increase that was going to be brought forth before the House. But the truth of the matter is this, that there were two ways in which this money could be raised, one was straight taxation, the other was taxation and a sales tax, which would increase pricing, and the alternative was a choice or the choice was that of the finance minister. He made the choice in two ways; an increase of taxation at one level and at the same time an increase in the sales tax which of course has had its repercussions since that time and it has as a matter of fact, increased prices considerably in some areas beyond the one percent. But I at no time suggested in my remarks to the reporter that the \$30 that was given to the old age pensioner was not due at all or was in fact not deserving to him. This is incorrect. And the suggestion that's been made, which is I suggest to you the improper way of use of the article, is the feeling that in effect there was any suggestion on my part at all to take away from what I think was the entitlement of the old age pensioner to receive an adjustment because of the increased cost of living, which in fact I suggest has further been increased by the measures that were taken by the finance minister in his budget.

MR. CHERNIACK: in view of the fact that I or others may have an opportunity to quote the honourable minister who just spoke, could I get clarification on how he pictures the impact of a sales tax will be on cost of living and on the cost of goods, the prices that the consumer has to meet.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister for Industry and Commerce spoke rather sorrowfully I thought that perhaps I had taken him out of context. If he would like I will read him the article and table it, if that would satisfy him. "The Federal Government has created an unfortunate situation by implementing tax increases when the report of the Carter Royal Commission on taxation may recommend new and dramatic changes in taxation methods, Sidney Spivak, Manitoba Industry & Commerce Minister said Monday night. He said the extra \$30 a month for needy pensioners would also contribute to further inflation. It is obvious that the budget has not been prepared for anti-inflationary reasons but rather just to raise money, he told a reporter, but the side effects will definitely be inflationary. In one sense the provisions of the budget are good because the older people will have more money but that money will be put right back into the economy he said. I am not saying however, that the finance minister could have done anything other than he did." Would you like me to table the article? It's out of Tuesday, December 20th Daily Graphic. And before I sit down, I might say . . .

MR. CARROLL: Did you write it yourself.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, no, I did not write it. It has a CP dateline, Canadian Press. But I might say our honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce perhaps should take a seat beside the new, is it Attorney-General? --(Interjection)-- Mines and Natural Resources Minister, who seems to have the same difficulty and has had this difficulty for many years.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my colleague and deskmate who introduced this motion was careful to say that his objection did not raise primarily from the amount of the salary that is being proposed by the Honourable the Minister but rather from the method by which the salary increases were accomplished. I make no bones about the fact that I object on both counts, the size of the salary as well as the method by which it was accomplished. I agree completely with the criticisms that have been made of the method that was adopted and I do not need to rehearse the gory details of this operation.

My honourable friend the First Minister referred with some satisfaction to the editorial in the Co-operator. I read that editorial and I am not surprised that it gave practically the same kind of information that my honourable friend gave us tonight and used the same comparisons, because just a few days before that time my honourable friend the First Minister in attempting to explain the salary increases to the press had used those comparisons, had used those same figures, exactly the same examples, and it appeared to me that the Co-operator simply copied them out of what the Honourable the First Minister had said, and I'd just like to take a moment to look at some of those comparisons. I won't go through them all, but as I gathered from the remarks of my honourable friend the First Minister, he at least partially justifies these salary increases by the fact that other people get large salaries. I don't think that this is a sufficient justification, but even if it were, even if we could use that as a good basic argument, let us take the Chief Justice whom he mentioned, or the President of the University whom he referred to. There were others and I won't go through them all, but either of those honourable gentlemen has at least had to spend a long period in preparation for the position that he occupies.

I'm not unfriendly toward the position of the Cabinet Minister and I don't for a moment derogate from its importance, and I certainly think that they should have a reasonable and proper salary, but we have only to recognize the fact of a good many of the people who have occupied and are occupying those positions to realize that they have not served a long apprenticeship for holding those positions. The Chief Justice certainly has to be a graduate lawyer. I'm not usually accused of trying to build up the legal profession, but certainly they have to go through a pretty complete course these days. Usually, in spite of the exigencies that exist with political appointments to the Bench, we still find that in spite of that they have served a considerable length of time at least at the Bar, and usually with some distinction, and to be appointed Chief Justice usually means that they have been pretty eminent in their profession and have given some outside service as well. --(Interjection)-- Frequently public and frequently political - I admit that. I don't . . . --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- Yes, that can happen, but although I have much criticism of some of the methods by which patronage and partisanship are shown, I must say that, in general, I think a public career is useful on the Bench - a former public career I think is useful to a person that is going on the Bench - and while I have no hope of the honourable members who sit in the New Democratic Party ever achieving the Bench through the political route, because they will never have a

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) government at Ottawa to so appoint them --(Interjection)-- I must say that -- well there would really have to be political patronage to appoint any members of that Party. But if my honourable friends ever were in that position, then at least I think that they too would try to choose people that had a good career at the Bar, so surely we can concede that the Chief Justice has served a pretty long apprenticeship and the President of the University. Does my honourable friend the First Minister really suggest that Cabinet Ministers per se should be put on the position, the same position as the President of the University? Here is a case where a person really has to have an outstanding career.

Maybe you think that I am trying to be too unfriendly toward the politicians, Mr. Chairman, but I am not. I have been one for a long time. I have the highest regard for them in general, but we have got to be realistic and recognize the fact that some people get into the House with a very small amount of previous experience, a pretty small record of public service. As a matter of fact, one of the former Attorney-Generals of this province was described by an opposition member at one time as a nondescript lawyer whom the whirligig of politics had happened to cast into the exalted position of Attorney-General. I'm not applying that to the particular present Attorney-General. There is no reference there, but there are some accidents happen about people getting into positions, and it just isn't realistic, Mr. Chairman, to consider that the Cabinet Ministers, who generally speaking occupy their positions for a comparatively short time, should be considered as being in the same professional status as people such as the Chief Justice and the President of the University.

My honourable friend the First Minister uses this insecurity of tenure as one of the reasons why they should have a higher salary. I use the insecurity of tenure as one of the reasons why they should not have such a high salary, because to me it indicates that their incumbency of these positions is temporary, usually. Half of the present Cabinet were not in my honourable friend's first administration and that is only eight years ago. They just don't last long, and one of the reasons that they don't last long is because they do things like this, Mr. Chairman, so I see no validity whatever in the argument that my honourable friend the First Minister uses of trying to compare the salary with people in the positions of the Chief Justice and the President of the University.

Now like my honourable deskmate, one of my main complaints is about this co-called representation allowance. Now exactly what does that mean, Mr. Chairman? It means an expense account or an additional \$3,000 that is tax free, and someone asked - I believe it was my honourable colleague from Portage la Prairie - was this salary and representation allowance made retroactive. Can we have an answer to that during the --(Interjection)-- It was not made retroactive. Well then, we have that answered. But the fact that has already been mentioned by someone that to carve out another \$3,000 expense allowance when the Ministers already get their expenses paid, and then on top of that to take advantage of the legislation that exists in order to make that \$3,000 tax exempt, is to me something that legislators should not do and something where I completely agree with my honourable friend the member for Selkirk, that this is what gives the politicians, and through the politicians the governments in general a bad image in these days, and, Mr. Chairman, I think we must be more careful than we have been recently to try and so conduct ourselves that we do not give this bad image to the public because there is a breakdown, there is a tendency toward a breakdown these days in the respect that people have for their governments, and anything of this type which smacks of self-seeking, as my honourable friend has mentioned, or tax evasion, not illegal tax evasion that is true, but still a method of taking advantage of legislation that exists in order to evade taxes is, I think, against the best interests of parliamentary institutions. I agree with my honourable friend the member for Selkirk that as far as this particular portion of the increase is concerned, it just looks as though my honourable friends are determined that so far as the Cabinet Ministers are concerned, that they are going to get for themselves that pension, at least for awhile, that this House prevented them from getting a couple of years ago.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General and my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare were ardent advocates of that pension at that time, and I can remember that my honourable friend the present Attorney-General with his usual colorful phrases was constrained to designate any of us that were so backward as to oppose a forward move of that kind as belonging to the Neanderthal man age or something of that term. --(Interjection)-- The dinosaur - I believe that was right. Well weren't they kind of contemporaries anyway?

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) My honourable friend now by the back door seems to be bringing in something that he was prevented from achieving by the front door, and I agree completely with the honourable member who introduced the motion that these matters should be debated in this House. I am pleased to see that my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is inclined to support us on this particular motion, although . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, may I inform my honourable friend from Lakeside that I preceded the Liberals in my condemnation when it was first made public back last September.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am unaware, Mr. Chairman, as to wherein sits my honourable friend's point of privilege. Just because I say to my honourable friend that I am happy to know that on this motion that we are going to have his valued support, he for some reason or other decided that that's a matter of privilege and stands up to interrupt my few remarks.

MR. PAULLEY: All I want is to put you on the right track for once.

MR. CAMPBELL: And my honourable friend continues to interrupt me. He talks long and loud and to little point a great deal of the time and yet he thinks that it is necessary to interrupt me as well on what he chooses to term a question of privilege. Well now, regardless of my honourable friend's

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, my name was mentioned a moment ago as being a staunch advocate of the raise. I think my main contribution at that time was that we had to bury some of the people that sat with you in this House on welfare and I said it wasn't right.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend has no question of privilege either, Mr. Chairman - there is no question of privilege there. If my honourable friend wants to debate this question, however, I'm delighted to have my honourable friend get up and explain exactly what he meant because he usually has to explain things two or three times for it isn't too clear, but he was a great advocate of the pension. Yes he was - yes - and he did make the statement that, not that they had to bury them - he has gone further today than he did on the other occasion - not that they had to bury them but he said that they had had former members on relief was all. He didn't go the distance of burying them, and when challenged to tell us any case of where he had had such a Minister or member on relief, he was unable to do so which didn't surprise me at all. --(Interjection)-- No, that is correct and my honourable friend will get an opportunity to talk about this, and I would counsel my honourable friend not to adopt the method of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party of interrupting the speaker on the floor just because he has some of his words recalled to him that he stated in a moment of exuberance a year or two ago. He should possess his soul in patience on these occasions and just wait it out.

Well, now I was attempting to say, when I was more or less rudely interrupted, Mr. Chairman, that I am glad to note that we have on this occasion the esteemed and valued support of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party because we didn't have it so far as the pension plan was concerned.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I can rise on that.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend has no question of privilege, because we did . .

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend has not had the opportunity of listening to my point of privilege so how does he know whether I have one or not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because I am stating the fact that we didn't have my honourable friend's support on that occasion. That is known to be the fact, and because I refer to something that happened some time ago.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute falsehood.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, when my honourable friend uses the term "falsehood" then do you think you should ask him to withdraw it? This is -- Are you going to ask him to withdraw it, Mr. Chairman?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Maybe I can pour a little oil on troubled waters. I am sure that my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP party did not, in the parliamentary sense, mean what he appeared to say.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no.

MR. ROBLIN: And I think probably being a good parliamentarian, he doesn't require any urging from me to put the matter right.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sure this is right. I'm sure that when my honourable friend says that something is a falsehood, what he really meant was that he wished he hadn't said

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) what he said that other time, and I can understand that in that he's in exactly the same position as my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend will sit down until I have an opportunity

MR. CAMPBELL: If my honourable friend is going to withdraw the term "falsehood" then I would be glad to have

MR. PAULLEY: I have no intention while the Honourable Member for Lakeside is still on his feet. I think that my honourable friend has been in this House long enough to know that there are occasions when, in order to yield the floor for what he requests, it is necessary for him to first of all sit down.

MR. CAMPBELL: But my honourable friend having achieved the floor, forgot to withdraw did he, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend or you, Mr. Chairman, suggest that my saying that the Honourable Member for Lakeside stated in my opinion a falsehood, if you demand me to withdraw that, Mr. Chairman, then I have no alternative other than to withdraw it or to subject myself to your further discipline. Did you ask me to withdraw that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not made the ruling that the honourable member should withdraw the statement, but I do ask the honourable member and members of the committee to be careful of the language that they use in the House in order that I may not have to rule. The Honourable Member from Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I make the request that the honourable gentleman withdraw the

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if my honourable learned friend desires me to withdraw the term "falsehood", I so withdraw that term and substitute "a misinterpretation of the facts."

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that's a big improvement, Mr. Chairman, and I plead guilty to frequently, I am sure with a lot of the other members of this house, drawing a different conclusion from what my honourable friend says to what he thinks he says, and I will conclude if I may, Mr. Chairman, by simply saying that I agree with the motion. I oppose the salary as it stands on both grounds, both the way it was done and by the amount, and by the fact that I think even if the members of the government were going to take advantage of the opportunity that was there by the provincial legislation that permits them to accomplish this raise by Order-in-Council, and even if they were going to take advantage of the federal legislation that allows for it to be tax free, even if they were determined to do both of those things, that they still could have waited. It wouldn't have really hurt them so greatly to have waited until this House met, and in my opinion that would have been much the more honourable way to do it, when the House met.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this motion. Do you want me to proceed now or do you want to call it 10 o'clock and I'll speak tomorrow afternoon.

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

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

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

IN SESSION

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

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

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

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